## 1 IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA 2 JANET SOLANDER, CASE NO. 76228 Electronically Filed 3 Appellant, Apr 17 2019 09:32 p.m. Elizabeth A. Brown 4 vs. Clerk of Supreme Court **VOLUME XXI** 5 THE STATE OF NEVADA, 6 Respondent. 7 **APPENDIX TO APPELLANT'S OPENING BRIEF** (Appeal from Judgment of Conviction (Jury Trial)) 8 KRISTINA WILDEVELD, ESQ. STEVEN B. WOLFSON 9 Nevada Bar No. 005825 Nevada Bar No. 001565 CAITLYN MCAMIS, ESQ. **District Attorney** 10 Nevada Bar No. 012616 STEVEN OWENS The Law Offices of Kristina Wildeveld Nevada Bar No. 004352 11 & Associates Chief Deputy District Attorney 550 E. Charleston Blvd., Suite A Office of the District Attorney 12 Las Vegas, Nevada 89104 200 Lewis Ave., Third Floor (702) 222-0007 Las Vegas, NV 89155 13 (702) 671-2750 14 **AARON FORD** Nevada Bar No. 007704 15 Nevada Attorney General 555 E. Washington Ave., Ste. 3900 16 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 (702) 486-3420 17 Attorneys for Appellant Attorneys for Respondent 18 19

20

## 1 INDEX

2	VOL. NO.	DOCUMENT PAGE NO.
3	III	Amended Information filed February 6, 20180622-0637
4	XXII	Defendant's Proposed Jury Instructions Not Used at Trial filed March 12, 2018
5	III	Excerpt of Proceedings: Jury Trial – Day 1 heard February 5, 2018 filed August 28, 2018
7	Ш	Excerpt of Proceedings: Jury Trial – Day 2 heard February 6, 2018 filed August 28, 2018
8	I	Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order filed June 17, 2015
9	I	Information filed July 28, 20140001-0019
10	XXII	Instructions to the Jury filed March 13, 20185310-5363
11	I	Joinder to Defendant Dwight Solander's Motion to Suppress
12 13	XXII	filed January 22, 2018
14	I	Motion to Strike Notice of Expert Witness filed January 26, 20180192-0197
15	I	Motion to Suppress Evidence filed January 22, 2018.0145-0152
16	I	Notice of Appeal filed March 30, 20150071-0073
17	XXII	Notice of Appeal filed June 21, 20185491-5492
18	I	Opposition to State's Notice of Motion and Motion to Admit
19		Evidence of Defendants Janet and Dwight Solander's Abuse of the Foster Children in their Home filed
20		January 18, 20180128-0142
	I	Order of Reversal and Remand filed April 19, 20160081-0090

1		
2	I	Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus filed November 5, 2014
3	I	Recorder's Transcript of Proceedings: Calendar Call; State's Motion to Admit Evidence of Defendant Janet and Dwight
4		Solander's Abuse of Foster Children in their Home heard January 23, 2018 filed July 27, 20180156-0191
5	I	Recorder's Transcript of Hearing: Further Proceedings: Continue Trial Date heard January 29, 2018 filed August 28,
6		2018
7 8	II	Recorder's Transcript of Hearing: Further Proceedings: Continue Trial Date heard January 29, 2018 filed August 28, 2018 (continuation)
9	II	Recorder's Partial Transcript of Proceedings: Joinder to Defendant Dwight Solander's Motion to Suppress, State's
10		Motion to Quash Dr. Sandra Cetl's and Jacqueline Bluth's Subpoena Duces Tecum heard February 1, 2018 filed August 10, 2018
12	III	Recorder's Partial Transcript of Proceedings: Joinder to
13		Defendant Dwight Solander's Motion to Suppress, State's Motion to Quash Dr. Sandra Cetl's and Jacqueline Bluth's
14		Subpoena Duces Tecum heard February 1, 2018 filed August 10, 2018 (continuation)
15	XXII	Recorder's Transcript of Proceeding: Sentencing heard June 5, 2018 filed July 24, 2018
16	XXII	Sentencing Memorandum filed June 1, 20185375-5422
17	I	State's Bench Memorandum Pursuant to Court's Request Regarding Issue in Pretrial Writs of Habeas Corpus filed
18		October 15, 2014
19	I	State's Notice of Expert Witnesses [NRS 174.234(2)] filed January 4, 2018
20	I	State's Notice of Witnesses [NRS 174.234(1)(a)] filed

1		January 9, 20180125-0127
2	I	State's Notice of Motion and Motion to Admit Evidence of Defendants Janet and Dwight Solander's Abuse of the Foster
3		Children in their Home filed January 8, 20180097-0124
4	I	State's Opposition and Motion to Dismiss Defendant's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus filed November 19, 2014.0047-0052
5	III	State's Opposition to Defendant Janet Solander's Joinder to
6		Dwight Solander's Motion to Suppress Evidence filed February 1, 2018
7	III	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Strike the State's Experts filed February 2, 2018
8	I	State's Return to Writ of Habeas Corpus filed December 17,
9		20140053-0070
10	I	State's Supplemental Notice of Witnesses [NRS 174.234(1)(a)] filed January 22, 2018
11	II	Transcript of Proceedings: Evidentiary Hearing – Day 1
12		Excerpt heard January 31, 2018 filed February 13, 2018
13	II	Transcript of Proceedings: Evidentiary Hearing – Day 2
14		Excerpt heard February 1, 2018 filed February 13, 2018
15	III	Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial – Day 4 heard February 15, 2018 filed August 28, 2018
16	IV	Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial – Day 4 heard February
17		15, 2018 filed August 28, 2018 (continuation)0751-0845
18	IV	Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial – Day 5 heard February 16, 2018 filed August 28, 2018
19	V	Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial – Day 5 heard February 16, 2018 filed August 28, 2018 (continuation)1001-1172
20		

1	N/	Transporiet of Decoadings, Iver Trial Day 6 haard Eshenson
1	V	Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial – Day 6 heard February 20, 2018 filed August 28, 2018
2	VI	Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial – Day 6 heard February
3		20, 2018 filed August 28, 2018 (continuation)1251-1433
4	VI	Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial – Day 7 heard February 21, 2018 filed August 28, 20181434-1500
5	VII	Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial – Day 7 heard February
6		21, 2018 filed August 28, 2018 (continuation)1501-1706
	VII	Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial – Day 8 heard February
7		22, 2018 filed August 28, 20181707-1750
8	VIII	Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial – Day 8 heard February 22, 2018 filed August 28, 2018 (continuation)1751-1936
9	VIII	Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial – Day 9 heard February
10		23, 2018 filed August 28, 2018
11	IX	Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial – Day 9 heard February 23, 2018 filed August 28, 2018 (continuation)2001-2226
12	IX	Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial – Day 10 heard February 26, 2018 filed August 28, 2018
13	X	Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial – Day 10 heard February
14		26, 2018 filed August 28, 2018 (continuation)2251-2500
15	XI	Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial – Day 10 heard February
16		26, 2018 filed August 28, 2018 (continuation)2501-2552
16	XI	Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial – Day 11 heard February
17		27, 2018 filed September 18, 20182553-2750
18	XII	Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial – Day 11 heard February 27, 2018 filed September 18, 2018 (continuation)2751-2757
19	XII	Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial Day 12 hoard Echmony
20		Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial – Day 12 heard February 28, 2018 filed September 18, 20182758-3000
20		

1	XIII	Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial – Day 12 heard February 28, 2018 filed September 18, 2018 (continuation)3001-3076
3	XIII	Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial – Day 13 heard March 1, 2018 filed August 28, 2018
4	XIV	Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial – Day 13 heard March 1, 2018 filed August 28, 2018 (continuation)3251-3363
5 6	XIV	Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial – Day 14 heard March 2, 2018 filed September 5, 2018
7	XV	Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial – Day 14 heard March 2,
8	XV	2018 filed September 5, 2018 (continuation)
9	XVI	Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial – Day 15 heard March 5, 2018 filed September 5, 2018 (continuation)3751-3947
11	XVI	Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial – Day 16 heard March 6, 2018 filed September 18, 20183948-4000
12 13	XVII	Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial – Day 16 heard March 6, 2018 filed September 18, 2018 (continuation)4001-4149
14	XVII	Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial – Day 17 heard March 7, 2018 filed August 28, 2018
15 16	XVIII	Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial – Day 17 heard March 7, 2018 filed August 28, 2018 (continuation)4251-4379
17	XVIII	Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial – Day 18 heard March 8,
18	VIV	2018 filed September 18, 2018
19	XIX	Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial – Day 18 heard March 8, 2018 filed September 18, 2018 (continuation)4501-4601
20	XIX	Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial – Day 19 heard March 9, 2018 filed September 18, 20184602-4750

1		
2	XX	Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial – Day 19 heard March 9, 2018 filed September 18, 2018 (continuation)4751-4914
3	XX	Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial – Day 20 heard March 12, 2018 filed September 18, 20184915-5000
4	XXI	Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial – Day 20 heard March 12,
5		2018 filed September 18, 2018 (continuation)5001-5250
6	XXII	Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial – Day 20 heard March 12, 2018 filed September 18, 2018 (continuation)5251-5280
7		
8	XXII	Transcript of Proceedings: Jury Trial – Day 21 heard March 13, 2018 filed September 18, 20185294-5309
9	XXII	Verdict filed March 13, 2018
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		

Did you read -- before you interviewed these girls, 1 2 did you read Janet Solander's book? 3 No. I've actually never read her book. Okay. The fact that she wrote that book, does that 4 5 affect in any way how you would have interviewed the children 6 on March 11th? 7 No. I have no idea what was in the book because like 8 I said, I didn't read it beforehand. So but even if I did, it 9 wouldn't have affected anything anyway. I'm not sure what's in 10 the book. So but, like I said earlier, prior to doing a 11 forensic interview, I wouldn't look at, just like how I 12 wouldn't read articles in the news about a case, I wouldn't 13 read something like that that could potentially put other 14 information in my head. I just go off of what law enforcement 15 or CPS would provide to me as the allegations. 16 Okay. So on March 11th, did you care that Janet 17 Solander had written a book? 18 Α Not at all. 19 And then today, as you sit here, you know, four years Q 2.0 later, do you care that Janet Solander wrote that book? 21 I think it's irrelevant. Α 22 Okay. And you've never even read it? Q 23 Α Correct. 24 MS. BLUTH: Okay. Nothing further, Your Honor.

JD Reporting, Inc.

25

Thank you.

1	THE COURT: All right.
2	MR. FIGLER: Just based on that.
3	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
4	BY MR. FIGLER:
5	Q But you do admit that you received it four days
6	before the interview; correct?
7	A Whatever the date is on that email, yes.
8	Q And you forwarded it to at least three people the
9	morning before you did the interviews; is that correct?
10	A Yes.
11	Q And one of the people that you forwarded it to was
12	Kristina Bernat; correct?
13	A Correct.
14	Q And who was Kristina Bernat in March 11, 2014, to
15	you?
16	A Also a forensic interviewer.
17	Q Okay. And do you know that she was the interviewer
18	who interviewed the Stark girls in this related to this case?
19	A I don't recall who the Stark girls are.
20	MR. FIGLER: Okay. We have a stipulation, Your
21	Honor, that Kristina Bernat was the forensic interviewer who
22	interviewed Ivy and Autumn Stark in relation to this case.
23	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
24	MR. FIGLER: All right. I have no further questions.
25	Thank you.

1	THE COURT: Anything else, Ms. Bluth?
2	MS. BLUTH: No.
3	THE COURT: Do we have any juror questions for this
4	witness?
5	All right, ma'am, I see no additional questions.
6	Thank you for your testimony. Please don't discuss your
7	testimony with any other witnesses.
8	THE WITNESS: Okay.
9	THE COURT: Thank you, and you are excused.
10	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
11	MR. FIGLER: [Unintelligible]
12	Your Honor, all the defense exhibits have been
13	that were proposed with the exception of one have been
14	admitted. This defense has no further witnesses at this time.
15	So the defense would rest.
16	THE COURT: All right. Any rebuttal witnesses?
17	MS. BLUTH: No, Your Honor.
18	THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, we're
19	going to go ahead and take a brief recess just till 11:10. All
20	of the evidence has been presented in this case. After our
21	brief recess, the Court will read to you the instructions on
22	the law, and that will be followed by the closing arguments
23	from the attorneys. Once that is concluded, the case will be
24	submitted to you for your deliberations.
25	During this brief recess, you're all reminded you're

1	not to discuss the case or anything relating to the case with
2	each other or with anyone else. You're not to read, watch or
3	listen to any reports of or commentaries on the case, person or
4	subject matter relating to the case. Do not do any independent
5	research by way of the Internet or any other medium, and please
6	do not form or express an opinion on the trial
7	Let's go ahead and take until 11:15 for our break,
8	11:15 for the break. And as I said, when we come back, the
9	Court will read to you the instructions on the law.
10	Please follow the bailiff through the double doors.
11	(Jury recessed 10:58 a.m.)
12	MS. BLUTH: She just got done adding the attempts
13	on
14	THE COURT: Okay.
15	MS. BLUTH: So she said it should be less than, like,
16	two minutes.
17	THE COURT: Is she going to email it to Crystal to
18	print out?
19	MS. BLUTH: She's going to email it to me. I'm going
20	to email it to Crystal.
21	THE COURT: Okay. So we just have to wait then for
22	that?
23	MS. BLUTH: Yeah. It should be minutes.
24	THE COURT: And then you've added the attempt
25	instruction; right?

1	MC DITIBLE Voc
1	MS. BLUTH: Yes.
2	THE COURT: And all of the other instructions have
3	been changed?
4	MS. BLUTH: Yes.
5	THE COURT: All right. We'll just when we get
6	those, Defense, State, just as we are numbering, just look at
7	those particular ones carefully so we make sure that the
8	changes have been made correctly.
9	MS. BLUTH: Yes. Yes.
10	THE COURT: All right. We'll just be on a brief
11	recess.
12	(Colloquy regarding scheduling)
13	(Proceedings recessed 11:02 a.m. to 11:15 a.m.)
14	(Outside the presence of the jury)
15	MR. FIGLER: Yeah, I'm just going over the latest set
16	cursory, but
17	THE COURT: Okay. Well, let's do it all together
18	because that's faster.
19	MS. BLUTH: Okay.
20	THE COURT: So make a copy for me and a copy for
21	yourselves, and then we can number them and get going.
22	MS. BLUTH: Yes.
23	(Pause in the proceedings)
24	MR. FIGLER: Are we on the record yet?
25	THE COURT RECORDER: We are.
	JD Reporting, Inc.

THE COURT: No. She's making the copies.

MR. FIGLER: I'll just raise this right now if you want to wait for Ms. Bluth to come back, but just for the record we --

THE COURT: Okay. Wait. Are we --

THE COURT RECORDER: Yeah, we're on.

MR. FIGLER: For the record, Your Honor, the State has reintroduced the mental suffering language into the averments.

THE COURT: Right.

2.0

MR. FIGLER: -- of the Information in the instructions, and that was done over our objection. That was already noted. So we don't have to reargue it. The defense objects because, A, we believe that there would be a prejudice, but also that that would necessitate the filing of an amended -- a second amended information which was not done in this case, and there is now a discord between the last filed Information and that Jury Instruction Number 2 to the jury, and again that is over our objection on both counts. So just submit it. We don't need to argue it until Ms. Bluth gets back. I just wanted to raise that to the Court.

THE COURT: We figure we might end by 4:00.

MR. FIGLER: Maybe.

MR. HAMNER: No. Respectfully, no.

THE COURT: At this point. I mean --

1	MR. HAMNER: Possibly over 5:00.
2	THE COURT: What's that?
3	MR. HAMNER: Possibly over 5:00.
4	THE COURT: Well, like I said, the jurors all know
5	they may have to stay past 5:00 for closings.
6	(Ms. Bluth entering)
7	THE COURT: All right. We're going to go through
8	everybody's got their packet and number.
9	MR. FIGLER: No. Ms. Bluth this still getting hers.
10	MS. BLUTH: Yeah. I just wanted to
11	(Pause in the proceedings)
12	THE COURT: All right. Do we all have the packets?
13	Everybody ready?
14	MS. BLUTH: Yes, ma'am.
15	THE COURT: All right. Number 1, It is now my duty
16	as Judge.
17	2, If in these instructions.
18	3, An Information is but.
19	MR. FIGLER: And then that's the one we have our
20	objection to now.
21	THE COURT: Right. You guys need to file a corrected
22	superseding amended
23	MS. BLUTH: Amended.
24	THE COURT: to conform to the instruction.
25	MS. BLUTH: Got it.

1	MR. FIGLER: And our objection to that is noted;
2	right?
3	THE COURT: Yeah.
4	MR. FIGLER: Okay.
5	THE COURT: I mean, it's on the record.
6	MR. FIGLER: Great.
7	THE COURT: 4, To constitute the crime charged.
8	Are you fine with the location of the reasonable
9	doubt instruction?
10	MR. FIGLER: That's fine, Your Honor.
11	THE COURT: All right. So that would be 5.
12	6, You are here to determine.
13	7, The evidence which you are to consider.
14	8, The credibility or believability.
15	9, A witness who.
16	They've got the where did you put the It is a
17	constitutional right of a defendant?
18	MS. BLUTH: I thought I
19	MR. FIGLER: It's a little later back, but it's
20	definitely in there.
21	THE COURT: Okay. So you're fine with the location?
22	MR. FIGLER: Yeah, it doesn't matter.
23	MS. BLUTH: We can definitely move it up. I
24	didn't whatever you guys want.
25	THE COURT: Okay.
	JD Reporting, Inc.

1	MR. FIGLER: I'll leave it to the Court's
2	THE COURT: Well, Adoptive parents, that's in the
3	wrong place.
4	MS. BLUTH: Where is it?
5	THE COURT: That you put
6	MS. BLUTH: Oh, yeah. No, agreed.
7	MR. FIGLER: All right. So the one I last left off
8	here, Your Honor, was 9, A witness.
9	THE COURT: Right. I'm going to put that before, It
10	is a constitutional okay. So next up, I just went to the
11	back because that's what I did.
12	10, A person who commits a sexual penetration.
13	MR. FIGLER: Okay.
14	THE COURT: All right. 11, An act done with intent
15	to commit a crime.
16	MR. FIGLER: Okay.
17	THE COURT: 12, Physical force.
18	13, A person is not.
19	14, Submission is not.
20	15, There is no requirement.
21	16, It is a defense.
22	MR. FIGLER: Oh, if we could just for a second, Your
23	Honor, I just want to make it very clear for the record, since
24	we weren't doing it numbered yesterday, that the defense had
25	objections to the cumulative 12 through 15 being introduced,

1	and we had offered some alternate language. That's all. I
2	just want to make that clear.
3	THE COURT: 17, Where a child has.
4	MR. FIGLER: Oh, sorry. Please hold.
5	Okay.
6	THE COURT: 17 18, A person who.
7	19, If you find.
8	20, Corporal punishment.
9	MS. BLUTH: Do you want to put adoptive there after
10	that?
11	THE COURT: Okay, yeah. Let's make 21 from the
12	back it's way in the back Adoptive parents have the same
13	rights as natural parents.
14	MR. FIGLER: Can you hold on a second, Judge. There
15	we go. We found it.
16	MS. BLUTH: That'll be 21.
17	MR. FIGLER: Thank you, Your Honor.
18	THE COURT: That will be 21.
19	22, As used in these instructions.
20	23, In order to use.
21	24, A person who attempts I'm sorry, A person who
22	unlawfully.
23	25, Battery means.
24	26, Any person who.
25	27 is the statute: If the State has failed to prove

1	beyond a reasonable doubt that the assault occurred between May
2	22nd and May 22nd, 2014
3	You're fine with this one?
4	MR. FIGLER: Uh-huh.
5	MS. BLUTH: It was actually May 23rd, but do we
6	care?
7	THE COURT: What's that?
8	MR. FIGLER: No.
9	MS. BLUTH: Nothing.
10	THE COURT: It's fine?
11	MS. BLUTH: It's fine.
12	THE COURT: Okay. 28, The Department of Family
13	Services.
14	All right. 29, Evidence that the defendant.
15	30, You may have heard testimony.
16	31, It is not necessary.
17	32, It is a constitutional right.
18	33, Although you are to consider.
19	34, In your deliberation.
20	35, During the course of this trial.
21	36, When you retire.
22	37, If during your deliberation.
23	And 38, Now you will listen to the arguments of
24	counsel.
25	All right. The verdict form I believe has been
	JD Reporting, Inc.

changed at the request of the defense, and those have been 1 2 added as the alternatives. 3 Any objection to the verdict form as redone? 4 MR. FIGLER: No, Your Honor. 5 THE COURT: I guess that's it; right? Okay. 6 MS. BLUTH: Yes. 7 Okay. Kenny, bring them in. THE COURT: 8 MR. FIGLER: And Ms. McAmis will have time to set up 9 her computer before because we're taking that break; right? 10 Well, okay. It's 11:30. It's going to THE COURT: 11 be noon by the time I read these, and if --12 MR. FIGLER: Okay. We're good. 13 It's an hour. We've got sandwiches. THE COURT: 14 I'm thinking around 1:00 we'll take a lunch break. They'll go 15 in the back and eat their sandwiches. The bailiff keeps the 16 door open so they don't start talking and normally would be, 17 like, right there. So we make sure they're not starting to 18 talk about the case. 19 MR. FIGLER: Thank you, Your Honor. 2.0 And then you guys would do yours roughly THE COURT: 21 then around 2:00. 22 MR. HAMNER: Yeah, mine will be a little longer than 23 an hour just as a heads up. 24 THE COURT: I knew that.

JD Reporting, Inc.

Sorry.

MR. HAMNER:

25

(Pause in the proceedings)

2.0

(Jury entering 11:29 a.m.

THE COURT: I'll see counsel at the bench.

(Conference at the bench not recorded)

THE COURT: The record should reflect the presence of the State through the deputy district attorneys, the presence of the defendant, Ms. Solander, along with her counsel, the officers of the court and the ladies and gentlemen of the jury.

Ladies and gentlemen, as I told you before the break, in a moment I am going to read to you the instructions on the law. It is important that I read these instructions exactly as they are written. I am precluded from trying to expound upon them or clarify them in my own words in any way.

You will have a number of copies of these written jury instructions back in the jury deliberation room with you so that you can refer to them throughout your deliberations. Each instruction has been numbered for your convenience and ease of reference.

(Reading of the instructions not transcribed)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, Instruction

Number 3 then sets forth all of the counts of the Amended

Information that were previously read to you at the beginning

of the case. It sets forth all 46 counts. I'm not going to

reread those to you at this time, but you are advised that they

are all here and you're to follow them in your deliberations,

and they are all a part of Instruction Number 3.

(Resumes reading the instructions)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, that concludes the instructions on the law. Is the State ready to proceed with their closing argument?

MR. HAMNER: Yes.

2.0

THE COURT: And, ladies and gentlemen, because the State has the burden of proof in this case, they both open and close the closing arguments.

Mr. Hamner, you may proceed.

MR. HAMNER: Thank you very much. If we could just cue over.

(Closing argument for the State)

MR. HAMNER: Why not just let us go to the bathroom? If you just let us, none of this would have ever happened. Those were the words of Amaya Solander during this trial when she shared with you just her feelings on everything that was going on in this house. Because, ladies and gentlemen, this world that these three little girls lived in was a world of abuse created solely by Janet Solander due to her irrational obsession with toileting and food, just the basic abilities to just do things like using the bathroom were completely taken away and created all of this, and Amaya expressed her frustration about this.

And before we get into kind of the specifics of the

counts, there's a couple of instructions I want to go over.

One of them is direct and circumstantial evidence. Now, you
may have remembered weeks ago the Judge gave you this kind of
discussion about the rain. Do you remember this rain story?

Maybe you did, maybe you didn't, but it kind of goes, like,
this.

2.0

Let's say one day you are kind of getting ready to go to work. You start seeing storm clouds gathering; right? You kind of get into your car. You can feel humidity in the air. You hop in your car. You're hearing on the radio that a storm is coming. You're driving, and as you start to drive to your house, you start to see little droplets of water hit your windshield. You get out. You're getting literally wet from all of the rain you go into your house.

If you are called as a witness, you could testify, you know what, I saw the rain because of the things that you were seeing with your own eyes. That, ladies and gentlemen, is an example of direct evidence. It's someone who's got personal knowledge of something they've actually seen with their own eyes, but that's not the only type of evidence you get to consider. The other is circumstantial evidence, and so the way this rain story kind of goes is something like this.

You're getting ready for work; right? You hear on the radio, you know, a storm is coming. You don't see the rain. You kind of come outside, and you see the storm clouds

gathering, but you don't see the rain. You're driving. You can hear thunder rumbling. You don't see the rain. You get to your house. It's not raining yet. You go inside. You close your door. Maybe about an hour later you still don't look out your windows. When you come back outside the clouds have parted. The sidewalk looks as it's been soaked with water. You can see in the gutter there's this stream of water. The car which you left outside has little beads of water drops everywhere, but you never saw the rain.

2.0

If you came to the conclusion, you know what, I think when I was inside it rained because of all those little things, those little things, that's circumstantial evidence. It's a proof of a chain of facts and circumstances which in this case would tend to show whether the defendant is guilty or not, but here's what's really important. The law makes no distinction between the two. One is not necessarily better than the other, and you get to rely on both which is really important because you've got tons of direct evidence.

I mean, you've got I don't know how many children and even her own daughter that saw many things with their own eyes, but then there's a lot of other pieces where you can connect dots about what kind of happened in this house for these number of years, but this is a really important instruction.

Common sense is also critical. Listen, you don't leave it at the door, okay. So please use your common sense

because it's really important when we're evaluating kind of the reasonableness of certain things that were done in this case.

It's critical. So please do that.

2.0

And one of the things with respect to the girls is this is kind of important just to get out of the way is try to understand how old these girls are in this house. This is the time frame that you heard from the testimony from all the different witnesses. From January of 2011 to November of 2013, these girls lived in that house, and you can see on the charging documents what their birthdays are -- Ava, Amaya, Anastasia.

What's really important for you guys to remember is, number one, they're not 18 years old, okay. And that's important for the child abuse counts because they have to be minors under 18. So you don't have to worry about that element with respect because we know, and it's not in dispute, all these kids were under 18. The other thing is they were all under 14 when living in this house, and that's particularly important when it deals with sexual assault of a minor under 14. It's not even close. They weren't even close to 14 in that house when these things happened. So just kind of keep that in mind.

Now, the way we're going to do this is I'm going to kind of take the charges kind of by crimes because they apply -- many of them apply to all three girls, and one of them

is sexual assault with a minor under 14. There are 11 sexual assault with a minor under 14, and here's kind of how it breaks down. Ten of them are dealing with when the defendant was inserting catheters into their genital openings, okay. Ten of them are about that. There's one sexual assault count, and it deals with Anastasia. It was when the defendant was frustrated about again another accident where she shoved a paint stick in this girl's genital opening, okay.

2.0

But, numerically, when you go back and you're looking on your verdict form, 7 and 8 are with respect to Ava; it's catheters. 19 was with respect to Amaya. There were seven times that we allege that she, Anastasia was sexually assaulted with a catheter, and that's Counts 30 through 36, and then there's Count 37 which is the stick, okay.

Now, how is it defined? A person commits sexual penetration upon a child under 14 when they do it either against the victim's will or under conditions in which the perpetrator knows or should know that this victim was either mentally or physically incapable of resisting or understanding the nature of it.

Now, what's important when you look at the elements of this crime, one of the things you don't see in here is that there needs to be an element that the State has to prove that the perpetrator is sexually gratified. That's not there. It says sexual assault, but that's not an element because the

purpose of this law is to protect people from having anything put into their genital areas without their consent. That's the goal of this, okay.

2.0

And what it talks about is that when you penetrate a child, under the statute, it's any intrusion, however slight, from either another person's body or any object that's put into the genital openings — in this case, that's the relevant part, genital openings — of the body of another. The law in your instructions even say that placing an object on or into the genital opening of another constitutes penetration, and the labia majora — we had a lot of talk with Dr. Cetl — is part of the female genitalia.

And that becomes really important because, you know, when we talk about colloquially what vagina means versus kind of biologically, you know, what we looked on that diagram that it's actually a hole, but as Dr. Cetl testified kind of in conjunction with what you are even seeing in this instruction is that once, ladies and gentlemen, you go beyond the labia majora, those big lips, you are going into the genital opening because what we've learned from the testimony is that the urethra, that urethra opening, is well within the genitals of a female.

No corroboration required. Now, Nevada lays out that there is no requirement that the testimony of a sexual assault victim be corroborated, that you are entitled that if you

believe any one of these girls just on their own, if Amaya got up here and you believed, you know what, I believe everything you said, and I believe it beyond a reasonable doubt, that's -- you're entitled at that point to find her guilty beyond a -- if you believe it beyond a reasonable doubt.

2.0

Now, you're entitled to look at corroborative evidence if you want, but there is not a requirement under Nevada law that, you know, someone else needs to see it, someone else needs to match it up, not with these type of crimes. There's no requirement of that. The nice thing is in this case is there's a lot of corroboration, and we'll get to it, but you don't have to if you don't want to.

Force is something not necessary. You know, sometimes we have an idea of what, you know, a sexual assault looks like in the movies and you're pinned down. That's not what the law says. The critical question is whether or not this is being done without this person's consent or under a situation that the perpetrator should have known that this person is either incapable of resisting or physically not able to give her consent. The key is consent. Did this person want this to be done to them?

The circumstances also matter. What the law says is that your age, your strength, the surrounding circumstances are all factors about whether you're evaluating whether or not in this case these three little girls were manifesting some sort

of opposition. I think when we've actually listened to the testimony it's abundantly clear that none of these girls wanted this done, but, of course, they were being subdued, you know, with threats of having vaginas cut out at a razor blade.

2.0

But there's two defenses, and one of them is the legitimate medical purpose defense, okay. So what the law says is that, listen, a person is not guilty of sexual assault if the penetration is for a legitimate medical purpose -- keyword on legitimate -- and a reasonable and good-faith belief that the penetration is for a legitimate medical purpose is a defense, but again it's got to be reasonable. It's got to be in good faith, and that's where things like your common sense are going to kick in. Because when we go through this, what becomes abundantly clear in this case is that there was no legitimate medical purpose. There was only an unreasonable belief that she was entitled to do this, and it was not done in good faith, but we'll cover it.

But, again, it's our burden. So, listen, if there's any evidence that presents that the penetration was for a medical purpose, we've got to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that it wasn't undertaken for that legitimate reason, and we'll happily do that.

Consent is the other one, okay. And in this case, listen, it's a defense if a defendant entertains a reasonable good faith belief that the alleged victim consented, but,

again, as we get into the facts, what becomes very clear is these kids were clearly manifesting either through yelling or squirming or fighting off that they did not want this to happen. So this is really not really going to be in play, but you need to know as a matter of law it's available to a defendant.

2.0

And, again, the belief has to be based -- if it's believed on ambiguous conduct or that the alleged victim was kind of basically consenting due to, like, force or violence or duress, that's not reasonable. So that's actually really applicable in this case because when you whip out a razor and you threaten to cut someone's pussy out -- because those are literally the words that were used -- that's not reasonable.

Submitting is not consent. So if this child is in such fear that they kind of lay back and just let it happen, you can't sit there and say, well, they just let it happen. So it's okay. Okay. That's not what the law says. That's not consent.

Exact dates aren't required. We can give you a time frame, and that's very clear. These girls were very clear that these things were happening when they lived in that Wakashan house which is within the window when they were clearly under 14 years of age.

So what do we have to prove? They're under 14. There is no dispute on that. Their genital openings were

penetrated. They didn't consent, and there was no legitimate medical purpose. So let's get to it.

2.0

Let's start first with Ava, okay. What did she tell us? She said you know what, I was on the towel. Janet had this catheter, and I told her I didn't have to use the bathroom, and she put it in me, and pee came out, and this happened more than one time, and that's the reason why there's two counts because she saying it happened more than once.

And she actually was able on the stand to delineate the two different times. She said the first time was inside the bathroom. She remembers telling us that, Me and Anastasia and I were all lined up, and we all went in there, and they could see what was happening to the other ones. That's what she was saying. I could see either after I was done what was happening to my sisters.

And then the second time she was saying, look, it happened up in the upstairs bathroom. She described to you, ladies and gentlemen, where it went and what happened. It went into my private area. Quote, I felt the tube stuck inside of me, and pee came out. And she said very clearly, and we kind of called her back, that she did not want this to be done to her.

She also did this. She also explained using that diagram that that was the area where it happened. The catheter went there, and Dr. Cetl told us this whole area is the genital

opening. Once you are past the labia majora --

MS. MCAMIS: Well, objection. Misstates the evidence.

THE COURT: Overruled.

2.0

MR. HAMNER: Like I said, as Dr. Cetl testified, once you are beyond the labia majora, once you start going inward at that point, you are past that genital opening because this is the beginning of it. The labia majora is the beginning. She even said, you know, you have to kind of -- you have to kind of part past it. Generally the labia majoras are closed, and you kind of have to spread it open. You have to go past the labia minora to get to the urethral opening.

Additionally, she even described that path that you had to travel beyond that because just putting the tip of a catheter up against the urethral opening is not going to do it. It has to go all the way up to the urethra and get into the bladder for urine to actually come out which is significant when we're talking about penetrating someone.

But another thing Ava did before she ever saw this was she described what it looked like, and you have your notes with respect to that. She described, you know, this is this bag, and it was clear, and it had a tube and, like, a tip, and she kind of described it, and then she took a look at this photo, and she said that's it. That's the catheter, which is interesting, folks, because we know from this trial where that

photo came from. It was sent by the defendant to her husband just days after they bought the catheter. And how do we know that? Because we have the email, and we'll get to it.

2.0

But that's significant for one of the victims that we have charged being a victim of sexual assault to recognize a photograph sent by the defendant to her husband of a catheter filled with urine. It's not empty, folks. That's urine.

MS. MCAMIS: Well, objection. Misstates the evidence.

MR. HAMNER: The State would submit that that's urine.

THE COURT: Well, and, ladies and gentlemen, it's up to you in terms of what -- I don't think there was specific testimony that there was urine, but it's up to you to draw whatever inferences you may draw from the evidence. This is -- again, the argument from the lawyers isn't evidence. The lawyers are just suggesting to you how you should interpret the evidence. At the end of the day, it's up to you folks collectively as to how you interpret the evidence that was admitted.

And let me just touch on this because it came up. From time to time, there may be objections that a lawyer has misstated the evidence. I may not remember, or I may remember incorrectly as to what the evidence was. So regardless of anything the lawyers may say or even what I may say, it is your

collective recollection of what the evidence was that should control in your deliberations.

All right. Go on, Mr. Hamner.

2.0

MR. HAMNER: And you know what, opposing counsel is correct. No one testified that that was urine, but the State will submit to you -- well, first the State will ask please use your common sense. The State will submit that's probably not lemonade. It ain't iced tea. Specifically, when you start looking at the timing of when that purchase of those catheters were made and when that email gets sent -- we'll get to it -- the State will submit that is absolutely urine, and it belongs to one of those three little girls. She's guilty of both Counts 7 and 8.

Let's go to Amaya. What did she say? She said, Well, one time I had to pee, and I guess she thought we were holding it, but we were scared to tell her. So she set a towel on the floor. Ladies and gentlemen, if you listen to just these facts, it's corroborative in a lot of ways. Once again, the second child says — relayed when they testified that the defendant had a suspicion that they were holding pee, same thing Ava said. Laying out of the towel, same thing as Ava said.

Janet said, quote, If I put this catheter in and you pee, you're going to get whooped. She used the catheter on me in my private part, and then she said, She made me go into Ivy

and Autumn's bathroom to do this. She also said I didn't want this done to her. What did she tell us? No. I just wanted to use the bathroom. I didn't want anything inside of me. And she made it clear Janet was the only one who put this in there. Dwight wasn't at home at that time. It was Janet.

2.0

She, like Ava -- and that's a typo there, but Ava also described where it went, and she also pointed to the urethral opening, and she also described what the catheter --

MS. MCAMIS: Well, objection. I think that misstates the testimony.

THE COURT: And, ladies and gentlemen, you're just reminded as to what your recollection was of the testimony. I remember it the way Ms. McAmis did, but my memory could be wrong. So, again, it's your recollection as to what the testimony was that should control in your deliberations.

MR. HAMNER: Well, think about your notes about where she pointed out on that demonstrative. Where was the area that she was circling? The State will submit it was in this general area, but she also described what a catheter looked like before she saw that photo, and when she saw the picture, she also recognized it. And the State will submit to you at this point based on her testimony alone defendant is guilty on Count 19. So you can check it off.

Let's go to Anastasia, and there are a lot for Anastasia, and this is kind of how they break down. Two of

them were with respect to being assaulted in a bedroom. One of them was with respect to being in a bathroom, and four of them was with respect to being in the loft, and she talked about these different locations. She said, One time was in Ava's room, often in the bathroom, more than one time, and I guess, folks, I apologize — oh, that's right. I misspoke when I was talking, but it's two in the bathroom and one in the bedroom.

2.0

And she testified often in the bathroom, more than one time, and then when she talked about the loft, she said it happened in the loft. It happened a lot. And on direct, she said it happened three to four times, and on redirect she specifically said it happened four times in the loft, and that's the reason why there are four counts with respect to the loft.

She even kind of gave kind of a general overall number. She said Janet put a catheter in me about seven to eight times which is the reason why there are seven charged counts of sexual assault. She explained why from her impression and observations why Janet did it. She said, If she felt we had pee in us, she'd take us into the bathroom. That's the same thing you are hearing from both of those other girls. She explained where it went, In my vagina. Janet stuck a catheter in us. She also talked about how she would try to fight her off and how she had to squirm, and she would have to take a hand and hold her down.

And we'll get to that battery with an intent charge because these facts overlap right into that charge, but we'll get to that.

2.0

I fought and I squirmed every time. She also talked about kind of the position. You had to be laid on the floor, on the towel. She would lay her down. She'd clean the needle. She'd clean my vagina, and she'd spread my legs, and she would insert the catheter in me. And she said, Every time it was penetrated and go in, the pee would come out.

But she also kind of talked about that kind of restraint, you know, holding open the leg and having one hand pressed against the leg, and she said this holding down happened about every time, but she also described what it actually started to feel like. She said it would be in there for about 25 or 30 seconds. She said, you know, for as long — it would be in for me as long as the pee was kind of coming out, and then Janet would take it out.

And she also on cross-examination when asked, Well, how did it feel, she told opposing counsel she was, like, It burned when it was in me, and I screamed, and she said that this was — it would become, like, a punishment. We got in trouble if urine came out, and then she'd kick us or grab us. She almost threw me off the stairs once. She even threatened to throw me off the balcony. These were the things that this woman would do upon — after putting a catheter in, this was

the aftermath if pee came out.

2.0

And she described it. She said, you know, there were clear bags with measurement numbers, and there was like a little needle, and then she, you know, she did that before she ever saw the photo, and, again, she also recognized it.

And she also talked about, and not all the girls do, but Anastasia kind of talked about that razor and how it kind of led her to kind of submit because of the threats that she was making. She talked about how scared she was, and so we would submit because she laid out the different rooms that it happened and the different places, the sensations [unintelligible]. Just based on her testimony alone, the defendant is guilty of Counts 30 through 36, and you can check them all off at this point.

Now, I mentioned that there were defenses right, two defenses. There was, based on this evidence, there was absolutely no defense to what she did. She had no right or reason to do this, none of these girls consented. So that's not available to her. There's nothing about their conduct that would lead her to believe, yeah, this seems, okay. They want this done. So that's out the door. She made them submit using a razor blade. That should give you -- when you're thinking about circumstantial evidence, think about that for a second, that the only way you can get it done is by whipping out a razor blade and threatening to cut out private parts.

And here's the thing. There is no legitimate medical purpose to do this, none. No doctor recommended that the defendant do this. How many doctors did we hear from today? When did you hear that testimony? It didn't happen. And here's the thing. She should've known. She should have known, but I'm not done with the legitimate medical purpose.

What did Dr. Mileti tell us? I would not recommend a parent to administer a catheter on a child even if it was in a situation of deliberate holding. I wouldn't do it. Her belief, if they get up -- her belief can't be reasonable or in good faith because there is no records of anyone telling them to put in a catheter, not a single doctor recommended it.

And here's the thing. Think about all the visits those kids had. Think about all the visits those kids had where they're complaining about bowels or urination. In all those visits, not a single actual medical doctor said you know what we really need to do right now, we need to put a catheter in just to check it because it's medically necessary. That never happened.

MS. MCAMIS: Well, Your Honor, can we approach, please.

THE COURT: Sure.

2.0

(Conference at the bench not recorded)

MR. HAMNER: -- things up. We do know that some of those girls had to be put under for colonoscopies and things

like that and were hospitalized where there were some procedures that were done. So presumably there may have been a catheter administered at that point, but what I'm talking about, ladies and gentlemen, is when she's going in for all these visits, you know, Doctor, oh, there's so much pain. It's just crazy. You know, the bowels are out of control. I mean, you remember all that? Not a single doctor did it, and that's significant because they're the ones that went to medical school. They're the ones with the training and the expertise and the background, and they're not doing it.

2.0

And here's the thing. And here's another little note. Maybe some of you might be thinking, well, I mean, you know, the catheter was used for its intended purpose; right? I mean, if she wanted to check for urine and it was done for that reason, so I guess that's okay, the State will submit to you that's irrelevant because here's the reason why. Because no one is telling Janet Solander that you need to check these girls' bladder for a legitimate medical purpose, and that's what's important.

The State is not sitting here and saying that she abused the catheter outside of its intended purpose. What the State is saying is that she had no reason to do it in the first place. She had no right to do it, but we know the reason why. She wanted to do this because she wanted to know if they had pee because she was obsessed. She was obsessed. Ladies and

gentlemen, wanting to know if your children have pee in their bladder isn't reasonable, good faith belief and nor is it a legitimate medical purpose, but that was the basis.

2.0

Here's a suggestion. If you want to know if your kid's got to pee, let them go pee. Let them go use the bathroom. That's it. Don't beat them for it. Don't hold -- restrict the bathrooms. Don't lock the bathroom doors. That's a simple solution. That's a reasonable solution if you've got such a curiosity.

And just to be clear, this was in no way the voiding of the bladder that was discussed by Dr. Stephen. There was some line on cross-examination, Well, I mean, you talked about voiding the bladder. Well, I got up on redirect and said, Doctor, please explain to me, What's voiding the bladder? Oh, well, that's just if a kid needs to go to the bathroom you let them go if they feel the need. Shoving catheters in their genital openings is not what -- that was not the doctor's recommended practice for voiding the bladder. It was simply just let them go to the bathroom, but she didn't follow that. She didn't want to do that.

This is also relevant. Janet, the nurse, the evidence is pretty clear that Janet told everybody that she was a nurse to virtually everybody. There's evidence that she was a registered nurse, a Lieutenant Colonel. Janet was never an actual nurse. She never provided any proof to DFS. Even her

own daughter admitted, Yeah, my mom didn't do nursing work. I never saw any degrees around the house. You know, she did administer some physicals and drug tests.

2.0

And this is significant. It's significant because if the defendant is not a doctor and she's not a registered nurse, she can't make a call whether there is a legitimate medical purpose for a catheter. It's not reasonable, and it's not legitimate.

But there were some other comments in the opening about the sexual assault charges, and again, as the Judge noted, you know, nothing we say in closing or openings is evidence, but I still note it because it was significant when I heard it. One of the things that was said was that there would be no credible evidence of a sexual assault. This was a distraction from the important task at hand. It's about word choice and a narrative that's being spun, and another thing, he said it was important for you guys to determine what is verified and what is not, and what is innuendo and what is true.

You may not even remember ever even hearing it, but I took it down because it just stood out to me. Here's the thing. This case, ladies and gentlemen, particularly these charges, does not rise and fall on just these kids. It can as a matter of law if you want it to, but that's not what it is. There's far more evidence because the catheter, a sexual

assault, they're corroborated.

2.0

What did we hear? And this is where we start talking about circumstantial evidence and connecting these dots. What about Autumn Stark. She lived in that house from November of 2011 to March of 2013. She remembers the girls being taken upstairs. She remembers Janet and Danielle being present. She remembers them threatening to use a catheter on one of the girls, and she said, you know, at the time, I didn't know what it was, but I thought it meant something to do with peeing.

That's significant because what dog does Autumn Stark have in the fight? She doesn't even really know what it is, but she remembers the threats. She remembers — think about the location upstairs in the bathroom. Where did all these girls say that that happened? Upstairs in those bathrooms. It's corroborative.

But you have the defendant's own daughter. She said they used them on the girls upstairs, all three of them. That was her testimony. I couldn't watch them do it to the girls. She saw the actual catheters --

MS. MCAMIS: Objection. Misstates the evidence.

THE COURT: It's overruled.

But again, ladies and gentlemen, it's your recollection as to what the testimony was from Ms. Hinton that controls.

MR. HAMNER: Please check your notes because I think

what happened is -- and this was interesting about Danielle. You know, Danielle sure said a lot to the police four years before; right? And when it came to some of the small stuff, she was willing to kind of sit here in this room and say, yeah, I saw these things, but when it came to the big things, big memorable things, she goes, oh, well, my memory is really fuzzy as I sit here now, but I definitively know I told the police about all of them, and I'm not saying to you that I was lying to the police.

2.0

That's an interesting sort of thing when we're evaluating Danielle because here's the thing. The State would submit to you who's she related to? Defendant. Who does she have to say it in front of? The defendant. Did we ever have a situation with any other children of the defendant when the defendant was around have some reluctance about talking about things that the defendant did? Yes. Ava, Amaya, Anastasia, and they told you why. We were scared. Who's the only person, the child -- of all the witnesses that we heard that still has at least as far as we know some connection to the defendant? Danielle Hinton.

The State will submit to you she was nervous sitting up here having to say all those things, but there was a lot of detail she gave, and she was not denying the detail she gave to the police. She said she couldn't bring herself to watch what her mom was going to do, and she said, I actually saw the

catheters downstairs, and I asked mom, What are they? Mom said, That's a catheter. She said Dwight and Janet would go into the bathroom and threaten them. She even then said later on, oh, the girls even told me about that. That was something she didn't tell the police, but she decided to say it up on the stand, but, again, it's corroborative.

2.0

Here's the other thing. We had physical proof they actually bought the catheters. Here it is. Dwight Solander purchases them on December 6, 2012, has them sent to Wakashan, and they're Bard brand catheters. Remember that date, December 6th. So days after ordering, the State will submit to you the defendant actually used it and then sent emails as proof. December 11th, five days later, from Janet to Dwight, and what's the subject line? 300 cc. That's an interesting subject line because if you look what the State would submit would be urine is almost up at 300 cc. And what's the brand name? It's Bard. It matches.

And this is just another example of how everything here is matching. Put them side by side, but you can just see the dates here, here.

So here's the thing. Here's what's significant about this. This wasn't just simply a threat. This wasn't simply an attempt, and here's how we know this. Aside from everything that the girls told us, let's just look at this evidence that's recovered from Dwight's computer. It came from his wife. The

State would submit this is urine, and it proves that she actually used it. This wasn't done to frighten. 300 cc. She's measuring it. She's telling Dwight this is how much I got out of one of these girls.

2.0

And here's the thing. You got to see when we had sergeant -- when we had Detective -- I think Detective Johnson, Zachary Johnson -- I might be getting the name wrong -- that's right. See, good. He went through email after email.

Remember all these emails that we got? Janet loved sending emails. Here's the thing. When did Janet ever send a photograph of something hypothetical? When did she just kind of attached something where she's just pontificating? This is what maybe urine might look like. This is what maybe underwear might look like. Go back. You'll have all the -- go flip through them. That's not what it was. Janet constantly was updating Dwight about all of the trials she's dealing with with her unruly children. She couldn't help herself.

And this is the coup de grace. I knew they were hiding that urine from me, and now I got it, 300 cc worth. That's the point of this, and that's how we know it wasn't just mere words. She was a woman of action. So let's move on. So she's guilty of all those catheter counts.

Inserting the stick in Anastasia. What did she say?

I was in the second house. I'm in the bedroom, Ava's old

bedroom she's even -- can even remember being kind of halfway

in a closet and halfway not. She says it's just me and Janet. I had to lie down, and she shoved a paint stick up my vagina. It went in this middle area, just not in the hole. She said the words between the labia minora. I think that's probably when she was looking at the demonstrative aid. And I felt the paint stick in between the labia minora, and she was trying to get it in, and then she stopped.

2.0

But here's the thing. She talked about it being in her for about 30 seconds, and she was even asked on cross, like, what did it feel like? And, boy, did she tell us. I felt the wooden paint stick in my vagina. So I could feel the wood. It felt hard and rough. I screamed and cried when she inserted the paint stick. She even explained how it came out. Well, how did it leave? She took it out, and it burned when it came out. I don't think it bled, but I didn't look. She was asked, well, did it bleed? Well, no, I didn't look because she was afraid she was going to get hit. That is the power this defendant had over these children.

She even took a look at the paint sticks that we recovered and was able to kind of show, look, it's not as long as the really long one, but kind of in between the shorter one and this long one, and she explained why it happened to her. She said I had an accident, and this was my punishment, my punishment, not a legitimate medical purpose, my punishment.

Again, with respect to the catheter, using it -- I'm

sorry. With respect to inserting a stick, this paint stick into her vagina, she had no right or reason to do this. She didn't want it, no legitimate medical purpose, no doctor recommended this, and she should've known better. She is guilty of Count 37.

2.0

So those are the sexual assault counts. Let's move on to battery with intent to commit sexual assault. This will move a little bit quicker. There's two counts because this witness testified it happened more than one time, the holding down part. Look, battery, all it is, it's wilfully using force upon another person, and wilful is being defined as, look, typically you have a purpose or a desire or a willingness to commit the act in question. Okay. So you want to use force or violence on someone else.

But here's what's important about force. It doesn't actually have to be violent. You don't actually have to cause any pain, and the long and short of it is just this: It can be an unwanted, an intentional and unwanted touching. So if you get touched and you didn't want to be touched, you could say, hey, that was a battery. You wanted to do that. I did not want you to touch me that way. That's it. I'm not hurt. You don't get the right to just put your hands on me and touch me in any way. That's really the thrust of this.

And what's important about this is, listen, when someone does a wilful, unwanted touching and there's a specific

intent to commit a sexual assault, you are guilty of this particular crime. And again, what's important about this is so the elements are going to be a purposeful unwanted touching on another person — that's Anastasia — with the intent to commit sexual assault. And again, it's not about being sexually gratified. It's about wanting to penetrate one of their genital openings. That's the key.

2.0

So what did we hear? Again, we talked about it so I won't go through it extensively, but she was talking about how she had to hold her down with her hand because she was fighting and squirming the whole time, and she kind of talked about it in more detail, holding on to the leg and being held down every single time, and she says essentially, like, when this would happen, when I was being held down, that's when the catheter would go into me, and that's how we know the specific intent. It was completed. Because when Janet would hold her down, she didn't just stop there. She actually completed the thing that she wanted to do. So we have a purposeful unwanted touching, holding her down.

On another portion of the element, it's Anastasia, with the intent to commit sexual assault. She wanted to penetrate her without her consent, and she indicated that this sort of holding down happened every single time. So find her guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. Find her guilty on Counts 38 and 39. It happened more than once. So check them off.

Assault with use of a deadly weapon. This is when Janet was threatening to cut out their vaginas with a razor. That's Counts 13, 23, 46. An assault is when someone either uses physical force or they kind of intentionally place another person in this reasonable kind of apprehension or this reasonable fear of being immediately hurt, okay. So you're either using -- you're trying to use physical force, or you do something that scares them thinking I'm about to get hurt. That's really all an assault is, okay.

2.0

On assault with a deadly weapon, here's the definition, and that's any instrument if it's used in its ordinary manner can cause substantial bodily harm. Think like a gun, okay, you know, if you ordinarily use it for its purpose. I think, you know, some people could argue a razor might be this, but I think a better definition for deadly weapon is any instrument under the circumstances in which is used or threatened to be used is readily capable of causing substantial bodily harm or death, and when you threaten, display a razor and say I'm going to take this and carve out your vagina, if that's the way it's being threatened, that is certainly a deadly weapon, and the way that Janet Solander was using the razor, it certainly, the way she was threatening to use it was capable of causing substantial bodily harm.

And here's the thing with use. You don't actually have to produce the harm because the goal of this crime is, on

one element of it, is to scare them. It's that reasonable apprehension of immediate bodily harm. So if you scare them enough, that's it. The crime's done.

2.0

So, look, here's the thing. All the girls described what happened to them with this razor. Some of them drew the razor. Some of them described it to you, and they all kind of described Janet's words and actions. Ava said she said, If I didn't quit moving, she would cut out my private part. Amaya said, If you pee on the towel, I'll cut out your private part and then laughed. Anastasia said, I'm going to cut your pussy out with this razor, and then she also talked about the videos because she even took it a step further and added videos into her kind of scaring Anastasia.

And they all talked about how Janet showed them the razor, okay. So we have the threats. We have the displaying, and they all were terrified. They all were really afraid of this happening, and they submitted. They all kind of, at that point — when it got to that point, they just let it happen.

And so here's the thing. Her threat to do this places them in reasonable fear of imminent bodily harm or immediate bodily harm. A razor is a deadly weapon based on the way she was using it. She used the razor by displaying it and just got them to submit to being sexually assaulted. So she is guilty for one Count 13, 23, 46. That's one for each girl. Check them off.

Now, there's one other instruction you have about the timing of an assault with a deadly weapon and the battery with intent, and what it basically says is that we needed to prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt that the assaults with the razors and the holding down of Anastasia happened within 2011 and 2014, between May and then July of [unintelligible] with respect to the battery intent.

2.0

And here's the thing. Here's how you can just not even worry about that. It's her email. Here's the thing.

What's the date on that? They bought that on December 6, 2012, and they sent it — she sent the email with the filled, what the State submits is filled full of urine on December 11th, 2012, well within that time frame because here's the thing.

She's not going to be threatening to carve out people's vaginas if she doesn't have the catheters yet; right? She's not going to be holding kids down if she doesn't have the catheters; right? And we know that the catheters were ordered in 2012, well within that window, and we know that we had a filled bag of urine or when you use your common sense, that's being sent back to Dwight showing him how it worked. So you're in the window. You're fine. We've proven it.

So let's talk about child abuse charges. There's kind of two kinds that we talked about. Some of them are physical. We're going to do those first. There's a few of those and then a lot more which constitute negligent treatment

or maltreatment. So child abuse when it's defined is when you cause a kid who's under 18 to suffer either unjustifiable physical pain or mental suffering as a result of abuse or neglect. That's child abuse or neglect or endangerment, okay, but we define this.

2.0

And another thing you have to know is some of these crimes is that if you find that there's child abuse, in some situations, you need to figure out if substantial bodily harm happened, and some of those apply in this case. So, for example, like the burns on Anastasia; that's going to be one that's a child abuse, substantial, and we'll get into what that all means, but most of the counts are just regular child abuse, but that are some that have this additional element of substantial bodily harm.

But Nevada defines abuse and neglect as either it's physical or mental injury of a nonaccidental nature. So it's not an accident. It can be either sexual abuse or sexual exploitation, and we're not dealing with that, but with respect to some of these other counts, it can be produced from negligent treatment or maltreatment under circumstances which indicate that a child's health and their welfare is being harmed or being threatened with harm.

A physical injury, because again here if you look up here and they talk about kind of a physical injury up here, we define it. That's going to be either a permanent or temporary

disfigurement or impairment of some sort of bodily function or organ of the body.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

What's negligent treatment or maltreatment? Now, this occurs if a child has been either abandoned, they're without proper care or control or supervision, or they lack subsistence, which is important when we start talking about withholding food and water, education, shelter, which is important we start talking about having children sleep on boards with no clothing basically and no blankets or pillows, medical care or other care necessary for the well-being of the child either because of the faults or habits of the person, which really isn't Janet's case, or just due to their neglect or really the refusal of the person to provide them because that's really -- that's really Janet's issue. She doesn't want to do certain things. It's not that she is forgetting. not because she's careless. It's because she deliberately does not want to do certain things with these kids or provide these kids certain things.

What's substantial bodily harm? It's either two things, okay. You can have — if you have a bodily injury that causes serious permanent disfigurement or a protracted loss, and permanent disfigurement is important because that's where we start talking about the scars, the scars that have been left for years. They're still there. That's where the substantial bodily harm comes with the stripes, the stripe counts because

you're going to have permanent or prolonged physical pain.

2.0

And that is defined as physical suffering or an injury that lasts longer than the pain immediately resulting from the wrongful act. So that's kind of like, look, if you get hit, yeah, you're going to have maybe some temporary pain, but if it starts lasting for hours or days or months afterwards, that's significant, and that's in particular when you start thinking about things like the burns. I mean, yeah, there is scarring. We know there's scarring, like the burns. When you think about when Ava's eye got smashed in the counter and it swelled shut and the pain that resulted from that. It didn't immediately go away, and that's really kind of how these kind of are at play in this case.

But, listen, there's a law about corporal punishment because corporal punishment is not against the law, okay. You can inflict physical pain on your kids if you are a parent or guardian which she is, and here's the thing. Excessive corporal punishment can constitute abuse. You can go too far. There can be a line that is crossed, and Nevada defines it as being excessive is when it goes beyond what is proper or reasonable under the circumstances. Again, this is where your common sense becomes real important because we have to think about, well, was it really reasonable what she was doing? And, listen, the use of an implement is not necessarily unlawful, but, again, it's got to be reasonable under the circumstances,

okay.

2.0

So let's talk about the physical injuries. Striking the kids, that's Counts 1, 14, 24, one for each girl. All the girls talked about being hit with the sticks. They all talked about being hit with hands. A lot of them describe some time she's wearing rings, being kicked. They all said that, you know, they were all hit, and primarily the defendant is the one doing it, and the strikes were constant. They happened every single day, multiple times a day. And the injuries were significant. You heard about, yeah, we would be hit with the sticks, and we'd start to bleed.

They've talked about their scars. You've seen the scars. Ava even said my skin would break and bleed. This is Amaya. Remember she said that was me when she saw that photo. She beat me that day, and she just kept hitting me. That happened all the time. The smallest things, like a math problem wrong, she would hit us.

And this is important, folks, when we're talking about reasonableness, about excessive corporal punishment. The use of the force needs to be reasonable. Beating kids because they get a math problem wrong, is that reasonable? That's for you to decide. The State would submit it absolutely is not, that this was their day-to-day life.

But it's not just the girls that tell you about it.

There's eyewitnesses. There is physical evidence. We got all

the paint sticks. They were collected, and there's photographs, and we'll touch on some of those. So let's talk about some of the corroboration.

2.0

What did Ivy say? They had scabs and scars on their bodies from the hitting. That's what little Ivy told us. Areahia even said the Solander girls' butts were bruised, raw, and there were cuts. She said if they didn't get their homework right they would go upstairs, and it sounded like they were getting hit. That's circumstantial evidence that you can think about.

Areahia also said Janet had a long skinny wood stick in her hands one time. That sounds like a similar description to those Home Depot sticks. Heather Richardson said Amaya had bruises all over her arms and legs, and Ms. Debbie noticed the scars and marks upon their return, things that were not present when they were in her care three years before. Despite going through all their horrible history with their biological family, they didn't have those scars when they first showed up at Ms. Debbie's, but after going to Janet's and they came back, they did.

Even the defendant's own daughter corroborates it.

Yeah, that they were beat with paint sticks, all three of them, always on their bare butts, the body position kind of bent like a rainbow, and we heard from other people. I mean, I think Autumn talked about the downward dog position. All of these

girls talked about the position, kind of hands and arms extended. It's all corroborative. Their skin would be chapped, and she even indicated she remembered that Anastasia would bleed through the underwear and that even Dwight would hit them until it broke, and other kids talked about being hit with sticks so much that they would break, and the hits would keep coming.

2.0

But you have the medical kind of photographs or at least the CPS word -- not CPS, but the crime scene photographs taken during their visit with Dr. Cetl, and you heard about all these. Years later, they're still here. This is Ava. These are permanent. They have not gone away. These marks haven't gone, and the doctor -- not with respect to this one.

But this was a mark, and I noted this one because even Amaya said, I remember one time I got hit so hard and that scar was left. Now, Dr. Cetl didn't think of it because it was in a nonprotected area that it was significant, but when you as a juror because you've heard everything can connect it up, you know, use your common sense where that came from because Amaya told you. It was from being hit, and she was hit so hard that that mark was left. It's excessive.

This is Anastasia's buttocks, and you'll have these photos, and you can kind of look at these marks. They have stayed for years. And so, listen, we know because of the scarring that that means that these strikes resulted in

substantial bodily harm, but you also have the prolonged pain. Use your common sense about that. If you've got a cut, does that pain -- use your common sense, do cuts that bleed, does the pain immediately go away?

2.0

The State would submit that it doesn't, and when you have eyewitnesses all talking about any of the bleeding that aren't the girls, you have the girls talking about the bleeding, and you even have residual scars now, as the State would submit as further proof that they were there, we know that those girls when they were struck --

MS. MCAMIS: Well, objection as to "we know."

MR. HAMNER: The State -- okay. The State would submit that that evidence indicates that these children suffered from prolonged pain, and then they were permanently disfigured because of the scarring. That's not going away. Both of these are sufficient. You can use one or the other or both, but both are sufficient to find that in the case of striking these children it was child abuse resulting in substantial bodily harm because we know that this is excessive.

MS. MCAMIS: Objection. "We know."

THE COURT: Well --

MR. HAMNER: Again, I apologize for my wording.

The State will submit this is excessive. The paint sticks, hands, kicks, every day, multiple times a day, the bases in which it's being done, accidents, getting a homework

problem wrong, and the beatings are so excessive that you're bleeding and you're scarring, this is excessive. It's improper. It's too much, and it's not reasonable under these circumstances. The defendant is guilty of Counts 1, 14, 46.

2.0

And we've already kind of talked about this, and I apologize. I don't know why there's an error here. Anyways, so let me just kind of move on. So that was with respect to her eye, and I'd walk back to this, but let's turn to Count 2, and this was slamming Ava's eye into a counter, okay.

She told us how it kind of happened. She ended up not being able to hold it. She was forced to sit on a bucket that day, and she ended up having to go. So she went in the bucket and Janet came up from behind and kicked her, and then kicked her towards the counter because she's, like, in the kitchen and then started repeatedly smashing her face in the counter. She said my eye turned green and purple and pretty much it was about to close up. It hurt. I had to get glasses after that.

Both sisters remember seeing it. You know, Amaya even remembers Danielle actually had to step in and say, you know, Mom, you're not supposed to do that, and Janet -- Danielle even said there were times when I had to step in and stop my mom because things in my opinion were going too far, and that's corroborative. Now, she doesn't say this is the specific time, but you can connect these dots. Could this have

been one of those times? The State would submit, yes.

2.0

So we know in this case that this was a physical injury. It wasn't an accident. She wanted to do that. She wanted to punish her for peeing in a bucket that she had made her sit on for who knows how many hours. It temporarily disfigured her eye. How do we know that? Because she said it swelled up almost to the point where it was completely shut, and that's important when we're talking about physical injury. It impaired her ability to see. If your eye is swelling up, you're not going to be able to see as you normally do. This is a physical injury, and it resulted in substantial bodily harm because when you use your common sense, we know — the State knows, and you using your common sense, that if it lasted, that probably didn't go away immediately when your eye is kind of swollen up. So she's guilty of Count 2.

Count 25, pouring hot water on Anastasia. What did Anastasia say? This whole thing started as she was once again kind of being disciplined; right? She said I had to go out and clean up poop with my bare hands. It was a punishment for having an accident. It starts with that. So when she went into the downstairs bathroom to wash off her poop hands and the water was too hot, she kind of reared back, but that wasn't good enough for the defendant.

Defendant comes in, and basically starts filling up kind of candlelight tops with the hot water and pouring it all

over and also putting her underneath the faucet and burning her, and she said, I was screaming, and when we think about, you know -- I don't --

MS. MCAMIS: Your Honor, can we approach?

THE COURT: Sure.

2.0

(Conference at the bench not recorded)

THE COURT: And, ladies and gentlemen, if any of the images appear different to you on the computer presentation, the State indicates that they did not enhance them, but they may appear different. You're reminded that you'll have the actual exhibits back in the jury deliberation room with you so that you can refer to those and examine them throughout your deliberations.

All right. Go on, Mr. Hamner.

MR. HAMNER: And she indicated that she was screaming. And then she also indicated that for that she never went to a doctor which is interesting when you think about Janet and her doctors' visits. I mean, how many doctors testified? There were tons, but this didn't get a checkup? Why is that? The State would submit the reason is is because how is she going to explain that one? That doesn't look like Crohn's to me. That's not von Willebrand's. That's abuse. She knew it. She didn't take that child to go get the help, and she is scarred to this day.

Her sisters remember. Check your notes. They

remember what that was like. I think even Amaya when she saw that photo remembered, really remembered what had happened to her sister.

2.0

And then we have Dr. Cetl. Now, on March of 2014, she didn't have access to this photograph. She just had the child herself, and in her — based on her training and experience, she believed this to be a scalding burn due to water, but then a while later, when she finally actually got that photograph, she confirmed again on the stand that that — that email that Janet sent to Dwight, she didn't know where it came from, but that email with that photograph further confirmed her initial impressions that that's what it was. She believed that the pattern was consistent with deliberate nonaccidental burn.

MS. MCAMIS: Objection. Misstates the testimony.

MR. HAMNER: You can check your notes.

THE COURT: And again -- that's overruled.

But, again, ladies and gentlemen, it's your recollection as to what the witnesses actually said that should control your deliberations.

MR. HAMNER: She indicated that in her opinion that that was probably a second degree burn which are extremely painful, and they take for weeks to heal if treated, which this wasn't which is important when we're considering substantial bodily harm.

MS. MCAMIS: Well, objection. Assumes facts not in evidence.

THE COURT: Overruled.

2.0

MR. HAMNER: The witness testified that she --

THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. HAMNER: Okay. The witnesses, not just

Anastasia, but other children said that she didn't go to a

doctor for that. Janet gave her a bandage, but this is

important when you're considering whether or not this burn

constitutes substantial bodily harm because it would take weeks

to heal if treated. So this child was exposed to prolonged

physical pain and still has residual scars on her back, her

shoulder, and behind her ear.

And you'll have these photos, and you can go and compare, and you can see, you can match these up. I mean, the doctor did as well, but you'll have them back there. But these patterns the State would submit would fit.

So to the extent that let's say -- I mean, let's just say for a second that this was some sort of discipline. This would be excessive. There's no reasonable reason to do that to a child to that severity. So if the extent is that, well, this was some sort of discipline for doing something inappropriate, the State would submit it is excessive, improper and unreasonable under the circumstances.

And when you think about if there's a submission

then, well, if it's just an accident or it was an accidental kind of scalding, remember what the doctor said about forget the stepping into the shower. The patterns would be totally different. It would be sprayed. It wouldn't be kind of — think about that, and then think about the testimony of the people who were there who saw. Those three girls, they told you Janet deliberately did this.

2.0

So again it's physical. It's not an accident.

Results in a physical injury, and it results in substantial bodily harm, prolonged pain, and she's still permanently disfigured. She's guilty of Count 25.

Let's move on to the negligent treatment, maltreatment, okay. So as I was talking about, one of the ways you can have abuse and neglect is by negligently treating and maltreating a child, and here are the things that are things that you can look for or identify to constitute negligent maltreatment of a child.

One of them is going to be if a child -- if the defendant doesn't properly care or control or supervise a kid. Another one is going to be where you fail and you don't give them subsistence necessary for their well-being. Another one is going to be not getting the medical care necessary for their well-being. Another one is going to be not providing them sufficient or necessary shelter for their well-being. And then there's this kind of catchall, this last other care necessary

for the well-being of the child either because of their faults or their habits of the caretaker or the neglect or refusal of the person to do it.

2.0

Sitting on buckets, Counts 3, 15, 26, one for each girl. Everyone told you, lots of people told you about the buckets. The girls did, the Starks, Areahia, Danielle, Christina Day, Gail Anderson, even Janet admitted to Gail Anderson and Lori Wells that she was having them sit on buckets. This is not a secret. So really the question becomes well, is making them sit on these buckets some sort of form of negligent treatment or maltreatment? The State would submit it is. It's an example of not providing them proper care or at the very least a failure to provide other care necessary for their well-being because of her neglect, and in particular her refusal to do so.

And here's the thing, and here's kind of the reasons why. No one else had to do this. None of the other kids had to do this. We heard from the testimony, you know, Ivy had some kind of peeing issues. Autumn started having a little peeing issues when she got there. The Diaz-Burnett kids did. Areahia told you I had a few accidents. I was potty trained before, but I got there and started having some.

Here's the thing. If the Solander girls, the Stark kids, the Diaz-Burnett kids are all having some relative amount of peeing and potty issues, why is it that only the Solander

girls have to sit on those buckets? If it's some sort of proper potty training method, is not good for the goose -- I just screwed up that line. What's good for the goose is good for the gander; right? That's a saying.

2.0

Why only them? Because it wasn't an appropriate training method. It wasn't a method that Janet employed to help these girls out to really correct the problem. It was a punishment. It was used to embarrass these kids because the other foster kids [unintelligible] to watch them just sitting on buckets with basically hardly any clothes on all day. Danielle Hinton even testified, I never had to sit on a bucket when I grew up. Why? And the reason is is because there was nothing reasonable or proper about it. This was a form of abuse.

And here's the other thing. These girls said Janet never explained why to them, why we had to have the buckets. The length of time is significant. They sat on them for hours with no pants. We're thinking about things that are reasonable; right? Maybe in some scenario, maybe a kid has a bad case of diarrhea so it's kind of, like, maybe this kid can't make it. So maybe on one day or afternoon when you're feeling the kid is really incontinent, maybe, okay, look, sweetie, here just sit on this bucket for a second because you're having a hard day.

But that's not what was happening here. This was a

day in, day out, hours on end sort of thing. It doesn't fit the mold as some sort of helpful potty training method. There were working toilets everywhere. Upstairs. Downstairs. Why the buckets? Because it wasn't -- it wasn't done to assist these kids. It was abusive.

2.0

She never mentioned it to a single physician. Why is that? The State will submit the same reason why she didn't take Anastasia when she was burned. You're doing what? I mean, if she was being straight up about the length and the time and it applied to all three kids, she hid that because she knew it was wrong. Even her own daughter thought it wasn't normal.

Forcing kids to sit on buckets for that length, it's a form of negligent treatment or maltreatment. It's improper care. There's nothing proper about this. Failing to let them use a toilet or a normal chair because, remember, it was also kind of used in lieu of a chair, and here's the other weird thing about it. They weren't even allowed to pee and poop in it. If that happened, they got hit, which is interesting if you're going to try to spin it as, well, no, this is just these kids are so out of control with their bowels. They weren't even allowed to use it for that purpose. They were punished if they went in the bucket.

And this was also mental suffering. They told you it was embarrassing for them, especially with the other kids

around. They told you that. She is guilty of Counts 3, 15 and 26.

2.0

Holding urine and bowels for long periods of time is Counts 4, 16, 27. There are a lot of rules. There are a lot of rules, and we just have to kind of quickly kind of go through them because all of them relate to these charges. Once they were adopted, they weren't free to use any bathroom that they wanted. The bathroom use was cut off for long periods of time. Timers were used. If they requested to use the bathroom during the no-bathroom period they got hit. If a kid had an accident during the no-bathroom period, they got hit.

When they actually got to the bathroom, they were timed. 30 seconds to pee, any longer, you got hit. Minute and 30 seconds to poop, any longer, you got hit. They were checking them with black lights. They weren't given enough toilet paper. The kids even said that one of the problems with the no toilet paper was they couldn't wipe enough, and so they'd have a little stain in the underwear which they incessantly checked which you've seen the emails on which then got them in trouble, and they got hit for that.

They had their bathroom door locked overnight. Then they put up the electrified gate. It was just a regular gate, but these little kids were literally so scared of this they're like I'm not even testing it because I don't want to get electrified. There was an alarm on the door to make noise to

let them know if these kids were trying to use the bathroom at night.

2.0

Withholding the blankets was kind of a "reward" too you about peeing and pooping when they're sleeping on the boards. And there was even one part of the testimony where one of the kids said that literally at one point when Janet was away, Dwight actually had to text Janet to get permission to let the kids use the bathroom.

That is the world and the rules that she created in that house, and what was the effect? Amaya, I was scared to ask her. I was scared she'd slap me off the toilet.

Anastasia, I had some bedwetting issues when I first got there, but then things became continuous at Janet's house. If we peed, we got in trouble. Janet said we held it in. We got in trouble if we peed either way. If we peed too much, we got in trouble. If we peed if we had to go, we got in trouble. I became scared to ask, and as a result, I had accidents. Ava's saying, I could only go when the timer was up, but I got in trouble when the timer did go off. It was confusing. Even Areahia testified they couldn't go where they wanted to.

This is significant, folks, because when we are evaluating whether or not these rules that she put in place were appropriate you can't look at each one in a vacuum. You have to look at it all collectively. That's a lot of rules, and it had a profound affect. These kids were terrified to ask

her because they'd get hit if it didn't fit right.

2.0

And here's the other thing that we know. I mean there was a lot of talk, well, these kids come from this horrible sexual abuse background and terrible things happened to them, and that's all true, but here's the thing. When it came to peeing and pooping, at Ms. Debbie's house there weren't any issues. I mean, Anastasia maybe bed wetted a little bit at night, but the two older girls, no issues. When they were in the Jubilee house, when they were foster kids, when they had agencies watching them with the Solander girls, the rules were different, and there weren't any major issues.

When Ms. Finnegan came in and allowed them to kind of use the bathroom like normal people, what did she say? No bathroom issues. Think about this. They were sent off to the Marvelous Girls Academy, and that should be at the height of it's just too out of control here. These kids are so crazy. I have to get them out of the house. What happens when they show up at Marvelous Girls? No bathroom issues. What's the only difference? There was no rules. And when they're back with Ms. Debbie, there's no issues again. What is the only constant? These bizarre overly restrictive rules in this house.

And there's more corroborative evidence. Think about what the Stark girls and Areahia told you about kind of their worlds before and after when it came to -- in the house when it

came to toileting. Think about the therapists and the workers that dealt with them. This is the environment she created. She even admitted to the timers to Dr. Mileti, but only when Amaya brought it up first. Amaya seemed to be the one that would always kind of pipe up, and she piped up with a doctor, but make a note she didn't provide that information.

2.0

And here's the thing. The doctors, most of these doctors testified that it is really important for parents to give accurate information about what's going on for them to get an accurate assessment, and the State would submit Janet absolutely did not do that. I certainly wouldn't recommend parents order their children to deliberately withhold their urge or need to urinate or hold stool, and she even kind of added particularly if they have these kind of symptoms; right?

Because if she's such a concerned parent and she's got to bring all these kids in to really cure all of these bathroom issues, isn't it interesting that these doctors are all kind of generally saying the worst thing you can do is make them hold their bowel and their urine? She did the opposite of proper medical advice given these symptoms. That's child abuse. This is improper care.

And given what visits they were going for, this would be improper medical care. With these bowel and these GI and these urinary issues, she absolutely should not have been doing this. This was a failure to provide appropriate medical care because it had gotten to that point. Failing to let them hold -- you know, to let them -- the failure to let them hold their bowels and urine for long periods is solely due to her refusal to let them do it. She just didn't want to, and this resulted in mental suffering. And you heard about everything from those girls about what it was like and the confusion and the frustration and the feelings and the fear. She's guilty 4, 6 and 27.

2.0

Sleeping on the boards. Look, all the girls discussed the boards, the fans, the lack of blankets, the pillows, the lack of pajamas. Even some of the girls told you about one of the Stark girls recognized the board; right? Danielle Hinton remembers the boards, told you a lot about it, and it's corroborated by the photos. I mean, Amaya was, like, oh, look, there's Anastasia's board.

Danielle had some interesting observations. Now, again it was I can't really remember exactly right now, but I can tell you I definitely said all these specific detailed things to the police, but it was the board was so hard that Amaya would curl into a ball. Amaya was placed on the board because she peed herself. It was a punishment. No blankets or pillows. They just slept in their underwear as punishment. Oh, you get the fan. These were the sort of things that Danielle was sharing, her own daughter.

This is an example of improper care. It's an example

of a lack of shelter. Kids are entitled to have -- and here's the thing. There's no blanket shortage in this house. There's no pillow shortage. There's no mattress shortage. This is a failure to kind of provide this care because she didn't want to.

2.0

And you're given an interesting contrast when you think about Ms. Debbie. When you think about Ms. Debbie, what did she say when dealing with Anastasia? Did she whip out the board? No. She said, no, you just -- you just get up and you change those sheets. That's what you do. You get up in the night. You take them to the bathroom if you need help. That's what you do. But these were Janet's choices, and as a result, she negligently treated and maltreated them.

And, again, it's an important dichotomy. None of the other kids had to do this, not the Starks, not the Diaz-Burnett kids, not Danielle. They all got beds and bedrooms and sheets. And, remember, we know that they had bathroom issues, but they got sheets. They got linens. They got mattresses. Why the difference? Because she was abusing her own daughters. That was her choice.

There was even a difference when the nannies were around. They got to use the cots, and that's interesting. Why did she switch up the rules? Because the State would submit the defendant was worried that if Jan Finnegan knew they were sleeping on boards with no clothing, she probably would've gone

to the authorities a whole heck of a lot sooner than she did ultimately. So you change the rules when you get a foreigner in your house, make it seem nicer.

2.0

And we kind of talked about this. Janet even admitted to Danielle she didn't want to be bothered with washing the sheets or the blankets. There is no doctor recommendation for any of this. I mean, bottom line is there is no justification for it. It was unnecessary. It was abusive. For all those reasons, I'm not going to go through it again, but she should be found guilty on 5, 17 and 28.

Kicking the kids down the stairs or pushing them down the stairs. Ava said she was kicked down the stairs after the eye smashing incident. If you remember how that went down, it was after she smashed her eye on the counter. She went upstairs into the bathroom and took a look in the mirror for the first time to see what her face looked like, and Janet didn't like anyone looking in the mirror. So that's when, when Janet found that out, she became incensed and basically kicked her all the way down the stairs as a punishment for just looking at her eye.

Ava said, Look, if we had accidents, one of the things she would do would be kicking us down the stairs, and she'd tell this whole story about how she got kicked down the first kind of section, and Janet kind of caught up and kicked her down some more. I'm sorry. That's a mix up. That was

Anastasia's story. Amaya just kind of said in general we would get kicked down, but Anastasia relays this whole story of kind of going down in midflight and Janet catching up, and she's trying to get up, and Janet gets there and kicks her all the way down.

2.0

You even have some corroboration of kind of a similar pattern of behavior with Kaeshia and Demyer. When they started having accidents, they were dragging them up the stairs by their hair and kicked them up the stairs. This is excessive. If this is considered some form of a corporal punishment, it's excessive. It's excessive to kick kids flights down the stairs for having an accident or for simply looking in a mirror. It's not reasonable.

So again, it's a form of negligent maltreatment because this is an improper way to care for your kids. These kids are entitled to walk down normally down the stairs, and a refusal to do so demonstrates why it's abusive, and it resulted in suffering. These kids were scared of living with her because of these sort of repercussions. She's guilty of Counts 9, 20 and 40.

Withholding food and water from the girls, and that's Counts 6, 18 and 29. So, look, all the girls talked about the blended meals. They all discussed the meals being taken away. It went down from three to two to one. When Jan was in there, it was already down to two at that point. You have all the

girls talked about not being given water. Jan even talks about it was crazy. We really couldn't give much water at all. It was even bizarre kind of to her.

2.0

And the withholding of food or water could last for days, and it was a punishment. From what you heard from the testimony of these girls, it was a punishment for having an accident. But what was really interesting was Dr. Mileti even said -- Mileti said, like, look, a liquid [unintelligible] is actually not good for constipation, and she even testified I couldn't find any records that Dr. Sheikh recommending that there be a liquid or puréed diet. She indicated that Janet reported that Dr. Sheikh said that this is what needed to be put in place.

This is how bad the water and food situation was. The kids were trying to find different ways to get food. They snuck food out of the pantry. The nannies were giving them food kind of under the cover of the cameras. Anastasia fully admitted, I ate food out of the trash. I was hungry. Ava would try to get water while brushing her teeth. Ava and Amaya would drink the water while showering. Anastasia literally told us that she drank water out of the toilet. That's how thirsty she was.

And here's the thing. There's no reason for this. There wasn't a single doctor that recommended to these kids to not have any water. The only person who came remotely close

was maybe Dr. Dewan, and that was kind of in the context of, look, if you've got a kid that's maybe, like, not getting enough calories because they're, like, filling themselves up on juice or other drinks, you try to kind of reduce it, but it's not one of these things where you don't get any water after 12:00 o'clock or a thimbleful of water or a tiny Dixie cup full of water.

2.0

And what did the children tell you? That they told you that Janet was not being honest about the feeding patterns and the water habits, and they were too scared to speak up because they were afraid of what was going to happen. And there were times where she was giving PediaSure which she didn't fully give to these kids, and they testified to that. There was even a time where Dr. [unintelligible] even recommended, hey, take these kids — take that kid off of a liquid diet. Please put her back on solids, and Janet expressed a reluctance to do it, and it didn't change.

And here's the thing. Take a look at these pictures, and this is important too. If you're looking for some corroborative evidence, this is Anastasia. Look at that kind of face. Look at kind of the chubbiness of those cheeks. That's before she's in Janet's. That's taken like on -- with Ms. Debbie. There's a photo we have of them in a big group. That's her before Janet. This is her at some point in the middle of Janet's. And if you heard the testimony from the

Stark girls and Areahia Diaz, those girls were really, really skinny. That's what she looked, like, living in this house.

2.0

And then, this picture is in March of 2014. After she has spent months away at the Marvelous Girls School academy eating the foods that she wants and drinking, see if you see a difference. The State would submit absolutely there is because she was not giving these children enough water and nutrition.

So this is also child abuse because again, it's a form of negligent treatment or maltreatment. It's improper care. You are failing to provide these children the subsistence necessary for their well-being. And in the case of, for example, Anastasia, who was being brought in to Dr. Dewan for a failure to thrive, i.e., not getting enough calorie intake, it's a failure to provide appropriate medical care, and the failure to let them eat and drink like normal kids, it's solely due to her refusal to do so, and this results in mental suffering. She's guilty of Counts 6, 18 and 29.

The ice showers, Counts 10, 21, 41. Look, all the girls kind of tell you why. You heard from Danielle about it, as it's corroborative evidence. But here's the thing. When we talk about whether or not this is appropriate, again, no one else had this done to them, not the Stark kids, not the Diaz-Burnett kids, not Danielle. So what was the point of doing this to these kids when they were showering?

And there was never an explanation to even why. It

was abusive. She was picking on them. It's improper care. Again, just letting these kids take a normal shower, it's solely due to her refusal to do it, and as a result, they suffered mentally. They even talked about how they'd slunk away in the shower trying to get away from the ice. She's guilty of Counts 10, 21 and 41.

2.0

Licking urine off the floor with respect to Ava,

Count 11. Ava tells you that -- when she was on the stand,

she's, like, look, one time I peed on the floor, and Janet got

mad and slapped me and made me lick my pee, and then she said I

resisted, and I didn't do it, but here's the interesting thing.

Ava admitted that at the preliminary hearing she said not once,

but twice that she did it.

I want you to think about her demeanor on the stand when talking about this topic. The State would submit to you that she did not want to sit on the stand and tell you that she licked up urine because she was embarrassed. That's your call. And when you think about -- oh, okay. And when you think about -- when you think about her demeanor on that stand, when you think about whether it happened or if it didn't, the State would ask you to consider everything else that you've heard about happening in this house.

Do you think from everything that you've heard about Janet and how she treated these kids, do you think Janet wasn't really serious about making these kids lick up their urine?

The State would submit she absolutely made that kid do that, and that is the reason why Ava said it at the preliminary hearing, twice.

2.0

This is clearly improper. There's no excuse in the book that would justify making a kid consume their own urine, and it's due simply because she refused to allow that kid to maybe clean it up normally or her clean it up herself, and it resulted in mental suffering, and the State would submit you got to see that up on the stand when she was uncomfortable talking about the topic to you. She's guilty of Count 11.

Soiled underwear in the mouth, Counts 12, 22 and 42. This is all three girls. Again, all the girls testified about it, but it's also corroborated. Areahia said, Janet made us watch. It was so disgusting. Danielle said they had soiled underwear, like basically urine soaked, and it was also on their head. They crawled on their hands and knees. All these kids were talking about the baby and the goo goo gaga stuff. You heard that a lot.

And you also heard from kind of these girls, and, you know, Ivy on cross was, like, Yeah, she really struggled to say that chant with all the underwear in her mouth because I think at one point I was, like, Really, she had underwear in her mouth, and she was saying that, and Ivy explained it, Yeah, she really did. She was having a tough time and she did it.

Autumn said, You know, back then I thought it was discipline.

And for her, she said, but now I know it was wrong. She remembers the whole thing about Dwight rounding them up saying, Hey, girls it's audience time. Let's get together. Let's laugh at them. They said they were never treated this way.

2.0

And there was never an explanation as to why this was done to the Solander girls. And here's the other thing. You have other corroborating evidence. You have in an email, when Janet sent an email telling Dwight that Anastasia pissed in her pants, his response is, She's going to hate life tonight. Have her start crawling with Ava. Janet has sent another email to Dwight kind of excited about the fact that she let the foster kids see Anastasia with her pants down. This is corroborative of the things that those girls told you as well as the other foster kids in the house.

And, again, there's nothing proper about making kids put soiled underwear in their mouth. It's improper medically, and it's due solely because she refused to provide that care, and it caused them to suffer. They were embarrassed and they told you about that. She's guilty of Counts 12, 22 and 42.

Standing in the garbage while urinating and defecating, Count 44. Well, she talked about it happened three or four times. I would have to stand in this big clear kind of garbage bag. If I had an accident, sometimes I'd stand in it all day. The sisters remember it happening.

Again, it's totally improper. I mean, there's no

good reasonable excuse for making a kid do this. It's improper medically. It's probably — it's not hygienic to make kids do that, and it is solely because she refused to let the kid not be in a garbage bag full of pee and poop. This resulted in mental suffering. She's guilty of Count 44.

2.0

Forcing Anastasia's head in the toilet, Count 43, again, Anastasia said, Look, I got my head put in the toilet because I pooped, and at this time, my pee was in the toilet. Another time I peed and Janet slammed my head in the toilet and split my head open, and Ava said, I remember Janet smashing her head in the toilet.

Look, here, folks, at best, this is -- at worst, it's a form of negligent -- at best it's a form of negligent treatment or maltreatment because it's improper care. It's improper medically. You shouldn't be putting children in bowls full of urine, and it was done. She was forced to do this solely because the defendant didn't want to do otherwise. She's guilty of Count 43.

Just a couple of other important points. We've covered all of the counts at this point. Here's the thing. Just remember, the evidence has demonstrated these girls were not medically fragile. There's no diagnosis of any of these things; yet they told everyone at different times that they definitively had these diagnoses. That's important.

You might wonder why didn't they say more earlier?

Because the testimony from these kids is that Janet would tell them not to say anything, that everything was fine, and they told us that they were in complete fear of punishment. They were in fear of CPS not actually doing anything. One of the girls, Ava said, I was in fear of being separated from my sisters. I was afraid we could go to someplace and it could be worse, and I wouldn't be there to help them.

2.0

And think about the environment in that house as being a reason as to maybe why they didn't feel so eager to pipe up. These are some of these examples of the environment in that house.

And there was a point where in opening, and again it's not evidence, but there was a comment that was made that what they did was reasonable. You know, at one point there was a follow up. There was some hard parenting decisions, but it came from a good place, and the State would submit how is being ordered to crawl on the floor with underwear in your mouth coming from a good place or a hard parenting choice? How is sleeping on boards with no pajamas or blankets and fans blowing on you, how is that coming from a good place?

Threatening to cut out kids' vaginas, withholding food or water for days, making them sit on paint buckets for hours, these were not — these choices aren't hard for parents to make. This is not a rock and a hard place, any of these options. This is abuse. This is abuse.

And there was in opening kind of line about perspective, word choice and context is particularly important to pay attention. The State would ask well, then which -- I think we've kind of met this perspective. Which perspective did you want? Because in this trial, and we thank you for your patience, you've heard a lot of different perspectives, and you should consider every single one of these perspectives to evaluate whether what she was doing in that house was abusive.

2.0

And to be clear, these people and what they witnessed and the physical evidence that was collected gave plenty of context about what she did to these kids.

This isn't a case about word choices. Those paint sticks that you saw in this courtroom wasn't a word choice. The scars on their bodies, not a word choice. The catheter emails and the orders and the photos, they're not word choices. It's evidence, and it was collected. The emails, all the emails, that's not word choices. Those are things she chose to send to her husband, things that she chose to memorialize with photographs. It's not a narrative spin.

The buckets, the photos, the admissions about that, the photographs of second-degree burns and the misreporting of diseases, these weren't the State's word choices. This is the evidence, and you should consider it because this was never a case about word choice.

At the end of the day, this is a case about the world

that Janet Solander created for her three daughters. No one forced her to do this, no one. And as a result of her own conscious choices, she should be held absolutely responsible for her conscious choices.

I'd ask you, and I thank you for your patience in this trial. I thank you for listening to all these witnesses, but we ask you after you've considered everything that you've heard and you consider this environment that she created, we ask you to find her guilty on every single count.

Thank you.

2.0

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Hamner.

Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to go ahead and take our lunch recess. In a moment, I'm going to have you all follow the bailiff through the rear door. The case is not over. We still have closing arguments from the defense and rebuttal argument for the State.

So the prohibition about speaking about the case with each other or with anyone else during the lunch break is still very much in effect. You're reminded you're not to begin talking about the case with one another during the lunch break. You're also reminded that you're not to read, watch or listen to any reports of or commentaries on the case, person or subject matter relating to the case. Do not do any independent research by way of the Internet or any other medium, and please do not form or express an opinion on the trial.

1 Please leave your notepads in your chairs and follow 2 Officer Hawkes through the rear door. We'll be back from lunch 3 at 2:15, 2:15. 4 (Jury recessed 1:24 p.m.) 5 All right. 2:15. THE COURT: 6 MS. BLUTH: Sounds good. 7 (Proceedings recessed 1:25 p.m. to 2:23 p.m.) 8 (In the presence of the jury) 9 All right. Court is now back in session. THE COURT: 10 The record should reflect the presence of the State through the 11 deputy district attorneys, the presence of the defendant along 12 with her counsel, the officers of the court, and the ladies and 13 gentlemen of the jury. 14 And is the defense ready to proceed with their 15 closing argument? 16 MS. MCAMIS: We are, Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 18 (Closing argument for the Defense) 19 MS. MCAMIS: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, this 2.0 case has been about a significant failure by the Clark County 21 Department of Family Services and maybe not in the way that you 22 think, and we've heard testimony, it's true, that the 23 Department of Family Services failed Ava, Amaya and Anastasia 24 Solander, but you know who else they failed is Janet Solander.

JD Reporting, Inc.

Janet Solander was given girls that she was not

25

equipped to handle, and Janet Solander, you learned, was not equipped for a number of reasons. These girls, you heard, have mental health and behavioral problems that were not included in their medical passport, and you'll remember what the medical passport is. The medical passport is that document. It's that form and gathering of documents that's supposed to give a foster and adoptive parent an idea of what they are getting into.

2.0

Additionally, you heard about the medical passport as it came from the original foster parent Debbie McClain, and you heard from her, and she said, Oh, I have these photos, but I shredded them. Well, what evidence do you have before you of that? Unfortunately, what you heard was that Debbie McClain was not a good historian. You remember how each time that the State presented a witness and they would ask about those girls, you'll notice what they didn't ask you, and you'll notice what the defense had to ask was what happened to those girls? How did they become who they are before they ever got into the Solander home?

This case comes from the actions that Janet took after she adopted the girls who needed structure. They needed discipline, and she did her best to provide that. Now, you may not agree with what she did, but this is not a personal subjective test. The law will instruct you on what you are supposed to do, but this is not would I do this in my own home.

This is does it rise to the level of beyond a reasonable doubt as to each and every element of each and every offense in each and every one of those 46 counts. This is not a checklist.

This is not a shopping list. This is someone's life.

2.0

Now, the government just spent roughly an hour with maybe a hundred slides all about Janet Solander and the accusations against her from the adoptive children who did not agree with the rules in the home, but what do you actually know about Janet? You know that Janet's a mother of four biological daughters, and you know that she never had any CPS history with those four biological daughters. How do you know? Because the State would have dragged in yet another witness to talk about how bad Janet Solander is or how weird she is to them.

You also know that Janet Solander has a history of employment in the military service. Danielle Hinton, her biological daughter, testified, yes, she worked at Nellis Air Force Base generally in some nursing field because she administered — she meaning Janet — administered drug tests, and Danielle also testified that she knew that her mother worked at what she called the MEPS, and no one could figure out what that abbreviation was, but they all knew that was a military-base-type abbreviation out in Phoenix, Arizona.

And Danielle testified that she knew because she went to work with her mom, tagged along sometimes or was in the daycare, and she knew that Janet assisted in the physicals for those Air Force men. So generally in the nursing field.

2.0

Janet eventually remarried Dwight, and the two of them chose to expand their family when Danielle was in her last years of high school, and that's when they opened their home to a bunch of different children including short-term and long-term foster children.

Perspective, word choices, context, just like we talked about in our opening statement back when this trial began. Now, the government has given you this very evil narrative of Janet, very sinister, very mean-spirited narrative of who Janet is, and, in fact, I've put on this slide on the left for you of some of the things that she actually did.

What do you know about Janet's time in the foster care system? How did she get to this point? Well, for starters Janet was the kind of person who went through a very detailed, thorough licensing and background checks to be a foster parent, and you heard from a couple of witnesses, including the assistant director of the entire Department of Family Services who talked about the extreme vetting process that they use. There are home checks. There are background checks. She talked about fingerprinting. She talked about renewal checks.

There's a lot of eyes and ears in a foster home. In order to maintain that licensure, you have to maintain and follow all the rules. If you do not follow the rules, you are

going to lose your license, and you heard testimony that Janet Solander and her home were licensed from 2011 through the period roughly ending the charging document in November of 2013 and slightly beyond. So she had to go through at least two renewal processes because the Starks and the Diaz-Burnett kids were placed in her home.

2.0

Now, the government presented no reliable evidence, nor evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that Janet failed to comply with all of the foster care rules, okay. There was never a CPS investigation opened about how Janet took care of the Stark children, and you heard the State call witness after witness about how Janet took care of the Stark children and about how the 3 and a half year old Ivy and 5 or 6-year-old Autumn had potty accidents, but you also heard about some of the nonviolent or nonphysical discipline things that she did.

What you heard was she would put socks on their hands so they couldn't get them dirty and put them in their pants, and you heard from the caseworker, I don't have a problem with that. It wasn't reportable, and, in fact, it fixed the problem. The problem was the child was getting dirty and putting her hands where it didn't belong to, and the socks fixed it, simple enough solution.

And if you'll recall, that caseworker was Cherina

Davison. You'll remember her testifying, and, sure, there were

times where she said she found Janet odd and that her

communication style was very direct, but that isn't a crime.

That isn't a consideration before you. That's not one of the

46 counts.

2.0

You had no evidence of abuse. And, again, what does that really have to do with the Solander children? The Stark children were foster children. They were subject to different rules. You heard everyone in the foster care system testify different rules because it's foster. Parents can treat their own children, as long as it's legally appropriate, however, but foster kids, they have separate rules. The State kept saying, Why, why were they treated different? You already have that answer. You have it. You had it after witness after witness after witness. Foster care is different. Foster care is different, and Janet complied with how different it was.

You also heard from witness after witness after witness about the Diaz-Burnett sibling group, the PSR workers, the BST workers. You will remember all of them. Riley Castro, Christina Day, Jennifer Dowling, and you'll remember the 13-year intern therapist Lori Wells who can't seem to manage to take her licensing test after all this time. Well, she testified as well, and so did caseworkers like Gail Anderson.

Every single one of them had nothing to do with the care of the Solander children. They were other caseworkers. They were there for the Diaz-Burnett sibling group, who had their own very significant trauma and needs on their own, and

we'll get to that. Yet every single one of those people were called to tell you why they thought Janet was bizarre or abrasive or just didn't like being told what to do. Excuse me.

2.0

entirely about being told what to do. If you do not follow them, again, you do not keep your license. So the defense would submit if she really couldn't follow those rules and she was really such an untrustworthy person about any of these foster kids' medical needs, she would not have been allowed to continue to provide care for them.

DFS and CPS have many tools if they don't agree with what a foster parent is doing. They can direct the foster parent to stop the unwanted contact. They can require parenting classes. They can direct the foster parent to do something else. They can staff the case with a supervisor, and you heard every single witness from the caseworker say I could staff; I could report; I could go to a higher up; I had directives; I had measures; I had things I could do. And not one of them said Janet do something differently.

And that would have been between the dates of January 19th, 2011, and November 11th, 2013. Those are the dates that you are tasked with reviewing because those are the dates that correspond with the alleged conduct in the Information. So that time period, CPS and DFS never told Janet to do anything differently, and that's because, ladies and gentlemen,

she was not doing anything criminal.

2.0

And as far as the Stark and Diaz-Burnett children, it didn't have anything to do with the criminal charges of this case. So we are now in, I think, week five if my math is correct of trial, and how long did it take for you to actually start hearing testimony about the alleged victims in this case? Look at that Amended Information when you go back in the jury deliberation room. Nowhere on it does it say and list victims Ivy, Autumn, Areahia, Kaeshia, Demyer or baby Novaleih. None of them are victims. None of them appear on those pages.

Nevertheless, we spent the first nearly two weeks of testimony all about these children and again painting an evil narrative about how bizarre Janet Solander is and how the girls were somehow secreted away. But what objective evidence do you have of that? Think about that. The girls say, We were [unintelligible] in the bathroom. We were locked up. We were told that we couldn't talk to CPS, or we were told what to say to CPS.

Well, think about some of those unannounced home visits. Think about some of those unannounced CPS investigations. Think about the day that Crystal Rosas drove up, and the girls are outside playing; two of them are on bikes, and the other one is chasing them around. That's not secreted away.

Think about when Janet -- excuse me, Christina Day

walked in, and she saw the kids on the potties and then said well, okay, that's not what I would do in my home. I better contact Lori Wells, my supervisor. Those kids were not secreted away. There were times perhaps that they were not available, but I don't know that that's necessarily very shocking.

2.0

Think about this. There were caseworkers that are going into that home to deal specifically with the foster care children who have very specific needs. Do you really need 6-, 7-, 8-, 9-year-olds running around listening to confidential information? You don't. They're not a part of that process. The caseworker is not there to interact with those children. They're there, and they're tasked with spending time with each and every one of the children in their charge. So it's not a big -- it's just you don't have any objective evidence really that they were secreted away. What you have is the girls' stories and more on that later.

Now, you'll remember when Janet had the Stark children in her home she had a total of five young kids living with her and Danielle at some point for at least some period of time while she was still in high school and before she went to college. And you'll remember, Ivy was not fully potty trained. She entered that home at age 3 and a half. So she still had some accidents. Autumn was also potty trained but still had some accidents, and then she had the three Solander girls, and

we'll get to their behavioral issues.

2.0

Janet was the foster mother. She was legally responsible for keeping Autumn and Ivy safe, fed, clean, and she took it upon herself to advocate for them when they're own biological parents wouldn't, and that's part of how kids like that get into the foster care system.

Now, you'll remember the testimony of Cherina

Davison. The Starks came from a home of abuse and neglect, and one of the little girls unfortunately had been sexually assaulted, and as you'll read about in Janet's book -- that's in evidence. That's you get to take back with you. That you can actually read. You can read her words. You can read what she has to say, and you will read about kids who come from abused homes and that they act out in ways, and that's what you heard evidence of.

Cherina Davison, yes, they have this history. Some of them would act out. It's not the biggest deal. That's why they get services like a PSR worker, a BST worker, a therapist.

Now, when Janet took in the Diaz-Burnett kids,
Areahia Diaz was clinically obese, and her three younger
siblings were quite thin. They came from a home of extreme
neglect, no running water, meaning no running potties, no
running toilets for little children who were supposed to be in
potty training time. They came from not enough food, no
electricity. So they had severe emotional needs, and again,

unfortunately -- we are again talking about foster children -- Areahia had been sexually molested as well. So those kids had multiple BST, PSR workers and therapists because that's what they needed.

2.0

Now, I know you heard testimony about Janet, and you may have thought what a bizarre person, but what you also heard about was that Janet was an advocate for these kids when the biological parents missed visits, and she didn't care that she wasn't liked. She didn't care that she ruffled feathers because she was trying to take the task of being a foster parent seriously.

And that's what she writes about in her book is how the foster care system doesn't put kids first. They focus on parental rights. They focus on the system rights, but they don't focus on the needs of the children, and so she got very direct. She could be very abrasive, but she was always focusing on what? The needs of the children. That's what you heard. Hyperfocusing on the needs of the children, even if it included toilet training, which is not surprising considering again the Diaz-Burnett sibling group came from a home where there was no running electricity or water unfortunately.

And you also heard about Janet being an advocate when that intern therapist Lori Wells broke Areahia's trust, and Areahia needed someone to advocate for a new therapist. You heard Janet advocate for those children when Kaeshia needed to

go to the hospital. So she went to Monte Vista, and then she got a little bit better; however, just because a child gets a little bit better, it doesn't erase years of abuse. It doesn't erase years of parental failure.

2.0

And you remember when Janet scheduled all the significant dental surgeries for those youngest Burnett kids because their teeth were so rotten and decayed that they were brown. Remember how the government talked about Janet complaining about the foster care service providers. Remember how Janet threatened to sue people or get people fired because according to the government Janet was about to be found out.

Well, if you'll remember, Debbie McClain did the same thing. Remember her testifying that everyone at H.O.P.E. Counseling was a liar, that she wanted the therapist fired, and then she got the therapist fired, and then the new therapist came from Agape, which was a what? Debbie McClain's employer. I mean, talk about a conflict of interest.

The government wants you to believe that Janet was making up ailments of the foster kids in order to scam the government for more money, but you heard from all the caseworkers. You heard even from the therapist Lori Wells that Janet and Dwight seemed overwhelms — overwhelmed, excuse me, and when Lori Wells made one of her many calls into CPS, it was because she thought Janet and Dwight were not equipped to deal with the, quote, Special needs of these foster children.

Special needs, acknowledgment that Janet was just not dealing with normal kids because they had additional needs, and, of course, they did. You heard about where they came from.

2.0

Now, the government brought in doctor after doctor about the Solander girls, but only Dr. Dewan about Areahia. Yet there was ample testimony that Janet took all of her foster kids to medical appointments as was necessary, and the government asked over and over again, Didn't Janet tell you she was a nurse? Okay. Let's just take a step back. You have no evidence that anyone at DFS or any doctor deferred to Janet for medical diagnoses or treatment. Janet wasn't writing fake prescriptions. The government didn't prove any of that beyond a reasonable doubt.

Janet may have overstated her nursing experience. So what? She's not charged with it. It's not a crime. And you do have evidence that she had some medical knowledge based on her position at the military bases. So you have no evidence that anyone relied or cared enough to look into it because, again, Janet wasn't making diagnoses for these children. She was taking these children to doctors, and then she was hearing the words they were saying, and she apparently just built it up in her head because she took her duty to these kids as their foster parent that seriously.

Now, when Janet took these kids, these foster kids to actual doctors for actual diagnoses and actual treatment, there

was the testimony about the practice of foster parents faxing all their medical records and requests for approval to the CPS nursing unit, and you have no credible evidence that there was ever a failure for her to do that.

2.0

And I would also point out that you heard from none of Kaeshia, Demyer or Novaleih's doctors that Janet was ever reported for doing anything medically inappropriate as to those children, and that's because quite simply none of those doctors would testify to that. If they had, don't you thank we would've heard from them? I mean, you heard from a lot of people.

And this is why I'll direct your attention to Instruction Number 30, and when you get your jury instruction packet, they're numbered, and so that instruction talks about,

You may have heard testimony concerning actions or directions by the defendant towards the other foster children living in their home who are not subject of these criminal charges. You are not to consider this for any purpose beyond the extent that it establishes a motive, intent, common scheme or plan — excuse me, knowledge and/or absence of mistake or accident regarding the alleged abuse and neglect of the children named in the charges. The mere existence of

any alleged bad acts directed towards other people like foster children do not establish the guilt of a defendant beyond a reasonable doubt.

So you heard weeks of testimony about things you cannot consider when you are looking at 46 charges before you. This also means, and this instruction tells you that you cannot consider, well, I think Janet Solander is a bad person because of the way that she treated the foster kids in her care. So she must be guilty of at least one or more of the 46 counts. The law says you cannot do that, and when you guys came in and we talked about jury selection, you promised to take your duty seriously, and we will ask you to hold that promise.

2.0

Those foster kids are not the Solander kids. They were foster kids subject to all of the foster care rules, and Janet had a right under the law as an adoptive parent of the Solander kids to treat her own kids differently than the foster kids. Now, you may not like how Janet treated the foster kids, but your subjective feeling on that does not make her guilty of any of the charges.

And that brings me back to the Solander kids. You heard hours of testimony from PSR, BST workers, caseworkers and therapists for the foster children. What do you know about the Solander kids before they came into the Solander home? What do you know about what services they received while the Solanders

were fostering them? Who is it that presented that information to you?

2.0

The State called Heather Richardson and Debbie McClain about the Solander girls before their time in Janet's home; yet you know those are not the only two people in the kids' lives before they got to the Solander home. No. You heard that they had a PSR worker named Lisa Taylor. You know that they had a H.O.P.E counselor named Heidi Menusa [phonetic]. You know that at least one, Amaya, later needed a psychologist, Dr. Lisa Schaefer. Ladies and gentlemen, where are they?

I'm having one of those times where I'm a little slow. One more. Okay. That's fine.

The State didn't call them because the defense has absolutely -- or the State didn't call them, and the defense has absolutely no burden of proof. Why weren't they called? Because the State knew that they would have to give you a more accurate picture of the abuse and neglect that Ava, Amaya and Anastasia suffered before they ever met Janet Solander because that would tell the whole story about how these girls were before they got to the Solander home.

And you remember when the government asked Heather Richardson all about the girls, and she painted a lovely picture, and why not? You got to see those girls. In no way is this an attack on those girls. There's a few things that

the State and I can agree on, and it's that they are victims of abuse and neglect, but our discrepancy is where the abuse and the neglect originated. So you can feel sorry for those girls. You can like those girls. I am in no way saying not to, but you have to give context to what they are listening to.

2.0

Think about their word choice. Think about what they're presenting to you. They have a history. They were abandoned by their mother. They were neglected by their mother. They were dumped by their mother on a grandmother who was not equipped for them. They were beaten with belts. Their grandma yanked on their ears to the point where Department of Family Services observed marks and bruises and had to tell grandma stop hurting the girls. You can't discipline them that way. Those Solander girls witnessed domestic violence when their grandmother hit their grandfather in the home, and the grandma went to jail.

They went to therapy, first to H.O.P.E. Counseling where they disclosed all of this and later to Debbie McClain's employer, Agape. And, again, it was in counseling where all of the trauma and abuse they endured was more fully disclosed, and it was disclosed by the girls themselves. They confirmed this. When they were younger, when they had all of this information when it was still fresh in their mind, they disclosed this.

And, unfortunately, one of them was sexually molested by her brothers -- excuse me, by her mother's boyfriend. One

talked about how her grandmother made her sleep outside, and didn't that sound familiar? Because you'll recall Anastasia once said Janet made her do the same thing, this sleeping outside with the rocks and the bugs, so kind of recycling stories. Anastasia was once so angry with her teacher that in therapy she told the therapist her teacher hit her, and then the therapist inquired further, and Anastasia confirmed the teacher did not hit her, and she told the story because she was mad.

2.0

Amaya too made up a story. She made up that story that Debbie hit her, and she was going to tell Heather Richardson, and you'll remember that wasn't the only behavioral issues that the girls had. If you'll recall, Amaya had that one incident after the court hearing, and you heard how it was documented in a Unity note that the caseworker noted Amaya masturbated after the court to try to get her sister to join in, and she thought she would be able to use that to get back to her biological home. She acted out, and that's how the psychologist Lisa Schaefer got involved. You heard about that Unity note.

Now, you know after we brought it out on cross-examination that the girls went to H.O.P.E. Counseling and had different mental health and behavioral diagnoses. You also know this predated the Solanders. The girls had not met the Solanders yet. And just like I talked about, who was it

presented -- who was it that presented you with that information on the history of the girls? Was it the government? No. It wasn't until I started my cross-examination after Heather Richardson testified that the girls had no behavioral issues when they were placed in the Solander home, and I started asking questions. Well, what about H.O.P.E. Counseling? What about all these diagnoses? What about this?

2.0

I mean, look at this chart, and I kept asking her, Okay, well, what about Ava? Isn't it true she was diagnosed with a DSM-IV diagnosis of PTSD and enuresis? And I'm sure that's more than you ever thought that you would learn, but we all now know it. It's part of our vocabulary. You know that that is a urine voiding issue, and the girl's unable to control her urine. You know that Ava was diagnosed with poor self-esteem, that she was excessively withdrawn, and she was described in several ways as being kind of withdrawn. Well, that predated the Solanders.

Ava was also diagnosed with constant challenging of authority and excessive noncompliance to the point where she had persistent difficulties or disruptive behaviors sufficient to jeopardize school or home placement, and Heather Richardson said, well, yeah, but nobody told you that on direct. You need to wait until I got to cross before they really wanted to tell you what these girls had and endured and suffered before they

ever got to Janet Solander's home.

2.0

And it didn't stop at Amaya. As you'll recall,
Amaya -- or excuse me, it didn't stop with Ava. It continued
with Amaya. It continued with Anastasia. Again, the girls had
PTSD. Anastasia had a feeding disorder, a disorder in infancy.
Amaya had impulsive verbal outbursts, persistent intentional
aggression. Amaya was assaultive towards others and hits her
sister, and I know the girls testified and said, No, no, it's
verbal fights. It's not verbal fights. It was never just
verbal fights. The girls would hit the sisters.

Amaya was diagnosed and assessed as being extremely disruptive, dangerous and violent. She did not listen to adult directives in the home. She failed to respond to limit setting and other discipline. Again, a child like this was put in a home with Janet Solander, and none of this was indicated. None of this was included in the medical passport, and the system failed Janet by putting this child in that home without giving her the proper tools, and that was a failure for Janet, and that was a failure for Amaya.

Anastasia also assessed, excessive frequent tantrums, persistent intentional aggression, challenging behaviors, does not follow directions, severely emotionally disturbed, and falsely reported to H.O.P.E. Counseling that her teacher hits her.

I guess Heather Richardson and the government did not

want to tell you all about that, but ladies and gentlemen, you need to know that. You must know that.

2.0

Now, you heard testimony from Dr. Cetl about scars in the looping pattern. What did you also hear testimony about? What is a looping scar consistent with? Beatings with a belt. You heard zero evidence from any of the witnesses called that Janet, Dwight or even Danielle ever disciplined any of those children with a belt, but you heard evidence that the biological family beat the girls with a belt.

Dr. Cetl also testified about those scars and how concerning it was that she saw some of the same types of scars in the same types of areas on Ava, Amaya and Anastasia, the same types of scars, looping or linear scars, all consistent with being struck by a belt, and Dr. Cetl could not testify to any degree of medical certainty when those scars on the girls' bottoms occurred, none. She couldn't tell you. She could even give you a general time frame.

Now, I understand that Ms. Debbie testified that she bathed the girls, and she never noticed any scars, and I know that Ms. Debbie testified that she had the girls' medical passports, but Ms. Debbie said that she shredded the girls' medical passports, including photos she claimed that were in there that she saw of the girls. You were presented with no head-to-toe body exam of the girls prior to them entering the Solanders' care. The government presented you with no reliable

evidence beyond a reasonable doubt about where those scars came from.

2.0

And Ms. Debbie proved herself to be a poor historian. She couldn't remember back when the girls were in foster care that Anastasia had ringworm, and if you've ever seen ringworm on a child, it's visually memorable. Debbie didn't remember.

Now, I understand Ms. Debbie has had something like 40 foster children in and out of her home. So maybe an appointment here or there might escape her, but forgetting that Ava went to see an orthopedic specialist and that Ava's diet had to be adjusted so she lost weight to stop limping, Ms. Debbie didn't remember any of that. Instead, she gave you a charming anecdote about how Ava limped because she copied Ms. Debbie's arthritis in her hip.

But you heard from Dr. Alphonsa Stephen. You heard that Ava was not faking her limp. That limp was real, and that child was referred to a real orthopedic specialist Dr. David Stewart, which brings me --

Oh. Actually, if you could go back a slide, please.

We talked a little bit about how some of the girls kind of cycle their stories or how they've, as you can probably tell, they've exaggerated some of their stories, and this didn't come just in the Solander home. They have a history of it, and so I brought out a couple of the notable H.O.P.E notes, and if you'll recall, H.O.P.E. was the counseling.

You'll remember in August of 2009 about Anastasia making an angry face, and the State tried to say, well, she was hugging. She's had boundary issues and clinging, and you'll remember that's not what it was. Anastasia made an angry face. She showed her anger towards her therapist. She grabbed her therapist by the neck. In this same incident where she was angry and grabbing her therapist by the neck, Anastasia disclosed that she lied about her Aunt Jessica spanking her, and she lied because she was mad, which, sure, kids do, the same kids who then went into Janet Solander's home. So the therapist was dealing with Anastasia's anger behaviors both after reports that she would hit and kick her sisters and stay angry for a long time, and I brought that out on cross-examination.

2.0

And then you'll remember in the May 2009 note for Amaya, Debbie McClain was told you can't say, Just because you witnessed domestic violence doesn't mean you can act like that. She was told you can't say that to foster children. You'll recall Janet and Dwight were accused of saying something very similar, but unlike Debbie McClain, Just because you witnessed domestic violence doesn't mean you can act like that, Janet and Dwight said they were fearful for the kids' futures. They didn't want them to end up another statistic, again, advocating.

Also in May of 2009, Ava disclosed that her mother's

boyfriend used to beat her with a belt on her bottom in her biological home. February of 2009, Ava disclosed that her grandmother went to jail for hitting her grandfather, something that the girls witnessed in the home, and in January 2009, Ava discussed in therapy how she and her sisters physically fought each other, physically.

2.0

Now, you've heard from a lot of people, but you heard from a lot of people about the Diaz-Burnett kids and about the Stark kids. Who did you not hear from? Who did the State not call to tell you more about Ava, Amaya and Anastasia? Well, there's the PSR worker Lisa, who would've been the same as, like, Jennifer Dowling or Christina Day, would have had those same types of observations about the girls; Heidi Menusa, the H.O.P.E therapist, someone who would have been apparently more qualified than Lisa Wells, the 13 year intern; Dr. Lisa Schaefer, the psychologist.

The State didn't call anyone from Agape counseling. Even if they liked Agape better than H.O.P.E, they didn't call anyone from there; Dr. David Stewart, the ortho specialist that the little child went to when she was in Debbie McClain's care; Andrea Ledgeworth [phonetic], who was the nanny for over a year, and to whom Detective Emery confirmed, Yep, I interviewed her; Rebecca, another nanny. You didn't hear from anyone from the staff at La Petite Academy even though the State made a rather big deal in opening statement about that

information-only call.

2.0

You didn't hear from Dr. Dezenberg, whose records Dr. Cetl reviewed. You didn't hear from Dr. Sheikh, whose records Dr. Cetl reviewed. You didn't hear from any of the doctors from Amaya's December 2011 hospital stay after her seizure. You didn't hear about any eye doctor from Ava about the alleged damage to her eye from the kitchen counter slam and why she was prescribed glasses. You didn't hear from Dr. Crispin, the last pediatrician who the girls saw for a physical prior to going to The Marvelous Grace Girls Academy -- which I have decided to abbreviate this way throughout my PowerPoint presentation just so you're aware -- and who Yvette Gonzalez actually knew about because Dwight told her. Dwight told her what pediatrician the girls last saw.

You didn't hear from Jackie Henry, the Florida CPS worker to come and explain that the girls never disclosed anything about catheters. You didn't even hear from other students or staff at The Marvelous Grace Girls Academy in Pace, Florida. So the State found all kinds of people to testify to you about the foster kids in the home and only two to testify about the Solander girls, three if you include Danielle.

Now, if the Solander girls didn't have any behavioral issues, maybe that would make sense, but that's not what you heard. You heard lots of people interacting with the Solander girls while they were in foster care, and even afterwards when

they were adopted.

2.0

Now, we talked about who wasn't called, and we talked about some of the things that Ms. Debbie was verbally reprimanded for saying to the girls, and you'll remember she was told you can't say things like I'll kick your ask, and she spelled it a-s-k. Now, ladies and gentlemen, common sense doesn't evaporate just because you've joined us for jury duty, and I'll kick your ask doesn't mean anything, and you know very well what words Ms. Debbie said. She said I'll kick your ass, and it is probably because Amaya was acting up, and acting up happens.

Many of you shared with us you're parents. So you know that acting up happens, and kids are not perfect. Kids test boundaries and parents have limits, and sometimes parents say exactly what they want to say to keep the kid in line. You heard it from Ms. Debbie, and you certainly heard it from Ms. Janet Solander because she ended up being subject to these criminal charges.

Now, we can all agree that Janet Solander was not best equipped to deal with these girls, but it doesn't make her guilty of any of the offenses. Indeed, you have to look at each and every one, and it's not a checklist. It's not a shopping list. You're not just going check, check. You are tasked with actually evaluating the testimony you heard.

Now, Janet has been charged with several counts of

child abuse, neglect or endangerment, and in order to find Janet guilty of any of these counts, you must find beyond a reasonable doubt that all of the elements that are charged -- or elements of the offense rather, and, again, you'll have your jury instructions back in the back. So I tried to make it kind of like broken down so you can see the different elements.

2.0

And a specific important one is unjustifiable physical pain. Unjustifiable physical pain doesn't mean that common sense goes out the door. It doesn't mean that your duties as a parent don't let you reprimand your child. You heard that there's an instruction about corporal punishment. Even if you personally don't agree with it, it is not criminal abuse per se just because an implement may have been used.

Now, you've also been tasked with reviewing the charges for child abuse, neglect or endangerment with substantial bodily harm, and you'll see that. I believe that's in Instruction 19. Substantial bodily harm means injury that creates a substantial risk of death or which causes serious permanent disfigurement or a protracted loss or impairment of the function of any bodily organ or prolonged physical pain.

Now, the counts, as I was able to glean from the Information, about substantial bodily harm relating to the spanking with the paint sticks on the buttocks were Count 1, 14 and 24 for these children. The State wants to point to the little scars on their bottom, and they have some scars on their

bottom, but beyond a reasonable doubt, you don't know when the scars were there. You don't know who put them there, and you have evidence that's consistent with looping, meaning a belt, and you have no evidence that Janet and Dwight or anyone in the Solander home used a belt.

2.0

Bodily injury which creates a substantial risk of death or which causes serious permanent disfigurement. The State wants you to focus on the disfigurement, but remember the modifier. Remember the word that is used. It's serious permanent disfigurement or protracted loss. You don't have that. Or prolonged physical pain.

Now, I don't know how many of you have experienced being spanked, but a lot of us are familiar with that concept. There is an immediate stinging, sure, with being spanked, but prolonged for days. It was a paint stick. It was not a belt. It was a paint stick. It was not like one of those cords. You've seen different accounts in the news. It's a paint stick which is something a lot of you can recall when I asked about in voir dire. What about the Italians who use the wooden spoons? They slap you on the back of the hand. It's a paint stick. It's not a belt.

Now, even if you don't agree with corporal punishment as a valid form of discipline -- and that's your prerogative, this is not what you would do in your own home, this is what actually happened in this case, and does it rise to the level

of abuse -- Janet and Dwight admitted to spanking their adopted children with paint sticks to multiple people at DFS and CPS, specifically even to Crystal Rosas. Crystal Rosas did not tell them to stop, and if you'll recall, that's the CPS investigator who went out, and they said, Yes, we spank our children with -- both of them, Janet and Dwight, we spank our children with paint sticks on their bottoms. Crystal didn't say stop. She didn't tell them that they could not spank their children with paint sticks, and she did not instruct them to change their behavior in any way.

2.0

Now, Crystal Rosas works for the Clark County

Department of Family Services, and that's the government, and
that's the same government that is now charging Janet even
though the government knew that Janet spanked her kids with
paint sticks, and that government did not find it abusive. So
they can't make it a crime now.

The government wants you to believe that it was Janet and Dwight who spanked the girls so hard that it left scars on their bottoms, and you heard the testimony of the girls. You heard how they claim to have been beaten every day multiple times a day to the point where they bled all the time. So I ask you, when Dr. Cetl was testifying and you were actually shown those photos, is that what you were expecting to see? My suspicion is I bet you thought you would see a whole lot more.

Now, the State's hired expert, Dr. Cetl, was a woman

who they paid for her testimony, and she testifies again and again on cases for the State for child abuse cases, and you will remember she did not tell you how old the scars were to any degree of medical certainty. She couldn't tell you with any degree of medical certainty what specific implement caused them. She just said things were consistent with, and the State wants to point to well, it's consistent with a paint stick.

2.0

But you know what else we asked her? If they were consistent with a belt, and you are going to remember we've talked about that. You know that what leaves looping scars, a belt. Who beat the Solander girls with a belt? The people in their biological home. The government has not shown you any credible evidence that those scars did not exist prior to the girls entering the Solander home.

And the only timeframe Dr. Cetl could testify to in a medical degree of certainty was that mark on Anastasia's ear, the line. It was red, and it was crusty, a recent, a fresh injury, days to weeks old. And you'll remember at the time of that forensic interview and that physical examination with Dr. Cetl, that would've been in March of 2014, and the girls, Ava, Amaya and Anastasia had been in The Marvelous Grace Girls Academy since mid-November of 2013. So there is no possible way that injury could have been caused by Janet. The recency of that injury means that it was something from her time at Marvelous Grace Girls Academy.

Now, let's talk about a parent's legal right to discipline their child, and let's review all of the legally allowable corrective actions that Janet took to try to change her children's behaviors, and she was doing this because she tried to instill structure. So we talked about how there was a rewards or demerits chart on the fridge, and it didn't work after a while. So then she moved on to different forms. So she talked and the girls confirmed they were put in timeout.

2.0

They had privileges removed. Now, they testified about all day every day they were on buckets, and all day every day they did this. Well, they also confirmed one of the privileges that was removed was you would go to bed early and didn't get to watch the movie because there were more normal things going on in this home.

Now, Janet also did yelling. Yelling is one of the most common parental forms of discipline. She also took corrective action by popping the children on the mouth with an open hand, spanking with an open hand, and spanking with a paint stick. And again, ladies and gentlemen, I'm not asking you to like this behavior. I'm not asking you to adopt this behavior. I am just asking you to honor your duty as a juror, as a member of the jury, in determining whether this is the kind of conduct, this spanking with paint stick, that rises to the level of a substantial bodily harm, a prolonged, permanent disfigurement.

Janet was in a very tough position because she was dealing with foster children who she was not equipped to deal with, and so a lot of what you heard about was her attempt to set boundaries, to instill structure. [Unintelligible] the girls didn't have -- didn't acclimate while at school, and considering the H.O.P.E diagnosis, at least as to Ava, that's not terribly surprising. So the girls were homeschooled. They were given hourly bathroom breaks.

2.0

Now, I understand that they testified that they sat on potties, and I understand that they testified that they were restricted with the bathroom usage, but the answer was not, no, you don't get to go to the bathroom. Their practice was during homeschool hours, you heard, that the timer would go off every hour, maybe a little bit longer, hour and a half, maybe two hours, but every hour they would be asked and given an opportunity, do you have to go to the bathroom, and sometimes the girls would say, yes, and they would go, and sometimes they would say, no, and then there would be an accident, and that's when you heard about the potty buckets, only when the hourly bathroom breaks were not used because you'll also remember I asked about the black cloth chairs. They sat on chairs as long as they followed the rules.

Now, the government wants you to believe that the Department of Family Services failed over and over again with its investigations. They claimed that there were, if I did my

math correctly, and again, this is all argument. Your notes are going to do what's controlling, but they claimed there were, if I remember correctly, seven called in and seven failures, but let's break that down.

2.0

The first one was an information-only call in February of 2011. It didn't merit an investigation. It was just an entry. So it's not a true CPS investigation in the sense that the government was trying to claim.

Then you have the second one in August of 2011 where Heather Richardson outrageously claimed that she saw Amaya at the dentist's office with bruises everywhere, just this child was covered in bruises, but the reality is CPS did what it was supposed to do.

You heard about the call coming in, and the very next morning Pat Kelly, another person who was not called, Pat Kelly, the CPS investigator, went and interviewed the girls, each one of them individually, each one individually without the mother present, without Janet there. And you heard from the Unity data entry there were no bruises covered all over her face. It was just a scratch. The girls were able to be talked to in private.

Heather Richardson is not credible. Heather
Richardson told you, Well, I had to make this call because of
the dentist and there were all these multiple concerns. You've
been in trial for a month with us now. You didn't hear a

single dentist, a single orthodontist, a single doctor, a single eye doctor say they ever made a CPS report, and if you had or if there had -- if that had happened, you absolutely can bet you would've heard from that doctor.

2.0

Now, the third call would have been from the nanny Jan Finnegan, and when I say nanny, you remember Andrea was there for roughly a year what we heard. Jan was the Craigslist ad who was the temporary nanny for three weeks to fill in because Janet had to go back home to help one of her other daughters who just had a baby in Ohio. Now, Jan Finnegan disclosed everything that she saw. The Solanders admitted to everything that she saw, and guess what? That wasn't a crime.

DFS didn't do anything. They said, okay, you're using the paint sticks. Okay. They also confirmed the girls were getting fed twice a day, and it's blended. Okay. There was nothing about those blended meals that gave the DFS concern. There's nothing about those blended meals that rose to the level of malnutrition or poor hydration or any kind of nutritional neglect, or the doctors would have testified to that.

And you heard from many doctors, and not one of them testified that what they saw gave them any concern. They have a legal duty to report, and that duty to report, you'll remember, is just a mere suspicion, if they even suspect something. It doesn't have to be beyond a reasonable doubt.

It just has to be something is not right here. There's a red flag here. I have to call it in, and not one of those doctors did.

2.0

Now, all of the other calls into CPS were all in that very short period of time, okay. The remaining ones, numerous calls from Lori Wells, and then there was the report from Christina Day over the buckets. Now, you remember Lori Wells. None of her reports had anything to do with the conduct of the Solander children. She was concerned that Janet and Dwight couldn't meet the, again, the special needs of the foster — of the foster kids.

Christina Day observed the buckets. So did Gail Anderson. In fact, she took a picture of one of the buckets. It didn't give her any concern because she said she had no credible evidence when she walked around in that home that kids were actually sitting on toilets for 10 hours a day which was the initial allegation. Instead, what she saw was Ava and Amaya were doing homework on chairs and that Anastasia had a training potty in the kitchen, but when Gail Anderson went and showed up, Anastasia was upstairs cleaning herself after an accident.

And you heard evidence about the kids' accidents, and you saw pictures. Janet took pictures. Those kids had accidents. She was being very creative in her efforts to try to stop those accidents. It's absolutely no surprise that it

didn't work, but her attempts and her attempts to instill structure do not rise to a level of criminal activity because this was all implicitly or tacitly sanctioned by the Department of Family Services.

2.0

The government went in, and the government saw the buckets, and the government knew about the blended meals, and the government knew about the spanking with the paint sticks and never once said don't do that. Do something else instead. You need to take, like, parenting classes, or I need to get these kids removed. You didn't hear any evidence of that.

And don't forget, when CPS investigators go out for initial contacts, they're doing it unannounced. So there's no way for Janet to prep the girls or tell them what to say.

There's no way for CPS to walk in and Janet already have them secreted away because she's not expecting them. So CPS is walking into the home and observing what's actually happening.

Now, the Solanders have a right to impose allowable corporal punishment. Now, you have an instruction about adoptive parents have the same rights as actual parents, including the care, custody and management of your children, and corporal punishment means the infliction of physical pain. So the law allows for the infliction of some physical pain, including without limitations hitting, pinching or striking. A parent or guardian of a child may use corporal punishment as a means of discipline.

You are tasked with determining if that discipline imposed was excessive, constituting child abuse, but the use of an implement in and of itself is not unlawful. It just needs to be reasonable under the circumstances.

2.0

You heard evidence that the girls were spanked on their bottoms with paint sticks. You did not hear evidence that the girls were beaten in the face with paint sticks. You didn't hear evidence that the girls were beaten on their backs with paint sticks. You didn't hear evidence that the girls were beaten on their stomachs with paint sticks. Corporal punishment does include spanking on the bottom, and that's what you have evidence of.

Now, the Solanders have a legal right to rely on the government and the CPS investigators as an agent of that government because Janet admitted to them she spanked her children. She blended their meals. They knew about the potties. They knew about the limited toilet paper usage which is not a charge. It's not one of the 46 counts.

And at one period in time at least, you know that Dwight instructed Jan Finnegan not to feed the girls a blended lunch for a period of three weeks, but that the girls were fed two meals, and it was not nutritionally deficient. CPS didn't say stop. They didn't say discipline another way.

Two CPS investigators did not see any need to staff

the investigation with a supervisor, and they didn't rush their investigations. You heard about the 30-day period as a target, but one of the investigations took something like 60 days, and one took something like 40 days. CPS had no safety concerns in the home, and they knew about all of Janet's admissions, and they didn't tell her to change a thing.

2.0

Now, I would direct your attention to Instruction

Number 28, and that provides you that the Department of Family

Services and Child Protective Services are government agencies,

and its employees are government agents. A person who

reasonably and in good faith relies on the government for

advice or guidance cannot later be prosecuted for a crime

explicitly or implicitly approved by the government.

Now, this instruction does not apply to an individual who intentionally misleads the government to obtain approval for or acquiescence in his or her conduct, but let's get into what CPS acknowledged, the conduct that they actually acknowledged.

Crystal Rosas said how do you discipline the girls,

Janet and Dwight? In addition to taking away privileges and

putting them in timeout, they admitted to spanking the girls.

CPS confirmed the conduct and did not see any reason to suggest

corrective action or that the Solanders [unintelligible]

discipline.

This goes to the spanking counts, 1, 14 and 24.

There's no evidence before you that Janet intentionally misled the government for approval or acquiescence for spanking her children with paint sticks. That's actually what happened. That's what she admitted to, and that's what she's charged with. So when CPS and Crystal Rosas said, Okay, a person who reasonably and in good faith relies on the government actor for advice or guidance cannot later be prosecuted for that crime, for that conduct rather.

2.0

Now, again, CPS acknowledged this conduct, sitting on buckets. Nona Ocloo, that was one of the later investigators, physically saw a potty training bucket for Anastasia in the kitchen, and we talked about how Gail Anderson photographed the moment in September of 2013, including a Home Depot bucket. No CPS investigator directed Janet not to use the buckets because they didn't have evidence before them when they went through the home and talked to everybody that the girls were sitting on buckets all day long every day, 24/7.

The testimony you heard that Ava, Amaya and Anastasia got bathroom breaks every hour when their timer went off, and you'll remember they were homeschooled. When you get in regular school, you don't get hourly bathroom breaks. These girls got bathroom breaks more than you would in a traditional school. You are tasked with determining whether this is child abuse and neglect based on is this an extended period of time. It is not an extended period of time if the child is sitting on

a bucket for an hour, hour and a half and even two hours tops. As long as the child is not having an accident, they have the chairs that they sat on.

2.0

So I would submit to you that CPS acknowledged this conduct. They tacitly approved and endorsed this conduct, and Janet did nothing to intentionally mislead them that the girls were having the buckets in the kitchen. So this goes to Counts 3, 15 and 26.

CPS also acknowledged the restricted water and blended food. When CPS came out and Nona Ocloo did her investigation, she confirmed that the girls received blended meals, and she confirmed what was in those blended meals. She also confirmed that the Solander girls' water intake was restricted after 12:00. So no one intentionally misled the government about that. Nona Ocloo did not instruct Janet or Dwight to modify their behavior in any way related to the food and water intake for their girls.

And when CPS went out, when Nona went out and she did her body checks and she looked at those girls, she observed the girls who were well developed, well-nourished, and she said that is a safe home environment, and that is why the State has not met its burden with respect to Count 6, 18 and 29 as far as withholding food and water for extended periods of time.

And you'll remember little Anastasia. I asked her, you know, When you first started talking to this forensic

interviewer in March of 2014, didn't you tell her you went years without water, and she said, Yeah, that didn't actually happen. Because it didn't. There were water restrictions so that way the girls would not have bathroom accidents, but that's not the same as being restricted for extended periods of time.

2.0

And this was the instruction that I read to you, 28. Doing a little dance there. Okay.

Now, when we talked about CPS making their observations about the girls, well they weren't the only ones physically looking at the girls. You heard from everybody's doctors. You have no credible evidence of malnutrition or dehydration as to any of these girls. Now, again, this is conduct you may not personally approve of, but it's not conduct that rises to the criminal level of abuse.

Ava had many doctors' appointments. You heard from a bunch of different doctors. She saw Dr. Nyarko on all of these different days in December, in March, in August. No one reported anything at that time. There was no concern. She saw Dr. Bernstein in May, in June, in August, in September, in November, so several times over a six-month period in that one year alone and then again in January. And Dr. Bernstein you'll remember testified he had no concerns about her physical appearance. In fact, he determined her to be well nourished, well hydrated.

Dr. Bernstein testified he used testing to rule out von Willebrand's blood disorder. Now, a whole bunch of hype was made about this von Willebrand's, and Janet was diagnosing all of these — all of her kids with all of these diagnoses and illnesses. Well, it was the doctor who came up with this. It was the doctor who said we just need to rule it out.

2.0

Now, as a mother, when your child is in the hospital and your child is going to the doctor, when your child is seeing specialists and you don't know what's wrong and you're trying to rule out every single organic cause of what the behavior is because you want to do what's right for that child and you don't want it to be your fault, you want to see is there a medical issue. Is there something medically I need to clear that would explain what is going on?

That language, von Willebrand's, it came from the doctor. The doctor put that in her head. What she may have done and said out of panic when she started disclosing to other doctors, that's before you. That's for you to decide, but you'll recall it took six months to rule out von Willebrand's. So she was in panic six months because her daughter might have a bleeding disorder.

And you'll also remember that Danielle confirmed

Janet has that same disorder. So she knows how serious it is.

She knows how upsetting that kind of a diagnosis would be.

Ava also saw Dr. Rhee on all of these dates,

Dr. Rhee. Testing was suggestive of Crohn's disease. Again, Janet is not coming up with these diagnoses. The doctor is the one who said, Dr. Rhee confirmed, well, yes, I'm going to talk to the parent. I'm going to explain what I was trying to rule out. I would explain what Crohn's disease is. It took over a year to rule out Crohn's. So, again, she had to live with this fear of a possible diagnosis for over a year.

2.0

Now, Amaya also saw a number of doctors. Amaya was taken to Dr. Nyarko, just like Ava was, and she was also taken to Dr. Dewan. Dr. Dewan was testing for a potential thyroid condition. He noted possible hypothyroidism, noted because of symptoms that Amaya had dry skin and crinkly hair, and he testified about the different symptoms, and one he would have given some sort of even modest medication. This diagnosis, this possible condition came from a doctor, not from nurse Janet.

Dr. Raja and his partner Ahad, they also saw Amaya on these dates. Dr. Raja noted there was a tendency of malingering. Well, that's consistent with some of Amaya's other diagnoses, again not an attack on that child. Those children came from really terrible biological home conditions. So they've earned any kind of, you know, badge basically. If they've come from a bad home and they're struggling, there is absolutely a reason to lie. It doesn't make them a bad kid, but it also doesn't make every single thing that they say true

about Janet.

2.0

Now, Anastasia also had a number of medical appointments. She saw Dr. Nyarko. She saw Dr. Dewan. Janet came to the doctor complaining about excessive weight loss. Again, common sense doesn't leave just because you've entered jury service. It makes absolutely no sense that a parent would intentionally withhold food and water for a child and then very openly display that child for a doctor to see if she was getting away with child abuse. How does that make sense? What kind of motive is that? That's not a motive.

The doctor said PediaSure. What did Anastasia testify to? PediaSure was added to all blended foods. By August of 2011, Anastasia had gained weight. No height but gained weight. You have no evidence of food or water being withheld for excessive periods of time. And again this goes to Count 6, 18 and 29.

The doctors all testified the children were all well nourished. They are mandatory reporters. Not one of them made a report over the years that she took them to the doctors. You heard me ask well nourished, well hydrated. The doctor testified, well, yeah, I checked. Remember when -- well, actually it was one of you who asked a good question. How do you know if a child is well hydrated? And he talked about, like, watching the capillaries fill. He talked about physical exams. He talked about physically looking at those children.

You've heard no testimony that Janet's conduct caused Ava, Amaya or Anastasia to have food or water withheld that caused them to be malnourished or improperly hydrated to any degree of medical certainty.

If you'll excuse me.

2.0

Now, when we talk about this CPS-acknowledged conduct, there's also doctor-acknowledged conduct. The State wants to try to paint Janet as this liar or this master manipulator, but when she went to Dr. Mileti, she didn't try to stop Amaya from disclosing about timed to bathroom privileges in the home. She didn't dispute it. Dr. Mileti made no recommendation to change the bathroom timing, and she testified that disclosure did not trigger her duty as a mandatory reporter because it did not rise to suspicion of child abuse or neglect.

This goes to whether or not the girls caused to hold their urinary or bowel movements for, again, an extended period of time, not just period because that doctor testified, well, yeah, there are times when you really do need to teach your child to hold their bowels or their urine, like when they're in school, like when they're at the store, and they need to hold it, like when you're on a trip.

What evidence did you hear about trips? Ava, Amaya and Anastasia went to Disney World. They went to Knott's Berry Farm. They went to church. They went to the beach. They went

to Arizona at one point. And that's when she talked -- by she I mean Janet -- that's what Janet talked to Dr. Mileti about is trying to teach her children to hold their bowel and their urine. You are tasked with determining if that's unreasonable for an extended period of time. Hourly bathroom breaks, it's not an extended period of time. It's not unlawful. You may find it abusive the way that she did it, but it does not -- your subjective belief on whether or not something is abusive is not the same as if it is abused under the law for an extended period of time, which brings us to the exaggerated claims, the exaggerated allegations.

2.0

And I will submit that the next series of offenses all have some base in some physical observation in the home. The kids would take something or they would take an experience or they would recycle old allegations, and they would bring them, and they would exaggerate them, and they would make them in to these larger than life allegations.

All right. Let's talk about the sexual assault allegations and specifically the catheters -- well, let's take a step back. When I was talking to you about these exaggerated allegations from the girls, you heard those girls. Every day Janet beat me. Every day she made me waste away on paint buckets. I went days and days without food or water. Every day she kicked me up and down the stairs with high-heeled boots that apparently Janet would wear in the home when she's going

up and down stairs, and she's at home all day.

2.0

Now, again, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, your common sense doesn't leave the door. If you think that Janet is traipsing around chasing three little kids and some foster children in high-heeled boots up and down stairs, flights of stairs, that's your prerogative, but you don't have any credible evidence of that.

Every day, every day they beat me with paint sticks until our butts blood. When Dr. Cetl testified -- and you finally saw the pictures -- you saw some scars. You saw undated scars. What did you actually see? Wouldn't you expect to see a whole lot more and marks covering their body if they were being kicked and thrown and pushed downstairs and if they were being kicked with high-heeled boots? Wouldn't you have something different than a looping scar?

Doctors saw those children. CPS investigator saw those children. No one saw those children wasting away. No one saw those children sitting all day long on buckets. She didn't even -- actually, when you think about it, CPS didn't testify that they saw the girls doing homework every day all day long on buckets. Again, I'd ask you to recall the time that Crystal Rosas came into the home and she saw the girls outside playing, two of them on bicycles.

Is there a single doctor who has testified to any degree of medical certainty that anything Janet did caused

physical harm or abuse? No. When Janet expressed to multiple doctors, including Dr. Rhee that she was considering sending her children somewhere to inpatient to fix their behaviors, she told the same to DFS. She told the same to Lori Wells. She was not doing any of this in secret. In fact, she seemed to be calling out for better suggestions.

2.0

All right. So now we can talk specifically more about the sexual assault allegations and specifically the catheters. Think about the timing. Think about the timing of how this came into effect. Ava and Amaya and Anastasia didn't make a disclosure about catheters until very late.

And, in fact, Amaya didn't even testify about catheters until the first court hearing. She didn't tell Florida CPS. She didn't tell Steven Blankenship. She didn't tell anyone at Marvelous Grace Girls Academy where she lived for four months, and she didn't tell anyone, including Ms. Ebrahim. When Ms. Ebrahim interviewed her forensic interview, that never came up.

There was never a disclosure to Nanny Rebecca. There was never a disclosure to Nanny Andrea. There was never a disclosure to Nanny Jan, and Dwight wasn't home because he was working all week. That was her testimony, and Janet wasn't home because she was in Ohio. There was never a disclosure to CPS, Crystal Rosas or Nona Ocloo, and they testified they were able to interview the girls without interruption, without Janet

there.

2.0

You didn't hear any disclosures at Marvelous Grace Girls Academy and nothing from Florida. The first disclosure about catheters is by Anastasia to the forensic interviewer in Nevada in March of 2014. But Ava, when she actually talked about catheters, remember, she had to be prompted. We asked Ms. Ebrahim about that. She had to be prompted specifically about was there something with the tube in a bag to make her pee come out, and Ava said, Oh, catheter. And Ms. Ebrahim testified, Oh, what's a catheter? And Ava regurgitated exactly the question she got.

Amaya didn't disclose any catheter until the first court hearing and presumably when she was pretrialed with the DA. Now, you heard Ms. Ebrahim testify about the national standards and why those are so important. Because you don't want to feed the children the answers that you're seeking. You don't want to elicit inaccurate information, and that's why leading questions are such a problem. That's why leading questions create and invite unreliable evidence.

You don't have any information about how those pretrial conferences were conducted, none. They weren't recorded. They weren't videoed. You don't know if Amaya was led to anything, but you do know that given the chance, when she had open-ended questions from Florida CPS and then again with Nevada at the forensic interview in March 2014, she didn't

say anything.

2.0

Now, you heard testimony about Janet and Dwight and specifically Dwight purchasing the catheters as a way of threatening the girls to make them scared enough for the pee to come out, and Amaya actually testified to that. If you think about what Amaya actually said -- think back to what the girls said, not our questions, not the lawyer talk, what did that girl actually say and describe -- she said, I was so scared. I just peed. It was just easier to pee. Well, that was the whole goal, wasn't it? There was the purchase of the catheters. There was the purchase to threaten them. There was a purchase to do something because Janet had to do something to get them to stop withholding their urine.

You remember when I asked Dr. Mileti, If a child is intentionally accumulating urine in their bladder; that's not healthy, that's a problem; right? Yes. Now, the State wants to point you to, well, she didn't recommend that a catheter get inserted. Well, Janet's the one living day to day with these girls. When she originally had them come home, you know that she was working for the base. She gave that up so she could homeschool those girls, so she could improve their lives, so she could give them structure. Again, you may not agree with that structure, but she was trying based on being very ill-equipped.

And that's where you get into the book. She talks

about why she was ill-equipped. She talks about why the system is failing children. She talked about why the system is failing foster parents as well.

2.0

Janet and Dwight bought those catheters as a scare tactic. Now, the State wants you to say or the State wants you to believe, look, they email pictures back and forth. Think about those pictures. You saw a lot of pictures. Janet documented everything which again she talks about in the book about why. She also has descriptors in all of her emails. Ava did this. Amaya did this. Oh, look at this. Every child is assigned, every child is labeled in those emails. The catheter email, 300 cc, not a child, not a description. There's no context.

Actually, there's not a whole lot of context to the picture when you think about it. How do you know that's not a stock photo? How do you know that's not just something she made up to scare them? You don't have any credible evidence of catheters actually being used in that home. You don't. The purchase of the catheter, that email was dated December 6th. That email that Janet had the picture without assigning to any child was five days later on December 11th, 2012. How do you know that wasn't just a stock photo from the Internet? How do you know that there weren't more photos than that?

Remember when Detective Johnson testified, and he said, yeah, there were lots of photos and lots of emails, and

Mr. Figler asked, Okay, there were more emails. There were more photos that you didn't actually include. Who makes the determination about what photos and emails to bring into evidence? The government.

2.0

You have evidence that Dwight and Janet e-mailed all the time, and they sent pictures. You don't have any context about what came before or what came after, but what you do have is Amaya confirming, yeah, they used to scare us with catheters. So I would just pee because I would be so scared. You know what, I believe her because she wasn't talking about catheters being inserted. It was the government who asked, And then she stuck it in you; right? Because Amaya originally told you, I was just so scared I would just pee. Again, listen to what the girls actually described. Listen to their discrepancies in their own stories.

Now, Counts 7 and 8 relate to Ava. Remember on the State's slides how the State laid out Counts 7 and 8, and you remember how on Count 8 there wasn't a whole lot of information. Remember when I asked you to think about what Ava actually testified to. Oh, I understand that it is frustrating, and it can be very embarrassing to talk about different things when you are called to testify on the stand.

But Ava didn't really struggle to describe anything else. She told you all about everything else that Janet did. What she couldn't describe was in detail about the catheter.

She would say I don't know. I can't answer. You recall that she testified that Janet put the catheter in her vagina, and I would ask you to look at your notes, not the State's notes about what they think was circled, but what she actually identified and what she actually pointed to when she was called and when she testified was her vagina.

2.0

She said that the catheter went into her vagina and pee just came out. It just came out, right then like that. Dr. Cetl testified that's not how catheters work. If Ava is testifying in a way that makes it a physical impossibility for it to occur, that is a material fact about testimony, and if she is testifying falsely about a material fact, you can disregard all of her testimony, and there's an instruction about witness credibility, and I would direct you to that, and I'll get you the number in a minute. I put a note on it.

Now, let's say I have not convinced you with this, and again I don't have the burden proof, but this is a conversation about the burden of proof, and let's say, okay, well, you know what, Ava testified. You know, there were other girls who testified.

Okay. So we talked about Amaya's actual testimony. Janet threatened her with the catheter, and she was so scared that she peed herself because it was better to just pee herself and get spanked than to have to go through any other scare tactic. Amaya never disclosed any of this in her forensic

interview about catheters.

But it was Anastasia, Anastasia, whose favorite subject in school is drama, and Anastasia, who you heard would testify in a very exaggerated way. She said, well, I didn't have water for years. Okay. Well, that's not true. It was just days and days. Or I had to sleep outside with the bugs. Well, okay, really I was sleeping on towels [unintelligible] boards, or just her different things or, yeah, I had a catheter inserted more than five times, maybe like seven or eight, maybe like four. She couldn't keep her numbers straight. And that's something that you have to consider, ladies and gentlemen.

Then you have to consider the actual physical description of how Janet allegedly put a catheter into her. She said Janet put a catheter into me one-handed while holding me down. So this child was struggling. This child was kicking, and so she is alleged to have held the child down and at the same time put a catheter in one-handed. You all heard Dr. Cetl testify about how it's a physical impossibility.

MS. BLUTH: Objection. Misstates the evidence about physical impossibility.

THE COURT: All right. That's --

Well, and, ladies and gentlemen, it's your conclusion as to what the inferences are that can be drawn from the testimony itself. Again, this is just inferences that the lawyers are drawing.

Go on.

2.0

MS. MCAMIS: Absolutely. And I thank you for pointing that out. That's why I keep saying look at your notes. You don't have to look at my notes. Look at your notes. What did Dr. Cetl testify to? Is that something that people are really doing one-handed? You don't have evidence that Janet's a pro at catheterization. You don't have evidence that she knew how to do that.

You heard from her that the general practice is for two people to do it, but certainly if one person is going to do it, it requires two hands, and that's because -- and unfortunately I have to get graphic -- it has to do with the way that you have to spread the child in order to access the urethra, and none of that is what Anastasia actually testified to. She testified that she was kicking and screaming and fighting every single time. So Janet is doing this every single time one-handed. That defies logic. That defies common sense, and it defies Dr. Cetl's testimony, the State's own expert.

And I would redirect you to Amaya. You will recall that Amaya testified, after a little bit of prodding, And then she put the catheter in you; right? Yeah. Then she said, well, with one hand she had a razor blade, and then she was threatening me. So somehow Janet Solander, who was diagnosed with this you Willebrand's bleeding disorder is holding a razor

and single-handedly putting a catheter into the other child.

Again, these physical descriptions do not make sense. So I would direct you to that instruction I was talking about, and that's Instruction Number 8:

The credibility or believability of a witness should be determined by his manner or her manner upon the stand, the relationship to the parties, his or her fears, motives, interests or feelings, his or her opportunity to observe — to have observed the matter to which he or she is testifying, the reasonableness of his or her statements, and the strength or weakness of his or her recollections.

You are also instructed,

2.0

If you believe that a witness has lied about any material fact in the case, you may disregard the entire testimony of that witness or any portion of his or her testimony which is not proved by other evidence.

Dr. Cetl testified probable finding of abuse based on disclosure of two of the girls, not physical evidence, not other corroboration. Detective Emery didn't recover any catheters, didn't recover any biological materials in the home,

didn't recover broken paint sticks, didn't recover blood all over paint sticks, didn't recover blood anywhere, splatter.

2.0

What you have are the words of these girls, the words of these troubled girls which again is not their fault, but it gives context to their word choice, the choices that they made to make up this story about Janet Solander, who admittedly didn't want to go back home. Why? There was a lot of rules. There's a lot of restrictions. They didn't get sodas. They didn't get a whole lot of TV. They didn't want to go home.

But, ladies and gentlemen, if you can get over all of the vagueness and the lack of details from each of these girls when they testified, specifically Ava and Amaya who couldn't give you the specifics and then Anastasia whose specifics justify logic and the fantastical stories that she told about the catheters and the science defying one-handed catheter story that Amaya and Anastasia said that Janet put catheters in one-handed, if you somehow can get over that hurdle and believe their testimony, a person is not guilty of sexual assault if the penetration is for a legitimate medical purpose, and that's this instruction.

If the defendant presents any evidence that the penetration was for a medical purpose, the State must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the penetration was not undertaken for a legitimate medical purpose. Now, you see that, "presents any evidence," not beyond a reasonable doubt,

but any evidence. What evidence do you have before you about the purpose of this penetration? Now, certainly not for sexual gratification. You don't have any information about that.

2.0

You have lots of information though that these kids had bathroom accidents and that everything she did was intended to fix that. So you have evidence that there is corrective behavior, but more than that, you have more than that, what did Dwight and Janet talk about constantly? Why did they check the underwear? They didn't want there to be stains because there was a concern about UTIs, and as I anticipate you all know by now, a UTI is a urinary tract infection. They didn't want the kids to have medical issues.

So even if you believe that they really did defy science and defy logic and put these catheters into those girls where pee immediately came out, which again contradicts how Dr. Cetl testified a catheter actually works, the purpose was a medical purpose. It was to remove and void the bladder. It was to remove and void the bladder to prevent ongoing bathroom issues, to prevent things like UTIs, and it's on the State to prove beyond a reasonable doubt to you that the penetration was not undertaken for that legitimate medical purpose, but you have evidence before you, ladies and gentlemen, and that's what you heard about is the UTIs.

Now, you heard testimony about the girls refusing to go to the bathroom, and they would hold their urine at times,

and I would submit the reasons why they're up to you. You have to assess their credibility. Okay. The girls testified that they didn't want to live in the home. They didn't want to be adopted by the Solanders. They didn't like the rules. They didn't agree with them. So why were they holding their urine? That is one of the ways children can act out.

2.0

Dr. Mileti confirmed if a child is deliberately accumulating urine in the bladder it's not healthy. So if you can believe that catheters were actually used, based on Anastasia's description, Janet inserted the catheter like a nurse. So that object, that catheter was used in its medical purpose. It was used in its intended medical function.

All right. Now, you're also tasked with determining whether or not Janet committed battery with intent to commit sexual assault, and if there's no sexual assault or intent, specific intent to commit sexual assault, there can be no battery, and so that goes to Counts 38 and 39 with Anastasia.

And, ladies and gentlemen, I won't belabor this point. It speaks for itself. If there's no sexual assault based on the way they described that, then there's no battery with intent. It's just a battery. It's just an unconsented touching.

Now, you're also tasked with determining whether or not Janet committed assault with use of a deadly weapon beyond a reasonable doubt. Think about how you heard the assault

story. Now, and again I'm going to direct you to look at your notes. Ava alleged that she was threatened with a razor before a catheter was inserted. Again, this fabrication of this story, this fabrication that Janet has a razor — actually, I put Ava, but I think, and I would ask you to check your notes, I actually think that was Amaya regarding the one hand with the razor and the one hand with the catheter. Okay.

2.0

And Janet was alleged to have displayed a razor blade and threatened to cut Anastasia, but what did you hear from Anastasia? Lots of stories. What did the police recover in their search of the Solander home? Not a single razor blade, no. What other stories did the girls tell?

What other stories did Anastasia tell? I slept outside on the rocks with the bugs. I had to sleep on a towel, and the location of the towel in the house kept changing, but then it was, well, I can't actually remember where I slept. Do you remember when I asked her about the different things that she said when she talked to the forensic interviewers in March of 2014?

If you believe that Anastasia lied about any material fact in this case, you can disregard her entire testimony, or you can disregard a portion of that testimony and specifically as it relates to anything with the catheters, with the razor blades, with these threats. That's something that you should do. That's something that the defense is asking you to do.

All right. So you've also been tasked with determining whether or not sleeping on boards with fans blowing rises to the level of child abuse or neglect. Now, I understand what the girls testified about boards, but you have a lot of really strange conflicting testimony about the boards when you think about it, and the reason I asked about the different boards in the home, like isn't it true you had boards that separated you so you could focus on your homework, because there is a point they referenced things that actually happened and then expanded on them.

2.0

And remember when I asked the one little girl, one of the Stark girls, Isn't it true they had a board, and the board was used to steady the Wii, the Wii video game? And you heard about the Wii video game in the home. It was used to help one of the girls lose weight.

Also, the Stark children testified, and it contradicted the Solander girls' testimony that the Solander girls had cots that they would sleep with the boards on the cots, and I'd ask you to look at your notes. You have a whole lot of contradicting testimony about the way the girls slept.

And then you have that story about Anastasia saying;
Ava's board had an alarm on it. You heard different stories
about the alarm, and just nothing really matched up, and I
would ask you to review your notes pretty carefully about that.
Was it on the bathroom? Was it on the bedroom? Was it on the

gate? What did you actually hear? What evidence? What direct evidence do you have about alarms?

2.0

You recall Dwight's email purchase about bedwetting alarms. Bedwetting alarms that make beeping noises like dah-dah. Do you remember testimony about that? Isn't it just as true it was the bedwetting alarms, and that's what the alarm was? So then did Ava's board have an alarm or did her cot have an alarm?

And then I've already made a note about Autumn and Ivy and the cots. Autumn and Ivy testified about fans in the bathroom. I would ask you to check your notes. They didn't testify about fans in the loft. What did you actually hear about the use of fans in this case? They were used to keep the girls awake for homeschool. Again, you may find it abusive. You may not like it. I understand that. I'm not asking you to like any of this, but I am asking you to actually consider if that rises to the level of child abuse and neglect.

Caseworker Cherina Davison confirmed that she saw three sleeping cots in the home, but it did not raise any red flags. She didn't say anything about I saw three boards in the home and nowhere for the girls to sleep. She said she confirmed to that investigator, I saw three sleeping cots. So we would submit that Counts 5, 17 and 28 are not proven beyond a reasonable doubt.

Now, you've also been tasked with determining the

child abuse and neglect or endangerment charges relating to the soiled underwear, and I would ask you again to be very circumspect with what evidence you actually heard. Janet was alleged to have forced the children -- I put child, but it was all -- children to place soiled underwear in their mouths.

2.0

Now, you heard testimony that the girls were put in cloth diapers and crawled around in front of Autumn and Ivy, and it was very embarrassing, and it was very, you know, upsetting, and it was intended to do something.

Again, it was intended to do corrective behavior, and this is a method different than the paint sticks. So if you don't like the paint sticks, this is a nonphysical way that the children were supposed to somehow modify their behavior. It was a different effort. Danielle Hinton confirmed the crawling and the cloth diapers, but she testified that she never saw soiled undergarments go in the girls' mouths. What did you hear? That the soiled garments came from the allegations from Ava, Amaya and Anastasia, the girls who have a history of exaggerating.

Danielle Hinton testified, and you'll remember her testimony. Danielle is the biological daughter of Janet Solander. She was also charged in this case. Remember when I asked her, You were originally looking at 40 years, weren't you? Yes. You struck a deal up so you could get a possible probation and no jail time? Yes. It's contingent on you

testifying; isn't it? Yes.

2.0

Her testimony is clouded by her own motivation. The State needed her. They called her as a witness, and they dangled that plea offer for her, and she took it. So she had motivation to testify in a way that's consistent with the narrative, this evil narrative that the State wants to paint for you, but what did Danielle actually talk about when I asked her? I was tired. I had just done my own physical at the MEPS. I was trying to apply at the Air Force. I had been on Xanax. I didn't regularly take Xanax. It made me a little loopy, and I hadn't slept after the plane, and I hadn't eaten after the plane, and then she went and did an interview starting at 8:00 p.m. at night after she had already been up all day and traveled and was on Xanax.

It's your job to determine whether or not she was telling the truth or what she was telling the truth about and to also to determine what her individual motives are, and that one relates to Counts 12, 22 and 42. And I think that based on all of the contradicting testimony, you don't have it proven beyond a reasonable doubt that it was soiled underwear that went into their mouths. You do have information though that there was underwear that the girls were forced to place on their heads. That's not the charge in front of you. It's soiled underwear.

Now, you are also called on to determine basically if

Janet really did kick and kick the girls up and down the stairs depending on the direction. Most of them said down the stairs, but one of them did testify at some point up, and they testified that they would tumble and fall down the flight of stairs. Now, if these little children are being kicked and pushed and slapped so hard down the stairs, do you have any evidence from Dr. Cetl about skull fractures? Do you have any evidence from Dr. Cetl about bone fractures? Do you have any evidence of anything consistent with a fall down a flight of stairs? No.

2.0

The girls said, oh, Janet would kick me with her high heeled boot. Use your common sense. What mother with three children and two little foster children at one point and then four foster children at another point is walking around in high-heeled boots in her home and kicking kids up and down the stairs? Isn't it more likely that she nudged them or she tapped them on the butt to get them to go upstairs so they would not soil themselves downstairs and would instead hurry upstairs? Again, I'm not asking you to like the conduct. I'm asking you to put some context to it.

You recall when I asked Anastasia about, Oh, were you kicked up and down the stairs? Isn't it true you actually just fell on your knees and you weren't tumbling down the stairs? She said, yeah, and that's consistent with how she testified previously at preliminary hearing after she was again called on

the story.

2.0

Now, each of these girls has their own motive and their own history of exaggeration, and Ava is no different. Ava testified to you in no uncertain terms right there that she never licked any urine off of the floor. She said that to you, to your faces. I know that the State wants to bring out at preliminary hearing that she said something different. So do I because that's the point. She said something different. The conflicting testimony on this [unintelligible] Ava exaggerated a criminal charge against Janet out of her challenged mind because these again are challenged children.

Count 11 was not proven to you beyond a reasonable doubt because Ava testified, I did not lick urine off of the floor. I admitted that I was -- promised to be truthful in the preliminary hearing, but I didn't tell the truth then which brings me to Ava's kitchen counter allegation.

I'm asking you to review Count 2, to hold the State to their burden of proof beyond a reasonable doubt, to actually look at those elements, to actually think about this disfigurement allegation and also to consider how Ava told that story. And weren't there times when the girls would tell the same story, that it wouldn't make any sense? Look at your notes.

At one point, one of the children who alleged to have observed this incident was upstairs. She said I was upstairs,

and then Ava's saying, well, I was downstairs, and I got my face slammed in the kitchen counter, and it swelled up huge, and it was purple, and it was red, and, of course, if that happened that was horrible, but think about it. I asked her, Didn't you see a doctor close in time after the alleged incident? Yes. Okay. Did you have any doctor testify before you about any recent or fresh injuries to Ava's eyes? No doctor testified that they had even a slight suspicion of child abuse or neglect or that they ever had a reason to make a CPS report.

2.0

And that included Dr. Cetl testifying that she -- we asked her -- do you remember -- What about skeletal fractures? What about eye sockets? She testified about scars on the bottoms, scars on the body. She did not testify about anything related to an eye injury.

And you'll recall that the girls saw Dr. Crispin right before they went to The Marvelous Grace Girls Academy in Florida and that was a physical done in November of 2013. There was no eye injury then. You didn't hear from any doctor, like an optometrist, that Ava had to get glasses because of an eye injury. Doctors are mandatory reporters. If they even suspect something, they have to report it.

Amaya also has her own evidence of exaggeration that she's presented to you. Amaya and her sisters all testified Amaya has a history of lying. And again, that's not

surprising, given their history. It's not surprising given where they came from. It's not surprising given that their biological home did not set them up for success in the future. It did not teach them right.

2.0

Ms. Debbie confirmed that Amaya has a history of lying. You have the specific example of Amaya threatening the same kinds of allegations that you are considering for Janet. Debbie hit me or Debbie pushed me. I'm going to call Heather Richardson. It wasn't true then, and it's not true now. Amaya at the dentist, Heather Richardson, she's covered in bruises. The very next morning, CPS investigator Pat Kelly goes out, disproves Heather Richardson's observations.

You heard Amaya. You heard about her incident in the family court proceeding and how she used that because she thought that acting out would get her what she wanted which was to go home.

And we talked about Anastasia and her evidence of exaggeration. Now, you'll remember when I asked her the question, Isn't it true when you were younger you lived with Ms. Debbie? You talked with Heather Richardson about having trouble telling the difference between reality and what you saw on TV? She said, yeah. Remember her evidence of exaggeration, Years without water. We slept on boards. We slept on towels. I slept on rocks outside with the bugs one time. That's not the first time she said that. She's recycled this story too.

I don't have information or evidence before you to prove or disprove, and it's not my burden about whether or not the grandmother did that, but that's the same story. She's recycled that. Anastasia testified that her head was forced into the toilet and that she — I believe that the government has alleged that she, like, split her head open. Dr. Cetl looked at that child. The only observation about that child's head was the recent and fresh ear mark, nothing about splitting her head open, no evidence that there was ever any skeletal fracture.

2.0

Just like Ava testified she was forced to lick her own urine off of the floor, Anastasia has created this story and fabricated this about being forced to put her head in the toilet, but Ava admitted that she told a lie. Ava actually stepped up.

What motive did Janet have to put a child's head into the toilet? She adopted these children? I know that the State wanted to talk to you about on the January 19th, 2011, and on, but she went through significant efforts to get these children. She had to foster. She had to live by all the rules of foster. Then she adopted them. She took them to Disney World. She took them to Knott's Berry Farm. She took them to church with her. She tried to raise them right.

And then when she encountered behaviors that she didn't know what to deal with, she acted in a way that has now

become before you, but it's all conduct that CPS knew about because they were still in the home because Janet was still a licensed foster care provider. Everything that you have been presented with was Janet's attempt to stop the bathroom accidents.

2.0

And that brings us to the story of Anastasia and the burn, and that's as to Count 25. Now, I want you to recall the conflicting testimony that Anastasia gave about the burn and the different versions that she gave about the burn, and that's why I did the very tedious questions that I know none of you enjoyed. I know. I have eyes, okay. But her story didn't make sense, and then it was switched, and she's giving different versions of it all at the same time.

Now, she testified at the preliminary hearing, and I read the direct quote, that she was cleaning the dog bathroom. Now, I don't know what that means, but that's what she testified to under oath, that she was cleaning the dog bathroom, and then she said, no, I was actually trying to wash my hands. I was trying to wash my hands with scalding water. It was too hot.

Okay. Let's break that down. Did you see any evidence of scalding water that was too hot for her hands? Did you have a picture with her hands burned? No. Okay. So then Anastasia testified that she was in the downstairs bathroom where there is no shower, as a reminder, and the State asked,

well, did Ava have anything to do with it? And Anastasia said, well, no, Ava was nearby, but she was waiting to see -- like, to get into the shower. Well, that would've been upstairs. So that didn't make sense either.

2.0

Okay. So putting aside just that which didn't even make sense because you can't have the same incident happen on two different levels of the house, think about what Anastasia actually talked about, scalding hot water coming out of the bathroom sink on the first floor. And you saw pictures, and you'll see pictures of that home, and you'll see pictures of how small that little guest bathroom is. It's not a full bathroom. It's a guest bathroom.

But Anastasia says that Janet Solander, and you look at her, Janet Solander picked Anastasia up by one arm and dunked her underneath the kitchen sink — or excuse me, she didn't say that, the bathroom sink. Okay. So assuming that that's physically possible, while Janet is supposed to be holding this wiggling, writhing, screaming child who's getting burned, she's also somehow taking a little candle lid, the lid, a lid, filling it up with the same water where the child's head is supposed to be and splashing it in her face.

There's no evidence that Anastasia actually had splash marks or burns or water-related injuries to the front of her face. What she had was that picture where her hair is wet, consistent with a shower, where there is spillage here,

downward, which again doesn't really make sense if she's supposed to be wiggling and screaming but held somehow vertically or horizontally underneath the sink. Just physically the way that her story is doesn't make sense, and at one point when she tells the story, the candle lid is the first splash, and at another point when she tells the story, the candle lid is the second splash. The timing doesn't add up. The amount of water doesn't add up. This story is a fabrication.

2.0

The fact that Anastasia got burned, you have that picture, but you don't know beyond a reasonable doubt how that child got burned which is why we asked, Isn't it true, Anastasia, that you and Ava were having a dispute? And there were disputes in the home. Ava frequently -- not frequently, that's a misstatement. Ava at one point was tasked with handing out the toilet paper. The girls got mad if they didn't get enough toilet paper, and they would fight, and the girls would dispute it, but they have a history of physically fighting.

You don't know beyond a reasonable doubt how that injury got there, and you don't know beyond a reasonable doubt that the injury is all that disfiguring permanently. Number one, the ear, that ear mark, the recent injury that Dr. Cetl observed in March of 2014 had nothing to do with the shower, even if it is the same location.

And then Anastasia shared with us what the skin looked like afterwards. She doesn't have -- [unintelligible] she had an exposed neck. You could see that. She doesn't have lingering, long and deep impacting burns. She doesn't have a whole bunch of scar tissue. She has what you saw in those pictures. It's some pigment discoloration. It's not an internal organ failure. It's not a loss of limb. It's not a loss of use of anything. It is some pigment discoloration.

2.0

And you don't have any evidence that Janet acted in any way that wasn't medically appropriate for it. Now, I understand the State wanted to bring out why didn't she take Anastasia to the doctor, and that's for you as a jury to decide what to do with that information, but based on the way that that child healed and presented to you, you have no evidence that she didn't do anything like bandage it or apply things like Neosporin to actually treat that.

You don't have any information about what degree burn that was. I know Dr. Cetl testified, but she testified from a picture. She could not testify to a medical degree of certainty that that was a nonaccidental or an accidental burn. She could not testify to a medical degree of certainty. So that does not meet the standard of beyond a reasonable doubt. You do not know what happened. You do not know the real story of Anastasia's burn, and the State did not prove it to you.

Now, I would also ask you to remember some of the

different things that Anastasia said as well. Remember when she said, well, we would take cold showers and get dumped with ice, but then also we would have burning hot showers. You have the pictures of their bodies. You have the pictures of what Dr. Cetl saw and what Dr. Cetl directed to have photographed.

2.0

You don't have corroborating information about scalding hot showers, but Anastasia repeated that to Jan Finnegan, and Jan Finnegan told that to CPS, and CPS Crystal Rosas did a body check and did not testify about any observable recent or fresh mark on Anastasia's body or ear. And we've talked about Dr. Cetl's testimony.

Now, Anastasia has told a number of stories, including the story of the trash bag, and this relates to Counts 44 and 45, and she testified, I was forced to stand in a trash bag all day long. All right. Well, you simply know that this can't be true because if you take her for her word that she sat on the potty buckets all day long, 24/7, she could not also have been in a trash bag all day long. There's just physically not enough time in the day to have showers, to get held under sinks, to sleep on the rocks with the bugs, to stand in the trash bags, to stand on the potties and to do her homework. There's just not enough time. Again, Anastasia's stories, Anastasia's exaggeration.

Is it more likely she was asked to remove the soiled clothes and leave them in the trash bag and then instructed to

take a shower? And I asked her about that, and she said well, yeah, eventually. Well, what do you know? You know that Janet Solander had a bunch of kids in that home. Common sense doesn't leave the door. If you have a soiled child in your home and that soiled child is smelly, you don't want it standing -- you don't want the child standing in a soiled trash bag smelling up your house. You would have to clean that up. Why would you add more work for yourself when you already have this many young children all in your house at the same time? It just doesn't make sense.

2.0

And you will recall that Anastasia was not in trash bags all day long every day, and she testified that it happened a couple of times, but when it did it was all day. Anastasia had her own bathroom issues which were observed by the BST worker Christina Day, and you'll remember when I asked her. She saw Anastasia soil herself, and that when Anastasia was saying I have to go to the bathroom, I have to go to the bathroom, she was frozen. She wouldn't move, and Janet was urging her to go to the bathroom, but she had an accident.

In response, Anastasia went and cleaned herself up because that's what actually happened in the home. That's what actually Janet was doing was go clean yourself up, not beating with paint sticks all day long every day. And again, CPS was in that home at a home visit. Nona Ocloo testified that she saw Anastasia leaving the bathroom after an accident and that

she had cleaned herself up. The story of the trash bag was not proven to you beyond a reasonable doubt based on the way that Anastasia's stories are told.

2.0

And that brings us to the paint stick, and that's Count 37. You'll recall Anastasia changing testimony again. First the paint stick went inside of her vagina. Then she testified, Okay, well, really the paint stick didn't go all the way in the vagina. It just kind of went around inside, and you remember her stumbling over her words. She looked at the diagram, and she picked one of the words, the labia maj — and she couldn't figure out how to pronounce it, but that's what she identified because she had a diagram.

Then she said that the paint stick was held inside of her vagina for less than half a minute, and I didn't put the exact number because I couldn't remember if it was 20 seconds or 30 seconds. Again, I would direct you to look at your notes. Think about how she's describing this.

Think about what would Janet's motive be to insert a paint stick just one single time inside of Anastasia's vagina? If you believe her testimony that Anastasia, as a result of her bathroom accidents, was having catheters inserted into her, wouldn't Janet just have inserted another catheter as opposed to a paint stick? This story doesn't make any sense. The details of the story don't make -- don't make it credible, and she could not describe to you in sufficient detail anything

that would give context to the story. Janet had no motive, and you're allowed to consider whether or not Janet had a motive, but you're also allowed to consider this context in relation to all of the other stories and all of the other exaggerations particularly made by Anastasia.

2.0

And I would ask that you look very closely at Dr. Cetl's testimony. We've heard no testimony of bone fractures from falling down the stairs. We've heard no testimony of skull fractures or eye socket fractures or permanent disfigurement because of Ava's eye being slammed into the kitchen counter.

What you did hear testimony about is that this is the first case she's ever testified in, and she's testified in a lot, where sexual assault was charged by way of a catheter. She made an assessment and noted probable abuse based on the disclosures in the forensic interviews, but not for any other reason. She didn't have any physical corroboration. And you heard testimony about how catheters are actually inserted and that the pee doesn't come out immediately after a catheter is inserted contrary to what those girls explained, contrary to what they are saying happened.

And she could not testify to a reasonable degree of medical certainty that anything Janet Solander did caused the growth or the height concerns. You actually heard she said, well, there are many factors, environmental, genetic, early

years development, including limited to no prenatal care by the bio mother that could've also contributed very likely to the growth and the height development. Again, this goes to the count about withholding food and withholding water. You don't have medical evidence before you to any degree of medical certainty that anything that Janet Solander did directly caused the growth or the height concerns that Dr. Cetl testified about.

2.0

And you remember at the very beginning of this trial when the State said something like, You are entering a world of child abuse. Well, they were right about that. They were wrong about where it is. They were wrong about Janet being the world of child abuse. There is one thing that the government and Janet Solander agree on is that there's something seriously wrong with the foster care system.

Now, you heard little snippets from the book from the government, who quoted passages about that's when the rage can start, but you had no mention of what came before that quote in the book, and you had no mention about what came after it, and that's why we talked about context. The book is entitled Foster Care: How to Fix This Corrupted System, and that book is in evidence before you. When you go back to deliberate, you'll have it with you. Don't just thumb through it. Read it. It's not that long. Luckily -- Janet's a little older -- she typed it for those of us who don't like the small font.

It's a little bit bigger. It's readable.

2.0

Janet identifies the most basic of problems. Foster parents are not equipped to handle the children in their care because they have not been properly trained. She hit the mark right there. Parents who have been, like, normal biological parents may never have had to deal with some of the behaviors that foster children exhibit because they aren't prepared, Janet warns, that foster parents can become angry and can abuse children, even killing them, and that's why Janet wrote this book. She even dedicated it to foster children out there, and she dedicated it to kids who lost their lives as a result of abuse, and she dedicated it to her daughters at the time, Ava, Amaya and Anastasia.

Janet talked about how different age groups of children react when they are placed in the foster care system, how some of them -- and this was all based on her experience, and she talks about this in the book. It's not just the Starks. It's not just the Diaz-Burnett kids. It's not just the Solanders. She had other foster kids. You didn't hear about any of them, and you certainly know if there had been a problem with them you would probably be in trial for another week.

So she expressed concern for the older children in foster care who quickly learn to manipulate the system, to make false allegations against a foster parent because they wanted

to be moved out of the home, and she noted how these older kids will sometimes age out of the foster care system and then turn to crime, become another statistic.

2.0

Now, Janet shared this book as a way to share how she and Dwight were deceived about the true history of Ava, Amaya and Anastasia, how DFS was not forthcoming, and you have evidence of that. Heather Richardson didn't tell you anything until I brought it out on cross-examination. So DFS was not forthcoming, but that didn't excuse bad conduct. She said there's still no reason to neglect, abuse or murder these children in foster care. And she used case example. She used research. She cites articles about other foster parents who were very ill-equipped who ended up murdering their children.

You don't have any evidence of that as to Janet Solander. What you have is evidence that she was ill-equipped and found someone who was equipped, Marvelous Grace Girls Academy, that they privately paid for, and you'll have this. This has been marked as evidence and introduced on behalf of the defense about the intake and enrollment fees that were received, and Mr. Blankenship confirmed that.

When Janet had had enough and didn't know where else to turn, she got help. She looked further. She didn't murder her children, but she saw that there were failures in the DFS, that other foster parents had gone -- had done these horrible acts, and she wanted to call the department out on it.

Everything Janet did she did out of a genuine desire to help these girls so they would not end up a statistic. Those are her words.

2.0

Now, I know that Janet didn't testify, and you've got an instruction that's saying you can draw no negative inference. You don't get to even comment on that. That is not a part of your deliberation at all, but you still get the benefit of this book. You still get to hear from her, her words. She wrote about the general system failure and that parents' rights, the biological parents' rights were prioritized over the welfare of the children.

And in this case, you heard all about how vocal an advocate Janet was. Heather Richardson confirmed it. She said, yeah, Janet and Dwight are staunch advocates. They said if they need IEPs, the kids are getting IEPs. If they need help with their homework, they're getting help with their homework. They met the teachers.

But she was also a staunch advocate for foster kids like Areahia Diaz whose biological parents were missing visits and whose intern therapist broke Areahia's trust. So Janet advocated for Areahia to get a new therapist. It didn't make her popular, but it didn't make her a monster.

In this book, in this book, and that's in evidence, [unintelligible] remember during the search warrant it specifically looked for it, and they seized all of her books,

all of her research, all of her notes from the publisher.

Don't know how that it proves that she committed child abuse against the Solander girls, but they seized all of that anyway. They knew before even interviewing the Solander girls that Janet had written this book. You have evidence of that because of the hundreds of emails that were distributed all among county employees.

2.0

So in this book, Janet talks about taking foster kids to their dental appointments and spending \$500 on clothes and toiletries on the first day of getting them because these kids come from nothing, and you'll recall that each child only gets 692 or whatever that figure was. It's, like, 691-something, but it rounds up to 692. So she's going above and beyond spending 500 on Day 1 for these children. That money is supposed to go for food, for care, for housing, for all kinds of stuff, and Janet is making sure that she's using that money so these kids have food, so they have clothes, so they have supplies, so they have toiletries, all the things that their own parents could not or would not provide.

But Janet also talks about a lot of the hardships that she had as a parent adjusting to being a foster and an adoptive parent. So you heard me ask about the time Anastasia smeared her feces under the bed, and that was one week after she was adopted, and Anastasia confirmed it when I asked. Janet actually wrote about that in the book. When Anastasia

was 6, and one week after the adoption was finalized, Janet used the feces smearing incident as an example of how children who underwent extreme trauma will manifest that trauma in totally unexpected ways.

2.0

Now, if you'll remember -- sorry. Okay. Now, if you'll remember, Janet had a lot of observations about the different ways that the foster kids acted up, and she just wasn't prepared for that, but Anastasia nevertheless smeared her feces. These behaviors predated any of the structure or any of the rules that Janet later made to try to correct these behaviors because one week after adoption would've still been in January 2011, would've still been at the Jubilee home. It would've still been before all of the wild stories, the really wild allegations are alleged to have happened. All of the kids' behaviors predated that because the Solanders inherited that.

And this book also explains how the foster care system works and how lots of people come into your home and that fostering opens you up to public eye, and she explained how CPS may pop in on you from time to time because that's what they do. They're just people concerned for the children, and they have to do their job, and that's why she explained she documented everything, photos, videos, et cetera.

She wrote, We have the video eating -- excuse me. We have a video of our daughter eating one of her favorite foods,

and right after finished, the daughter went through the garbage can eating who knows what, and she couldn't explain it. And you remember the testimony of one of the DFS caseworkers who confirmed Janet should keep a video and take it to the doctor to show.

2.0

And what other evidence do you have that Janet took lots of photos? A lot. You have a lot. And that gives context to why there's so many photos in this case and why they're not as bizarre and outrageous as the State wants them to seem. You have that photo of Amaya's face when it's red and blotchy and kind of itchy looking, and it's got the little scratches there. Well, don't you remember there was testimony about Amaya having a history of a skin rash? Wouldn't that picture be consistent with all of the little marks consistent with a skin rash?

And again, a photo of the catheter. You saw a lot of photos, including when the kids had soiled accidents. You saw no photos of actual catheters being inserted, and Janet documented everything.

This book, this book also criticized how some of the caseworkers were lazy, and they didn't spend enough time with the children in the home to be able to gauge their needs, and when you read that book, you'll see that she's calling out Gail Anderson, but not by name, but that would've been consistent, and her description would've been consistent with how Gail

Anderson was in the home and not paying enough attention to baby Novaleih.

2.0

Janet was critical of the medical physical and mental health care for foster children and how DFS -- desperate DFS is to place the children that they won't consider if the foster or adoptive home is a good fit for each child. Janet expressed that had she and Dwight had a more complete history of their adopted girls she's unsure if she would've gone through with the adoption process right away or asked for more time, but she emphasized anyway -- okay. She emphasized anyway that she loved the girls, and they were her girls, but she was ill-equipped for the type of behaviors that later arose.

She criticized the foster care system for warehousing kids, for not having the type of psychological care facilities available to help the children, including her middle child.

Janet even wrote, I would rather send my child to a long-term treatment facility out of state for as long as necessary than give up on her and place her back into the system where she will become even more damaged than before. Again, the words and conduct of someone who is trying to do better for these girls.

The bottom line of Janet's book is that the foster care system does not serve its intended purpose which is the best interests of the foster children, and that's why she wrote this book, to expose the systemic failure and to suggest change

so that children don't become statistics or are placed in inappropriate foster homes.

2.0

So I urge you to actually read this book. I urge you to give context to the quotes that the government pulled out in their opening statement and which I anticipate they will reference in their final closing statement.

Now, I don't get a final opportunity to speak. The State has the burden of proof. So I only get to talk to you once, but that's why we ask you, think about that. Think about that from the beginning. We said word choice, context, perspective. When Ms. Bluth is up here making her final statements, I want you to keep in the back of your mind, what's the appropriate word choice? What is the appropriate context and perspective?

This book, the government didn't like that book. We've talked about the stack of emails that circulated all throughout the county. It was even sent to the forensic interviewers, like Faiza Ebrahim right before she interviewed the Solander girls. She confirmed she got it that morning on March 11th of 2014, and you'll see email forwards and comments that went all the way up the chain about this book including Paula Hammack, that assistant director.

What you won't see is all of the off-the-record calls, text or in-person conversations about that book. That book is not good for the government. Janet published it, and

shortly thereafter it spread like wildfire through the Department of Family Services, and those email forwards start in February of 2014, and when was it that Yvette Gonzalez started making her investigations? February of 2014. When was it that CPS in Florida came into contact with the Solander girls? February 28th, 2014.

2.0

Don't let the government fool you. That book was a problem. If that book wasn't such a big deal, why is it e-mailed over and over and over again? If that book wasn't such a big deal, why is it in the search warrant? Why did they seize all of the copies, all of her publishing notes, all of her research material?

And again I want to focus you on this world of child abuse. It came up in the opening statement, and I imagine you're going to hear it again in the final closing statement. Child abusers don't take their children to doctor after doctor to rule every -- excuse me, to rule out every possible organic cause of enuresis and encopresis to make sure nothing is wrong with their children.

Child abusers don't keep taking in foster children even after CPS has been called out to their home. Child abusers don't paid large sums of money out of pocket to Marvelous Grace Girls Academy for the hopes of correcting their children's bad behaviors. Child abusers don't take their children to physicals right before they pay money out of pocket

to send their girls to good schools with religious components. Child abusers don't invite all of the CPS-DFS caseworkers, doctors, all of who are mandatory reporters into their lives repeatedly.

2.0

If these girls were beaten every single day and deprived of food and water for days on end as they testified, someone would've seen it. If they were so abused and neglected, Steven Blankenship at Marvelous Grace Girls Academy and his staff wouldn't have said nothing for four months if the children showed up so starved, so skinny or so bald from their heads being shaven.

You may not agree with Janet's methods, and you may not like what you heard. You may think Janet is a bad person, but none of that meets the standard of guilt beyond a reasonable doubt on all 46 counts.

In this case, Janet Solander admitted to the vast majority of the acts that she's been charged with. She admitted them to the government, CPS and DFS, the same government that's now charging her criminally when they never told her to stop before. She disclosed the majority of the acts to the doctors who are mandatory reporters.

You heard those girls. They didn't want to be adopted by the Solanders, and they didn't want to return home after Florida. So they disclosed all of the conduct that everybody already knew about in Florida on February 28th,

2014, when they were interviewed, and then -- and they weren't interviewed again until about 10 days later on March 11th, 2014.

2.0

And in those 10 days they were together. They were able to talk, and they were able to develop this story. They drew from what they had already said, and they drew from their time in the foster system, and they drew from the unfortunate physical abuse that they suffered in their biological homes, and they saw an opportunity. They saw a way to forever escape the structure, rigid rules and no-nonsense approach of Janet Solander, and they made up some fantastic stories.

Little Anastasia, they withheld water from me for years. Okay. Not years, just days. Janet stuck a catheter up my private one-handed while she was holding me down with the other, and then she stuck a paint stick in my vagina. Okay. Not my vagina, just kind of around the part of the diagram I can't pronounce.

Ava said catheters were put in her many times, maybe five, maybe seven to eight, but at the preliminary hearing, remember when I asked, Didn't you testify it was only three times, and then on redirect examination it was a different number yet again. Her story kept changing. Even when Anastasia testified in trial, her story kept changing.

In March of 2014, there was a forensic interviewer who had to prompt Ava about the catheters. Ava didn't disclose

it initially, and she didn't even know what the interviewer was talking about until the interviewer said, Is there something with, like, a bag and a tube? And then Ava said, Oh, yeah, catheter. Amaya never said anything about catheters in Florida in February of 2014 or in Las Vegas with the forensic interviewer in March of 2014.

2.0

That 10-day period is significant because that 10 days is the opportunity that all of the girls got to talk, got to get their stories together, got to start figuring out how they could get out of the Solander home. These girls made up stories long before they came into the Solander home, and Debbie McClain confirmed they're all teenagers now, and they're still lying to her to get what they want.

They're children. They're damaged children, and it is okay to feel sorry for them. It is okay to feel empathy for them because of what they've been through, but many of you are parents, and you know that there's another side to children, and sometimes they exaggerate or they lie to get what they want, and that's what these girls did.

They lied and made up fantastical stories about their head smashed in toilets and licking pee up off of the floor, being kicked up and down the stairs, falling, hurting, being picked up one-handed and dumped under boiling hot sink water while simultaneously the other hand is filling up a tiny little lid and splashing it in her face even though she's face down in

the sink.

2.0

These girls had accidents. These girls had lots of accidents. You saw those pictures. Janet gave them structure, timed bathroom breaks, rules, penalties for breaking the rules. She took them to doctors to rule out medical issues to see if anything was causing those kinds of accidents, and when enough was enough, she threatened them with a catheter and said, If you don't pee, you'll get the catheter.

What did Danielle Hinton testify to about the actual catheter? Not that she saw it, not that she knew that Janet actually inserted it, but she testified, well, the girls would just run around and say, If you don't pee, you'll get the catheter. If you don't pee, you'll get the catheter. That's consistent with being threatened, with being scared enough based on a picture or based on a fake catheter being shown to you.

Amaya confirmed it. She said she was so scared that she just peed. She didn't use the words Janet put a catheter in me. It was the government who put those words in her mouth. She testified I saw the catheter and peed out of fear. Look at your notes. I ask you to look at what she actually testified to.

When we talked in jury selection about the leeway that we give parents, remember when we talked about threats, and you remember one of us had the same experience I had where

my dad used to say, I brought you in to this world. I can take you out of it. And I'm still here, and that juror is still here. Janet used threats too as a parent. The catheter is an example of those threats. If you don't pee, you'll get the catheter. That's not a criminal charge. That's not in one of the single one of the 46 counts, and because if you don't pee you'll get a catheter is not a crime.

2.0

And the same is true for the pitchers of ice that you heard about. The girls testified about how closely Janet watched them in the shower, but they also testified that they were able to sneak water in the shower and that Janet used a black light after the showers to check for pee. Much of that doesn't make sense.

If you're watching the children, why would you need to do a black light afterwards? Isn't it more likely that she's using the black light to make sure that there's not any pee or feces in the bath so that the next child can get into a sanitary bathtub? Isn't it just as likely that Janet filled up a pitcher of ice to dump it out of the shower just to scare the girls and not actually dump it all over them?

Look at your instructions. How does that qualify as unjustifiable physical pain under the law? I mean, sure it's unpleasant, but it's fleeting. That pain or that fear would be fleeting, and again, you may not agree with it. I'm not asking you to, but it's certainly a less physical form of discipline.

It's not spanking, and assuming it actually did happen, the physical pain would be far less than any kind of spanking.

2.0

Also, don't just gloss over some of the testimony that the girls would have boiling hot showers. Anastasia and Ava both testified to that, but you were presented with no evidence that Ava had any burn marks or injuries from scalding hot showers. Again, these girls have colluded together, have gotten their story straight and exaggerated. It is not surprising why. That home had a lot of rules, and they didn't want to live there anymore.

The government is trying to convince you that Ava,
Amaya and Anastasia lived in a world of child abuse. It's
true. They did, but the world of child abuse is where they
came from. The world of child abuse is what Janet Solander
wrote a book about. The world of child abuse is the one thing
we can agree that everyone in this case wants to change, but
the world of child abuse has nothing to do with what happened
in Janet Solander's home.

We'll concede Janet was not a good match for an adoptive home, and we'll concede that she got very creative with her efforts to modify behavior. In fact, the girls testified to lots of the nonphysical forms of corrective measures, timed bathroom breaks, timed mealtimes, fans blowing on them during homework to keep them awake, a spray bottle.

Now, when that didn't work, the discipline measures increased,

and they increased to spanking with paint sticks.

2.0

And ultimately when their discipline methods didn't work, Janet and Dwight paid for the girls to attend the behavioral school, The Marvelous Grace Girls Academy, and they got demerits there too, but Janet put them in a school that she believed would help them, and it sounds like it did because over time they got fewer demerits. That's the context, the word choice and the perspective we ask you to keep in mind as you heard all of the evidence.

Think about Ava, Amaya and Anastasia's word choice.

Think about what they exaggerated. Think about what they testified to that just didn't make sense and consider this as you decide whether or not you find every single thing that they said to be true, or did they say things that were taken from parts of true and blow them up larger than life?

You may not agree with what Janet Solander did to help these girls, but DFS and CPS didn't disagree with her methods. A reasonable person is allowed to rely, just as that instruction said, on the government when government tacitly endorses and condones the methods a parent is using. Janet relied on that. The same government is now trying to say her conduct is criminal. It wasn't then, and it wasn't now.

The government spent the past four weeks or so trying to prove how the government failed to investigate the Solander home. The government didn't fail. They were in the home.

They didn't see anything that was wrong to them. They didn't see any evidence of the exaggerated claims in the 46 counts that are before you, and DFS isn't on trial here. Janet Solander is.

2.0

Janet Solander had absolutely no motive to snap on January 19th, 2011, after she adopted those three children. She had no motive to completely change everything she was as a person and start abusing or neglecting her children in such an open manner by having the government in and out of her home and having doctors' offices in and out of her life. She didn't snap and beat her children on a daily basis.

There's no evidence before you that their mouths were and their lips were split open because of her rings or that they had permanent damage because of being kicked up and down the stairs. They exaggerated these claims of sitting on buckets all day long, 24/7. Those were their words.

If you are actively physically abusing your children, if you are actively neglecting their medical and nutritional needs, it makes no logical sense that you would take them to doctors who you know will physically examine them or for the children to be taken for colonoscopies up their rectums where their bottoms are exposed, and if you're beating those children on their bottoms every single day and breaking paint sticks to the point where their bottoms are bruised and bloodied from cuts all over their skin, why would you take them to the

doctor? The doctors saw none of that, and that's because it wasn't there.

2.0

This has been a trial about how the foster care system failed, and Janet was not a good match for these troubled girls. This case has been about Janet's varying methods and rules that didn't work. You may have found it abusive. You may not have agreed with it, but that doesn't make her conduct criminal when you look at these allegations.

I am asking you to look at this allegation of the world of child abuse, what you actually have before you.

Remember the Christmas photo. Remember how Janet treated Ava,

Amaya and Anastasia, just like all of her other kids. Those are her biological kids in that photo. The season greetings from the Hinton Solanders.

After reviewing all of the evidence in this case we are asking you to return a verdict of not guilty on each of those 46 counts. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Ms. McAmis.

We should probably take a really brief recess before we move into the rebuttal argument from the State, just about 10 minutes which will put us at 5 minutes to 5:00, or 4:55.

During the brief recess, you are all reminded you are not to discuss the case or anything relating to the case with each other or with anyone else. You're not to read, watch or listen to any reports of or commentaries on the case, person or

subject matter relating to the case. Do not do any independent research by way of the Internet or any other medium, and please don't form or express an opinion on the trial.

Please place your notepads in your chairs and follow the bailiff through the double doors. We'll just take a real quick recess.

(Proceedings recessed 4:47 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.)

(Outside the presence of the jury)

MR. FIGLER: Do you -- my page 35 is out of order or --

MS. BLUTH: That's because Chris probably put it up.

MR. FIGLER: Yeah. On mine or on yours too?

MS. BLUTH: On probably -- I don't know. The page breaks are a little different on that one. We had Chris go print two copies, so I can go make a copy of that one if you want. They're the same it's just the page breaks are different.

MR. FIGLER: Yeah.

2.0

MS. BLUTH: There's a problem with when our system doesn't carry over to their system it's -- it breaks up event pagination.

MR. FIGLER: Your Honor, for the record the State after Ms. McAmis finished her closing argument has now filed a second Amended Information that's being done over our objection. The defense believes that it reasonably relied upon

the lack of mental suffering language in the --

MS. BLUTH: Wait one second.

THE COURT: They're coming in.

MS. BLUTH: One sec.

2.0

(Jury entering 5:01 p.m.)

MR. FIGLER: To be continued.

THE COURT: All right. Court is now back in session. The record should reflect the State, the defendant and her counsel, the officers of the court, and the ladies and gentlemen of the jury.

And, Ms. Bluth, are you ready to proceed with your rebuttal argument?

MS. BLUTH: Yes, Judge. Thank you.

The defense would have you believe that these three girls came with all of these issues, and that they were defiant and ill behaved almost to a psychotic nature with this PTSD, and all of these other things wrong with them that the defense just spent over two hours talking to you about. And if you think about it, the more you focus on that and how bad they were and how crazy they were, you might think well, Janet just had no other choice. I mean, what was she going to do with these three little disasters.

But at the end of the day it actually doesn't matter.

Amaya could have been skinning the family dog and eating it

half alive in the living room, and Janet still wouldn't be able

to do what she did to them. It doesn't matter if they were well behaved, if they were ill behaved, if they were defiant, if they were obedient; she cannot do what she did to them under any circumstance. And in her book she agrees with me. She says I do not condone any physical abuse, any physical abuse to a child regardless of that child's behavior.

2.0

The defense talks a lot about, you know, these children they came from a bad environment. They saw their mother do certain things, and then their grandmother beat them, and they came from this really bad environment, and they came with so many issues, and Janet was there to save them. That defense could be used in any case across the country where a foster child is involved. Foster children can be abused too —

MS. MCAMIS: Objection. Denigrating the defense.

THE COURT: I'm -- overruled. I don't think that's what she's doing.

MS. BLUTH: Foster children can be abused too. They all come from rough places; that's why they're in foster care. You're not in foster care because your dad works full-time, and your mom stays at home and goes to all your school practices and your games and helps out in the classroom and has dinner every night ready for you guys at 6:00. Foster kids have issues, okay. They're abused. They're neglected. Some are sexually assaulted. It doesn't mean that other people can't abuse them.

The defense wants to point out in that diagram about all the things that that initial psychiatrist talked about the girls having right when they got into Child Haven, right when they came in to foster care in 2008. And what I'd ask you to consider in regards to that is that therapist or sorry, that psychiatrist or psychologist saw those kids three years before Janet Solander adopted them. It was when they first got into the system.

2.0

So they had three years of therapy, three years of counseling, three years of being in homes where they were given proper care and proper love. And so this idea that they went straight from this evaluation by this doctor where it's PTSD and enuresis to Janet is not true. They had had daily therapy. They had had weekly therapy. And they had lived in environments that where they felt safe and they felt okay. And they went to Janet after being in that environment for a year and a half.

But when you look at what Janet is saying about those girls about what the defense is -- the picture that the defense is painting, compare it to everybody else who had interactions with those girls, and I'm going to talk about Debbie McClain in a second, but what about Heather Richardson their first CPS worker, it's actually their second CPS permanency worker, how she defined them or discussed them. What about Jan Finnegan, who was their nanny, who discussed the fact -- we asked her, I

mean, were they -- were they ill behaved, were their -- were they banging their heads, were they beating each other up, and she said, no, there was a lot of rules and they followed those rules; they were very obedient children.

2.0

Same thing with Autumn and Ivy Stark and Areahia Diaz. They didn't even talk. The Solander girls didn't even talk, and when they moved, they moved around the house with their hands above their head. Even Danielle the defendant's own daughter talks about the fact that they would sit and they would do their homework all day. She said that there were a couple times were Amaya acted out or yelled, but for the most part she said they sat and they did their homework.

The doctors, we asked the doctors who saw them, hey, when they were in your office, was there any ill behavior, were they acting out, no, they just sat there very quietly.

And then Mr. Blankenship, I would ask you to go back and read the biographies. If you remember, Janet and Dwight wrote a biography for each child that discussed how they thought that the child's behavior was, and they gave it to Mr. Blankenship, and Mr. Blankenship said this was not consistent with the behavior.

I mean, there's some pretty mean things in that letter. They're defiant. They don't like authority. They'll pee and poop just to do it on purpose. Read those and think the person that they are saying that about is their own child.

So the State would ask you to look at people who had interaction with those girls and is that consistent with the picture that the defense is trying to paint.

2.0

I want to talk about Debbie McClain for a second. This idea that Debbie McClain, this woman who had over 40 foster children, she has opened up her home to 40 foster children, and the defense would have you believe that she came in here and she lied, and she wanted to get a therapist fired so that she could move the kids' therapy service to her — the company she worked for, for Agape.

What motive does Debbie McClain have to come in here years later and tell lies about Janet Solander? She said, I didn't want to be an adoptive resource. I'm old. I've raised my own kids; that's what she said. And what did she do when these kids came back? She opened up her home and she adopted them. What motive does she have to do that other than just wanting to do what is right?

Debbie did not paint a perfect picture of these girls. She talked to you about their strengths. She talked to you about their weaknesses. She talked about the fact that sometimes they would lie, and sometimes there were hard conversations that she had with them. We didn't hide from that. Debbie didn't hide from that. She didn't backtrack on the fact that she told Amaya, I'm going to kick your ask. I mean, whether she said ask or ass whatever, the difference is

and the point is at least she didn't do it. Janet took it a little extra step or a lot of an extra step.

2.0

The defense has painted this picture that these children were out of control, that they were doing awful in school and that they just weren't progressing. We -- you have pictures. This is Ava; at the time she was Jocelyn, perfect attendance. Amaya, this one who had all these behavioral issues and was just doing so poor school they just didn't know what to do with her, that's a picture of her on the AB honor roll.

And then there's Anastasia. And Debbie was very — she was very clear in regards to some of the bed wetting issues that Anastasia had. And she talked about the fact that Anastasia had a nighttime bedwetting problem, and she had it pretty much the whole time that she had her at her home and that there were spouts two weeks that she would go without going to the bathroom or three months or sometimes as much as three months without going to the bathroom in her bed, but that that was an issue, and that was an issue that she had up until she gave them over to Janet.

And Ms. McAmis talked to you a little bit about the world of child abuse and our use of this in our opening statement. And if you remember right back to way back to when we talked about voir dire, one of the questions the State posed to you is, what about way back when before we didn't have

fingerprints and we didn't have DNA, like, what types of evidence did we rely on? And now you know probably why some of those questions were being asked. Child abuse isn't committed out in the open. It's not like a robbery when someone goes into a gas station and there's video cameras or there's witnesses. Child abuse happens behind closed doors, and it's very common that children don't disclose until much later just like you saw in this case. And so you have to use different tools other than scientific tools to figure out what happened here.

2.0

And something we like to call a tool for you guys to use is referred to as the three C's. And that's our, is the evidence corroborated? Is the testimony corroborated? Are the victims credible? And is there consistency? And so I'm going to talk to you about those in a moment.

So the credibility or believability of a witness should be determined by her manner upon the stand, her relationship to the parties, her fears, her motives, interest or feelings, her opportunity to have observed the matter to which she testified, the reasonableness of her statement, and the strengths or weaknesses of her recollections. And when you're thinking about that, I want you to think first about Ava. That's what Ava looked like on her first day of going in to foster care when she was Jocelyn. And I want you to think about three years later when she basically left foster care or

was getting exited out after them finding her in Florida. But most importantly I want you to think about Ava today and what she came in here and what she told you.

And what did Debbie tell you about Ava when I asked her how would you define those three girls; tell us about those three girls, and what did she say about Ava? Ava is probably the shy one. She's quiet. She's more withdrawn. She said her pain runs deeper. She doesn't want to talk about things. She turns inward. She kind of shuts down. She's more quiet. She's not as outspoken as the others. She likes to read books, but she keeps to herself. And I want you to think about when Ava Solander came up here, she stood here she swore to tell the truth and she --

MS. MCAMIS: Objection. Vouching.

MR. FIGLER: No, Harmon.

THE COURT: Overruled. I don't know that it's vouching.

MR. FIGLER: Your Honor, can we approach?

THE COURT: Sure.

2.0

(Conference at the bench not recorded)

MR. FIGLER: Your Honor, it's the same objection.

MS. BLUTH: We just discussed this.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MS. BLUTH: And one of the things that you can take into consideration is her manner of testifying on the stand,

and think back to Ava's mannerisms when she discussed things on the stand. And, you know, was she loud? Was she outgoing? Was she more quiet? What was she like when she was shown pictures of her sister?

2.0

You can take someone's manner of how they testify on the stand and guide that to let you know how you feel about someone's credibility especially in regards to Ava's demeanor when she had to talk about a few things. The catheters number one. That was something Ava did not want to talk about, and it was you could tell almost painfully obvious that she would pick at her eyebrow. She would kind of put her face down, and she's 16 years old; she doesn't really want to talk about her privates and things like that.

Like, she doesn't want to talk about licking her urine off the floor. That's probably maybe a little bit embarrassing at 13 when she testified at the preliminary hearing, but now that she's 16 that might be a whole different ballgame. And so the State would ask you to consider the fact that at preliminary hearing when she was 13 she discussed it in detail not once, but twice.

Another thing that you need to consider -- the State would ask you to consider in regards to Ava and her credibility is when she talked about her guilt. She said, I feel guilt. I felt guilty. What did you feel guilty about? I felt guilty that I couldn't protect my little sisters. She was a little

girl. She was a little girl, and she felt guilty because she couldn't stop what Janet was doing not to her, to her sisters. And so the State would ask you to consider that when you're thinking about Ava's credibility.

2.0

Now let's talk about Amaya. I think this picture of Amaya pretty much sums up Amaya. And if that picture doesn't sum up Amaya, well, then they're pretty much the same picture however many years later pretty much sums up Amaya. But what did Ms. Debbie say about Amaya? She's like, Amaya's the difficult one. She's going to tell how it is, and sometimes you're not going to like it, but she's going to give it to straight, but she's also the one that needs a little bit more tender love and care.

And what did Ms. Debbie tell you? She would get up early and make tea, and her and Amaya would sit there and they would talk about things because Amaya needed that extra type of attention. And she said Amaya wasn't anything that I couldn't handle, but she did need to be dealt with in a different way.

Amaya also said, I felt guilty, but her guilt was different. Her guilt was, I felt if Mr. Janet wouldn't have hated me so much that my sisters could have been saved; that was her guilt. And the State would ask you to consider that when thinking of her credibility.

And then there's Anastasia. And that picture kind of sums up Anastasia. I mean, what did Ms. Debbie say? She's the

outgoing one. She's the comedian. She's also going to tell you how it is, but she's just, like, talk, talk, talk, talk, talk, talk. And, I mean, how was she when, I mean, she was throwing, you know, jokes right or left. I was -- I asked her, you know, what did the timer look like, and she said it was a square and it was so-and-so big. And if you remember, I put up my hand and I'm, like, okay, so it was a square, and she goes, yeah, that's a circle I said a square. I mean, she really kind of, you know, she's -- she's playful.

2.0

And interesting enough you show the picture of the burn -- when her older sisters were shown the picture of that burn, both of them had trouble moving on from that, but you show Anastasia, and Anastasia's like, yeah, that was me that's what happened.

And so you need to consider their manner on the stand in which they testified, but you also need to consider their motive. What is the motive? These girls -- it's four years later. They live in a home with Debbie McClain. Janet Solander's out of their life. Dwight Solander's out of their life. Danielle Hinton's out of their life. You really think they want to walk in those doors four years later and talk about catheters being shoved up their urethra or their vagina, or having to stand in plastic bags while they peed and pooped all over themselves, or putting urine -- urinated underwear in their mouth? What is their motive to come in here and talk

about these things?

2.0

Some of you might need more than just what the children say and that's okay; you're entitled to that, and that's what corroboration is; that's the second C. What they're saying is it corroborated? They talked to you about paint sticks; you got paint sticks. They talked to you about scars in their bodies and where it would mainly be hit; they've got scars on their body.

And the defense wants to say well, you know, I mean, is that really -- is -- does that really substantial bodily harm? Well, yeah, those are scars on those girls. And think about it. If you're getting hit to the point where sticks are breaking and you're still being beaten, your skin is breaking open. You have to sit on your bottom unless you're sitting on buckets, I mean, then kind of on your bottom or if you're not even allowed a seat, like, you have to stand and do your homework all day, but if you're allowed to sit, what do you think that would be for a prolonged period of time? That would be painful.

They talked about buckets; you got buckets. They talked about the fact that their underwear would be checked, go through the e-mails. There are so -- you didn't see all of the e-mails, but you will have them. There will be more underwear in there than you could ever even imagine.

They talked about a light, a light being used to

check their underwear and a light being used to check the shower; they pointed out the light. They talked about the gates; there was a black one and there was a gray one. They talked about fans. There's fans up in the loft; look at the search warrant photos. There's fans near the gates.

2.0

They talked about the fact that when they would do their homework they would have to do it so late at night that they would continue to fall asleep, and the defendant would put fans in front of their faces and occasionally walk by and squirt them in the face with the water. You've got pictures of that.

They said that sometimes they slept on boards, and sometimes they slept on cots; you've got pictures of that.

They told you that there were cameras all over the house, and they felt like they were being watched. There's the cameras.

Anastasia told you about the burn; there's the pictures of the scars.

They told you that as a punishment when Janet really wanted to take something away from them that they loved, they would get haircuts. And there are tons of pictures in those e-mails about haircuts and Janet sending e-mails saying stuff like get your scissors to Dwight, or I finally did it, or check out this boy cut. It's all there. Everything those kids are saying.

The cold showers. Now, obviously there's not a

picture of the cold shower because that would be odd, but you have the Stark girls talking about it. You have Areahia Diaz talking about it, and you even have Danielle Hinton talking about it.

2.0

The catheters. You have e-mails about the catheters with the date. You have six; six were bought. Defense wants to say well, I mean, what if, you know, they were just -- they were just going to scare them. If -- why would you buy six, if you're just -- you only need one to scare somebody, so why are you buying six? But then five days later you have a catheter filled with urine.

And this obsession with toileting that the girls talk about. Go through the e-mails you will see picture after picture after with this obsession with toileting.

And then Danielle -- Danielle, let's talk about her credibility. Let's talk about her behavior on the stand. In her statement to police she was very detailed, very, very detailed about the things that she saw, the things that she heard. And then she takes an agreement to testify, and somewhere along with taking that agreement and walking through those doors she seemed to forget pretty much everything, and that was convenient for Danielle, and that was convenient for her mom.

And then she tries to pull the I took a Xanax.

That's the best Danielle Hinton got she took a Xanax and she

can't remember. Well, good thing that that statement was recorded. And I know it was painful to have to go over that for hours and hours and hours. But you heard every single thing that she told police, and she corroborated it all, the buckets, the blended food, the showers, the boards, the catheters, it's all there.

2.0

That's why corroboration is something you can look at because you can take the girls word for if you want, but if that's not enough for some of you, look at what they said and look at all of this evidence and you will see that it is all there.

Another jury instruction that you have is that you are here to determine the innocence and guilt or guilt, excuse me, of the defendant Janet Solander. You are not here to determine the guilt or innocence of anybody else. And so there are probably questions out there, and there are probably people wondering, well, what about Dwight Solander? Those are different questions for a different day. What we're here to talk about is the actions of Janet Solander and the actions of Janet Solander alone.

So the question really becomes is -- the defense would have you believe that she had to do this. She had to do the things that she did because number one, these kids were so out of control, and number two, because they were just -- they were sick. They had these gastrointestinal issues. There's

stuff going on.

2.0

One of the things that the State never has to prove is motive, okay. The State never has to prove it in any type of case even with murder cases, motive, but it is something that can be considered by you, and it's defined as, Motive is not an element of the crime charged, and the State is not required to prove a motive on the part of the defendant in order to convict; however, you may consider evidence of motive or lack of motive as circumstance in this case.

So the State would ask you to ask a few questions. If Janet had good intentions, if she was this advocate that the defense keeps wanting her to be this advocate, she was the only one that cared, guys. She was the only one that was fighting for those kids. If that is true, then ask yourself some of the following questions.

Number 1, why does she continuously represent to multiple people, CPS, therapists, doctors that she is a nurse; why would someone do that? The State would submit because people will take you more seriously. If you are talking to CPS and you're saying, hey, I'm a nurse, and this is what's going on, and these are the diseases these kids have, people are going to take you more seriously.

Why does she repeatedly lie to the doctors about actually what's going on in the home in regards to the health of the children? And that's -- we asked each of the girls,

when you went to the doctor with Janet would she be honest about what was going on? And what did the girls say? No, she would say we were getting all this sleep. She would say we are eating normal food. She would make it seem like we were living this normal life. But if you really wanted to get help for those girls, then why would you not give the doctor a complete history of what's going on? 'Cause what if those doctors — they need to know what's going on. They can't fix the problem if there is a problem unless they know what is being done at the home.

2.0

Why are the adopted children made to hide when others come to the home? How many witnesses came in here and said they had never seen the Solander girls? How many CPS workers, some of which we're going every single month and they had never seen those girls. And the girls told you when people would be there we would be told to go upstairs and hide in the bathroom or hide in the spare bedroom.

If her intentions were good and she had nothing to hide, then why when CPS came and took the Diaz-Burnett children, why would she not tell them where those girls were? Hey, yeah, if you want to talk to my adopted kids here they are; go talk to them. Why would she not tell them where they were? Yvette Gonzalez even told her, look, if you don't tell me, I'm going to have to do a missing persons' report. Do what you gotta do.

And then lastly, when Metro goes to execute that search warrant, the Solanders are on notice for about three weeks that they're being investigated by CPS. And when Metro goes to execute that search warrant, that house is completely packed up and those cameras are completely disassembled and you'll have the pictures. There were no computers in the house. There were no hard drives. There was no way for anybody to find any of that footage that was on those cameras. Why was that?

MS. MCAMIS: Judge, assumes facts not in evidence.

 $\,$  MS. BLUTH: No, that came in evidence in the search warrant that they --

THE COURT: That's overruled.

MS. BLUTH: Thank you.

2.0

If good intentions, if what you wanted was for the best of these kids, why get rid of or threaten people who are truly advocating for these children? And I want you to look at this list. Gail Anderson, Janet told her that she felt she was getting too close to the children, gone. Lori Wells, how many times did she try to turn Janet in? I think we had it up to 16 times she had contacted CPS, letters, phone calls, e-mails, gone.

Debbie McClain, she kept calling Janet or excuse me, Janet kept calling her and asking, like, hey, they've got this issue, they've got this issue and every time Debbie said she

was like, I'm sorry I don't have any of those issues with those kids. She writes an e-mail; I think she said it was in December of 2012, never hears -- never hears from Janet again. Heather Richardson, she's the one who turned them into CPS, her boss got written. Jan Finnegan, they tried to actually sue her for making a report to CPS.

2.0

And then the doctors, you heard testimony from multiple doctors, I told them to come in and, you know, run tests or try this and then come back, and then there was no follow-up. Then doctors had no -- there was no follow-up for them to compare. If you were advocating for these children, why are the other advocates who are fighting for those children disappearing in thin air? Why are you calling the ombudsman every time CPS doesn't do what you want? 'Cause you're not advocating for those kids; you're abusing them.

So we talked about motive and like I said, A, you don't -- you don't even have to consider motive, but for some of you who like to understand why, why do people do what people do. There are several reasons that one might come up with. The State would submit that perhaps there was a financial motive, And Janet writes the e-mail, I don't like living this way when every time I go somewhere it's a financial struggle. I hate depending on this foster care money because it makes me feel as if I am on welfare.

You also have Lori Wells and Gail Anderson both

discussed the fact that Janet and Dwight talked to them about getting more money and making sure it was documented in CPS records about these children's special needs. And I read into the record an e-mail that Dwight wrote Gail Anderson that said, We are requesting additional payment be applied ASAP as we have been caring for these children with both emotional, behavioral, medical, and psychological disorders for four months and feel we are entitled to receive it. So perhaps it's financial.

2.0

Or is it for sympathy? You have someone who's continuously taking these children to doctors even though tests are coming up negative, but they're still -- she's still taking them back, taking them to new doctors when the diagnosis she wants isn't given.

And then there's continuous representations to others that they have diseases well after the diseases have already been ruled out. Is it for sympathy? Does she want people to get attention for what she says these children have? Or is it about control? Think about it, the gates, the alarms, the timers, the withholding the food and water, the toileting, the limiting of toilet paper, taking them out of school to homeschool them. When she doesn't get what she wants, she changes the plan. Is it about control?

But unfortunately most of the time child abuse doesn't make sense, right. Everybody wants to know why would someone abuse a child? Why would they do that?

And Ms. McAmis said that to you multiple times. What would be Janet's motive? Why would she do some of those things? You're probably not going to find an answer because often the time people abuse just to abuse and it's mean. It's like taking a picture of Anastasia and then sending an e-mail that says, I just let three foster kids see Anastasia with her pants down. Or an e-mail that says from Dwight to Janet, She's going to hate life tonight. Have her start crawling with Ava.

2.0

Sometimes it's just to humiliate and sometimes it's just to hurt. Sometimes it's just to cause pain. Like the pictures that you have seen that corroborate what the girls told you about happened them. It doesn't always make sense.

You know, the defense wants to say for instance, like, the boot. They were talking about the kids said, you know, she would wear boots; that's actually not what she said. The child that talked about it was Amaya, and Amaya said sometimes when she was going to kick us around she would put on these black boots and she would use those. She didn't say, oh, she'd wear them all day, and she'd be doing the kitchen work and the vacuuming and all that. No, sometimes when she'd want to kick us around she had these special black boots that she would put on.

And the defense says these kids like to exaggerate, I mean, think of the things they've come up with. Let's pretend

for a second that we didn't have the e-mail or we didn't have the e-mail about have her start crawling with Ava. It would be kind of hard to believe that an adult would put 8-, 9-, 10-year-olds in cloth diapers, right, and have them crawling around and acting like babies. And maybe you'd think, I don't know, guys, that's kinda out there or, yeah, they had 'em sitting half naked on buckets all day, okay. There's proof. There's an e-mail that says, have her get on the floor and start crawling with Ava. It's not stuff that you would think about yourself, but unfortunately it's reality and you have the proof. You don't have to take the kids' word for it because you have the evidence

2.0

The defense says — talked a lot about this picture and what's worse than the defendant doing this to Anastasia Solander is the defendant doing this to Anastasia Solander and then pretending it was Ava. Ava McClain had nothing to do with those marks on that little girl, absolutely nothing. Janet Solander takes that on the chin every day of the week. She had that little girl under the sink and filled that candle top and burned her.

I want to clear up a couple of instructions in regards to the child abuse because child abuse you would think that it's kind of an easy instruction, but it's not. So the physical abuse that one's easy, right, like, that's what when we think of child abuse that's what we think of, we think of

kids being beaten or burned or kicked or things like that; that's the physical abuse. So that's when we talk about the stick injuries, the eye, the burn, okay.

2.0

The negligent treatment or maltreatment, that one gets a little bit more tricky. And whenever you guys get lost or you feel like you don't understand something, go back to the jury instructions. That's what they're there for, and they will guide you through it.

But one thing I want to point out about negligent treatment or maltreatment is it doesn't have to just be about mental suffering. So let me give you an example. It says if you cause a child to be placed in a situation where she might have suffered unjustifiable physical pain or mental suffering, you can be found guilty of child abuse, okay. So if you cause mental suffering you can be guilty of child abuse.

But also if you put a child in a position where they could have suffered unjustifiable physical pain, for instance, kicking a kid down the stairs. The kid doesn't actually have to have an injury or actually talk about pain. The fact that you kicked that child down the stairs, you put that child in a position where they could have suffered physical pain. That's where negligent treatment or maltreatment comes in to play.

It can be either mental suffering like some of the things we talked about with, you know, the sitting on the buckets, the cold showers, those types of things, but also if

you place a child in a situation where they could have been hurt. For instance, taking soiled underwear that has pee or poop in it and putting it in the child's mouth; that is placing the child in a situation where they could be injured, obviously you can't put pee or poop in your mouth.

2.0

So I want to be real clear. Look at the definitions when you're talking about negligent treatment or maltreatment because the defense wants to say, well, yeah, you might not like the fact that they slept on boards, and you might not like the fact that they took cold showers, but is that abusive? It's absolutely abusive. When you subject the children day in and day out to that behavior it is abusive.

If there was a situation where a child peed the bed and the parents didn't have -- they didn't have -- they couldn't clean the sheets for whatever reason that night, and so they laid out a board, and they gave the child a pillow and sheets, that's not abusive, okay. That's not abusive and the State isn't charging them that, but when it's every day with know pajamas and fans blowing on them, that's when it becomes abusive. So the State would ask you to look at each charge and look at the definition of negligent treatment or maltreatment.

Medical -- or excuse me, common sense, and I'm not going to read you the instruction because I think both

Mr. Hamner and Ms. McAmis talked about common sense, but I'd ask you to use your common sense when thinking about this idea

of medical necessity, that she had to do some of these things because it was medically necessary. She was the only one advocating for these kids.

2.0

The defense position is that Janet was a concerned, caring parent, and she had to do these things because she had to make sure she found out what was going on with these kids.

Look at the procedures these kids had before they were, like, 9 or 10 years old, multiple colonoscopies and endoscopies, biopsies, MRIs, CT scans. There was one where swallowed a pill that had a camera in it that worked down the system, a barium enema and then multiple emergency room visits with enemas.

If she was concerned, again she didn't give an accurate account of what was going on to the doctors, but more importantly she didn't follow the doctor's orders. You heard, hey, these kids they need to put on some weight. Get them some PediaSure. And what did Ava say about that. She did it for a little while and wouldn't even give me the full thing. She'd give me about and then she pointed to a Dixie cup and pointed to, like, an inch.

She subjected to children to constant testing from different doctors even after Dr. A says, yeah, I'm ruling that out, she goes and sees Dr. B. and starts it over. When doctors didn't watch -- do what she wanted, she moved on to the next doctor, but the defendant was the problem.

And the defense, you know, they can point out well, look at all these -- (unintelligible) Dr. Cetl how many medical records did you review, oh, so many. And the inference you're supposed to get is, well, obviously there was something wrong with these kids if the doctors were seeing them and testing them. Of course doctors are going to keep testing. They believe that their mother is a nurse, and the mother is saying my child is not getting better; please help me. What you're doing isn't fixing my child. Of course, they're going to keep running tests. They're not getting any answers. Doctors don't stop until they have the answers because if you stop and the kid isn't healed, what happens? So of course there's that many doctors. Of course there's that many records.

2.0

But you know that the defendant was the problem. She was the problem with the toileting issues. She was the problem that caused the G.I. issues. And you even heard testimony about the seizure.

So before I get there I want to talk about the toileting issues. You heard about this constant cycle that these kids were on, right. They didn't know if they could ask, and when they did ask they got in trouble. They got hit, but then if they didn't ask because they were too scared to ask, it was just this cycle; they were, like, on a hamster wheel, and it was never going to stop.

And what did the doctor say, if you were made to

withhold your bowel or your urine for long periods of time, 1 2 what can happen to you --3 MS. MCAMIS: Objection. Medical certainty exception. 4 MS. BLUTH: What exception? 5 THE COURT: I'm sorry? 6 MR. FIGLER: Medical certainty. 7 MS. MCAMIS: Medical certainty. 8 THE COURT: Okay. Oh -- approach. 9 (Conference at the bench not recorded) 10 THE COURT: You can continue your argument --11 MS. BLUTH: Thank you. 12 THE COURT: -- and the Court would just remind the 13 ladies and gentlemen of the jury that these potential causes 14 were not testified to to a reasonable degree of medical 15 probability or medical certainty. Meaning the doctor did not 16 pick one particular cause and attribute that to the seizure in 17 this particular case to the standard that's required for 18 medical testimony. 19 MS. BLUTH: Thank you, Judge. 2.0 THE COURT: All right. Go on. 21 So in regards to the toileting issues MS. BLUTH: 22 with the doctors. Multiple doctors discussed the fact that if 23 you hold your urine and you hold your poop for a really long

JD Reporting, Inc.

time, that can cause you to become constipated; that can cause

you to have all sorts of gastrointestinal issues.

24

25

You also heard from Dr. Cetl that when Amaya was brought into the hospital for her seizure, her body temperature was 90 degrees which is hypothermic. And she talked about some of the causes that can cause a child to have a 90-degree body temperature and go into a seizure. And like Judge said, she can't opine to any degree of medical certainty, but if someone was in the shower, in a cold shower with dumping ice on them and their body temperature got low enough that that can cause a seizure.

2.0

Janet, even after everything has been ruled out in her book she says the following: All three girls have a genetic intestinal condition. Since the incident with the school nurse, two of them have had colonoscopies at 8 and 9 years of age. Our oldest has to date had two colonoscopies and endoscopies combined; she also was diagnosed with Crohn's disease.

Our second oldest has an abnormality in her colon that was detected during the colonoscopy, and she was recently diagnosed with thyroid disease to add to her other medical conditions.

Our youngest has exhibited symptoms of diabetes and like our middle child is currently under the care of a pediatric endocrinologist.

All three children are also under the care of a pediatric gastroenterologist and are on a very strict diet.

Two of our children are currently under the care of a pediatric endocrinologist and will continue to see a specialist for the rest of their lives.

2.0

In her book in black and white, you don't have to ask somebody oh, hey, what did she say to you, it's in her own book where she wrote it, and she is still saying that these kids have the diseases that they have.

You have to think about environment. What happens when you take those kids out of their environment, out of Janet Solander? Poof, they're cured. They're not sick. They don't have toileting issues, Crohn's disease. You take away Janet Solander and you take away the problem.

I want to be very clear about something in regards to what's referred to as other matter evidence. Okay, this is very important. What this instruction says is, Evidence that the defendant committed offenses other than that for which she is on trial if believed was not received and may not be considered by you to prove that she is a person of bad character, or to prove that she has a disposition to commit crimes. Such evidence was received and may be considered by you only for the limited purpose of proving the defendant's motive, her intent, her common scheme or plan, her knowledge or her absence of mistake or accident.

And what that means is you can't consider the evidence we presented to you about the Diaz-Burnett children or

about the Stark children and say well, she did it to them so she did it to the Solanders, or she did this and she's a bad person. So she's a bad person with the Solanders too.

Absolutely not. The law is very, very clear when it comes to that. You can only look at that information to show the defendant's motives, why she would do something, her intent, her common scheme or plan, her knowledge and her absence of mistake or accident.

2.0

And I'm going to show you how that's applied. So the food issue, right. You heard testimony about in just regard to the Solander girls. They went — the Solanders went to school with Amaya, Ava, and Anastasia and sat with them at lunchtime to make sure they were eating their food, but then they had to homeschool them because they were eating out of the garbage and stealing food. Where did you hear things like that? They also said that they needed to time them while they ate; where have you also heard these things?

Autumn Stark talked about Janet made me sit by myself at lunch. I had to be moved from the other children because she said I was stealing other kids' food.

Areahia Diaz, yeah, I had to eat with the school nurse because Janet said I was stealing kids' food, and I was eating out of the garbage. That's that common scheme or plan. It's a same type of behavior, same act different kid. Same act different kid.

The toileting issues, the Solander girls, she has to check their underwear. She has to have them sit on buckets. She has to limit their toilet paper. These kids are soiling their pants daily. What did you hear from Autumn and Ivy Stark? What did you hear from Areahia about her and her siblings? Everybody's all timed going to the bathroom. Every day they're soiling their pants.

2.0

And Janet even says when someone talks to her about, okay, why all of a sudden are the Diaz-Burnett kids having issues? They all have issues. My adopted kids are sitting on pots for 10 hours a day. These kids they all have issues. Look at the common scheme or plan with every kid that comes into that house.

And then the illnesses. Solander girls they've got Crohn's, twisted colon, autism, diabetes, gastrointestinal issues, Von Willebrand's disease. Okay. First I want to talk to about the Von Willebrand's. That was not something -- and I'd asked you to refer to your notes because Ms. McAmis and I don't agree on what the evidence was, so you need to look at your notes.

The State submits that it was Janet's idea to start testing for Von Willebrand's because A, Janet has Von Willebrand and B, one of her biological daughters has Von Willebrand. So it seems more in line that Janet would ask the doctor to check for Von Willebrand, but, but if Janet really

believed that one of those little girls had a bleeding disorder, would she really be beating the hell out of them with a paint stick? I mean, that might cause you concern to beat the heck out of a kid with a paint stick who has an actual bleeding disorder.

2.0

But look at what she said about the Diaz-Burnett children and Autumn and Ivy Stark. Areahia Diaz, diabetes. I think she said Novaleih was autistic. Autumn, lactose intolerant. She had Ivy Stark tested for HIV; she was four years old and she had her tested for HIV. It is the same thing different kid, and that's why you were presented it.

The defense wants to say we spent three weeks listening to all this stuff not even about the Solander kids. Why? Because it paints the full picture. It paints the full picture. It doesn't matter what kid it is. They come in one way, and they leave with a whole bunch of diseases nobody knew that they had.

The use of control that I've been talking about, the gates, the cameras, the exclusion from siblings. The Solander girls weren't allowed to speak to each other. What was happening to Areahia when she got home? She wasn't allowed to pick up her sister — her brothers and sisters. She had to sit and finish her homework. Don't talk about what's going on the home; you heard that from multiple kids.

And then in the e-mails, you can see the e-mails is

the same conduct that's going on. You'll see this e-mail is attached, and it says Autumn or something like look at Autumn from Janet to Dwight. And then there's one about Kaeshia, and it shows Kaeshia's bed and then it shows pictures of Kaeshia.

2.0

So again you don't even have to trust the Solander girls. You don't have to trust the Diaz-Burnett or Areahia Diaz. You don't have to trust the Stark girls. Look at the e-mails; you'll see it's all there.

Okay, you guys we're almost done I promise.

At the end of the day when you look at all three of those siblings, you can look at them individually and you can look at them altogether, but there is only one common denominator and that's the woman that sits in this room, she's it. She's the big bow on a nasty package. She is the common denominator to what is happening in that house and what's happening to those kids, and it's not pretty, but it's criminal and it's a reality.

All right. Let's talk about CPS. Okay. Well, the defense would have you believe that all of this, all of this is about this book. That everybody in CPS knew about this book and that they were so mad about this book that they — they wanted to get Janet. They were going to get Janet, man. They were going to make her pay.

Okay, there's a few issues with that. Number 1, nobody cares about the book, hardly anybody even read the book.

And number 2, the thought that those people who testified could come up with a conspiracy and actively make it work, the brain trust that you saw come here and testify is laughable. Those individuals could come up with a conspiracy? First of all if they had a conspiracy where they wanted to get her, oh, my gosh they had every opportunity to get her. They had, like, seven open investigations to get her; they didn't take one of them. They did not take one of them. If they wanted to get her, oh my gosh, did they have every opportunity.

2.0

Let's talk about what they did or maybe let's talk about what they didn't do. They really did no investigation at all. Honestly, it's embarrassing. It's pitiful. When you go back, look at your notes and think about who is reporting this.

One of their own people is calling the hotline and reporting it. I'm really worried, the therapist, the BST workers, people at La Petite these are actual business — this isn't Joe Schmoe on the side of the street that sees something from his car. These are people that work with these kids every day that are in the home, but nah, hey, why listen to them.

They interview the children in an environment where they're not safe. So well, I talked to the kids. Oh, yeah, you talked to Amaya, Ava, Anastasia. What did Nona Ocloo say about that? First I said, tell me about what kids, you know -- because Ms. McAmis said well, you're kind of trained to tell whether or not kids are telling the truth, right, and Nona

said, yeah, yeah, we're trained in that. So I said, okay,
Nona, tell me about — tell me about what you're trained to do.
Well, I look at their body language, and if they're shy or if
they don't really want to talk or if they're reserved, then I
can tell that they're scared. Oh, really, like, the exact way
you explained the Solander girls? Well, yeah, they were
reserved.

2.0

And what about the one when you went upstairs who was cleaning the bathroom because she had an accident? Oh, she couldn't talk. She just looked at me with her eyes wide open and just stared, but Janet told me she had mental issues. So really, I mean, this is the level of investigation where we're supposed to protect kids.

And then they just take Janet and Dwight's word for it. I mean, these kids, psychological issues and mental issues. They're going to a boarding school. One of them pulls their hair out. No, take their word for it just like they took their word for that Janet was a nurse.

And then did not look up CPS history at all, and they even admitted to it. One of them even said why would I do that, the manager, Laura Hammack the supervising manager said, that's actually irrelevant. Oh, that's irrelevant? Well, too bad the director of CPS now the assistant director came in and said it's policy. You might want to check your policy Laura 'cause it's clearly relevant.

And the defendant admits to almost everything. She admits, except the catheter. She talks about the sleeping on the boards. She talks about -- or excuse me not the boards. She talks about the buckets. She talks about the blending of the food. She talks about hitting them with paint sticks. And there's no follow-up, like, okay, well, are there marks, how hard are you hitting them.

2.0

This is how bad it is. Gail Anderson didn't see this bucket; she didn't see the bucket. If you remember, I asked her you took this photo, right, you and the person there. She took this photo; she didn't remember that there was seeing a bucket, and then when she looked at the photo she didn't see that there was a bucket in the photo. That's the person who's going to make up this conspiracy to get Janet.

These were all the ways that they had to get her. A lot of chances to get good old Janet. A lot of chances for that conspiracy to go into effect. And yet time in and time out they left those kids in there unsubstantiated and brought new kids in, and closed it out with language like this, no safety concerns noted. The children have significant medical and mental health problems. All three girls are on special diets due to ongoing medical concerns.

Janet abused these kids and CPS failed them, and she does not get a pass because they can't do their job. The defense wants you to say, well, CPS knew what was going on so,

I mean, she can just rely on what they say. Number 1, she wasn't getting the full story. She wasn't -- she was telling them these are the issues these kids have and so Crystal Rosas is, like, oh, okay, well, yeah, I guess those kids are pretty sick, whew, she's got it rough. Don't give her a pass because CPS can't do their job.

2.0

Janet herself in her book talks about CPS, and this is what she has to say: When family service specialists are not able to effectively oversee their caseload, shortcuts are taken to try to satisfy reporting requirements. This results in short and ineffective visits and in some cases no visits at all. That is how these homes where abuse takes place are slipping through the cracks. The workers are so overwhelmed that they have to give attention to the cases that are glaring and put the cases that appear to have no issues in the back burner.

Couldn't have said it myself. Those are her words in her book about the job that CPS doesn't do, and how kids and cases fall through the cracks. Like the seven times they fell through the cracks in this case.

She even goes specifically into her home. The most recent monthly home visit from our foster children's caseworker was so rushed she only saw the three older children and never asked to see the baby who was sleeping soundly in one of our upstairs rooms. If something had happened to that baby who is

sleeping soundly in one of our upstairs rooms, excuse me -- the caseworker would have never figured out until the next monthly visit because at that time visits with family members had been temporarily suspended. This is a tragic scenario that is disturbing to say the least.

2.0

There's also a little quick bit about -- about the author. Janet Solander is a mother of four biological daughters and three adopted young daughters. She works in the medical field as a registered nurse and holds two degrees including a Bachelor's degree in nursing and a Bachelor's degree in healthcare administration. Apparently publishing companies don't check things either.

She is literally a stranger to the truth. This is in black and white in her book about the author where she talks — it's not, you know, Ms. McAmis said, well, I mean, she — I don't know she said she stretched the truth or maybe she exaggerated. No. No. That's called a lie. Not only did she lie that she was a nurse she went as far as to talk about the degrees she holds.

The last thing I want to talk about is consistency, the last C. We talked about credibility. We talked about corroboration. And now I want to talk about consistency. If you think about the amount of times these girls have had to tell what's going on, right, they had to tell Florida. Then they had to come and do an interview with CPS. Then they had

to testify at the preliminary hearing. Then they had to come here, and at two of those four events they were cross-examined by skilled defense attorneys that go over every single word. And if you look at the testimony and if you look at your notes, I'd ask you to look at whether or not they were consistent.

2.0

One thing the defense wants to discuss is this fact about the sexual assault and how they didn't talk about that until they came to Nevada. I want you to think of in a child's mind what's abusive in nature. Tell us about all the things, oh, we never got to eat; we got hit with sticks; she made us have cold showers.

Does a child understand the abusive nature of a catheter? Is that something that a child would say oh, and then she -- she had the catheter. You have to think of things the State would ask you or submit to you to think of things in regards to how a child thinks in regards to everyday terminology like a sexual assault.

When people hear the term sexual assault, they usually think of, you know, like a female walking home and she's pulled into a dark alley, and she's sexually assaulted; she's raped in the alley, but that is not what the law says. Read the instruction of the sexual assault. There doesn't have to be this sexual intent, I'm going to, you know, rape somebody. That's not what the law requires.

Also, common understanding of vagina. The State

would ask you if you ask 10 girls under 10, you know, what do you call your private, most of them would think that the whole thing was their vagina, right. They don't think that just the little hole is. So the State would ask you to consider that.

2.0

And also the common understanding of penetration. Before you got here and you thought of the term sexual assault, maybe you thought legally penetration meant it had to go in the actual vaginal hole, but now that you see the law, and you'll have the instructions, you can see what the law really means.

And the girls talked about the catheters being in two different spots. I believe that Anastasia talked about it being in the urethral opening, and if you remember, you might have in your notes, she tried to define it and she said ur-rith-ah-rel, you know. And then the other girls pointed I believe — check your notes not mine, but one girl, I think it was Amaya, pointed in this upper area and then Ava pointed into the hole.

Do children know -- it's not like they're watching, their head isn't down there figuring out which hole it's in, right? They're just going off of what they feel. And so maybe the tube goes where the tube goes, and that's where they think that it goes.

The point is that a sexual assault is committed when the object whether it be a finger, a penis, a catheter, when it goes beyond the labia majora, the big lips, it's done. It's a sex assault, and it doesn't have to be for the purpose of any type of sexual gratification.

2.0

There's been some things about the use of a razor or holding the girls down and how the -- how could this be done in two different, you know, with one person doing two different things. The State would ask you to check your notes. There was testimony that a razor was used to threaten, but there was never testimony -- the State submits that there was never testimony that she's threatening with a razor at the same time as putting the catheter in. The girls talked about she threatened them, hey, if you move I'm going to cut your private out, but there was never any testimony about she's got one hand with a razor and one hand with the catheter. So look at your notes; your notes are the best way to decipher.

The defense first told you that the kids are lying; it didn't happen. The catheters did not happen. They just exaggerated. Remember they stated that the photo was just probably — could be a stock photo, a Google image. But then there was, but if it did happen, it was medically necessary. So on one hand, oh, it didn't happen those kids are liars, but if it did happen —

MS. MCAMIS: Objection. Denigrating the defense.

MS. BLUTH: No.

THE COURT: Well, I don't think it's denigrating.

MS. BLUTH: -- can't ride two horses. It was never

medically necessary. Don't just focus on what the doctors told her or didn't tell her, but focus on what she didn't tell the doctor. She never told those doctors she was putting a catheter in those kids. Why didn't she tell? The same reason she didn't tell them about the burn. It's because the doctor would have been, like, say what? No, she didn't tell those doctors about the catheter because she knew she wasn't supposed to be doing that.

2.0

The defense asked you to consider well, we don't know what that is. It could have been a stock Google photo, but it is the same as Mr. Hammer pointed out, it is the same make of the Bard that you saw in the e-mail. So what you're left to think is, I mean, is Janet doing it to herself, are her and Dwight doing it to each other or are what the girls saying actually happened?

One thing the State would ask you to consider is what looks like all this dark colored hair around the bottom of the catheter and why all that hair would be there. Why would there be that much longhair at the bottom of the catheter? Could it be because the kid was fighting because they didn't want that stuck up them?

And then lastly the paint stick. Again, this is something that when you think of you're like no one would stick a paint stick up somebody, right, I mean, those are things that you just like you think no one would make kids crawl around act

like babies. No one would make kids put urine. It's not going to make sense. But think about the level of description that Anastasia gave you. She said, I remember where it was. I remember we were in Ava's old room, that I was half in the walk-in closet half out of it. She was really mad because I had an accident, and she stuck the paint stick in.

2.0

And what did she say about the paint stick? She did not say it went into the vaginal hole. She pointed and she again tried to pronounce it and she said labia meh-mayno-meh. So it's not like we have this, pardon me because it's kind of crass, but, like, this bloody stick that's being jammed up there. No, she put it in there, and she said it burned. The wood burned and it stung. So I'd ask you to think about the level of description that she gave you.

And she also talked about, hey, it happened to me a lot of times. I know that it happened to me, you know, once in the bedroom, twice in the bathroom, at least four times in the loft. You're asking a kid to remember how many times this happened to her when she said this was happening to her all of the time.

I started with this first paragraph: The easiest and most defiant way for a child to vent is by urinating or defecating in his or her pants on the bed or on another object. This is where the rage could start for foster parents. Rage can all too easily shift into abuse of the child. And I

stopped there, but if you continue reading, Janet says, This outcome can be prevented and the cycle can be broken.

2.0

When those little girls got adopted in January of 2011 that cycle could have been stopped. That cycle could have been prevented. She could have been a mom to them, but decisions were made and actions were taken and those decisions are hers. And people have to be held accountable for the decisions they make and actions they take. And Janet Solander has to be held accountable.

Those three little girls you now know argue a lot. And while normal teenage girls are arguing about, you stole my jeans, and you ate the last Nutri-Grain bar, and those are my shoes; what are they worrying about? What are they arguing about? Janet treated you better. Janet abused me more than she abused you. This was every single day of their life for years.

The State asks you to go back and take your time; read the instructions. Look at the photos, and most importantly look at the testimony of the girls, and find her accountable for what she did to them by finding her guilty of every single count.

And I thank you for everything that you've done so far.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Ms. Bluth.

The clerk will now swear the officer to take charge

of the jury.

2

1

## (Officer sworn)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, before I have you exit and follow the bailiff, as some of you may know there are 12 members of a criminal jury; there are 15 of you. Three of you are the alternates who were chosen somewhat at Those are Jurors No. 13, Ms. Cesena, Juror No. 14, Mr. Schumacher and Juror No. 15, Ms. Leishman.

The prohibition about speaking about the case and doing anything else relating to the case is still very much in effect for the three alternates because if God forbid before a verdict is reached in this case one or more of the regular jurors becomes ill or something like that, then you would be called in to deliberate with the jury. So the admonition is still in effect until you have been contacted by a member of my staff and told that the jury in this case has reached a verdict.

I must remind you that when you are excused for the evening you still need to be very mindful of the admonition. You are not to discuss the case with each other or with anyone else. You are not to discuss the case with one another until all 12 of you are back in the jury deliberation room together discussing the case together. So even if you're with another juror, you are not again to discuss the case unless all 12 of you are back in the jury deliberation room together.

Also obviously the prohibition about reading, watching, and listening to any reports or commentaries about the case or anyone or anything having anything to do the case is in effect. You're not to do any research on the Internet or any other medium and you are not to express any opinions on the case again unless you're in the jury deliberation room with one another.

I'd ask you all to collect your things and your notepads and follow Officer Hawks through the double door -- the rear door.

To the three alternates, make sure a member of my staff has phone numbers where you can reached tomorrow. If God forbid somebody becomes ill tomorrow and, you know, the next day becomes ill, we need to be able to get a hold of you.

All right. Thank you. If you'd all please exit through the rear door.

(Jury exiting 6:15 p.m.)

THE COURT: All right. Lawyers, they're not obviously going to have a verdict tonight. Leave phone numbers where we can reach you throughout the day tomorrow.

MR. HAMNER: Yes, Your Honor. Okay.

THE COURT: Like your cell phones or whatever.

And then in terms of the exhibits did you substitute out --

MS. BLUTH: I didn't, but I'll do that -- I'm sorry,

```
did you tell them 9:00?
 1
 2
                           No. Kenny will tell them in the back.
               THE COURT:
 3
               MS. BLUTH:
                          Okay. So but, I mean, that's what you're
 4
     telling them?
 5
                           Right.
               THE COURT:
 6
               MS. BLUTH:
                           Okay. So, yeah, I'll get it over here
7
    before 9:00.
                   The --
8
                          There's another one also that we need
               THE CLERK:
 9
     fixed.
10
               THE COURT:
                           We need the Wednesdays child one --
11
               MR. HAMNER: Correct.
12
               MS. BLUTH:
                          Yes.
13
               THE COURT: -- the sound taken out. And what was the
14
     other thing?
15
               MS. BLUTH: It's just -- I just have to --
16
               THE CLERK:
                          Cover a photo.
17
               MS. BLUTH:
                           Yeah. So I'm just gonna go make a copy
18
     of it.
19
               THE CLERK:
                           Oh, gosh.
20
               THE COURT:
                           Okay. So that'll all be done before
21
     tomorrow?
22
               MS. BLUTH:
                          Yes.
23
               THE COURT: And then, okay. Are you going to supply
24
     a laptop that --
25
               MS. BLUTH:
                           Yep.
```

1 THE COURT: Okay. So you'll have all that by 2 tomorrow? 3 MS. BLUTH: I'll get a clean one. They're all gone but. 4 5 All right, then. THE COURT: 6 MR. HAMNER: Thank you. 7 MR. FIGLER: Update. The defense was in the middle 8 of making objections to the Amended Information. 9 THE COURT: Oh, yes. Okay. Is this door shut? 10 THE CLERK: Yeah. 11 THE COURT: All right. The defense approached the 12 bench when -- made an objection when Ms. Bluth came to the 13 stand for her argument citing a case --14 MR. FIGLER: I believe it was either Mel Harmon or 15 Dan Seaton. It might have been Flanagan it might have been one 16 of those other high profiles --17 THE COURT: Okay. 18 MR. FIGLER: -- when the prosecutor steps out of 19 their role as the advocate and steps into another role such as 2.0 being in the witness stand that there is a certain veracity 21 associated with that and bolstering the testimony that it's 22 okay to comment, but not from the witness stand while 23 gesturing. And so that was our objection was actually 24 Ms. Bluth's physical presence in the witness stand and then

JD Reporting, Inc.

25

after --

THE COURT: I said Ms. Bluth could, you know, she just wants to act out, you know, turning away from the jury that's fine, but she couldn't quote the testimony or recount the testimony from the witness stand because that might make it look like she was testifying and somehow -- somehow give the testimony more credibility. She did not say the subject matter of anything that was said when she was up here. She's turned away and so --

MS. BLUTH: Judge, for the record though I -- 'cause, you know, there's stuff that they can't see on the black and white. I also didn't act out I asked them to consider --

THE COURT: Right.

2.0

MS. BLUTH: -- her body language, how she reacted to certain questions, but I physically did not act it out.

THE COURT: Okay. I thought you turned away from them at one point, but you may not have. In any event, I don't think there was anything inappropriate with that. Off the top of my head I don't recall that case that Mr. Figler is referencing, but to me the idea would be if the DA is stating testimony from the witness stand it would look more like the DA him or herself is testifying. I thought that might be the issue. So in any event, the record is what it is.

Anything else?

MR. FIGLER: Yes, Your Honor, I was in the middle of -- yes, thank you, Your Honor, for making that record.

And then additionally with regard to the second 1 2 Amended Information it was filed -- I believe I was stating it 3 was filed after Ms. McAmis had given her -- her closing argument. We object to the filing of the second Amended 4 5 Information, and we would ask for a mistrial based on it and 6 here's why; the defense has -- when the first Amended 7 Information was filed --8 THE COURT: Didn't we already have argument on this? 9 MR. FIGLER: I guess, but I have to object I think to 10 contemporaneous --11 THE COURT: Yeah, I mean, the filing of it only 12 occurred after Ms. McAmis's argument, but we all knew that they 13 would be filing a second amended. And my understanding is 14 Ms. Bluth had e-mailed that to my JEA so she could print it 15 out, but there were -- a mistake or something in from the 16 transmission --17 The pagination. MS. BLUTH: 18 MR. HAMNER: Yeah. 19 MS. BLUTH: The pagination was off. 2.0 THE COURT: -- and so you had to have your 21 secretary -- obviously my secretary doesn't work on that --22 MR. FIGLER: Right. The objection that --23 THE COURT: -- and typically we wouldn't even assist

JD Reporting, Inc.

Sure.

in printing it out frankly, but --

MR. FIGLER:

24

25

THE COURT: -- I think Ms. Bluth had to e-mail it or something back to her secretary or something like that. So that's why it was filed so late, but I think as of Friday we all clearly knew that she was going to be filing another amended to conform with what's set forth in Instruction No. 3.

2.0

MR. FIGLER: Which we also objected to -THE COURT: Right.

MR. FIGLER: -- and just so the record is clear we also object upon the filing of the second Amended Information. The defense is prejudiced in that we were relying upon the first Amended Information. This is not just a ministerial change but actually adds in a new alternate liability to Ms. Solander, as the Court might recall, that the defense nor the State really provided any evidence or thereby the contradiction of that evidence or the challenge of evidence in regard to contemporaneous mental suffering of any of the children other than what's intuitive.

So there was no testimony, say, from Dr. Cetl would these children have suffered any sort of mental suffering at the time. There was no evidence of mental suffering. There was no other doctors or other documentation, and that was because the defense had a good faith belief that it would not be coming in that it was purely a pain theory of prosecution and that reasonably came from the first Amended Information. I could appreciate the State's argument —

THE COURT: I think that --

MR. FIGLER: -- that they wanted to do the other but they didn't, and we had every right to rely on the Information when we did our opening, when we did our cross-examination and quite frankly throughout the course.

THE COURT: Didn't we make this argument, I mean, didn't we have argument on this already?

MS. BLUTH: Yeah.

2.0

MR. HAMNER: Yes.

THE COURT: I would just note, I mean, I think in this case it is really intuitive in terms of what the mental suffering would be, and I think a lot of the point of this if you believe the e-mail traffic was to humiliate the girls. So if the point of it is humiliation, i.e., mental suffering, I think we can reasonably intuit that that was it without medical opinion.

And that just sort of also begs the question, what potential cross-examination could you have done on any of the physicians where it's likely a physician would have said, no, that wouldn't constitute mental suffering, you know. Having your pants pulled down in front of younger children who are laughing at you isn't mental suffering, or sitting on a bucket isn't mental suffering, or standing and drinking a blended drink when your foster siblings get to eat, you know, chicken nuggets in a Swanson dinner isn't mental suffering.

So I really don't know what cross-examination would have been likely to have been elicited on that, but as I said, I don't think -- I think there's enough to for anyone to intuit that there was mental suffering without any kind of expert opinion on the subject just applying a reasonable person standard as to what that would be. And again if you read the e-mails that seems to be the point.

MS. BLUTH: The only thing, Judge. Oh, sorry. The only thing I want to point out, Judge, is the defense actually was on notice because A, it was in the original Information. And then when defense asked me to take out mental injury I took out mental injury, and my secretary accidentally took out mental suffering. And so we were all on the same page that mental injury wasn't going to be in there but mental suffering was. And I even specifically said, no, that we have to leave in because that's an actual element —

MR. HAMNER: Right.

2.0

THE COURT: And there was discussion on it.

MS. BLUTH: Right. So I just want to make sure that the record doesn't look like, oh, just today out of nowhere, I mean, we've been talking about this a few times, but that was always the understanding of the parties before the trial even started --

MR. HAMNER: Right.

MS. BLUTH: -- before the Amended Information was

even read.

2.0

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$  FIGLER: Well, and I will respectfully disagree that the --

THE COURT: Well, no, there was talk about the mental suffering because I said oh, you mean in the title to the offense, and then she said, no, and I thought, you know, where use spell out the offense, I thought that's what she was talking about, but she said, no, I left mental suffering in there. So I remember that there was discussion prior to filing the amended in terms of what they were taking out --

MR. FIGLER: Whether or not there --

THE COURT: -- and that's on the record.

MR. FIGLER: Well, the record is what I was going to say is going to speak for itself. The defense was not from our position on those that that was still in. It wasn't discussed in openings.

And as far as cross-examination, it may very well have required a different method or a different manner of cross-examination upon the children. There was — the record was devoid of any expert testimony I made that point, but with the children themselves I think that Ms. McAmis who did cross-examine them may very well have taken a different tack with regard to the mental suffering to show any number of different things. But that wasn't even in her mind because we were relying upon the first Amended Information. And so that

1	is the prejudice to us and why we object to the filing of the
2	second Amended Information as well as Instruction 2 or 3 3.
3	THE COURT: It's Instruction 3.
4	MR. FIGLER: 3, Your Honor.
5	THE COURT: Which you already made a record about
6	so
7	MR. FIGLER: Right. So with that we submit.
8	THE COURT: I think the record is what the record
9	is.
10	MR. FIGLER: Uh-huh.
11	THE COURT: They're coming back at 9:00 tomorrow
12	so
13	MS. BLUTH: Okay.
14	THE COURT: leave numbers, your cell phones or
15	whatever so
16	THE CLERK: So what about the missed files
17	THE COURT: What?
18	THE CLERK: medical records?
19	MR. FIGLER: That's court exhibit.
20	THE COURT: Those are a proposed exhibit so they
21	weren't admitted. So it doesn't go back. Whatever you do
22	don't send back the wrong exhibits.
23	MS. BLUTH: Oh my gosh, I've already been through
24	that.
25	THE CLERK: No, I won't.
	JD Reporting, Inc.

THE COURT: And don't send back any of the court exhibits not that you would, but -- at least if you send back the medical records it won't cause a mistrial. (Proceeding recessed for the evening 6:26 p.m.) -000-I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly ATTEST: transcribed the audio/video proceedings in the above-entitled case. Jani LOCs Janie L. Olsen Transcriber 

BY MR. FIGLER: [6] 71/22 79/14 79/23 81/2 84/18 88/4 BY MS. BLUTH: [1] 85/24 MR. FIGLER: [278] 3/15 3/20 4/6 4/9 4/13 4/19 5/1 5/4 5/12 6/1 6/11 6/14 6/23 7/18 8/2 8/16 8/18 8/23 9/1 9/23 10/1 10/3 10/7 10/10 10/14 10/17 11/3 11/6 11/11 12/11 12/22 12/25 13/4 13/10 13/12 13/16 13/19 13/21 14/19 14/23 15/1 15/8 15/11 15/19 15/25 16/3 16/6 16/8 16/12 16/14 16/17 16/20 17/3 17/6 17/11 17/19 17/23 18/2 18/5 18/11 20/10 21/7 21/10 21/15 21/17 21/19 21/22 22/3 22/9 22/12 22/23 23/1 23/8 23/15 23/18 25/7 25/11 25/24 26/7 27/13 29/20 30/4 30/6 30/14 30/18 30/25 31/9 31/12 32/1 32/4 32/8 32/25 33/3 33/7 33/10 33/15 33/21 34/5 34/8 34/12 34/16 34/20 34/22 34/25 35/3 35/5 36/4 36/19 36/24 37/8 37/10 37/14 37/18 37/22 37/24 38/2 38/6 38/10 38/12 38/14 38/17 38/21 38/24 39/2 39/4 39/7 39/12 39/14 40/3 41/22 42/22 43/1 43/5 43/8 43/13 43/15 45/5 45/7 45/17 45/19 46/5 47/24 48/3 48/6 48/16 48/18 48/20 49/12 49/19 49/22 50/21 51/1 51/5 51/8 51/12 51/15 51/20 51/24 53/5 53/7 53/15 54/21 55/3 55/5 55/8 56/2 56/9 56/13 56/19 56/21 56/23 57/1 57/4 57/8 57/12 57/17 57/22 58/6 59/13 59/18 59/20 60/8 60/18 60/25 61/7 62/16 62/19 63/3 63/15 63/17 63/22 64/13 64/20 64/24 65/4 65/6 65/11 65/21 66/3 66/6 66/10 66/13 67/10 67/15 67/25 68/7 68/11 69/23 70/1 70/8 70/12 70/14 70/17 70/21 71/5 79/18 80/20 80/22 84/13 85/19 88/2 88/20 88/24 89/11 91/15 91/24 92/2 92/7 92/11 92/23 93/9 93/19 94/1 94/4 94/6 94/10 94/19

94/22 95/1 95/7 95/13 95/16 95/22 96/4 96/14 96/17 97/4 97/8 98/4 98/8 98/12 98/19 261/9 261/12 261/18 261/22 262/6 269/15 269/18 269/21 288/6 309/7 309/14 309/18 310/24 311/9 311/22 311/25 312/6 312/8 313/2 315/2 315/11 315/13 316/4 316/7 316/10 316/19 MR. HAMNER: [56]

16/25 17/4 19/16 21/1 21/3 22/20 23/17 23/19 23/22 23/25 27/5 27/9 27/12 31/22 37/12 37/15 50/7 50/20 51/22 52/3 52/5 52/17 52/19 52/23 53/4 56/18 61/10 70/19 92/24 93/1 93/3 98/22 98/25 100/6 100/11 100/14 110/5 111/10 112/4 113/16 117/24 121/25 137/12 137/22 140/15 141/16 141/21 142/4 142/6 307/21 308/11 309/6 311/18 313/9 314/17 314/24

MS. BLUTH: [241] 3/4 3/7 3/13 3/19 3/21 5/5 5/18 5/23 8/1 8/5 8/13 9/5 9/10 9/20 9/24 10/2 10/12 10/16 11/8 11/12 12/10 12/16 12/24 13/9 14/16 14/20 15/5 15/10 15/12 15/15 15/17 16/7 16/10 16/13 16/15 16/19 16/23 17/7 17/21 18/7 18/16 18/19 19/3 19/8 19/14 20/4 20/9 20/16 22/2 22/5 22/10 22/18 22/21 22/24 23/11 23/14 23/16 24/12 25/4 26/13 26/20 26/25 27/14 27/17 27/22 27/25 28/8 28/17 28/19 28/23 29/2 29/16 THE MARSHAL: [6] 29/18 29/22 30/2 30/5 30/12 30/15 30/19 30/22 31/4 31/8 31/13 31/18 31/21 31/23 31/25 34/2 34/14 34/18 34/21 34/23 35/1 35/4 35/10 35/14 35/19 35/23 36/1 36/10 36/13 36/23 37/3 37/6 37/9 37/17 37/21 37/23 38/4 38/9 38/11 38/13 38/15 38/19 38/22 39/1 39/3 39/6 39/11 39/13 39/15 39/18 39/21 40/1 41/10 43/12 45/22 46/1 46/4 46/7 46/20 46/23 48/5 48/17 48/19 48/25 50/19 51/19 52/8 52/11 52/18 52/21 53/11

53/13 55/11 56/17 57/14 59/8 60/22 61/4 61/8 61/11 61/15 61/20 64/25 65/5 65/9 65/12 66/1 66/8 66/15 66/24 67/1 67/6 67/19 68/2 68/9 68/24 69/1 69/6 69/8 69/14 69/19 69/21 79/13 84/12 85/22 87/24 89/2 89/17 90/12 90/15 90/19 90/23 91/1 91/4 91/9 91/19 91/22 93/10 93/14 93/23 93/25 94/18 94/23 95/4 95/6 96/9 96/16 97/5 97/9 97/11 98/6 165/6 218/19 261/11 261/13 261/19 262/2 262/4 262/13 263/17 269/22 269/24 279/11 279/14 288/4 288/11 288/19 288/21 302/23 302/25 307/25 308/3 308/6 308/12 308/15 308/17 308/22 308/25 309/3 310/9 310/13 311/17 311/19 313/8 314/8 314/19 314/25 316/13 316/23 MS. MCAMIS: [32]

18/17 27/11 46/10 46/16 46/18 46/21 54/22 55/19 55/24 56/20 65/3 65/7 66/16 110/2 111/8 113/9 117/20 121/20 137/11 137/20 140/4 141/15 142/1 165/16 165/19 219/2 263/14 269/14 279/10 288/3 288/7 302/22

THE CLERK: [9] 71/10 80/21 308/8 308/16 308/19 309/10 316/16 316/18 316/25 THE COURT

**RECORDER:** [5] 6/13 71/15 71/19 91/25 92/6

THE COURT: [378] 6/21 9/19 14/10 15/22 16/1 16/5

THE WITNESS: [7] 71/12 71/17 71/20 79/17 79/19 89/8 89/10

UNIDENTIFIED **SPEAKER: [1]** 49/5

**\$500 [1]** 246/9

'Cause [4] 278/7 280/14 296/25 310/9 'em [1] 283/6

**-oOo [1]** 317/5

1 for [1] 246/14 **10 [16]** 15/3 67/21 77/15 77/25 95/12 157/18 158/6 199/16 253/2 253/4 254/7 260/21 286/8 292/11 301/1 301/1 **10-day [3]** 78/11 78/13 254/7

10-year-olds [1] 283/4 **10:22 a.m [1]** 69/15 10:29 a.m [1] 69/15 10:30 a.m [1] 70/23 10:58 a.m [1] 90/11 **11 [7]** 76/19 88/14 95/14 104/1 158/8 159/10 230/12

11:02 [1] 91/13 11:10 [1] 89/19 11:15 a.m [1] 91/13 **11:15 for [2]** 90/7 90/8

11:29 a.m [1] 99/2 **11:30 [1]** 98/10 11th [14] 38/15 76/12 76/12 81/15 81/25 82/1 87/6 87/16 123/13 130/12 171/21 215/21

**12 [10]** 1/14 3/1 95/17 95/25 159/11 160/19 228/18 306/5 306/22 306/24

250/20 253/2

**12:00 [1]** 204/14 12:00 o'clock [1] 156/6 **13 [9]** 37/12 37/13 95/18 128/3 129/24 188/15 270/16 270/19 306/7

**13-year [1]** 170/19 **14 [14]** 95/19 103/18 103/20 103/20 104/1 104/2 104/16 108/23 108/24 134/3 138/4 191/23 202/25 306/7 **15 [11]** 31/23 68/20 68/21 68/22 95/20 95/25 144/4 147/1 204/8 306/5 306/8 **16 [5]** 95/21 147/4 270/12 270/17 279/20 **17 [7]** 19/4 24/13 24/14 96/3 96/6 153/10 226/23

**18 [11]** 14/18 28/24 96/6 103/13 103/15 103/17 131/2 154/22 157/17 204/22 208/16 **19 [5]** 29/21 96/7 104/11 113/22 191/17

**19th [3]** 171/21 233/18 259/6 1:00 we'll [1] 98/14

**1:24 p.m [1]** 165/4 1:25 p.m [1] 165/7

20 [8] 1/13 31/24 37/7

48/13 48/20 96/8 154/20 240/15 **2008 [2]** 40/11 264/4 **2009 [5]** 187/1 187/15 187/25 188/2 188/4 **2011 [17]** 32/25 37/21 37/22 37/25 103/8 121/5 130/5 169/2 171/21 189/5 197/6 197/9 208/13 233/18 247/12 259/6 305/4 **2012** [6] 123/9 130/10 130/13 130/17 215/21 280/3

169/3 171/21 194/22 203/13 231/18 **2014 [33]** 32/19 32/22 37/19 72/4 75/22 76/12 76/19 78/16 80/10 80/16 81/10 82/23 84/4 88/14 97/2 130/6 141/4 157/3 194/20 205/1 213/5 213/25 224/19 236/24 250/20 251/3 251/4 251/6 253/1

**2013 [7]** 103/8 121/5

254/6 **2018 [2]** 1/14 3/1 **21** [**5**] 96/11 96/16 96/18 157/18 158/6 **22 [4]** 96/19 159/11 160/19 228/18 **22nd [7]** 37/19 37/20 38/8 38/9 38/17 97/2

253/3 253/24 254/5

97/2 **23 [4]** 37/13 96/20 128/3 129/24 **23rd [6]** 37/25 37/25

38/11 38/12 39/4 97/5 **24 [4]** 96/21 134/3 191/24 202/25

**24/7 [3]** 203/17 238/17 259/16

**25** [**5**] 96/23 115/15 139/16 143/11 234/7 **26** [**5**] 36/20 96/24 144/4 147/2 204/8 **27 [3]** 96/25 147/4 151/8

**28** [**5**] 97/12 153/10 202/8 205/7 226/23 28th [2] 251/6 252/25 **29 [5]** 97/14 154/22 157/17 204/22 208/16

**2:00 [1]** 98/21 **2:15 [3]** 165/3 165/3 165/5

2:23 p.m [1] 165/7

**30 [13]** 15/4 48/13 48/21 68/25 97/15 104/13 115/15 116/13 125/9 147/13 147/14 178/13 240/16 30-day [1] 202/2 **300 [5]** 123/14 123/16 124/2 124/19 215/12

5232

2	0	162/25 170/4 174/0	2000 untable [2] 205/7	168/12 172/5 174/12
3	8	162/25 170/4 174/8	accountable [3] 305/7	
<b>31 [1]</b> 97/16	8 are [1] 104/10	176/3 178/24 180/18	305/9 305/20	186/19 189/13 190/24
<b>32 [1]</b> 97/17	8 relate [1] 216/16	181/2 181/2 181/20	accounts [1] 192/17	192/25 193/22 199/16
<b>33 [1]</b> 97/18	8:00 p.m [1] 228/13	191/1 191/13 191/15	accredited [1] 74/11	200/16 202/17 203/3
<b>34 [1]</b> 97/19	8th [1] 38/16	193/1 194/2 201/2	accumulating [2]	205/2 208/22 211/11
<b>35 [2]</b> 97/20 261/9	<del></del>	203/24 205/15 208/9	214/15 223/8	211/19 213/5 214/5
<b>36 [3]</b> 97/21 104/13	9	209/14 212/1 220/22	accurate [4] 150/9	214/6 214/8 215/14
116/13	9-year-olds [1] 173/10	225/3 226/17 227/1	150/10 180/18 286/14	215/18 216/2 216/14
<b>360 [1]</b> 41/14	90 degrees [1] 289/3	231/9 241/15 242/11	accusations [1] 167/7	216/20 217/4 217/5
	90-degree [1] 289/4	242/13 243/8 243/12	accused [1] 187/19	219/14 222/16 223/9
<b>37 [4]</b> 97/22 104/14		244/10 246/2 251/14	acknowledged [7]	224/4 224/6 224/16
126/5 240/5	<b>9:00 [4]</b> 16/9 308/1	253/8 257/12 257/13	202/17 202/18 203/9	225/9 226/1 226/12
<b>38 [4]</b> 37/8 97/23	308/7 316/11	257/14 257/15 257/17	204/4 204/9 209/6	226/16 227/3 228/7
127/24 223/17	<b>9:07 [1]</b> 3/1	260/10 263/5 263/5	209/7	229/22 230/18 230/19
<b>39 [3]</b> 37/8 127/25	A	263/25 267/22 268/3	acknowledgment [1]	233/14 234/18 235/8
223/17		268/6 281/23 281/25	177/1	235/22 237/16 239/21
4	<b>a.m [9]</b> 3/1 69/15 69/15	282/4 282/4 283/22	acquiescence [9]	239/22 241/18 241/24
	70/23 81/14 90/11	283/22 283/24 283/25	50/17 50/24 51/17	246/25 250/3 255/11
<b>40 [8]</b> 15/4 48/14	91/13 91/13 99/2			
154/20 186/8 202/4	<b>AB</b> [1] 267/9	284/2 284/14 284/15	52/12 52/16 53/1 53/3	255/21 256/20 257/1 260/10 262/23 264/23
227/23 266/5 266/6	abandoned [2] 132/4	298/12 304/25	202/16 203/2	
<b>41 [2]</b> 157/18 158/6	181/8	abused [10] 118/21	acronym [1] 72/9	277/24 280/5 282/16
<b>42 [3]</b> 159/11 160/19	abbreviate [1] 189/11	174/14 210/9 252/7	across [1] 263/12	284/18 284/19 296/22
228/18	abbreviation [2]	263/13 263/17 263/23	act [15] 14/8 95/14	303/15 309/23 312/12
<b>43 [2]</b> 161/6 161/18	167/21 167/22	297/23 305/14 305/15	126/13 133/4 174/14	314/9
<b>432B [1]</b> 29/8	abilities [1] 100/21	abusers [5] 251/16	174/17 187/17 187/21	ad [1] 198/8
<b>44 [3]</b> 160/21 161/5	ability [1] 139/9	251/20 251/22 251/24	223/6 291/24 291/24	ADAIR [1] 1/12
238/14	able [21] 21/3 55/21	252/2	303/25 310/2 310/11	adamantly [1] 60/2
<b>45 [2]</b> 49/3 238/14	58/16 63/18 74/15	abusing [4] 152/19	310/14	add [11] 18/1 19/8
<b>46 [16]</b> 37/6 37/10	106/19 109/9 125/20	259/8 259/17 280/15	acted [5] 182/18	21/23 21/23 45/7 57/20
37/13 99/23 128/3	138/11 139/10 182/17	abusive [18] 146/5	233/25 237/9 247/7	68/4 236/7 236/8 239/8
129/24 138/4 167/3	191/21 197/20 212/25	153/9 154/17 158/1	265/11	289/19
170/3 179/6 179/10	248/22 253/5 253/5	163/8 193/15 210/7	acting [8] 58/20 59/1	added [11] 21/4 29/15
201/19 252/15 256/6	256/11 262/25 298/9	210/8 226/14 260/7	190/10 190/10 190/13	38/18 50/2 50/15 61/17
259/2 260/17	307/14	285/10 285/11 285/12	232/15 265/15 283/5	90/24 98/2 129/12
	abnormality [1] 289/17	285/17 285/17 285/20	action [4] 35/5 124/21	150/14 208/12
4:00 [1] 92/22		300/9 300/12	195/17 202/23	adding [5] 29/6 51/7
4:47 p.m [1] 261/7	about [637]	academy [14] 149/15	actions [9] 6/17 129/7	52/21 52/23 90/12
<b>4:55 [1]</b> 260/21	about the [1] 52/2	157/4 188/24 189/10	166/20 178/16 195/3	addition [4] 32/8 32/9
5	above [5] 28/24 40/13	189/18 194/22 194/25	276/19 276/19 305/6	40/3 202/20
-	246/13 265/8 317/7	212/15 213/3 231/17	305/8	additional [8] 21/4
5 or [1] 169/13	above-entitled [1]	244/17 251/23 252/8	actively [3] 259/17	78/20 83/2 86/13 89/5
<b>500 [1]</b> 246/14	317/7	258/4	259/18 295/2	131/13 177/2 281/5
<b>5:00 [3]</b> 93/1 93/3	abrasive [2] 171/3	accept [4] 7/22 84/9		
260/21	175/16		activity [1] 200/2	additionally [4] 32/13 110/13 166/9 311/1
<b>5:00 for [1]</b> 93/5	absence [3] 178/23	84/23 85/1	actor [1] 203/6	
<b>5:00 p.m [1]</b> 261/7	290/23 291/7	access [3] 65/19 141/5		address [1] 35/13
<b>5:01 [1]</b> 262/5	absolutely [26] 12/22	219/13	252/17 252/21	adds [1] 312/12
6	16/12 22/6 25/16 26/14	accident [21] 104/7	actual [23] 5/19 5/23	adequate [2] 59/3 59/6
6	41/19 50/22 112/11	125/23 131/17 139/3	14/7 48/15 70/10 70/13	adjusted [1] 186/11
<b>6 and [1]</b> 151/8	116/17 134/22 150/11	139/20 143/1 143/8	70/15 117/16 119/25	adjusting [1] 246/21
6-year-old [1] 169/13	150/24 157/6 159/1	147/11 154/12 155/7	121/19 140/11 177/25	administer [2] 117/8
<b>60 [1]</b> 202/3	164/3 180/15 180/16	160/23 178/23 196/18	177/25 177/25 200/19	120/3
<b>65 [1]</b> 82/8	198/3 199/25 207/24	199/21 204/2 239/19	217/21 218/12 248/18	administered [3] 118/3
691-something [1]	208/6 219/2 259/5	239/25 290/23 291/8	255/9 293/4 295/16	167/18 167/18
246/12	283/17 285/11 291/4	296/9 304/6	301/8 314/16	administration [1]
<b>692 [2]</b> 246/12 246/13	absolutely or [1]	accidental [2] 143/1	actually [119] 3/16	299/11
<b>6:00 [1]</b> 263/22	180/15	237/20	4/20 7/8 8/3 10/7 10/20	admissibility [2] 57/6
<b>6:15 [1]</b> 307/17	absolved [3] 50/25	accidentally [2] 28/11	11/17 11/17 12/6 12/16	57/10
<b>6:26 [1]</b> 317/4	51/6 52/13	314/12	15/19 16/21 19/19	<b>admissible [1]</b> 70/13
<b>6th [2]</b> 123/11 215/19	abundantly [3] 53/16	accidents [19] 137/25	28/12 42/23 43/4 43/6	<b>admissions [2]</b> 163/20
	107/2 107/14	144/21 148/17 153/21	47/24 49/4 53/2 59/22	202/5
7	abuse [86] 6/25 7/16	154/8 169/14 173/24	62/12 73/23 82/18 87/3	admit [11] 61/2 61/24
<b>7 and [1]</b> 104/10	41/3 41/4 49/13 72/13	173/25 199/22 199/24	97/5 101/19 105/16	62/4 62/7 62/15 62/25
7:40 a.m [1] 81/14	75/15 100/20 103/14	199/25 205/4 222/5	107/1 108/10 109/9	63/14 64/4 70/9 85/2
<b>7:40 in [1]</b> 81/21	130/22 131/1 131/3	234/5 240/21 248/17	110/17 115/14 122/25	88/5
7:40 to [1] 82/2	131/4 131/7 131/11	255/2 255/3 255/6	123/8 123/12 124/2	admits [2] 297/1 297/2
7th [4] 80/9 80/16	131/12 131/15 131/17	acclimate [1] 196/5	126/16 126/16 127/17	admitted [27] 43/16
81/10 81/24	133/18 137/18 140/22	according [2] 58/22	128/24 138/20 141/8	43/17 44/14 62/8 62/10
	143/14 145/14 149/4	176/11	141/19 147/12 148/7	64/11 70/12 81/5 89/14
	150/21 157/8 162/25	account [1] 286/14	155/9 162/4 167/8	111/20 120/1 144/7
	.55,21 10770 102720			5233

264/16 269/1 275/13 Α 275/14 281/15 286/22 admitted... [15] 150/3 289/10 309/25 311/3 153/5 155/18 158/12 311/12 193/1 198/11 201/15 **aftermath [1]** 116/1 202/21 203/4 230/14 afternoon [1] 145/21 233/14 252/16 252/18 afterwards [4] 133/7 296/20 316/21 189/25 237/2 256/15 admittedly [1] 221/6 again [122] 18/16 admitting [1] 63/10 18/19 26/16 42/5 45/11 admonition [2] 306/14 52/8 62/23 63/23 71/16 306/19 76/3 76/19 78/14 92/19 adopt [1] 195/20 104/7 107/11 107/18 adopted [19] 40/24 108/1 108/7 111/16 147/7 166/21 190/1 112/18 113/14 116/5 193/1 223/4 233/17 120/10 121/22 123/6 233/21 246/24 249/8 125/25 127/2 127/5 252/23 259/6 264/7 127/8 131/23 133/21 266/15 278/11 278/21 133/25 137/22 139/17 292/10 299/8 305/3 141/9 141/17 141/18 adoption [4] 41/14 143/8 149/20 151/17 247/1 247/11 249/9 152/14 153/10 154/14 adoptive [11] 95/2 96/9 157/8 157/21 158/2 96/12 166/7 167/7 159/12 160/15 160/25 179/16 200/19 246/22 161/7 162/12 170/4 249/6 257/20 266/13 171/6 172/12 174/25 adult [3] 29/11 184/12 175/1 175/20 177/8 283/3 177/19 181/19 184/4 advice [6] 44/4 44/18 184/14 187/23 191/4 50/12 150/20 202/12 194/1 194/2 195/19 203/7 196/24 197/1 199/10 advised [1] 99/24 203/9 205/13 205/22 advocacy [1] 79/22 207/1 207/6 207/20 advocate [10] 174/4 208/5 208/15 209/17 175/7 175/22 175/24 211/2 211/21 213/24 175/25 245/13 245/18 214/22 215/8 216/13 277/11 277/12 309/19 217/17 218/24 220/2 advocated [1] 245/21 221/4 222/15 224/1 advocates [2] 245/14 224/3 226/14 227/2 280/12 227/10 229/19 229/25 advocating [5] 187/24 230/11 231/25 236/1 279/17 280/11 280/15 238/22 239/23 240/5 286/3 240/16 242/3 248/16 affect [2] 87/5 148/25 249/19 251/9 251/13 affected [1] 87/9 251/15 253/2 253/22 affirmative [1] 33/16 256/24 257/7 280/3 afraid [4] 125/17 286/13 294/5 303/22 129/16 156/11 162/6 304/9 306/24 307/6 after [73] 32/17 48/11 314/6 54/12 78/13 78/16 against [8] 104/17 81/22 82/3 82/11 86/4 110/15 115/12 133/15 89/20 96/9 109/14 167/7 230/10 243/25 111/2 115/25 123/11 246/3 124/8 135/19 138/18 **Agape [5]** 176/16 149/25 153/12 153/14 181/19 188/17 188/18 156/5 157/3 164/7 266/10 166/21 169/11 170/12 age [6] 106/23 108/23 170/12 170/13 170/15 173/23 243/14 244/2 170/15 170/20 177/4 289/14 182/14 182/16 182/21 agencies [2] 149/10 183/4 187/12 189/5 202/9 195/7 199/20 204/14 agency [4] 42/2 44/3 216/7 219/21 228/11 55/13 55/14 228/12 228/13 229/25 agent [2] 41/24 201/14 231/5 239/25 241/19 agents [2] 44/3 202/10 242/19 246/23 247/1 aggression [2] 184/7 247/11 248/1 251/16 184/21 251/21 252/24 256/12 **ago [1]** 101/3 259/6 260/15 261/23

11/19 21/10 46/25 166/23 167/8 171/11 181/1 190/19 191/12 192/22 214/22 223/5 242/14 252/12 256/24 257/16 258/16 292/19 agreed [3] 28/10 95/6 260/7 agreeing [1] 63/14 agreement [2] 275/19 275/20 agrees [1] 263/4 ah [1] 301/14 Ahad [1] 207/17 ahead [6] 17/12 67/22 75/10 89/19 90/7 164/12 aid [2] 55/10 125/5 ailments [1] 176/19 ain't [1] 112/8 air [5] 101/9 167/16 168/1 228/9 280/13 alarm [6] 147/25 225/22 225/23 226/6 226/7 226/8 alarms [5] 226/2 226/4 226/4 226/6 281/18 alive [1] 262/25 all [359] allegation [9] 33/12 43/10 75/12 75/13 84/22 199/17 230/16 230/20 260/9 allegations [14] 32/22 72/23 87/15 210/11 210/15 210/17 210/19 210/21 212/8 227/17 232/7 243/25 247/14 260/8 allege [1] 104/12 alleged [16] 22/15 107/25 108/8 171/23 172/6 178/24 179/1 189/7 218/16 224/2 224/8 227/4 230/24 231/5 233/6 247/14 allegedly [1] 218/13 alleging [1] 72/13 alley [2] 300/20 300/21 Alliance [1] 74/13 allow [4] 6/24 40/22 78/10 159/6 allowable [3] 6/24 195/3 200/17 allowed [15] 21/20 42/8 59/25 60/20 146/18 146/22 149/12 171/9 241/2 241/3 258/18 273/16 273/17 293/20 293/21 allows [1] 200/22 almost [7] 115/23 123/16 139/7 262/16 270/10 294/9 297/1 alone [4] 113/22 116/12 205/22 276/20 along [4] 99/7 165/11 167/24 275/20 agree [20] 11/13 11/19 | Alphonsa [1] 186/15

already [24] 3/7 5/20 27/20 57/22 60/22 60/22 68/9 68/9 84/8 92/13 138/5 154/25 170/11 200/14 226/9 228/13 239/8 252/25 253/6 281/15 311/8 313/7 316/5 316/23 also [119] 7/2 17/12 25/13 27/11 35/22 35/23 46/12 59/16 65/13 86/16 88/16 92/15 102/24 106/22 109/23 109/23 113/1 113/7 113/7 113/8 113/19 113/20 114/23 115/4 115/10 115/13 115/18 116/5 116/6 119/21 129/11 135/11 137/1 140/1 140/16 146/16 146/24 157/8 159/13 159/15 159/19 164/21 167/14 167/19 169/14 170/15 173/24 175/6 175/22 178/5 179/7 182/24 183/19 184/20 185/4 185/10 187/25 191/14 195/11 195/15 195/16 196/20 198/14 204/9 204/13 206/22 206/25 207/8 207/9 207/17 207/25 208/2 209/7 215/9 220/15 223/13 223/23 225/1 225/16 226/25 227/22 228/17 228/25 230/20 231/23 235/19 237/25 238/3 238/18 241/3 242/2 245/18 246/20 247/17 248/20 256/10 257/3 271/12 271/19 272/1 272/16 280/25 284/16 284/25 289/1 289/15 289/24 291/15 291/17 299/6 300/25 301/5 304/15 307/1 308/8 310/11 312/6 312/9 313/17 alternate [2] 96/1 312/12 alternates [3] 306/6 306/11 307/11 alternative [4] 60/11 60/18 63/15 63/17 alternatives [1] 98/2 although [5] 7/23 19/19 62/12 63/12 97/18 altogether [1] 294/12 always [10] 5/11 30/16 49/22 49/24 60/15 135/23 150/5 175/16 282/13 314/22 am [10] 39/15 71/25 77/21 99/10 99/12 181/4 195/21 226/16 260/9 280/24 **Amaya [106]** 11/13 84/10 84/13 84/20

86/19 100/16 100/23 103/10 104/11 106/1 112/14 122/16 129/8 134/14 135/13 136/15 136/19 138/19 141/1 148/10 150/4 150/4 151/14 151/20 151/20 154/1 155/19 165/23 180/9 180/18 182/10 182/13 182/15 184/2 184/3 184/4 184/6 184/7 184/11 184/19 185/12 187/16 188/10 190/10 194/21 197/10 199/18 203/18 207/8 207/8 207/12 207/17 209/2 209/10 209/23 212/10 212/12 213/12 213/22 214/5 214/6 215/10 216/8 216/12 217/25 219/20 219/21 221/12 221/16 224/6 227/18 231/23 231/24 231/25 232/5 232/6 232/9 232/13 243/13 244/5 248/13 254/4 255/17 257/12 258/10 260/12 262/24 265/11 266/24 267/7 271/5 271/6 271/6 271/7 271/8 271/9 271/15 271/16 271/17 271/19 282/17 282/17 289/1 291/12 295/22 301/16 Amaya's [5] 189/5 207/19 217/21 248/10 271/9 **ambiguous [1]** 108/8 amended [23] 28/3 36/21 36/25 92/16 92/16 93/22 93/23 99/21 172/7 261/24 309/8 311/2 311/4 311/6 311/13 312/5 312/9 312/11 312/24 314/25 315/10 315/25 316/2 among [1] 246/6 amount [5] 74/21 75/2 144/24 236/8 299/23 ample [1] 177/6 Anastasia [127] 12/18 86/23 103/11 104/6 104/12 109/11 113/24 113/25 116/7 122/16 124/23 127/4 127/20 129/10 129/13 130/5 131/10 136/3 139/16 139/17 142/7 146/8 148/12 149/7 152/8 154/2 155/17 155/20 156/20 157/12 160/8

160/12 161/7 165/23

180/19 182/2 182/5

184/20 185/12 186/5

188/10 194/21 199/18

199/20 203/11 203/18

182/7 184/4 184/5

187/1 187/4 187/7

5234

Α Anastasia... [75] 204/24 208/2 208/11 208/13 209/2 209/24 212/10 213/4 218/2 218/2 218/3 219/14 221/13 221/16 223/17 224/9 224/10 224/13 224/20 225/21 227/18 229/21 232/17 233/4 233/12 234/6 234/8 234/24 235/1 235/7 235/13 235/14 235/22 236/10 236/13 237/1 237/12 238/1 238/7 238/12 239/11 239/13 239/16 239/16 239/20 239/25 240/5 240/20 241/5 243/13 244/6 246/22 246/24 246/25 247/8 253/12 253/23 257/4 257/12 260/12 267/11 267/13 267/14 271/24 271/25 272/13 274/16 282/5 282/6 283/14 283/15 291/12 295/22 301/11 304/3 Anastasia's [15] 136/22 151/15 154/1 161/6 187/11 194/16 223/10 237/24 238/10 238/22 238/23 240/3 240/19 258/10 272/13 **Anderson [13]** 43/22 144/7 144/8 170/21 199/13 199/19 203/12 248/24 249/1 279/18 280/25 281/4 297/8 **Andrea [3]** 188/21 198/6 212/20 anecdote [1] 186/13 anger [2] 187/5 187/11 angry [6] 182/5 187/2 187/4 187/7 187/13 243/8 another [49] 3/21 39/24 41/25 62/2 68/13 68/16 68/25 77/21 83/14 85/4 104/7 105/6 105/8 105/10 110/19 118/11 120/16 123/18 126/11 127/4 127/20 128/4 131/6 143/20 143/21 143/23 160/10 161/9 164/20 167/12 187/23 188/23 197/15 201/24 229/14 236/6 240/22 243/21 244/3 254/17 270/21 276/12 304/23 306/21 306/23 307/7 308/8 309/19 312/4 answer [9] 75/19 75/20 76/6 76/6 86/3 170/12 196/11 217/1 282/3 answers [3] 213/16 287/10 287/11 anticipate [2] 222/10

250/5 any [189] 5/6 6/2 10/13 18/24 19/5 24/8 24/16 24/20 24/25 25/1 25/2 25/21 26/2 26/4 26/6 26/23 28/25 29/2 33/2 33/9 40/10 40/14 41/12 41/13 41/18 41/19 42/6 42/17 55/6 56/15 59/5 61/12 63/25 63/25 69/2 70/14 73/15 74/22 78/14 79/21 80/5 87/5 89/3 89/7 89/16 90/3 90/4 90/5 96/24 98/3 99/13 105/5 105/6 106/1 107/19 119/25 120/2 122/14 126/17 126/23 128/11 128/16 137/6 140/7 145/10 147/7 147/13 147/14 149/7 149/11 153/7 155/10 155/25 156/5 161/22 162/24 164/22 164/23 164/24 167/10 171/8 173/15 177/10 177/12 178/20 179/1 179/20 185/6 185/7 185/15 185/19 186/12 189/4 189/6 189/22 190/21 191/2 191/20 193/10 194/4 194/5 194/12 198/18 198/22 199/14 200/10 201/25 202/22 204/16 205/13 207/22 209/3 211/6 211/24 212/5 213/2 213/12 213/20 215/17 215/20 216/6 217/24 217/25 220/17 220/19 220/24 220/25 221/21 221/25 222/1 222/3 224/20 226/16 226/19 229/6 229/7 229/8 230/5 230/22 231/6 231/7 231/19 233/9 234/21 237/9 237/10 237/17 238/9 240/23 241/16 241/17 242/5 243/20 244/14 247/9 247/10 256/16 257/2 257/6 259/2 260/25 261/1 261/2 263/4 263/5 263/5 263/12 265/14 277/3 279/8 280/1 287/10 289/6 302/1 302/12 307/2 307/4 307/5 307/5 310/16 310/22 312/14 312/16 312/19 313/18 314/4 315/20 315/23 317/1 anybody [7] 30/1 42/19 76/9 76/9 276/15 279/8 294/25 anymore [2] 55/16 257/10 anyone [24] 4/10 22/6 22/6 29/19 52/7 55/14 66/23 67/8 90/2 117/11

153/17 164/18 177/10 63/4 145/5 148/23 177/18 188/17 188/19 188/23 192/4 212/15 212/16 260/24 306/20 307/3 314/3 anything [54] 29/19 30/3 44/12 56/22 64/1 67/9 67/13 75/8 84/2 84/21 84/23 87/9 89/1 90/1 105/1 111/25 113/3 162/2 162/4 171/25 172/1 172/3 178/7 189/17 190/8 198/13 199/8 205/19 211/25 213/23 214/1 216/23 224/23 226/20 229/9 231/14 235/1 237/8 237/15 240/25 241/23 242/6 244/7 254/4 255/6 259/1 260/23 271/17 306/10 307/3 307/3 310/7 310/17 310/23 anyway [5] 25/21 87/9 246/3 249/10 249/10 anyways [2] 9/17 138/6 anyways I [1] 9/17 anywhere [2] 36/7 221/2 apart [1] 78/10 apologize [5] 9/21 17/6 114/6 137/22 138/6 apparently [4] 177/21 188/14 210/25 299/11 appear [7] 13/22 40/12 57/24 140/8 140/10 172/10 298/15 appearance [1] 205/24 APPEARANCES [1] 1/16 appears [3] 37/24 38/7 82/2 applicable [1] 108/11 application [3] 70/9 70/16 70/17 applied [3] 146/10 281/5 291/9 apply [11] 51/8 51/12 51/13 52/14 52/24 103/25 103/25 131/9 202/14 228/9 237/15 applying [1] 314/5 appointed [2] 54/12 54/12 appointment [1] 186/9 appointments [5] 72/22 177/7 205/16 208/3 246/9 appreciate [1] 312/25 apprehension [2] 128/5 129/2 approach [11] 21/3 27/11 80/25 82/8 84/14 86/3 117/20 140/4 253/10 269/18 288/8 approached [1] 309/11 appropriate [15] 7/9 7/13 13/23 44/1 44/20

150/25 157/14 157/21 170/9 237/10 250/13 250/13 approval [11] 45/1 50/17 50/24 51/17 52/12 52/15 53/1 53/3 178/2 202/15 203/2 approve [2] 45/15 205/14 approved [4] 44/6 49/25 202/13 204/5 approximately [1] 72/3 are [273] 6/12 7/4 7/16 10/5 12/12 14/8 14/10 15/22 15/22 16/1 16/1 17/10 25/15 34/18 35/15 37/12 39/15 41/14 44/3 45/11 47/7 47/9 47/10 48/22 49/3 49/14 49/14 55/6 59/11 60/2 61/4 61/17 61/17 61/24 69/1 69/9 72/13 72/23 73/15 73/15 74/1 74/1 74/13 75/9 75/17 77/22 79/4 79/20 80/5 88/19 89/9 91/6 91/24 91/25 92/5 94/8 94/12 94/13 97/18 99/12 99/24 99/25 100/1 101/7 101/15 103/6 103/10 104/1 104/3 104/5 104/10 105/17 105/19 105/25 106/23 107/13 108/12 110/1 110/6 110/7 110/10 111/17 113/24 114/13 114/17 114/21 118/6 123/1 126/6 127/1 127/3 130/23 131/12 131/13 133/13 133/16 136/12 137/16 137/17 138/1 141/22 143/15 143/15 144/24 145/18 146/21 147/4 147/4 148/21 149/16 150/17 152/1 154/16 157/10 162/10 163/17 165/16 166/7 166/18 166/24 168/20 168/20 168/25 171/4 171/21 171/22 171/22 172/4 172/10 172/22 172/22 173/7 175/1 178/18 178/19 179/6 179/14 180/5 180/11 181/1 181/5 190/13 190/23 191/3 192/13 194/9 197/2 201/1 202/9 202/10 203/23 208/18 209/19 210/4 213/15 213/18 216/22 218/23 218/25 219/6 220/15 221/3 226/23 228/17 228/25 229/5 230/11 231/21 232/7 240/3 241/18 241/21 241/25 242/10 243/3 243/15 245/2 245/14 245/15 247/14

250/1 252/3 252/21 254/16 259/3 259/17 259/18 259/22 259/24 260/13 260/16 260/22 260/22 261/14 261/16 262/11 263/23 265/25 268/13 273/11 273/12 273/22 274/20 274/23 275/9 276/13 276/14 276/16 276/16 276/17 277/19 277/21 277/21 278/3 278/11 278/22 279/2 279/5 279/16 280/12 280/12 280/13 280/19 281/5 281/8 281/11 287/6 289/24 289/25 290/1 292/3 292/9 292/10 295/16 295/18 295/19 295/25 297/6 297/7 297/21 298/3 298/4 298/8 298/9 298/12 298/13 298/14 298/17 302/14 302/15 302/20 303/13 303/14 303/24 305/7 305/11 305/12 305/13 305/13 306/5 306/5 306/6 306/7 306/18 306/20 306/21 306/22 306/24 306/25 307/5 308/23 313/21 316/20 area [9] 86/11 109/19 109/24 109/25 113/17 113/19 125/3 136/17 301/16 **Areahia [22]** 135/6 135/11 144/6 144/21 148/20 149/24 157/1

159/13 172/9 174/20 175/2 175/24 177/5 245/19 245/21 265/5 275/2 291/21 292/5 293/7 293/21 294/6 Areahia's [2] 175/23 245/20

areas [2] 105/2 185/12 aren't [6] 15/5 77/13 108/19 137/7 162/23 243/7

argue [15] 3/10 4/22 30/7 30/10 40/19 44/10 44/23 44/25 50/11 58/17 59/25 64/2 92/20 128/14 305/10

argued [4] 4/20 4/20 12/25 58/9

arguing [2] 305/11

305/13

argument [28] 2/2 2/3 2/4 44/9 48/15 54/18 60/2 61/5 63/23 64/10 100/5 100/13 111/16 164/16 165/15 165/18 197/1 260/20 261/23 262/12 288/10 309/13 311/4 311/8 311/12 312/25 313/6 313/7

58/18 89/22 97/23 5235

arguments [6] 48/9

178/7 179/16 183/17 239/15 246/24 249/9 253/20 264/25 265/13 184/2 184/11 186/21 arguments... [2] 100/9 188/11 191/10 191/21 268/3 269/4 272/4 164/15 192/23 195/21 195/22 277/25 292/18 297/9 **Arizona [2]** 167/22 196/6 196/21 196/22 298/24 303/9 310/11 210/1 200/19 200/24 201/14 314/11 **arm [1]** 235/14 202/2 204/2 204/2 asking [26] 12/1 12/3 **arms [2]** 135/14 136/1 204/22 204/22 205/5 15/5 33/22 65/9 65/12 arose [1] 249/12 205/13 206/7 209/8 65/13 66/8 66/9 83/13 around [23] 17/15 209/13 210/9 214/3 183/6 183/9 195/19 43/20 98/14 98/21 215/3 215/4 218/23 195/20 195/21 224/25 120/2 122/15 147/1 222/10 224/23 226/6 226/15 226/16 229/19 152/22 172/23 173/10 229/20 230/17 256/24 228/3 234/7 234/25 199/15 211/4 227/7 237/12 238/1 240/20 260/9 260/16 279/24 229/14 240/8 253/16 240/22 243/11 244/4 304/18 255/12 265/7 282/18 244/14 244/18 246/21 asks [1] 305/17 282/22 283/5 303/17 247/2 248/9 248/9 asleep [1] 274/8 303/25 249/17 249/17 252/6 ass [2] 190/9 266/25 arrangement [1] 77/19 256/3 256/18 256/21 assault [91] 3/23 5/21 arthritis [1] 186/14 258/8 258/12 258/18 7/10 7/19 9/22 9/23 articles [2] 87/12 259/7 267/17 267/17 9/24 10/10 10/23 12/4 244/12 12/7 13/2 13/5 13/5 268/12 269/10 269/10 as [249] 6/24 7/10 7/19 13/7 13/8 13/11 13/14 274/18 277/5 277/9 13/2 13/13 13/22 13/24 280/24 281/5 290/14 13/15 13/17 14/4 14/6 13/25 14/2 14/6 18/15 299/9 299/18 299/18 14/12 14/13 14/20 18/1 19/17 20/23 21/18 23/2 302/10 303/11 306/4 18/21 18/23 24/5 24/8 26/5 28/6 32/12 32/25 309/19 309/19 312/3 25/9 32/11 32/12 32/15 33/9 40/5 40/5 40/14 312/13 314/2 314/6 32/15 34/4 34/4 34/18 41/2 41/24 43/21 43/24 315/17 315/17 316/2 34/24 34/25 35/15 50/18 53/16 53/18 36/17 37/12 38/7 40/4 316/2 53/18 53/23 54/6 54/9 **ASAP [1]** 281/5 57/19 58/13 59/17 54/11 54/13 56/8 57/5 aside [2] 123/23 235/5 67/23 75/14 97/1 57/6 57/19 58/6 58/8 ask [76] 17/10 17/11 103/19 104/1 104/2 58/8 58/9 58/12 59/1 17/13 21/23 23/3 54/15 104/5 104/25 105/24 59/6 60/6 60/6 60/9 60/19 63/17 65/21 106/14 107/7 111/5 63/13 64/15 64/21 65/22 67/12 69/3 73/7 114/18 120/10 120/14 64/21 64/23 65/17 73/10 81/8 85/25 112/6 121/1 126/6 126/7 66/18 67/16 69/11 148/11 148/17 148/25 127/1 127/5 127/21 69/12 71/8 71/9 72/12 158/21 163/3 164/5 128/1 128/3 128/9 72/14 72/18 72/20 74/1 164/7 164/9 166/15 128/10 130/2 210/18 74/2 74/22 76/1 76/2 166/16 166/17 179/13 212/8 221/18 223/15 76/7 76/7 76/13 77/12 190/5 190/8 193/22 223/15 223/16 223/19 77/12 78/2 79/4 79/5 208/20 211/21 217/3 223/24 223/25 241/14 79/11 80/18 81/3 83/5 224/5 225/19 225/24 300/7 300/17 300/18 84/10 84/24 85/7 87/15 226/11 227/2 237/25 300/22 301/6 301/23 87/19 90/8 91/6 93/16 241/6 246/22 250/9 302/1 96/13 96/19 98/2 98/3 255/21 258/8 264/4 assaulted [6] 104/12 98/23 99/9 99/11 265/16 266/1 266/24 114/1 129/23 174/10 101/11 101/15 102/6 266/25 270/18 270/22 263/24 300/20 105/16 108/1 108/5 271/3 271/22 277/10 assaultive [1] 184/7 110/5 111/19 111/24 277/10 277/14 285/20 assaults [1] 130/4 112/21 113/12 113/14 285/25 287/20 287/21 assess [1] 223/2 115/15 115/16 115/16 287/22 287/22 290/4 assessed [2] 184/11 120/10 120/23 121/23 292/24 300/5 300/15 184/20 122/7 122/19 122/19 301/1 301/1 301/4 assessment [3] 72/10 123/12 125/20 125/21 302/6 303/16 304/13 150/10 241/15 126/11 131/3 131/15 307/8 311/5 assigned [1] 215/11 133/2 133/19 136/17 asked [52] 27/25 28/9 assigning [1] 215/20 137/8 137/9 137/11 64/13 64/21 67/4 85/10 assist [3] 54/13 146/4 139/10 139/17 141/19 115/18 123/1 125/9 311/23 142/16 143/13 146/2 125/16 177/8 180/22 assistant [3] 168/18 146/20 148/17 151/22 192/18 194/8 196/15 250/22 296/23 152/12 153/19 157/20 196/21 204/24 208/22 assisted [1] 167/25 158/3 160/5 160/13 213/6 214/14 216/1 associated [1] 309/21 160/13 162/8 162/9 216/11 216/19 224/17 assume [1] 80/22 164/2 166/9 167/2 assumed [1] 39/23 225/6 225/11 227/23 170/9 170/9 170/21 228/7 229/21 231/4 assumes [2] 142/1 172/2 172/2 174/10 231/12 232/18 234/25 279/10 175/2 177/7 177/22 236/12 238/24 239/1 assuming [4] 68/16

82/15 235/16 257/1 assumption [1] 76/10 at [280] 6/14 7/2 8/7 13/21 14/23 16/9 23/25 27/7 28/4 29/21 29/24 29/24 31/21 31/24 32/11 32/16 33/2 33/9 35/20 36/22 38/4 39/7 39/8 40/19 42/10 42/18 43/4 46/13 47/13 49/3 54/4 54/15 55/2 56/9 60/19 61/23 62/3 62/23 65/6 65/20 66/3 67/4 68/4 69/2 72/6 72/25 74/1 76/25 77/6 78/24 80/13 81/1 81/14 81/21 82/2 82/21 84/3 84/11 84/17 84/21 84/23 87/11 87/18 88/8 89/14 91/6 92/25 98/1 99/3 99/4 99/22 99/24 102/25 104/21 106/4 106/6 107/4 110/6 110/23 111/18 112/9 113/5 113/5 113/21 116/14 117/23 118/3 120/15 121/8 122/19 123/16 123/24 125/5 125/19 129/17 133/13 135/19 136/8 136/23 140/6 144/12 148/1 148/6 148/13 148/23 148/24 149/6 149/7 149/15 149/18 153/20 154/25 155/2 156/18 156/20 156/21 156/24 157/4 158/12 159/2 159/22 160/4 161/8 161/12 161/12 161/13 161/20 161/23 162/14 163/25 165/3 167/16 167/20 169/4 172/7 173/20 173/20 173/23 176/13 177/10 177/17 179/6 179/10 180/9 183/9 184/2 188/24 189/18 190/21 193/2 194/18 194/24 196/5 196/6 197/10 201/20 201/20 204/19 205/11 205/19 208/25 209/21 210/1 211/1 212/15 213/2 213/25 215/10 217/3 218/17 219/3 219/4 219/4 219/7 222/25 224/1 225/19 227/23 228/8 228/9 228/13 228/13 229/3 229/13 229/14 229/25 230/6 230/19 230/22 230/24 232/10 233/7 234/13 234/14 235/14 236/4 236/6 236/15 239/9 239/24 240/9 240/16 241/6 242/9 243/12 245/7 247/12 252/8 253/19 255/20 255/21 256/21 260/8 260/9 260/21 262/23

263/20 263/22 264/18 266/1 267/1 267/6 267/15 269/20 270/11 270/16 270/16 270/19 274/4 274/7 276/7 276/9 276/10 278/9 279/17 285/6 285/20 285/21 286/7 287/2 288/9 289/13 291/5 291/12 291/19 292/12 292/19 293/6 294/2 294/7 294/10 294/10 294/11 294/12 295/11 295/13 295/16 296/3 296/10 296/19 297/12 298/11 299/3 300/1 300/2 300/4 300/4 300/5 302/9 302/13 303/19 304/17 305/18 305/19 306/6 310/16 312/19 313/22 316/11 317/2 ate [3] 155/18 291/16 305/12 attached [3] 83/12 124/12 294/2 attack [2] 180/25 207/20 attempt [23] 7/10 7/19 9/21 10/11 10/21 10/23 11/1 11/24 13/15 13/23 14/3 32/11 57/19 57/21 59/11 59/17 67/25 68/1 68/4 90/24 123/23 196/3 234/4

11/1 11/24 13/15 13/23 14/3 32/11 57/19 57/21 59/11 59/17 67/25 68/1 68/4 90/24 123/23 196/3 234/4 attempted [2] 7/5 13/8 attempting [1] 54/1 attempts [6] 11/7 56/25 90/12 96/21 200/1 200/1 attend [1] 258/3 attendance [1] 267/7 attending [1] 20/8 attention [9] 76/11

281/17 298/14 ATTEST [1] 317/6 attorney [2] 80/6 84/20 attorney's [2] 79/5 81/10

80/9 163/3 178/12

202/7 249/1 271/17

attorneys [6] 1/18 71/1 89/23 99/6 165/11 300/3

attribute [1] 288/16 audible [1] 27/14 audience [1] 160/3 audio [6] 74/6 74/8 74/9 79/11 80/5 317/7 audio/video [1] 317/7 August [5] 187/1 197/9 205/18 205/20 208/13

Aunt [1] 187/8 authenticate [1] 61/18 authenticated [5] 61/22 62/3 62/9 62/14 63/3

authenticating [1] 60/9 author [2] 299/7 5236

80/5 82/18 189/12 Α away [27] 100/23 author... [1] 299/14 133/12 136/12 137/4 authorities [1] 153/1 137/15 139/14 148/7 authority [2] 183/20 154/23 157/4 158/5 265/23 158/5 172/14 172/24 autism [1] 292/15 173/4 173/16 200/15 autistic [1] 293/8 202/20 208/9 210/22 Autumn [20] 88/22 211/17 249/9 274/19 121/4 121/10 135/25 290/11 290/12 310/2 144/19 159/25 169/14 310/8 310/15 172/9 173/24 174/3 **AWDW [3]** 35/23 37/18 226/9 226/10 227/7 38/18 265/5 291/18 292/4 awful [1] 267/4 293/7 293/8 294/2 294/2 В Autumn's [1] 113/1 babies [2] 283/5 304/1 Ava [108] 82/7 83/10 baby [6] 159/17 172/9 85/2 103/10 104/10 198/10 249/2 298/24 109/3 110/19 112/21 298/25 112/21 113/6 113/6 Bachelor's [2] 299/10 122/16 129/7 134/13 299/10 136/11 153/12 153/21 back [83] 30/3 30/25 155/18 155/19 158/7 32/22 35/20 38/19 158/8 158/12 159/2 41/17 49/6 63/18 66/4 160/10 161/10 162/5 67/11 67/13 70/24 165/23 180/18 183/10 75/22 77/19 80/21 183/15 183/19 184/3 81/25 90/8 92/3 92/21 185/12 186/10 186/13 94/19 95/11 96/12 186/16 187/25 188/2 96/12 98/15 99/15 188/4 188/10 189/6 102/5 104/9 108/15 194/21 196/6 199/17 109/21 124/14 130/20 203/18 205/16 206/25 135/19 138/8 139/22 207/9 209/2 209/23 140/11 142/12 142/16 212/10 213/5 213/9 149/19 156/16 159/25 213/10 215/9 216/16 165/2 165/9 168/8 216/19 216/23 217/9 172/7 174/11 177/9 217/19 221/12 224/2 179/21 182/17 186/4 224/5 227/18 230/3 186/19 191/5 191/5 230/4 230/9 230/13 192/20 198/9 210/20 230/20 231/20 233/11 214/6 215/6 221/7 233/14 233/14 235/1 242/22 249/18 250/12 235/2 236/13 236/14 262/7 265/16 266/15 236/15 243/12 244/5 267/23 267/23 267/25 253/18 253/25 253/25 270/1 280/9 281/12 254/3 257/5 257/6 284/6 295/13 298/15 257/11 258/10 260/11 305/17 306/22 306/25 267/6 268/23 268/23 308/2 312/2 316/11 269/2 269/4 269/6 316/21 316/22 317/1 269/6 269/12 270/9 317/2 270/22 282/9 283/2 backdate [1] 37/2 283/9 283/16 283/16 background [4] 118/10 286/17 291/12 295/22 149/4 168/16 168/20 301/16 backs [1] 201/8 Ava's [16] 114/4 backtrack [1] 266/23 124/24 133/10 138/9 bad [19] 56/4 145/20 148/17 186/10 225/22 155/14 167/13 179/1 226/7 230/16 231/1 179/8 207/23 207/24 231/7 241/10 270/1 244/9 251/24 252/13 270/7 271/4 304/4 262/19 263/8 263/10 available [6] 14/5 290/18 291/2 291/3 25/15 108/5 116/19

296/23 297/8

240/1 254/3

badge [1] 207/22

bag [17] 83/20 85/7

130/18 160/23 161/4

213/8 238/13 238/15

238/18 238/25 239/7

173/5 249/15

AW [1] 37/9

257/24

averments [1] 92/9

awake [2] 226/14

aware [5] 79/4 80/5

avoid [2] 73/19 75/23

bags [4] 116/3 238/21 239/12 272/23 bailiff [5] 90/10 98/15 164/14 261/5 306/4 balcony [1] 115/24 **bald [1]** 252/10 ball [3] 47/17 50/9 151/20 ballgame [1] 270/18 bandage [2] 142/8 237/15 banging [1] 265/2 bar [1] 305/12 Bard [3] 123/10 123/17 303/12 bare [2] 135/23 139/19 barium [1] 286/11 base [4] 167/17 167/22 210/13 214/20 based [28] 15/11 20/1 20/7 33/10 47/21 51/25 53/17 88/2 108/7 113/22 116/12 116/16 129/21 141/6 177/16 203/24 214/23 220/22 223/9 223/20 228/18 237/13 240/2 241/15 243/16 255/15 255/15 311/5 bases [2] 137/25 177/17 basic [3] 75/12 100/21 243/2 basically [12] 18/15 72/20 108/9 130/3 132/9 139/24 145/10 153/18 159/15 207/22 228/25 268/25 basis [7] 11/23 13/22 13/24 40/20 47/13 119/3 259/11 bat [2] 35/2 36/1 bath [1] 256/17 **bathed** [1] 185/19 **bathroom** [78] 7/6 86/10 100/14 100/22 109/6 109/11 109/17 113/1 113/3 114/2 114/5 114/7 114/8 114/20 119/6 119/7 119/15 119/19 121/13 123/3 139/21 147/7 147/8 147/9 147/10 147/11 147/12 147/21 148/1 148/8 149/13 149/14 149/18 150/17 152/11 152/17 153/15 172/16 196/8 196/11 196/12 196/16 196/20 203/19 203/21 203/22 205/4 209/10 209/12 210/5 222/5 222/18 222/25 225/25 226/11 234/4 234/15 234/18 85/12 86/6 86/8 110/22 234/24 235/9 235/11 235/12 235/12 235/16 239/14 239/17 239/18 239/19 239/25 240/21 255/4 257/23 267/17

267/18 278/16 292/6 296/9 304/17 bathrooming [1] 43/20 **bathrooms** [2] 119/7 121/14 **bathtub** [1] 256/18 **battery [22]** 7/2 7/3 12/7 13/6 13/8 13/20 14/5 32/15 35/8 35/21 38/6 96/23 115/1 126/7 126/10 126/20 130/2 130/7 223/14 223/17 223/20 223/21 **BB [1]** 81/4 be [297] 3/5 3/10 3/17 4/1 5/16 5/16 5/18 6/1 6/7 6/18 6/18 7/3 7/9 7/21 8/20 9/6 10/20 12/25 14/7 15/1 15/3 15/4 16/22 19/10 19/10 19/19 19/20 20/5 20/6 20/12 20/17 20/19 20/23 21/3 21/12 23/4 23/6 23/9 23/11 23/22 24/2 25/6 26/17 26/18 26/21 27/5 27/9 28/8 28/15 33/5 33/21 33/24 33/25 36/2 36/21 36/23 37/1 37/9 37/19 37/24 37/25 38/3 39/22 41/4 41/5 42/10 43/19 44/5 44/18 45/3 45/14 46/25 48/8 48/14 49/1 49/5 49/8 49/24 50/4 53/2 56/3 56/17 58/9 58/16 58/20 58/24 59/7 59/17 60/20 62/2 62/17 62/22 63/4 63/18 64/9 64/17 64/21 65/14 65/22 67/4 73/8 73/16 73/17 74/15 74/17 77/6 77/19 78/1 78/10 80/24 82/2 82/18 85/3 86/14 89/22 89/23 90/15 90/23 91/10 92/14 94/11 96/16 96/18 98/11 98/16 98/22 103/14 104/23 105/25 106/21 107/11 107/11 108/4 108/7 109/21 111/22 113/13 115/5 115/14 115/16 117/10 117/25 118/12 119/10 120/14 123/16 124/7 126/16 126/17 126/19 127/3 128/15 128/17 130/14 130/16 131/10 131/17 131/19 131/25 133/19 133/25 134/10 134/20 136/2 139/10 141/7 142/20 143/3 143/4 143/4 143/18 143/20 143/22 143/23 149/15 150/4 150/23 153/5 153/10 153/22 155/11 155/12 161/4 161/15 162/6 162/7 163/9 164/3 165/2 168/16 174/23 175/16 176/11 179/10

182/17 186/3 186/11 196/15 196/18 197/20 198/25 199/1 201/4 202/12 203/7 205/24 206/12 206/24 209/3 212/5 213/6 213/7 216/9 216/21 218/23 220/6 222/9 223/3 223/16 227/2 230/14 235/17 235/21 236/2 238/16 240/18 243/21 244/1 248/14 248/22 252/22 256/23 257/2 258/14 259/21 262/6 262/25 263/12 263/13 263/17 266/13 268/17 270/17 271/18 273/7 273/18 273/19 273/21 273/23 275/1 277/5 277/12 278/1 278/15 278/16 281/5 282/2 282/20 283/2 284/10 284/12 284/14 284/15 284/23 285/4 285/6 290/13 290/17 290/20 291/19 293/2 300/23 301/24 302/1 302/4 302/18 303/8 303/18 303/19 303/20 305/2 305/2 305/7 305/9 306/13 306/19 307/14 308/20 310/19 310/21 311/13 312/4 312/23 313/12 314/6 314/7 314/14 beach [1] 209/25 beads [1] 102/8 beat [11] 119/6 134/15 135/22 185/9 188/1 194/11 210/22 211/8 259/11 263/9 293/3 **beaten [8]** 181/10 193/20 201/7 201/8 201/10 252/5 273/13 284/1 beating [5] 134/20 239/22 259/22 265/2 293/2 beatings [2] 138/1 185/5 became [5] 53/16 54/9 148/13 148/17 153/18 because [319] become [8] 115/21 166/18 234/1 243/8 244/3 249/19 250/1 288/24 becomes [11] 65/18 105/13 107/14 108/1 133/22 144/9 276/21 285/19 306/13 307/13

307/14

304/17 5237

bed [8] 149/7 195/12

285/13 294/4 304/23

bedroom [8] 75/14

114/1 114/7 124/24

124/25 225/25 278/17

246/23 267/12 267/18

Б	begin [4] 464/40	312/22	170/2 106/1 104/0	137/3
<u>B</u>	begin [1] 164/19 beginning [6] 54/9	believability [3] 94/14	179/3 186/1 191/2   192/1 198/25 221/23	bleeding [9] 58/22
bedrooms [1] 152/16 beds [1] 152/16	99/22 110/8 110/8	220/5 268/16	221/25 222/20 223/24	58/24 137/6 137/8
bedwetting [5] 148/12	242/9 250/10	believe [49] 9/11 11/23		138/2 206/21 219/25
226/3 226/4 226/6	begs [1] 313/17 begun [1] 54/13	12/19 32/19 40/8 48/4 53/7 55/23 56/23 58/14	230/18 236/11 236/20 236/21 237/22 240/2	293/1 293/5 <b>blended [15]</b> 46/15
267/14	behalf [1] 244/18	58/15 58/24 59/15	246/13 252/14 301/25	46/17 154/23 198/15
been [100] 4/18 14/3 19/12 32/20 37/4 54/1	behaved [4] 262/16	59/20 60/3 78/18 80/13		198/16 198/17 200/6
54/14 55/1 55/16 55/17	263/2 263/2 265/1 behavior [17] 154/7	83/11 92/14 97/25 106/1 106/2 106/3	<b>bicycles [1]</b> 211/23 <b>big [16]</b> 8/17 9/7 11/10	201/16 201/21 204/10 204/11 204/12 208/12
55/20 58/2 62/5 62/8	193/10 195/20 195/21	106/5 116/20 176/18	64/3 105/19 122/5	276/5 313/23
63/7 66/20 68/19 68/19 70/5 71/8 75/22 80/18	204/16 206/11 222/7	191/16 193/17 196/23	122/5 156/23 160/22	blending [1] 297/4
81/3 81/5 81/22 82/3	227/10 227/13 257/21	215/6 216/10 220/16	173/15 188/25 251/8	<b>blood [4]</b> 206/2 211/9 221/1 221/2
82/6 84/8 89/12 89/13	263/6 265/14 265/19 265/21 275/16 285/12	221/17 222/13 223/9 224/20 233/5 240/20	251/10 272/6 294/14 301/25	bloodied [1] 259/24
89/20 91/3 91/8 97/25 98/1 99/17 102/6 118/2	291/24	262/14 266/7 276/22	bigger [2] 47/5 243/1	bloody [1] 304/11
132/4 132/23 139/1	behavioral [9] 166/3	283/3 287/7 294/19	biggest [1] 174/17	blotchy [1] 248/11
150/24 165/20 171/9	174/1 182/12 182/23   183/5 189/22 258/4	301/11 301/15 309/14 311/2 313/13	bikes [1] 172/23 bind [1] 36/21	<b>blow [1]</b> 258/15 <b>blowing [4]</b> 162/19
171/20 174/9 175/2 188/11 188/14 190/25	267/7 281/6	<b>believed [7]</b> 106/2	bio [1] 242/2	225/2 257/23 285/19
191/13 191/14 193/20	behaviors [12] 183/21	108/8 141/7 141/13	biographies [1] 265/17	
194/20 194/21 194/23	184/21 187/11 195/4 212/3 233/24 243/6	258/6 290/17 293/1 <b>believes [1]</b> 261/25	biography [1] 265/18 biological [21] 135/17	2/8 16/21 32/6 36/6 40/13 57/4 57/12 61/25
197/25 198/5 225/1 226/25 228/9 228/13	247/9 247/11 247/15	belong [1] 169/21	167/9 167/11 167/16	85/21 89/1 92/3 92/20
234/3 235/3 238/18	249/12 251/24	belongs [1] 112/11	174/5 175/8 182/18	93/6 93/9 250/11
243/4 243/5 243/20	<b>behind [3]</b> 138/13 142/13 268/6	<b>belt [12]</b> 185/5 185/8 185/9 185/14 188/1	185/9 188/2 194/12 207/21 220/25 227/21	262/11 305/24 309/12 310/1 311/14 312/1
244/18 247/11 247/12	being [100] 8/24 13/2	192/3 192/5 192/15	232/3 243/5 245/10	Bluth's [1] 309/24
247/13 248/24 248/25 251/21 252/17 254/16	71/8 75/5 80/1 84/24	192/21 194/9 194/11	245/19 253/8 260/13	<b>board [11]</b> 56/7 151/12
260/3 260/5 262/24	85/11 95/25 106/17 107/3 111/5 114/1	194/11 <b>belts [1]</b> 181/10	292/23 299/7 <b>biologically [1]</b> 105/15	151/15 151/19 151/20 152/9 225/12 225/12
271/21 281/6 281/16	114/2 114/3 120/16	bench [10] 32/6 81/1	biopsies [1] 286/9	225/22 226/7 285/16
285/1 289/10 293/18 299/3 302/3 303/6	121/5 121/6 124/25	84/17 99/3 99/4 117/23	birthdays [1] 103/10	<b>boarding [2]</b> 78/5
303/10 305/4 305/5	125/8 126/11 127/5   127/12 127/14 128/6	140/6 269/20 288/9 309/12	<b>bit [16]</b> 5/10 72/22 83/25 126/8 149/7	296/16 <b>boards [22]</b> 43/2 132/9
305/5 306/15 309/15	128/20 129/23 130/19	benefit [2] 36/14 245/8		148/5 151/9 151/10
309/15 314/2 314/2 314/21 316/23	131/21 131/22 132/10	bent [1] 135/23	196/14 219/21 243/1	151/13 152/25 162/19
beeping [1] 226/4	133/20 134/4 134/5 134/6 136/5 136/20	<b>Bernat [3]</b> 88/12 88/14 88/21	267/21 270/15 271/12 284/5 299/6	218/8 225/2 225/4 225/5 225/7 225/7
<b>before [84]</b> 1/12 6/7 6/11 10/18 32/21 33/6	137/25 138/11 139/18	Bernstein [3] 205/20	bizarre [6] 149/21	225/18 226/20 232/23
33/23 34/8 37/19 37/25	143/21 143/23 143/24	205/22 206/1	155/3 171/2 172/13	274/12 276/5 285/9
48/7 48/15 49/3 54/16	144/1 144/14 146/9 154/23 155/1 156/9	<b>Berry [2]</b> 209/24 233/22	175/6 248/9 black [11] 147/15	297/3 297/3 bodies [4] 135/5
62/10 69/4 81/22 82/3	157/11 157/12 162/5	besides [1] 57/1	196/21 256/12 256/15	163/14 238/4 273/7
82/6 82/11 87/1 88/6 88/9 95/9 98/9 99/9	162/9 162/16 171/3	best [10] 27/3 62/22	256/16 274/3 282/19	<b>bodily [27]</b> 58/14 58/16
100/25 110/19 113/19	171/5 175/10 175/22   183/17 184/11 185/14	161/12 161/13 166/22 190/20 249/24 275/25	282/22 290/4 299/14 310/10	128/12 128/18 128/23 129/2 129/20 129/21
116/4 122/3 135/16 144/22 149/25 156/22	190/17 192/13 192/14	279/16 302/14	bladder [13] 3/4 7/24	131/8 131/14 132/1
156/24 166/12 166/18	199/24 205/5 208/14	bet [2] 193/24 198/4	110/17 118/18 119/2	132/19 132/20 132/25
170/2 173/21 179/6	211/13 211/14 214/23 215/18 216/11 229/5	<b>better [18]</b> 6/7 21/11 28/18 28/24 39/2 52/14	119/11 119/13 119/14 119/18 214/15 222/17	137/1 137/19 139/11 141/25 142/10 143/10
179/24 180/4 180/6 180/19 180/21 183/24	233/13 241/10 242/12	102/16 126/4 128/15	222/18 223/8	191/16 191/17 191/20
183/25 203/1 203/15	246/21 248/18 252/11	173/2 176/2 176/3	blade [8] 7/25 9/2	191/22 192/6 195/24
206/18 216/7 222/1	254/22 254/22 255/14 255/14 255/15 259/14	188/18 212/6 217/23 249/20 287/8 305/14	107/4 116/22 116/25 219/23 224/8 224/11	273/10 <b>body [17]</b> 83/14 105/6
222/22 224/2 231/6 231/17 233/1 234/1	261/24 264/10 264/16	between [11] 84/9	blades [1] 224/24	105/8 132/2 135/23
242/5 242/18 242/22	268/3 272/22 273/13	84/20 92/17 97/1	blah [8] 22/4 22/4 22/4	185/24 204/19 211/12
246/4 247/13 249/19	273/25 274/1 274/15 278/9 279/3 284/1	102/16 125/4 125/6 125/21 130/6 171/20	22/4 22/4 29/12 29/12 29/12	231/14 238/9 238/10 273/8 289/2 289/4
250/18 251/25 252/20 254/11 259/3 259/12	301/10 301/12 304/11	232/21	Blankenship [6]	289/8 296/3 310/13
260/10 260/19 264/6	309/20	beyond [49] 5/7 18/25	212/14 244/20 252/8	boiling [2] 254/23
267/25 286/7 287/18	<b>belabor [1]</b> 223/18 <b>belief [25]</b> 3/9 3/10	24/10 24/18 24/24 24/25 25/3 25/22 26/2	265/16 265/20 265/20 blanket [1] 152/2	257/4 bolstering [1] 309/21
301/6 306/3 306/11 308/7 308/20 314/22	5/22 6/5 9/15 18/14	33/23 34/6 40/13 97/1	blankets [6] 132/9	Bonanza [1] 31/21
314/25	18/22 20/1 20/7 20/24	105/18 106/3 106/4	148/3 151/10 151/21	bone [2] 229/8 241/7
<b>beforehand [2]</b> 11/15	22/3 22/15 22/17 23/13 24/6 26/9 107/9 107/16	106/5 107/20 110/6 110/14 127/24 130/4	153/6 162/19 <b>bled [2]</b> 125/15 193/21	<b>book [56]</b> 30/11 81/11 82/2 87/2 87/3 87/4
87/8	107/25 108/7 117/10	133/20 167/1 169/4	bleed [5] 125/16	87/7 87/10 87/17 87/20
<b>began [1]</b> 168/9	117/10 119/2 210/8	169/8 177/12 178/20	134/11 134/13 136/4	159/5_174/10 175/12
				5238

В	1
book [43] 214/25	br
215/8 242/16 242/19	2
242/20 242/21 243/10	br
243/17 244/4 245/8	1
245/23 245/23 246/5	2
246/8 246/25 247/17	2
248/20 248/20 248/23	br
249/22 249/25 250/3	8
250/15 250/15 250/21	2
250/24 250/25 251/7 251/8 251/9 257/15	br
263/4 289/11 290/4	br
290/5 294/20 294/20	8
294/21 294/25 294/25	1:
298/7 298/18 299/14	2
books [2] 245/25	br 1
269/10	2
<b>boot [2]</b> 229/12 282/15	br
boots [7] 210/24 211/5	br
211/14 229/15 282/16	br
282/19 282/22 bore [1] 59/4	2
borrowing [1] 24/21	br
boss [1] 280/5	3
both [25] 27/1 32/16	br
44/14 53/25 54/25 58/4	2
58/21 58/23 74/7 92/19	br
100/8 102/17 112/12	6: 8:
114/21 137/16 137/17	1
137/17 138/19 187/11	1
193/6 257/5 272/12	2
280/25 281/6 285/23	br
<b>bothered [1]</b> 153/5 <b>bottle [1]</b> 257/24	br
bottom [10] 153/7	2
188/1 191/25 192/1	br
201/11 249/22 273/14	1
273/15 303/17 303/19	19
bottoms [8] 185/16	br B
193/7 193/19 201/6	1
231/14 259/22 259/23	2
259/24	bι
<b>bought [6]</b> 6/16 111/2 123/8 130/10 215/4	1
275/6	1
<b>boundaries [2]</b> 190/14	2
196/4	2
<b>boundary [1]</b> 187/3	2
bow [1] 294/14	bι 4:
<b>bowel [5]</b> 150/19	4:
150/23 209/17 210/3	4
288/1	4
<b>bowels [6]</b> 117/15 118/6 146/21 147/3	8
151/3 209/20	1
bowls [1] 161/15	1
boy [2] 125/10 274/23	1
boyfriend [2] 181/25	19
188/1	1
brain [1] 295/3	2
<b>brand [2]</b> 123/10	
123/16	2
break [18] 14/25 67/18	2
67/22 68/15 68/16 70/3 90/7 90/8 98/9 98/14	2
99/9 113/25 134/13	bι
136/6 164/18 164/20	2
.55/5 15-/ 15 10-/20	bι

97/4 234/21 reaking [4] 255/4 59/23 273/13 273/13 reaks [12] 104/2 96/8 196/20 203/19 03/21 203/22 210/5 255/4 257/23 261/14 61/16 261/20 rief [6] 89/19 89/21 9/25 91/10 260/19 60/22 riefing [1] 72/22 ring [10] 15/13 40/6 6/20 98/7 122/24 50/16 210/15 216/3 30/6 237/11 rings [6] 179/21 86/18 210/10 230/16 34/6 240/4 road [1] 26/22 roader [1] 27/2 roke [3] 136/5 175/23 45/20 roken [3] 191/6 221/1 05/2 rothers [2] 181/25 93/22 rought [16] 61/11 5/22 85/3 85/6 86/19 6/24 150/4 157/12 77/4 182/21 186/24 87/13 244/8 256/1 89/2 297/18 rown [1] 176/8 ruised [2] 135/6 59/24 ruises [6] 135/14 81/12 197/11 197/12 97/19 232/10 rushing [1] 155/19 **ST [7]** 57/5 170/17 74/18 175/3 179/22 39/14 295/15 ucket [15] 45/25 38/11 138/13 139/4 45/11 145/23 146/23 03/11 203/13 204/1 97/9 297/9 297/12 97/13 313/22 uckets [51] 42/14 2/20 42/21 42/24 3/22 44/11 44/12 4/12 45/9 45/12 45/23 6/7 47/14 50/13 83/11 4/6 84/7 144/4 144/6 44/9 144/10 145/1 45/10 145/16 146/4 46/13 162/22 163/20 95/10 196/19 199/7 99/12 199/13 200/6 .03/10 203/14 203/17 04/7 210/23 211/18 11/21 238/17 259/16 73/15 273/20 273/20 76/5 283/7 284/25 92/2 297/4 ugs [5] 182/4 218/6 24/14 232/24 238/20 built [1] 177/21

bunch [8] 22/1 25/11 280/13 295/14 168/5 205/17 206/2 237/5 239/3 293/16 **burden [16]** 25/1 26/4 26/5 26/11 26/11 41/6 41/18 100/8 107/18 180/16 204/22 217/17 217/18 230/18 233/2 250/8 burdens [1] 45/20 burn [16] 141/7 141/14 141/22 142/9 234/7 234/8 234/9 237/17 237/20 237/24 257/6 272/11 272/12 274/16 284/3 303/5 burned [11] 115/20 125/14 146/8 234/23 235/19 236/10 236/12 283/20 284/1 304/12 304/13 burner [1] 298/16 **Burnett [18]** 144/20 144/24 152/15 157/23 169/5 170/16 170/24 172/2 174/19 175/20 176/6 188/8 243/18 278/19 290/25 292/9 293/6 294/6 **burning [2]** 140/1 238/3 burns [6] 131/10 133/8 133/9 163/21 235/23 237/4 business [1] 295/16 but [461] **butt [1]** 229/17 buttocks [2] 136/22 191/23 **butts [3]** 135/6 135/23 211/9 30/20 30/22 71/4 71/5 180/14 180/15 188/10 188/17 188/18 189/1

**buy [1]** 275/8 **buying [1]** 275/10 **BW [1]** 37/23 **C's [1]** 268/12 **C299737 [1]** 1/7 **C299737-3 [1]** 1/7 **CAC [1]** 79/20 **CACs [1]** 74/11 **CAITLYN [1]** 1/20 call [24] 14/24 30/13 120/6 158/17 169/11 197/5 197/14 197/23 198/5 199/2 232/8 244/25 268/11 301/2 called [20] 32/5 71/8 101/15 109/21 167/20 171/2 180/3 180/16 185/6 190/2 197/3 197/15 216/22 217/5 228/3 228/25 229/25 251/21 299/17 306/14 calling [6] 212/6 248/23 279/23 279/24

calls [5] 176/23 199/4 199/6 250/24 279/21 calorie [1] 157/14 **calories [1]** 156/3 came [73] 40/8 78/19 84/5 102/10 109/6 109/20 111/1 111/21 115/22 116/1 122/3 122/5 123/25 125/13 125/15 135/19 136/19 138/13 141/11 149/6 149/12 149/25 150/1 155/25 162/16 166/10 174/8 174/21 174/24 175/20 176/16 177/3 179/11 179/24 186/1 204/10 206/5 206/15 207/15 207/21 208/4 211/22 212/10 212/18 216/7 216/7 217/8 217/8 222/15 227/17 232/2 242/18 242/19 251/5 251/14 254/11 257/14 262/15 263/8 263/10 263/10 264/4 266/7 266/15 269/3 269/12 278/12 278/19 279/11 296/23 300/8 309/12 312/24 camera [1] 286/10 cameras [7] 155/17 268/5 274/14 274/15 279/5 279/8 293/19 can [142] 3/10 16/17 18/16 20/2 22/7 23/11 27/3 27/5 30/7 30/13 30/20 30/23 33/1 33/9 35/7 35/8 47/23 50/11 51/25 52/1 55/12 55/14 59/18 59/18 64/2 64/18 65/11 65/15 66/18 81/23 84/14 91/21 94/23 96/14 99/16 101/9 102/2 102/7 102/21 103/9 108/19 113/23 116/13 116/24 117/20 120/23 123/19 124/25 126/17 128/12 130/8 131/17 131/19 132/20 133/16 133/18 133/18 133/19 135/9 136/18 136/23 137/16 138/25 140/4 140/12 141/16 142/14 142/15 142/15 143/14 143/16 150/18 151/18 170/8 171/12 171/13 171/14 171/15 174/12 174/12 174/12 181/1 181/3 181/4 186/21 187/17 187/21 190/19 191/6 192/18 198/3 212/7 216/21 217/12 218/23 221/10 221/17 223/6 223/9 223/16 224/21 224/22 242/17 243/8 243/8 245/5 248/2 256/1 256/17 257/16

261/15 263/13 263/17 269/18 269/24 270/5 276/7 276/8 277/5 284/14 284/15 284/23 287/1 288/2 288/10 288/24 288/24 289/4 289/8 291/5 293/25 294/11 294/11 296/5 298/1 301/9 304/25 305/2 305/2 307/12 307/20 313/15 can't [41] 9/13 17/9 17/17 20/17 23/9 29/2 30/10 34/14 41/11 43/19 47/2 47/3 61/15 84/4 108/16 117/10 120/6 145/21 148/23 151/17 170/19 181/13 187/16 187/18 190/5 193/16 217/1 224/16 235/6 238/16 253/17 263/24 276/1 278/8 285/5 289/6 290/24 297/24 298/6 302/25 310/10 candle [4] 235/19 236/5 236/7 283/19 candlelight [1] 139/25 cannot [10] 7/3 44/5 49/24 50/18 179/6 179/7 179/11 202/12 203/7 263/3 capable [2] 128/17 128/23 capacity [3] 72/6 72/19 75/5 capillaries [1] 208/24 car [4] 101/9 101/10 102/8 295/18 care [77] 41/2 54/5 58/10 87/16 87/20 97/6 132/5 132/10 132/10 135/16 143/19 143/22 143/25 144/12 144/13 146/15 150/21 150/23 150/25 151/25 152/4 154/15 157/10 157/15 158/1 160/17 161/14 168/14 169/9 169/10 169/12 170/7 170/13 170/13 170/23 171/4 171/10 173/8 174/6

175/8 175/9 175/13 176/9 179/9 179/15 185/25 186/4 188/20 189/25 200/20 234/3 242/1 242/15 242/21 243/3 243/15 243/24 244/2 244/11 246/15 247/17 249/4 249/13 249/14 249/23 260/3 263/18 263/19 264/4 264/11 268/24 268/25 271/13 280/23 289/22 289/24 290/1 cared [2] 177/18 277/13

carefully [3] 51/3 91/7 225/24

5239

C careless [1] 132/16 cares [1] 294/25 caretaker [1] 144/2 caring [2] 281/6 286/5 carry [1] 261/20 Carson [1] 41/15 carve [2] 128/19 130/14 case [114] 1/7 9/12 13/21 15/21 25/5 35/20 36/6 40/25 41/2 42/6 44/21 44/22 47/10 49/14 50/11 53/16 54/7 54/7 54/8 54/17 59/16 62/16 62/24 63/4 64/6 64/16 67/24 73/12 75/4 75/6 78/18 79/1 80/7 80/16 87/12 88/18 88/22 89/20 89/23 90/1 90/1 90/3 90/4 92/17 98/18 99/23 100/8 102/13 103/2 105/7 106/11 106/25 107/14 107/23 108/11 120/22 131/9 132/12 133/13 137/17 139/2 145/20 157/11 163/12 163/24 163/25 164/14 164/17 164/20 164/22 164/23 165/20 166/20 171/15 172/4 172/6 192/25 220/17 224/21 226/13 227/22 241/13 244/11 245/12 248/8 252/16 257/16 260/5 260/15 260/23 260/23 260/25 261/1 263/12 268/8 277/4 277/9 288/17 298/20 306/9 306/10 306/12 306/16 306/20 306/21 306/23 306/24 307/3 307/3 307/6 309/13 310/18 313/11 317/8 case law [1] 35/20 caseload [1] 298/9 cases [11] 25/12 49/13 50/6 79/8 194/2 194/2 277/4 298/11 298/14 298/15 298/19 caseworker [8] 169/18 169/23 171/16 173/12 182/15 226/18 298/22 299/2 caseworkers [8] 170/21 170/23 173/7 176/21 179/22 248/3 248/21 252/2 Castro [1] 170/17 catchall [1] 143/25 catching [1] 154/3 catheter [103] 4/15 7/6 7/8 7/23 7/25 8/6 8/12 8/21 11/22 19/9 19/22 20/18 59/15 59/20 84/22 85/8 85/10 86/6

86/7 86/7 86/11 86/14

86/20 86/24 104/13 109/5 109/24 110/15 110/24 111/2 111/6 112/23 112/24 113/8 113/19 114/16 114/23 115/8 115/25 117/8 117/12 117/17 118/3 118/13 118/21 120/7 120/25 121/7 123/2 124/22 125/25 127/14 163/14 213/9 213/10 213/12 214/17 215/11 215/19 216/25 217/2 217/7 217/22 218/8 218/13 218/14 218/17 219/22 220/1 221/15 222/16 223/10 223/11 224/3 224/7 240/22 241/14 241/19 248/16 253/13 254/4 255/7 255/8 255/10 255/13 255/13 255/15 255/18 255/20 256/3 256/5 256/7 275/10 297/2 300/13 300/14 301/24 302/10 302/13 303/4 303/7 303/18 303/19 catheterization [1] 219/7 catheters [55] 3/11 4/15 6/17 6/19 46/3 46/6 50/13 84/8 84/11 84/22 104/4 104/11 112/9 119/16 121/19 123/1 123/8 123/10 130/15 130/16 130/17 189/17 210/19 212/9 212/11 212/13 213/4 213/6 214/3 214/11 215/4 215/18 216/9 216/11 217/9 218/1 220/25 221/15 221/16 222/14 223/9 224/23 240/21 241/18 248/18 253/18 253/25 254/4 270/8 272/22 275/5 275/5 276/6 301/10 302/16 caught [1] 153/24 cause [15] 126/16 128/12 131/2 206/10 251/18 282/11 284/12 284/14 288/16 288/24 288/24 289/4 289/8 293/3 317/3 caused [13] 58/14 58/22 58/24 160/18 194/5 194/23 209/1 209/3 209/16 211/25 241/23 242/6 287/16 causes [5] 132/21 191/18 192/7 288/13 289/4 causing [3] 128/17 128/23 255/6 cc [5] 123/14 123/16 124/2 124/19 215/12 cell [2] 307/22 316/14 **Center [1]** 72/10

centers [1] 79/22 certain [9] 77/8 77/13 103/2 132/15 132/17 132/18 263/9 309/20 310/14 certainly [9] 44/22 128/21 128/22 150/11 190/16 219/10 222/2 243/20 256/25 certainty [15] 185/15 194/4 194/5 194/16 209/4 211/25 237/20 237/21 241/23 242/6 288/3 288/6 288/7 288/15 289/6 certify [1] 317/6 Cesena [1] 306/7 cetera [4] 43/20 54/10 60/14 247/23 Cetl [39] 9/8 61/5 62/20 62/20 62/23 105/11 105/16 109/25 110/5 136/10 136/16 141/4 185/3 185/10 185/14 189/3 189/4 193/22 193/25 194/15 194/20 211/9 217/9 218/18 219/5 220/22 222/16 229/7 229/8 231/11 233/6 236/23 237/18 238/5 238/5 242/7 287/2 289/1 312/18 Cetl's [3] 219/18 238/11 241/7 **chain [2]** 102/13 250/21 chair [2] 146/16 146/17 checkup [1] 140/19 chairs [6] 165/1 196/21 cheeks [1] 156/21 196/21 199/18 204/3 261/4 challenge [1] 312/15 **challenged** [2] 230/10 230/11 **challenging [2]** 183/19 184/21 **chance [1]** 213/23 **chances [2]** 297/16 297/16 change [12] 45/20 152/10 153/2 156/17 193/9 195/3 202/6 209/12 249/25 257/16 259/7 312/12 changed [2] 91/3 98/1 changes [4] 69/21 70/5 91/8 281/22 changing [4] 224/15 240/5 253/22 253/23 chant [1] 159/21 chapped [1] 136/3 character [1] 290/19 charge [12] 5/13 5/21 49/15 115/1 115/2 173/14 201/18 228/23 230/10 256/5 285/20 305/25 charged [12] 11/20 94/7 111/5 114/17 177/15 190/25 191/3

252/17 277/6 charges [17] 32/12 32/16 58/7 58/13 103/24 120/10 120/23 130/22 147/6 172/3 178/19 178/25 179/6 179/20 190/18 191/15 227/1 **charging [5]** 103/10 169/3 193/13 252/19 285/18 **charming [1]** 186/13 chart [2] 183/9 195/6 **chase [1]** 63/20 chasing [2] 172/23 211/4 check [28] 31/3 56/18 113/23 116/13 117/18 118/14 118/17 121/25 127/25 129/25 140/25 141/16 190/23 190/23 222/8 224/5 226/11 238/9 256/12 274/1 274/1 274/22 292/2 292/25 296/24 299/12 301/15 302/6 checked [3] 147/19 208/21 273/21 **checking [2]** 78/22 147/15 checklist [2] 167/3 190/22 checks [5] 168/16 168/20 168/21 168/22 204/19 Cherina [4] 169/23 174/7 174/16 226/18 chicken [1] 313/24 chief [6] 1/18 54/17 62/16 62/24 63/5 64/16 **child [157]** 6/25 7/15 29/5 29/9 29/11 31/18 35/16 41/3 41/4 49/13 75/18 75/18 76/8 76/10 77/4 77/6 77/7 77/8 77/10 77/11 83/13 84/21 86/20 96/3 103/14 104/16 105/5 108/14 112/19 117/8 122/18 130/22 131/1 131/4 131/7 131/11 131/12 132/4 132/11 137/18 140/23 141/6 142/11 142/21 143/15 143/17 143/18 144/1 150/20 157/8 169/20 176/2 184/14 184/17 186/6 186/17 188/20 191/1 191/10 191/15 194/2 195/2 197/11 200/24 201/2 202/9 203/23 203/25 204/2 206/7 206/8 206/8 206/11 207/20 208/7 208/8 208/9 208/23 209/14 209/20 214/14

203/4 227/22 241/14

215/21 218/15 218/15 218/16 219/13 220/1 223/7 225/3 226/17 227/1 227/4 231/8 233/7 235/18 236/12 237/14 239/4 239/5 239/6 242/11 242/13 246/2 246/11 249/6 249/15 249/16 251/13 251/16 251/20 251/21 251/24 252/2 256/17 257/12 257/13 257/14 257/15 257/17 260/10 263/6 263/13 264/3 265/18 265/25 267/22 268/3 268/6 281/23 281/25 282/17 283/22 283/22 283/25 284/12 284/14 284/15 284/16 284/20 284/20 285/1 285/4 285/13 285/16 287/8 287/9 289/4 289/22 300/12 300/13 300/16 304/22 304/25 308/10 child's [9] 29/10 131/21 233/7 233/16 235/20 263/6 265/19 285/3 300/8 children [183] 6/20 7/6 7/7 12/19 40/10 40/11 40/24 40/25 41/1 54/4 57/5 58/15 58/16 59/23 60/10 72/12 72/21 73/2 73/3 73/6 73/9 73/12 74/23 79/6 79/12 80/2 80/7 82/5 87/5 102/19 119/1 122/14 124/17 125/18 132/8 137/13 137/18 142/7 150/12 156/8 157/7 157/10 161/15 167/7 168/5 168/6 169/11 169/12 170/5 170/6 170/6 170/9 170/23 172/2 172/12 173/9 173/12 173/14 173/19 174/23 175/1 175/15 175/17 175/18 175/25 176/25 177/19 177/20 178/8 178/17 178/24 179/2 179/23 185/8 186/8 187/18 191/24 193/2 193/5 193/6 193/8 195/17 196/2 199/9 200/20 201/16 203/3 207/21 208/17 208/25 210/3 211/5 211/16 211/17 211/17 211/18 212/3 213/16 215/2 223/6 225/16 227/4 227/5 227/13 229/5 229/13 229/13 229/14 230/11 230/24 233/17 233/20 239/9 243/3 243/7 243/9 243/10 243/15 243/23 244/11 244/13 244/23 245/11 5240

215/10 215/11 215/12

C citing [1] 309/13 City [1] 41/15 children... [60] 246/14 claim [2] 193/20 197/8 247/2 247/21 248/22 claimed [4] 185/22 249/4 249/5 249/15 196/25 197/2 197/10 249/24 250/1 251/16 claims [3] 210/11 251/19 251/20 251/25 259/2 259/15 252/10 254/14 254/14 **clarify [1]** 99/13 254/17 256/14 259/6 CLARK [7] 1/2 3/1 72/1 259/8 259/11 259/17 79/5 80/6 165/20 259/21 259/22 263/8 193/11 263/13 263/17 265/4 classes [2] 171/14 266/6 266/7 267/4 200/9 268/7 273/3 277/25 **classroom [1]** 263/21 278/11 278/20 279/17 clean [11] 39/24 115/6 279/19 280/11 280/12 115/7 139/19 159/7 281/6 281/10 281/17 159/7 174/3 239/7 285/11 286/21 289/24 239/22 285/15 309/3 290/1 290/25 291/1 cleaned [4] 28/15 291/19 293/7 295/20 28/15 239/20 240/1 297/20 298/23 301/18 cleaning [4] 199/20 312/17 312/19 313/21 234/15 234/17 296/9 315/19 315/21 clear [29] 26/21 27/5 children's [7] 72/10 27/21 28/5 28/9 53/17 74/13 79/22 195/4 59/2 67/2 95/23 96/2 251/24 281/3 298/22 107/2 107/14 108/1 chin [1] 283/18 108/20 108/20 110/22 choice [14] 120/16 113/4 116/3 119/10 152/20 162/18 163/2 119/22 160/22 163/9 163/13 163/14 163/24 206/14 267/12 283/21 181/6 221/5 250/10 285/6 290/13 291/4 250/13 258/8 258/10 312/8 262/21 clearer [1] 53/10 choices [10] 152/12 clearly [10] 3/23 4/6 162/23 163/12 163/15 47/9 66/19 108/2 163/17 163/22 164/3 108/22 109/20 159/4 164/4 168/7 221/5 296/25 312/4 chose [5] 62/24 64/4 clerk [1] 305/25 163/17 163/18 168/3 client [1] 65/24 chosen [1] 306/6 clinging [1] 187/3 **Chris [2]** 261/11 clinically [1] 174/20 261/14 close [10] 19/14 54/16 Christina [8] 16/15 100/9 102/3 103/20 144/7 170/18 172/25 103/20 138/17 155/25 188/12 199/7 199/12 231/5 279/19 239/15 closed [4] 73/8 110/10 Christmas [1] 260/11 268/6 297/19 CHRISTOPHER [1] closely [2] 241/6 256/9 closer [1] 15/21 **chubbiness** [1] 156/21 closet [2] 125/1 304/5 **church [2]** 209/25 closing [17] 2/2 2/3 233/23 48/9 49/4 60/1 89/22 circle [1] 272/8 100/5 100/9 100/13 circled [1] 217/4 120/11 164/15 165/15 circling [1] 113/18 165/18 250/6 251/15 circulated [1] 250/16 261/23 311/3 circumspect [1] 227/3 closings [1] 93/5 circumstance [3] 7/9 cloth [4] 196/21 227/7 263/4 277/9 227/15 283/4 circumstances [13] **clothes [4]** 145/10 7/4 20/8 45/2 102/13 238/25 246/9 246/17 106/22 106/23 128/16 **clothing [2]** 132/9 131/20 133/21 133/25 152/25 138/4 142/24 201/4 clouded [1] 228/2 circumstantial [6] clouds [3] 101/8 101/2 101/21 102/12 101/25 102/5 116/23 121/3 135/9 coached [1] 73/24 citations [1] 50/6 codified [1] 25/17 cites [1] 244/12 coincides [1] 14/17

cold [7] 238/2 274/25 275/1 284/25 285/10 289/7 300/11 collect [1] 307/8 collected [3] 135/1 163/10 163/16 collective [1] 112/1 collectively [2] 111/19 148/24 college [1] 173/22 colloquially [1] 105/14 Colloquy [1] 91/12 colluded [1] 257/7 colon [2] 289/17 292/15 Colonel [1] 119/24 colonoscopies [5] 117/25 259/21 286/8 289/13 289/14 colonoscopy [1] 289/18 colored [1] 303/17 combined [1] 289/15 come [38] 18/2 18/11 27/3 60/18 60/20 75/7 75/13 90/8 92/3 101/25 102/5 110/17 115/9 149/3 174/13 186/23 189/16 207/23 213/9 214/5 214/19 241/19 246/11 247/18 263/18 266/11 272/25 278/12 280/8 280/9 280/19 282/25 293/15 295/2 295/3 295/4 299/25 300/1 comedian [1] 272/1 comes [7] 50/6 132/25 139/24 166/20 284/22 291/4 292/12 comfortable [4] 77/4 77/7 77/9 77/11 coming [16] 31/7 42/10 79/6 101/11 101/24 115/16 136/7 162/18 162/20 197/14 207/2 235/8 262/3 281/11 312/23 316/11 comment [3] 162/13 245/6 309/22 commentaries [4] 90/3 164/22 260/25 307/2 comments [2] 120/9 250/21 commit [15] 12/7 14/6 32/15 35/21 36/2 38/7 95/15 126/7 126/13 127/1 127/4 127/21 223/14 223/16 290/19 commits [2] 95/12 104/15 committed [7] 82/4 223/14 223/24 246/2 268/3 290/16 301/23 common [34] 23/1 25/14 102/24 102/25 107/12 112/7 130/19 133/22 136/19 137/2 137/3 139/12 139/13

178/21 190/6 191/9 195/16 208/5 211/3 219/17 229/12 239/3 268/7 285/22 285/24 285/25 290/22 291/7 291/23 292/12 294/12 294/14 300/25 301/5 common-law [2] 23/1 25/14 communication [1] 170/1 companies [1] 299/12 **company [1]** 266/10 compare [3] 142/15 264/20 280/11 complaining [3] 117/15 176/9 208/4 complaint [6] 32/17 36/25 36/25 38/21 39/8 39/10 complaints [1] 36/22 complete [6] 62/11 66/2 66/13 162/3 249/7 278/6 completed [4] 13/11 13/18 127/16 127/17 completely [7] 8/21 47/12 100/22 139/7 259/7 279/4 279/5 completion [1] 14/7 complicated [1] 76/4 complied [1] 170/14 comply [1] 169/9 component [1] 74/8 components [1] 252/1 comprehensive [1] 47/8 **compulsive** [1] 31/14 computer [4] 29/24 98/9 123/25 140/8 computers [1] 279/6 concede [4] 13/2 36/7 257/19 257/20 concept [1] 192/13 concern [10] 35/13 58/7 58/10 198/17 198/22 199/14 205/19 222/10 243/23 293/3 concerned [5] 150/15 199/9 247/21 286/4 286/13 concerning [2] 178/15 185/11 concerns [7] 197/24 202/4 205/23 241/24 242/7 297/20 297/22 concluded [1] 89/23 concludes [1] 100/3 conclusion [2] 102/10 218/22 **condition [4]** 54/4 207/11 207/15 289/12 conditions [4] 78/9 104/17 207/21 289/20 condone [1] 263/5 condones [1] 258/20 conduct [34] 4/13 11/20 32/21 50/25 51/18 52/13 52/16 53/1

53/3 108/8 116/19 171/23 195/23 199/8 202/16 202/17 202/22 203/8 203/9 204/5 204/5 205/14 205/14 209/1 209/7 209/7 229/19 234/1 244/9 249/20 252/24 258/22 260/8 294/1 conducted [2] 82/4 213/21 Conference [7] 81/1 84/17 99/4 117/23 140/6 269/20 288/9 conferences [1] 213/21 confidential [1] 173/10 **confirm [5]** 38/2 38/4 39/8 55/5 55/8 confirmed [26] 141/9 141/12 181/21 182/7 188/22 195/8 195/11 198/14 202/22 204/11 204/12 204/13 206/22 207/3 223/7 226/18 226/22 227/14 232/5 244/20 245/13 246/24 248/4 250/19 254/12 255/17 **confirming [1]** 216/8 conflict [1] 176/17 conflicting [3] 225/5 230/9 234/8 conform [2] 93/24 312/5 confront [1] 62/22 confuse [1] 35/12 **confused** [1] 8/7 confusing [3] 35/12 35/14 148/19 confusion [1] 151/6 conjunction [2] 53/19 105/17 connect [3] 102/21 136/18 138/25 **connecting** [1] 121/3 connection [1] 122/19 **conscious [2]** 164/3 164/4 consent [13] 18/10 22/11 22/14 22/18 105/2 106/17 106/20 106/20 107/23 108/14 108/18 109/1 127/22 consented [3] 22/16 107/25 116/18 **consenting** [1] 108/9 conservatively [1] 48/14 consider [34] 13/23 94/13 97/18 101/21

158/21 163/7 163/23

164/8 178/19 179/6

179/8 218/11 218/12

226/16 230/20 241/2

241/3 249/5 258/12

264/5 270/18 270/21

270/22 271/3 271/22

272/15 272/16 277/8 **5241** 

	204/44		E4/40 74/0 00/0E 07/04	Counta C [2] 454/22
<u>C</u>	281/14 continuously [2]	corresponds [1] 18/9 corroborate [1] 282/12	54/12 71/2 80/25 97/24 99/3 99/7 112/4 115/19	Counts 6 [2] 154/22 157/17
consider [6] 280/17	277/16 281/10	corroborated [8]	165/12 262/9	Counts 7 and [3]
290/24 301/4 303/9		105/25 121/1 151/14		112/13 216/16 216/17
303/16 310/11	contradicted [1]	159/13 268/13 268/13	counseling [10] 53/25 176/14 181/17 181/19	
consideration [2]	-			Counts 9 [1] 154/20
170/2 269/25	contradicting [2]	273/5 276/4	182/22 183/7 184/23	county [10] 1/2 3/1
considered [5] 154/10	225/20 228/19	corroborates [1]	186/25 188/17 264/10	72/1 72/3 79/5 80/6
164/7 277/5 290/18	contradiction [1]	135/21	counselor [1] 180/8	165/20 193/11 246/7
290/20	312/15	corroborating [2]	count [29] 28/24 37/4	250/17
considering [6] 141/24	contradicts [1] 222/15	160/7 238/6	37/7 104/5 104/14	coup [1] 124/18
142/9 175/19 196/6	<b>contrary [3]</b> 36/6 241/20 241/20	corroboration [9]	113/22 126/5 129/24	couple [13] 12/17 15/8 37/6 43/8 68/15 81/8
212/2 232/7		105/23 106/11 135/3	138/8 139/15 139/16	
consistency [3] 268/14	contrast [1] 152/6	154/6 220/24 241/17	143/11 158/8 159/10	101/1 161/19 168/17
299/20 299/22	contributed [1] 242/2	273/4 276/7 299/22	160/21 161/5 161/6	186/24 239/13 265/11
consistent [20] 141/13	control [14] 112/2 113/15 118/6 132/5	corroborative [10] 106/6 112/18 121/15	161/18 164/9 191/23 204/22 208/16 216/18	283/21   course [14] 20/18 49/1
185/5 185/13 192/3	141/20 143/19 146/21	123/6 136/2 138/24	230/12 230/17 234/7	53/20 60/14 67/1 97/20
194/6 194/7 194/9	149/16 183/14 267/4	149/23 156/20 157/20	240/5 242/4 305/21	107/3 177/3 231/3
207/19 228/5 229/9	276/24 281/18 281/22	160/12	Count 1 [1] 191/23	287/6 287/9 287/12
229/24 235/25 248/14	293/18	Corrupted [1] 242/21	Count 11 [2] 158/8	287/13 313/5
248/14 248/24 248/25		cot [1] 226/7	159/10	court [56] 1/2 1/12
255/14 265/21 266/2	controlling [1] 197/2 controls [1] 121/24	cots [7] 152/22 225/18	Count 13 [1] 129/24	1/23 6/23 6/25 7/11
300/5	convenience [1] 99/17	225/19 226/10 226/19	Count 13 [1] 129/24 Count 2 [3] 138/8	13/25 23/19 25/5 25/6
conspiracy [8] 58/9	convenient [2] 275/22	226/22 274/13	139/15 230/17	25/8 33/24 40/6 40/15
58/9 58/11 295/2 295/4	275/22			
295/5 297/14 297/17	-	<b>could [106]</b> 3/10 3/23 4/1 4/10 6/17 9/6 14/3	Count 25 [3] 139/16 143/11 234/7	40/21 41/6 42/8 48/3 53/20 57/13 63/5 63/10
constant [5] 134/8	conversation [1]			
149/21 183/19 286/21	217/18 conversations [2]	16/9 16/22 17/19 21/4 27/11 32/1 33/5 33/13	Count 37 [3] 104/14 126/5 240/5	64/21 64/23 65/9 65/13 65/18 65/23 65/24
287/19	250/24 266/22	35/17 38/6 40/17 44/10		66/19 66/20 66/23 67/3
constantly [2] 124/15		45/7 45/17 45/19 47/24	<b>Count 43 [2]</b> 161/6 161/18	67/16 67/16 70/24 71/2
222/8	convict [1] 277/8 conviction [1] 65/15	53/8 53/18 55/13 56/12	Count 44 [2] 160/21	79/7 80/14 89/21 90/9
constipated [1] 288/24	convince [1] 257/11	59/16 61/25 62/5 62/13	161/5	92/21 99/8 165/9
constipation [1] 155/9	convinced [1] 217/16	63/9 63/16 64/7 64/12	Count 6 [1] 208/16	165/12 182/14 182/16
constitute [5] 94/7	cool [3] 30/5 39/3	65/13 71/15 71/15	Count 8 there [1]	212/13 213/13 232/14
130/25 133/18 143/16	39/11	71/23 82/9 84/1 87/13	216/18	262/7 262/9 288/12
313/20	coordinator [1] 72/8	95/22 100/11 101/15	counter [9] 133/10	312/13 316/19 317/1
<b>constitutes [2]</b> 105/10	copied [1] 186/13	109/13 109/14 113/13	138/9 138/14 138/16	court's [5] 24/1 48/11
142/10	copies [7] 68/20 68/21	125/11 126/19 128/14	153/14 189/7 230/16	65/14 66/18 95/1
constituting [1] 201/2	68/22 92/1 99/14	138/25 148/18 155/4	231/2 241/11	courtroom [1] 163/13
constitutional [3]	251/11 261/15	162/6 162/6 167/20	country [1] 263/12	cover [4] 83/4 107/17
94/17 95/10 97/17	copy [12] 61/16 65/13		counts [52] 37/13	155/17 308/16
<b>consume [1]</b> 159/5	65/14 66/2 66/6 66/8	171/18 175/16 185/14	92/19 99/21 99/23	covered [5] 57/11
contact [5] 16/6 55/20	69/12 70/5 91/20 91/20	185/16 186/19 193/8	101/1 103/14 104/13	161/20 197/12 197/19
171/13 173/3 251/5	261/15 308/17	194/15 194/23 214/20	109/8 112/13 114/13	232/10
contacted [2] 279/21	cords [1] 192/16	214/21 214/22 225/8	114/18 116/13 124/22	covering [1] 211/12
306/15	corporal [12] 96/8	227/24 237/3 237/19	126/6 126/8 127/24	covers [1] 5/9
contacts [1] 200/12	133/14 133/15 133/18	237/21 238/17 240/25	128/3 131/12 131/19	CPS [88] 43/10 44/23
contained [1] 13/5	134/19 154/10 191/11	241/22 246/19 254/10	132/25 134/3 138/4	67/6 71/25 72/21 74/3
contemporaneous [3]	192/22 200/18 200/21	262/24 263/12 266/9	144/4 147/1 147/4	74/14 79/21 84/10
28/7 311/10 312/16	200/24 201/10	270/10 271/21 273/24	154/20 154/22 157/17	84/13 87/15 136/9
contemporaneously	correct [29] 23/8 26/17	284/17 284/21 285/1	157/18 158/6 159/11	136/9 162/4 167/10
[1] 63/7	22/2 27/14 44/12 57/22	285/4 287/20 295/2	160/19 161/20 167/3	169/10 171/11 171/24
context [20] 82/9 82/12	72/15 74/19 77/24	295/4 302/4 302/18	170/3 179/10 190/25	172/17 172/18 172/20
156/1 163/2 163/11	78/12 78/17 79/2 80/2	303/10 303/19 304/24	191/2 191/21 201/19	176/23 178/2 189/15
168/7 181/5 215/13	83/15 85/4 85/9 86/15	305/4 305/4 305/5	202/25 204/8 216/16	193/2 193/4 197/7
215/14 216/6 221/5	86/17 86/21 87/23 88/6	310/1 311/14 312/25	216/17 223/17 226/23	197/12 197/16 198/2
229/20 241/1 241/3	88/9 88/12 88/13 112/5	313/18	228/18 238/14 252/15	199/4 200/11 200/14
242/20 248/8 250/4	145/7 172/5 247/10	could've [1] 242/2	256/6 259/2 260/17	200/15 201/14 201/23
250/10 250/13 258/7	308/11	couldn't [28] 10/6	Counts 1 [1] 134/3	201/25 202/4 202/17
contexts [1] 21/20	corrected [1] 93/21	121/18 122/24 124/17	Counts 10 [2] 157/18	202/22 203/5 203/9
contingent [1] 227/25	correcting [1] 251/23	147/17 148/20 155/2	158/6	203/14 204/4 204/9
continuance [2] 54/16	correction [1] 44/17	155/10 169/17 171/7	Counts 12 [3] 159/11	204/10 204/18 205/9
63/18	corrective [6] 195/3	172/17 185/16 186/4	160/19 228/18	209/6 211/16 211/19
continue [6] 57/24	195/17 202/23 222/6	194/4 199/10 216/25	Counts 13 [1] 128/3	212/14 212/24 213/24
171/10 274/8 288/10	227/10 257/22	218/10 221/12 240/11	Counts 3 [3] 144/4	231/9 232/11 234/1
290/2 305/1	correctly [5] 61/22	240/15 248/2 270/25	147/1 204/8	238/8 238/8 239/23
continued [3] 184/3 184/4 262/6	91/8 197/1 197/3 317/6	271/2 271/17 285/15	Counts 38 [1] 223/17	247/20 251/5 251/21
continuous [2] 148/13	correspond [2] 60/20	296/10 298/17 310/3	Counts 44 [1] 238/14	252/2 252/18 258/17
140/13	171/23	counsel [11] 32/6	Counts 5 [1] 226/23	264/22 264/23 277/17
				5242
				1

_	
C	249/13
<b>CPS [19]</b> 277/19	Crohn's [7] 140/22
278/13 278/19 279/3	207/1 207/5 207/6
279/21 280/4 280/6	289/15 290/11 292/15
280/14 281/2 294/18	cross [19] 2/8 63/12
	85/23 115/18 119/12
294/20 296/19 296/23	125/9 159/20 182/22
297/23 297/25 298/6	183/4 183/24 187/14
298/7 298/18 299/25	244/8 300/2 313/4
CPS-acknowledged [1]	313/18 314/1 315/17
209/6	315/19 315/22
CPS-DFS [1] 252/2	
cracks [3] 298/13	cross-examination [14]
298/19 298/20	2/8 63/12 85/23 115/18
Craigslist [1] 198/7	119/12 182/22 183/4
crass [1] 304/11	187/14 244/8 313/4
crawl [2] 162/17	313/18 314/1 315/17
303/25	315/19
crawled [2] 159/16	cross-examine [1]
227/7	315/22
	cross-examined [1]
crawling [6] 160/10	300/2
227/14 282/8 283/2	crossed [1] 133/19
283/4 283/9	crusty [1] 194/17
crazy [4] 118/6 149/16	Crystal [25] 31/1 39/16
155/2 262/20	43/12 43/13 43/15
create [1] 213/19	43/16 43/17 44/14
created [7] 100/20	46/18 47/25 67/23 69/3
100/23 148/9 150/2	90/17 90/20 172/21
164/1 164/8 233/12	
creates [2] 191/18	193/3 193/3 193/7
192/6	193/11 202/19 203/5
creating [1] 26/5	211/22 212/24 238/8
creative [2] 199/24	298/3
257/20	CT [1] 286/9
credibility [12] 94/14	cue [1] 100/12
217/14 220/5 223/2	culpable [1] 42/11
268/16 270/7 270/22	cumulative [1] 95/25
271/4 271/23 275/16	cumulatively [1] 14/2
299/21 310/6	<b>Cunningham [1]</b> 33/11
credible [10] 120/14	cup [2] 156/6 286/19
178/3 194/13 197/22	cure [1] 150/16
199/15 205/12 211/7	cured [1] 290/10
	curiosity [1] 119/9
215/17 240/24 268/14	curl [1] 151/20
cried [1] 125/12	currently [2] 289/22
crime [18] 42/7 44/5	290/1
49/25 94/7 95/15	cursory [1] 91/16
104/22 127/2 128/25	custodian [1] 61/13
136/9 170/1 177/15	custody [1] 200/20
193/16 198/12 202/12	cut [15] 29/12 63/20
203/7 244/3 256/7	107/4 108/12 116/25
277/6	128/2 129/8 129/9
crime's [1] 129/3	
crimes [6] 49/15 72/15	129/10 137/2 147/8
103/24 106/10 131/7	162/21 224/9 274/23
290/20	302/11
criminal [16] 50/25	cuts [3] 135/7 137/3
51/2 51/6 172/1 172/3	259/25
178/19 190/18 191/12	cycle [6] 186/21
200/2 205/15 230/10	287/19 287/23 305/2
256/5 258/22 260/8	305/4 305/4
294/16 306/5	<u> </u>
	D
criminally [1] 252/19	<b>DA [4]</b> 80/13 213/14
crinkly [1] 207/12	310/19 310/20
Crispin [2] 189/9	<b>DA's [1]</b> 79/17
231/16	dad [2] 256/1 263/19
critical [5] 47/10	dah [2] 226/5 226/5
102/24 103/3 106/16	dah-dah [1] 226/5
249/3	daily [3] 259/11 264/13
criticized [2] 248/20	292/4
İ	·

```
damage [2] 189/7
259/14
damaged [2] 249/19
254/14
Dan [1] 309/15
dance [1] 205/8
dancing [1] 86/10
dangerous [1] 184/12
dangled [1] 228/4
Danielle [40] 12/19
57/24 58/4 121/6 122/1
122/2 122/11 122/20
138/20 138/22 144/6
145/11 151/13 151/16
151/24 152/16 153/5
157/19 157/23 159/14
167/15 167/19 167/23
168/3 173/20 185/7
189/21 206/22 227/14
227/20 227/21 228/7
255/9 265/8 272/20
275/3 275/15 275/15
275/22 275/25
dark [2] 300/20 303/17
data [1] 197/19
date [11] 30/8 30/9
33/19 33/23 34/8 76/17
88/7 123/10 130/10
275/6 289/14
dated [1] 215/19
dates [12] 30/7 30/8
32/18 32/21 36/19
108/19 123/20 171/20
171/21 171/22 206/25
207/18
daughter [12] 102/20
120/1 121/16 135/21
146/11 151/24 167/16
206/20 227/21 247/25
248/1 265/9
daughters [9] 152/19
164/1 167/10 167/11
198/10 243/12 292/23
299/8 299/8
David [2] 186/17
188/19
Davison [4] 169/24
174/8 174/16 226/18
day [89] 1/13 30/25
46/13 56/1 78/11 78/13
86/17 101/7 111/18
134/9 134/9 134/15
134/23 134/23 137/24
137/24 138/12 140/24
144/7 145/10 145/21
145/24 146/1 146/1
160/24 163/25 170/18
172/21 172/25 188/12
193/20 193/21 195/10
195/10 195/10 195/11
198/15 199/7 199/12
199/16 202/2 203/17
203/17 210/21 210/22
210/24 211/1 211/8
211/8 211/18 211/20
211/21 214/18 214/18
228/14 238/15 238/17
238/18 238/19 239/12
239/12 239/13 239/15
```

```
239/23 239/23 246/10
246/14 252/5 254/7
259/16 259/23 262/23
265/10 268/23 273/17
276/18 282/20 283/7
283/18 285/11 285/12
285/18 292/7 292/11
294/10 295/19 305/15
307/14 307/20
daycare [1] 167/25
days [26] 31/5 77/16
77/25 88/5 111/2
123/11 123/13 133/6
155/5 162/22 192/15
194/18 202/3 202/4
205/18 210/23 210/23
215/21 218/6 218/6
252/6 253/2 253/4
253/13 254/8 275/10
DAYVID [5] 1/21 29/25
37/17 46/8 49/10
de [1] 124/18
deadly [10] 32/16 34/4
36/17 128/1 128/10
128/15 128/21 129/21
130/2 223/24
deal [16] 8/17 9/8
11/10 54/2 75/11 173/8
174/17 176/24 188/25
190/20 196/2 227/24
233/25 243/6 251/8
251/10
dealing [7] 104/3
124/16 131/18 152/8
177/1 187/11 196/2
deals [2] 103/19 104/6
dealt [2] 150/2 271/18
death [3] 128/18
191/18 192/7
Debbie [46] 40/9 54/3
135/14 149/20 152/7
152/7 156/23 166/10
166/13 176/12 176/16
180/3 181/18 182/11
185/18 185/20 185/21
186/3 186/6 186/7
186/12 187/16 187/20
188/20 190/3 190/9
190/16 232/5 232/8
232/8 232/20 254/12
264/21 266/4 266/5
266/11 266/18 266/23
267/11 269/4 271/9
271/14 271/25 272/18
279/23 279/25
Debbie's [3] 135/19
149/6 186/14
decayed [1] 176/7
deceived [1] 244/5
December [10] 123/9
123/10 123/13 130/10
130/12 189/5 205/18
215/19 215/21 280/3
December 2011 [1]
189/5
December 6 [2] 123/9
130/10
decide [4] 134/22
206/18 237/12 258/13
```

decided [2] 123/5 189/11 decipher [1] 302/14 decision [1] 5/1 decisions [4] 162/15 305/6 305/6 305/8 dedicated [3] 243/10 243/11 243/12 deep [2] 6/11 237/4 deeper [1] 269/8 defecating [2] 160/21 304/23 defendant [58] 1/10 1/20 5/5 5/21 6/5 12/20 18/24 19/5 22/17 24/8 33/19 34/10 34/12 71/1 94/17 97/14 99/7 102/14 104/3 104/6 107/24 108/6 111/1 111/6 112/20 113/22 116/13 117/3 120/5 122/12 122/13 122/14 122/15 122/16 122/19 123/12 125/18 134/7 138/4 139/23 139/24 143/19 152/24 161/17 165/11 178/16 179/3 221/21 262/8 274/8 276/14 277/7 283/14 283/15 286/25 287/14 290/16 297/1 defendant's [5] 121/16 135/21 265/8 290/21 291/6 defense [118] 2/3 2/5 5/21 6/4 6/7 6/14 6/16 7/12 12/2 12/23 12/25 18/12 18/15 18/23 19/25 20/12 23/2 24/7 24/17 24/18 24/18 24/19 24/22 24/23 24/25 26/1 28/9 29/3 32/13 33/2 33/16 33/16 41/18 42/1 44/8 46/25 50/18 53/15 53/22 54/1 54/10 59/2 59/6 59/14 60/8 61/16 61/20 62/21 64/10 65/12 66/1 69/4 71/4 71/5 80/18 81/3 84/20 86/19 89/12 89/14 89/15 91/6 92/13 95/21 95/24 98/1 107/6 107/11 107/24 116/17 164/15 165/14 165/18 166/17 171/6 180/14 180/15 224/25 244/19 261/25 262/14 262/17 263/7 263/12 263/14 264/1 264/19 264/19 266/3 266/7 267/3 273/9 275/6 276/21 277/12 282/14 282/24 283/13 285/8 286/4 287/1 293/12 294/19 297/25 300/3 300/6 302/15 302/22 303/9 309/7 309/11 311/6 312/10 312/13 312/22 314/9 314/11 315/14 5243

D defense's [3] 32/10 58/7 59/16 defenses [4] 25/15 107/5 116/15 116/16 **deferred [1]** 177/10 defiant [4] 262/15 263/2 265/23 304/22 deficient [1] 201/23 defies [3] 219/17 219/17 219/18 define [5] 29/8 131/5 131/25 269/5 301/13 defined [6] 104/15 126/11 131/1 133/2 264/24 277/5 defines [2] 131/15 133/19 definitely [3] 94/20 94/23 151/18 definition [5] 11/7 29/8 128/11 128/15 285/21 definitions [1] 285/6 definitively [3] 9/14 122/7 161/24 defy [2] 222/13 222/14 defying [1] 221/15 degree [18] 141/22 163/21 185/15 194/4 194/5 194/16 209/4 211/25 237/17 237/19 237/21 241/22 242/5 288/14 289/4 289/6 299/10 299/11 degrees [4] 120/2 289/3 299/9 299/19 dehydration [1] 205/13 **deliberate [4]** 117/9 141/13 242/22 306/14 deliberately [4] 132/16 143/7 150/12 223/7 **deliberation [9]** 97/19 97/22 99/15 140/11 172/8 245/7 306/22 306/25 307/6 deliberations [7] 89/24 99/16 99/25 112/2 113/15 140/13 141/20 delineate [2] 44/8 109/9 demeanor [3] 158/14 158/19 270/7 demerits [3] 195/6 258/5 258/7 demonstrated [1] 161/21 demonstrates [1] 154/17 demonstrative [2] 113/17 125/5 **Demyer [3]** 154/7 172/9 178/6 denied [2] 56/1 57/11 denigrating [3] 263/14 302/22 302/24 denominator [2] 294/13 294/15 dental [2] 176/6 246/9

dentist [3] 197/24 198/1 232/10 dentist's [1] 197/11 denying [1] 122/23 department [14] 40/23 44/2 44/23 97/12 165/21 165/23 168/18 181/11 193/12 196/24 200/3 202/8 244/25 251/2 depending [3] 73/11 229/2 280/23 depicted [1] 40/10 Depot [3] 83/11 135/13 203/13 deprived [1] 252/6 **DEPT [1]** 1/7 deputy [4] 1/18 71/1 99/6 165/11 **describe** [5] 134/5 214/8 216/23 216/25 240/25 described [16] 109/17 110/13 110/20 110/21 110/23 113/7 113/8 113/19 115/13 116/2 129/4 129/6 129/7 183/17 216/14 223/20 describing [1] 240/17 **description [7]** 135/12 215/12 218/13 223/10 248/25 304/2 304/14 descriptions [1] 220/2 descriptors [1] 215/9 designed [2] 4/1 4/8 desire [2] 126/12 245/1 desperate [1] 249/4 **Despite** [1] 135/16 destroyed [3] 40/17 40/24 41/19 detail [6] 122/23 122/23 127/12 216/25 240/25 270/20 detailed [4] 151/18 168/16 275/17 275/18 **details [3]** 75/15 221/11 240/24 detected [1] 289/18 detective [8] 43/14 48/7 70/21 124/6 124/6 188/22 215/24 220/24 determination [1] 216/3 determine [8] 50/1 94/12 120/17 228/15 228/17 228/25 276/13 276/15 determined [4] 6/18 205/24 220/6 268/17 determining [8] 195/22 201/1 203/23 210/4 223/13 223/23 225/2 226/25 develop [1] 253/5 developed [1] 204/20 development [2] 242/1 242/3 device [2] 3/16 4/1 devoid [1] 315/20

**Dewan [6]** 156/1 157/13 177/5 207/10 207/10 208/3 **Dezenberg** [1] 189/2 **DFS [21]** 42/1 45/23 50/12 119/25 171/11 171/24 177/10 193/2 198/13 198/16 212/4 244/6 244/8 244/23 248/3 249/4 249/4 252/2 252/18 258/17 259/3 diabetes [3] 289/21 292/15 293/7 diagnosed [7] 183/10 183/15 183/19 184/11 219/24 289/15 289/19 diagnoses [9] 161/24 177/11 177/19 177/25 182/23 183/7 206/4 207/2 207/20 diagnosing [1] 206/3 diagnosis [7] 161/22 183/11 196/6 206/24 207/7 207/14 281/12 diagram [6] 105/15 109/24 240/10 240/12 253/16 264/1 diapers [3] 227/7 227/15 283/4 diarrhea [1] 145/20 Diaz [25] 144/20 144/24 152/15 157/1 157/23 169/5 170/16 170/24 172/2 174/19 174/20 175/20 188/8 243/18 245/19 265/6 275/2 278/19 290/25 291/21 292/9 293/6 293/7 294/6 294/7 Diaz-Burnett [17] 144/20 144/24 152/15 157/23 169/5 170/16 170/24 172/2 174/19 175/20 188/8 243/18 278/19 290/25 292/9 293/6 294/6 dichotomy [1] 152/14 dicta [1] 25/16 did [271] 6/17 11/21 11/22 13/22 15/6 17/14 17/24 17/25 25/18 27/13 28/10 28/18 28/24 29/3 29/8 29/20 34/5 36/25 37/17 40/9 41/23 42/10 43/23 43/23 44/13 46/13 46/17 46/18 47/23 49/10 49/10 52/6 52/7 54/11 55/5 55/8 55/20 56/14 57/9 57/25 58/17 59/21 59/24 60/12 60/24 61/7 62/19 63/3 68/9 68/9 72/6 75/25 76/22 78/7 78/14 78/16 78/18 79/24 81/22 84/10 84/21 86/13 86/20 87/1 87/2 87/8 87/16 88/9 94/16 95/11

101/5 106/20 108/3 109/3 109/21 109/23 110/19 112/14 113/2 113/13 114/19 115/19 116/4 116/17 117/3 117/4 117/7 118/7 120/2 121/2 121/13 122/13 122/16 124/10 124/11 124/23 125/10 125/10 125/14 125/16 126/20 127/8 135/4 135/20 139/16 140/9 142/16 143/7 144/6 144/20 148/19 149/13 150/11 150/19 152/8 152/8 152/23 153/1 156/8 158/13 158/16 159/24 159/24 162/14 163/5 163/11 166/18 166/22 166/23 167/7 168/12 168/14 169/15 170/21 172/5 176/12 177/3 182/8 184/12 184/25 185/4 188/9 188/9 193/3 193/9 193/15 194/3 194/13 195/11 195/15 196/25 197/12 199/3 199/12 201/6 201/25 202/22 204/6 204/10 204/15 204/18 208/11 209/13 209/14 209/23 210/7 211/11 211/25 214/7 215/10 215/10 216/24 219/5 222/5 222/7 222/8 222/13 224/9 224/10 224/12 224/13 226/1 226/7 226/7 226/12 226/19 227/16 228/7 228/12 229/1 229/3 230/13 231/6 231/14 232/3 232/4 233/3 233/16 234/10 234/21 234/22 235/1 237/24 238/9 238/9 239/13 241/12 241/23 242/6 245/1 245/1 251/10 254/19 255/9 257/1 257/13 258/6 258/14 258/16 263/1 263/3 265/12 266/14 266/18 268/2 269/4 269/6 270/9 270/24 271/9 271/14 271/18 271/25 272/5 274/22 276/23 278/2 279/20 286/17 286/17 287/3 287/21 287/25 288/15 290/5 291/1 291/2 291/2 291/15 292/4 292/5 295/8 295/9 295/10 295/11 295/22 296/19 299/17 302/16 302/19 302/21 304/7 304/7 305/20 307/23 308/1 310/6 310/14 313/4 313/4 315/21 didn't [236] 3/12 7/8 7/14 25/13 29/18 29/23

35/17 36/7 39/21 44/12 44/13 44/24 46/3 46/9 47/9 49/23 52/6 57/10 59/23 61/12 61/13 62/2 62/14 63/25 67/9 70/14 87/8 94/24 101/5 109/1 109/5 113/1 113/3 117/4 119/19 119/20 120/1 121/8 123/5 125/15 125/16 126/3 126/19 127/17 129/8 133/12 135/7 135/18 136/16 139/14 140/19 140/23 141/5 141/10 142/7 146/7 149/1 150/6 151/4 152/4 153/5 153/17 156/13 156/17 158/11 158/20 161/17 161/25 162/9 166/16 169/21 171/3 172/3 175/8 175/9 177/8 177/12 180/14 180/15 182/2 184/2 184/3 186/6 186/12 186/23 187/23 188/17 188/18 188/23 189/2 189/3 189/4 189/6 189/8 189/15 189/17 189/22 193/7 193/8 195/6 195/13 196/5 196/5 197/6 197/25 198/13 199/14 200/1 200/10 201/8 201/9 201/23 201/24 202/1 202/6 203/15 205/1 205/2 205/3 209/9 209/11 211/19 211/19 212/10 212/12 212/13 212/14 212/14 212/16 213/2 213/12 213/25 214/17 216/2 216/23 218/4 220/24 220/25 221/1 221/1 221/2 221/7 221/8 221/9 221/9 222/9 222/11 223/3 223/3 223/4 223/5 226/11 226/20 228/10 230/15 231/5 231/19 233/25 234/11 235/4 235/5 235/16 236/16 237/11 237/15 240/7 240/14 241/17 243/19 244/7 244/9 244/21 244/22 245/4 245/21 245/22 248/21 250/15 252/22 252/23 253/20 253/25 254/1 255/18 257/9 257/25 258/2 258/12 258/17 258/25 259/1 259/1 259/10 260/6 265/6 265/6 266/13 266/22 266/23 266/23 267/1 267/8 267/25 268/1 273/22 282/19 283/1 283/1 285/14 285/14 286/13 286/15 286/24 287/20 287/22 295/7 295/11 297/8 297/9 5244

D 258/17 315/2 dismiss [1] 35/8 121/18 122/25 126/2 **Disney [2]** 209/24 126/20 127/18 128/7 disagreeing [1] 13/24 didn't... [17] 297/11 disappearing [1] 233/21 129/19 130/24 132/15 297/12 300/7 302/16 280/13 disorder [8] 184/5 132/17 137/3 138/21 302/20 303/2 303/2 184/5 206/2 206/21 disassembled [1] 139/3 139/6 139/10 303/4 303/5 303/6 206/23 219/25 293/2 142/20 144/3 144/15 279/5 303/20 307/25 310/11 disasters [1] 262/22 293/5 144/17 144/18 150/11 311/8 313/3 313/6 discern [1] 58/21 disorders [1] 281/7 150/18 151/4 152/10 313/7 discipline [18] 142/19 display [2] 128/19 152/12 152/15 153/22 diet [4] 155/11 156/16 142/22 159/25 166/22 208/8 154/17 156/17 157/16 186/10 289/25 169/15 181/13 184/14 displayed [1] 224/8 158/3 158/11 158/23 diets [1] 297/22 192/23 195/2 195/16 displaying [2] 129/15 158/24 159/1 161/1 difference [6] 149/19 200/25 201/1 201/24 161/2 161/16 161/17 129/22 152/19 152/21 157/6 202/19 202/24 256/25 disposition [1] 290/19 164/2 164/23 164/23 232/21 266/25 257/25 258/2 disprove [1] 233/2 164/25 166/12 166/25 different [73] 4/14 disciplined [2] 139/18 disproves [1] 232/12 166/25 167/8 167/11 18/10 21/20 32/17 185/7 dispute [7] 10/19 59/18 168/13 168/25 170/5 36/16 43/8 54/25 73/11 disclose [3] 213/12 103/16 108/25 209/11 170/22 171/3 171/5 76/25 77/17 103/8 171/5 171/6 171/14 253/25 268/7 236/13 236/18 109/10 114/4 116/10 disclosed [14] 42/16 disputes [1] 236/14 171/18 171/19 171/24 116/11 140/8 140/10 46/21 181/18 181/20 172/3 172/14 173/2 **disputing [1]** 14/8 143/4 149/11 155/15 181/21 181/23 187/8 disregard [4] 217/13 173/9 177/16 178/4 161/23 163/6 168/5 187/25 188/2 189/16 220/18 224/21 224/22 179/2 179/11 179/23 170/6 170/8 170/11 198/11 217/25 252/20 disruptive [2] 183/21 179/24 182/3 187/9 170/13 170/14 170/14 252/24 184/12 192/24 196/16 197/2 182/23 191/6 192/17 distinction [3] 20/25 197/13 198/13 199/8 disclosing [2] 206/17 195/7 205/17 205/18 209/10 22/23 102/15 200/2 200/8 200/8 207/13 211/15 216/22 disclosure [11] 17/16 distraction [1] 120/15 202/19 206/11 208/22 218/8 224/17 225/7 46/5 52/1 209/13 distributed [1] 246/6 209/19 213/23 214/12 225/22 227/11 227/14 214/12 215/15 215/16 212/11 212/19 212/20 district [10] 1/2 1/12 230/3 230/7 230/8 212/21 212/23 213/3 1/18 71/1 79/5 80/6 215/21 215/22 216/7 234/9 234/13 235/7 220/23 81/10 84/20 99/6 219/8 219/10 219/10 238/1 243/14 247/7 disclosures [2] 213/2 165/11 219/12 220/2 222/1 253/21 261/14 261/17 241/16 disturbed [1] 184/22 224/16 224/25 224/25 268/8 270/17 271/18 discoloration [2] 237/6 **disturbing** [1] 299/5 226/2 226/5 227/9 271/20 276/18 276/18 divulge [1] 77/13 237/8 227/10 228/21 229/6 286/22 291/24 291/25 discord [1] 92/17 **Dixie [2]** 156/6 286/19 229/7 229/8 230/7 293/11 301/11 302/5 **DNA [1]** 268/1 231/12 235/1 236/24 discoverability [1] 302/5 315/18 315/18 do [289] 3/25 4/4 4/7 57/6 237/13 237/15 237/23 315/22 315/24 discrepancies [1] 9/9 12/13 13/1 15/2 237/23 238/21 239/2 differently [3] 171/19 216/15 19/23 20/2 20/15 20/19 247/21 247/22 248/6 171/25 179/17 20/21 22/24 26/17 27/7 249/20 256/15 257/17 discrepancy [1] 181/2 difficult [1] 271/10 discuss [8] 3/12 89/6 28/5 31/11 32/1 33/25 261/1 261/1 261/9 difficulties [1] 183/21 90/1 260/23 300/6 35/4 35/8 36/9 36/16 262/21 263/1 263/3 digestive [1] 45/10 306/20 306/21 306/24 38/2 38/5 39/7 39/9 263/5 263/9 265/10 dinged [2] 29/5 29/13 discussed [16] 11/14 39/17 40/12 41/8 44/24 265/24 266/14 266/16 dinner [2] 263/21 47/15 47/22 48/2 51/10 11/16 58/19 119/11 266/17 267/1 267/9 313/25 151/10 154/23 188/5 53/8 55/12 56/15 57/14 273/16 273/17 274/6 dire [4] 62/10 63/10 264/24 264/25 265/18 57/15 62/17 62/19 274/7 276/22 276/22 192/19 267/24 269/22 270/1 270/19 63/11 63/21 64/12 277/18 278/24 278/24 direct [20] 2/7 71/21 281/1 288/22 315/15 65/23 69/8 71/16 71/23 278/25 280/14 280/18 80/9 101/2 101/18 discussing [1] 306/23 72/13 72/14 73/20 74/2 280/18 280/19 281/25 102/18 114/10 170/1 74/24 76/12 77/15 79/2 282/2 283/16 286/1 discussion [4] 28/4 171/12 171/14 175/16 79/8 79/10 79/15 79/16 286/5 286/24 291/6 101/4 314/18 315/9 178/12 183/23 202/7 disease [6] 207/1 80/10 80/15 81/9 81/13 295/11 296/2 296/20 217/14 220/3 224/1 297/24 298/6 298/18 207/5 289/16 289/19 83/11 83/13 83/16 226/1 234/15 240/16 290/11 292/16 83/19 84/9 84/15 84/24 299/25 301/1 301/18 directed [3] 179/1 diseases [6] 163/22 85/2 85/10 85/14 87/20 307/3 307/4 307/25 203/14 238/5 277/21 281/15 281/15 88/5 88/17 89/3 90/4 313/2 316/21 317/6 direction [1] 229/2 290/7 293/16 90/4 90/6 91/17 93/12 doctor [60] 47/15 directions [2] 178/16 47/16 47/18 62/7 62/20 disfigured [3] 137/15 96/9 97/5 98/20 100/22 184/22 139/6 143/11 101/4 103/3 103/23 117/2 117/12 117/16 directives [2] 171/18 104/16 107/16 107/22 disfigurement [10] 118/5 118/7 119/14 184/13 132/1 132/21 132/22 108/24 110/15 111/2 120/5 126/3 136/13 directly [1] 242/6 191/19 192/7 192/8 113/1 115/25 116/6 140/17 142/8 142/16 director [4] 168/18 143/2 150/5 153/6 192/10 195/25 230/20 116/18 117/2 117/3 250/22 296/23 296/23 241/10 117/9 117/17 117/24 155/24 177/4 177/4 dirty [2] 169/17 169/20 disfiguring [1] 236/22 118/22 118/23 118/24 177/10 189/6 198/1 disagree [4] 3/22 26/7 119/20 120/1 121/9 198/2 198/4 206/5 disgusting [1] 159/14

206/6 206/8 206/16 206/16 207/2 207/15 208/4 208/8 208/11 208/20 209/7 209/18 211/24 231/5 231/6 231/8 231/19 237/12 248/4 251/16 251/16 260/1 264/12 278/1 278/6 286/25 287/25 288/15 292/25 303/3 303/5 doctor say [1] 198/2 doctor's [3] 47/18 119/17 286/15 doctor-acknowledged [1] 209/7 doctors [55] 60/12 60/12 63/18 64/5 64/11 117/3 140/18 150/7 150/8 150/17 177/20 177/25 178/6 178/8 189/5 198/19 198/21 199/2 205/12 205/17 206/18 207/8 208/17 208/19 211/16 212/2 231/21 252/3 252/21 255/5 259/20 260/1 265/13 265/13 277/17 277/23 278/7 280/7 280/8 280/10 281/10 281/12 286/14 286/22 286/23 287/5 287/6 287/10 287/13 288/22 288/22 303/1 303/3 303/7 312/21 doctors' [3] 140/18 205/16 259/10 document [2] 166/5 169/3 documentation [3] 63/24 64/1 312/21 documented [5] 182/15 215/8 247/23 248/19 281/2 documents [4] 53/17 53/19 103/10 166/6 does [43] 8/3 35/3 35/4 42/6 47/3 51/8 51/12 51/13 52/14 52/24 79/5 79/17 81/17 83/9 87/4 120/23 121/10 122/12 126/25 132/16 137/2 137/3 167/1 170/4 172/8 179/19 184/21 192/25 201/11 202/14 208/9 210/7 237/22 249/23 256/21 266/11 266/16 273/10 277/16 277/23 281/16 297/24 300/12 doesn't [75] 3/8 3/9 7/15 8/3 17/20 19/19 22/22 28/15 36/5 42/7 45/20 47/1 51/1 58/2 84/1 94/22 121/11 126/15 130/15 130/16

132/14 137/5 138/24

140/21 143/19 146/1

175/13 176/3 176/3

5245

D doesn't... [46] 187/17 187/21 190/7 190/8 190/20 191/8 191/9 198/25 207/24 207/25 208/5 211/3 236/1 236/4 236/7 236/8 237/2 237/3 237/4 239/4 239/10 240/23 241/19 256/13 260/7 261/20 262/23 263/1 263/24 269/8 270/12 270/14 271/6 280/14 281/21 281/24 282/13 284/10 284/18 293/15 298/18 300/22 302/1 311/21 314/20 316/21 dog [6] 18/8 121/10 135/25 234/15 234/17 262/24 doing [53] 5/12 11/16 19/14 21/16 28/10 29/14 31/10 37/9 42/3 42/13 42/14 42/14 43/19 43/19 52/1 63/7 75/23 87/10 95/24 118/10 133/23 134/8 142/22 146/8 150/24 157/24 162/4 163/8 171/12 172/1 178/7 195/4 199/18 200/12 205/8 211/20 212/5 219/6 219/16 239/22 263/16 267/4 267/8 271/2 282/20 283/14 283/15 287/9 302/5 303/8 303/13 303/14 306/10 domestic [3] 181/14 187/17 187/21 don't [231] 4/10 4/19 317/1 4/19 4/20 5/2 5/19 9/11 9/11 9/17 9/20 10/7 11/19 11/23 12/9 13/13 15/13 16/15 16/15 17/4 17/4 17/9 17/19 18/7 18/8 22/23 23/5 24/22 25/20 26/4 26/5 26/7 26/11 30/16 31/3 32/18 33/4 33/5 33/8 35/3 35/7 35/11 35/12 36/1 37/2 38/3 39/20 41/8 41/16 41/17 41/20 41/21 44/8 45/13 45/21 47/2 47/22 49/2 49/7 55/9 55/19 55/24 56/6 56/13 58/5 58/10 59/20 60/18 60/24 61/12 313/18 61/16 62/12 64/9 64/15 65/14 65/21 66/5 66/6 66/13 66/14 66/23 67/3 67/8 69/12 70/19 75/6 75/7 75/8 75/8 77/12 78/9 78/12 79/19 81/5 309/9 81/16 82/15 83/1 86/4 86/9 88/19 89/6 92/13 92/20 98/16 101/24 275/21 102/1 102/2 102/4

102/19 102/24 103/15 138/25 104/22 106/12 106/12 111/13 119/6 119/6 119/7 125/15 126/16 126/22 128/24 138/6 140/3 143/20 147/24 156/5 169/18 171/11 173/5 173/11 173/15 175/15 178/9 191/10 191/12 192/1 192/2 192/10 192/12 192/22 196/12 200/8 200/11 203/21 206/9 206/12 211/6 213/15 213/17 213/20 213/22 215/17 215/18 216/6 217/1 217/17 219/4 219/6 219/7 222/3 227/12 228/19 233/1 234/16 236/11 236/20 236/21 237/9 237/17 238/6 239/5 239/6 240/24 240/24 242/4 242/23 242/25 244/14 245/6 246/2 248/12 250/1 250/7 251/7 251/16 251/20 251/22 251/24 252/2 255/8 255/12 255/13 256/4 256/6 257/3 261/3 261/13 263/15 265/23 268/7 269/16 278/23 280/1 280/17 280/17 280/21 283/5 283/11 284/6 287/10 290/4 290/10 292/19 293/23 294/5 294/6 294/7 296/4 298/5 299/12 299/16 301/3 302/24 303/1 303/9 310/16 310/18 314/1 314/3 316/22 done [50] 8/20 9/16 15/14 32/16 36/22 53/19 61/9 63/16 64/7 74/1 76/2 78/20 80/6 81/19 90/12 92/12 92/16 95/14 103/2 106/17 106/21 107/3 107/16 109/14 109/21 236/1 113/2 116/21 116/24 117/6 118/2 118/14 124/2 129/3 137/25 146/4 157/22 160/6 161/16 206/17 228/8 231/18 244/24 261/24 278/9 294/9 301/25 302/4 305/22 308/20 door [15] 98/16 102/4 102/25 116/21 147/21 147/25 164/14 165/2 191/9 211/3 239/4 307/9 307/10 307/16 doors [6] 90/10 119/7 261/5 268/6 272/21 dots [3] 102/22 121/3

double [3] 90/10 261/5 307/9 doubt [41] 5/7 19/1 24/10 24/19 24/24 25/1 25/3 25/22 26/3 33/23 34/6 34/7 94/9 97/1 106/3 106/5 107/20 127/24 130/4 167/1 169/8 177/13 179/4 186/1 191/3 192/1 289/1 198/25 221/23 221/25 222/20 223/25 226/24 228/20 230/13 230/18 186/15 236/11 236/20 236/21 237/22 240/2 252/15 **Dowling [2]** 170/18 188/12 down [76] 12/8 12/14 12/18 17/21 30/24 31/19 65/15 65/18 66/21 67/8 75/15 86/11 104/3 106/15 113/25 114/25 115/6 115/12 120/21 125/2 126/10 127/10 127/12 127/14 127/16 127/19 127/23 130/5 130/16 153/11 153/11 153/12 153/13 153/19 153/22 153/23 153/25 154/2 154/3 154/5 154/11 154/16 154/16 154/24 154/25 160/12 191/6 197/4 231/16 210/24 211/1 211/5 218/15 218/16 229/1 188/19 229/2 229/4 229/6 229/9 229/15 229/22 229/23 234/21 241/8 253/14 254/22 254/25 259/14 269/9 270/12 189/2 282/7 284/18 284/20 286/10 301/19 302/4 313/21 downloading [1] 36/20 downstairs [7] 123/1 139/21 146/3 211/13 229/18 231/1 234/24 downward [2] 135/25 207/18 **Dr [3]** 156/14 210/2 312/18 **Dr. [82]** 9/8 53/25 54/23 55/15 61/5 62/20 62/23 105/11 105/16 109/25 110/5 117/7 119/11 136/10 136/16 141/4 150/3 155/7 155/10 155/12 156/1 157/13 177/5 180/10 185/3 185/10 185/14 186/15 186/17 188/15 188/19 189/2 189/3 189/3 189/4 189/9 193/22 193/25 194/15 194/20 205/17 205/20 205/22 206/1 206/25 313/24 207/1 207/3 207/9 207/10 207/10 207/17

207/18 208/3 208/3 209/9 209/11 211/9 212/2 214/14 217/9 218/18 219/5 219/18 220/22 222/16 223/7 229/7 229/8 231/11 231/16 233/6 236/23 237/18 238/5 238/5 238/11 241/7 242/7 286/22 286/23 287/2 **Dr. A [1]** 286/22 Dr. Alphonsa [1] **Dr. B [1]** 286/23 Dr. Bernstein [3] 205/20 205/22 206/1 Dr. Cetl [37] 9/8 61/5 62/20 62/23 105/11 105/16 109/25 110/5 136/10 136/16 141/4 185/3 185/10 185/14 189/3 189/4 193/22 193/25 194/15 194/20 211/9 217/9 218/18 219/5 220/22 222/16 229/7 229/8 231/11 233/6 236/23 237/18 238/5 238/5 242/7 287/2 289/1 Dr. Cetl's [3] 219/18 238/11 241/7 Dr. Crispin [2] 189/9 **Dr. David [2]** 186/17 **Dr. Dewan [6]** 156/1 157/13 177/5 207/10 207/10 208/3 Dr. Dezenberg [1] Dr. Lisa [4] 53/25 54/23 180/10 188/15 Dr. Mileti [7] 117/7 150/3 155/7 209/9 209/11 214/14 223/7 **Dr. Nyarko [3]** 205/17 207/9 208/3 **Dr. Raja [2]** 207/17 **Dr. Rhee [4]** 206/25 207/1 207/3 212/2 Dr. Shaffer [1] 55/15 Dr. Sheikh [3] 155/10 155/12 189/3 Dr. Stephen [1] 119/11 dragged [1] 167/12 **dragging [1]** 154/8 drama [1] 218/3 drank [1] 155/21 draw [4] 76/11 111/14 111/15 245/5 drawing [1] 218/25 drawn [1] 218/23 drew [4] 129/5 253/6 253/6 253/7 drink [3] 155/20 157/15 drinking [2] 157/5

313/23 drinks [1] 156/4 drive [3] 65/22 66/7 101/11 drives [1] 279/7 driving [2] 101/11 102/1 droplets [1] 101/12 dropped [1] 47/17 drops [1] 102/8 drove [1] 172/21 drug [2] 120/3 167/18 dry [3] 29/13 43/3 207/12 **DSM [1]** 183/11 **DSM-IV** [1] 183/11 dub [1] 18/9 dubs [1] 14/17 due [10] 100/20 108/9 132/12 141/7 151/3 157/16 158/3 159/6 160/17 297/22 **duly [1]** 71/8 dump [2] 256/19 256/20 dumped [3] 181/9 238/2 254/23 dumping [1] 289/7 dunked [1] 235/15 duress [1] 108/10 during [17] 40/8 62/24 78/10 89/25 97/20 97/22 100/16 136/10 147/10 147/11 164/18 164/20 196/12 245/24 257/24 260/22 289/18 duties [1] 191/10 duty [8] 93/15 177/22 179/12 190/7 195/21 198/23 198/23 209/13 Dwight [54] 57/23 58/4 58/14 58/17 58/23 59/1 113/5 123/2 123/8 123/13 124/3 124/16 130/20 136/4 141/10 148/7 160/2 160/8 160/11 168/2 176/22 176/24 185/7 187/19 187/22 189/13 189/13 192/4 193/1 193/6 193/18 199/9 201/21 202/20 204/16 212/21 214/2 214/3 215/4 216/5 222/8 244/5 245/14 249/7 258/3 265/17 272/19 274/22 276/17 281/1 281/4 282/7 294/3 303/14 **Dwight's [3]** 123/25 226/3 296/14 71/18

**E-b-r-a-h-i-m [2]** 71/13 e-mail [19] 17/12 17/12 28/1 30/9 31/1 39/24 57/4 280/2 280/21 281/4 282/5 282/7 283/1 283/2 283/8 5246

E	132/4 132/11 132/19	empty [1] 111/7	150/2 162/8 162/10	191/12 192/22 193/3
-	144/1 148/15 235/4	encompass [1] 50/4	164/8 204/21 263/8	193/13 198/24 204/1
<b>e-mail [4]</b> 294/1 303/12 312/1 313/13	284/23 299/12 309/14	encopresis [1] 251/18	263/10 264/16 290/8	207/14 211/19 212/12
e-mailed [4] 30/2 216/5	electricity [2] 174/25	encountered [1]	290/9 295/20	222/13 231/8 231/21
251/9 311/14	175/21	233/24	environmental [1]	235/5 236/25 243/9
e-mails [13] 15/6 31/3	electrified [2] 147/22	encourage [1] 77/8	241/25	243/10 245/6 246/4
273/22 273/23 274/21	147/25	end [15] 16/24 17/2	environments [1]	249/16 249/19 250/17
274/21 275/5 275/13	element [10] 26/21	17/4 17/5 60/15 62/22	264/15	251/21 253/22 254/1
279/21 293/25 293/25	103/15 104/23 104/25	92/22 111/18 146/1	equipped [13] 166/1	254/25 265/6 265/6
294/8 314/7	127/20 129/1 131/13	163/25 187/23 245/2	166/2 176/24 181/10	265/8 273/16 273/24
each [33] 37/15 73/13	167/2 277/6 314/16	252/6 262/23 294/10	190/20 196/2 214/24	275/3 277/4 278/23 280/17 281/10 286/18
77/4 77/9 90/2 99/17	<b>elements [7]</b> 28/13 104/21 127/3 191/3	endangerment [4] 131/4 191/1 191/15	215/1 243/3 244/13 244/15 244/16 249/12	286/22 287/16 289/10
129/24 134/3 144/4	191/4 191/6 230/19	227/1	erase [2] 176/3 176/4	292/8 293/13 294/5
148/23 164/18 166/14	elicit [1] 213/17	ended [6] 73/8 138/10	error [1] 138/6	294/25 296/20 296/20
167/2 167/2 167/2	elicited [2] 76/1 314/2	138/12 190/17 213/24	escape [3] 49/15 186/9	298/21 306/23 311/23
173/13 188/6 190/22	else [35] 15/23 16/2	244/13	253/9	314/15 314/22 315/1
197/17 197/17 221/11	24/13 28/4 32/7 35/8	ending [1] 169/3	<b>especially [3]</b> 75/18	315/24
230/2 246/11 249/6	39/19 48/23 53/14	endocrinologist [2]	146/25 270/7	evening [2] 306/19
260/16 260/24 265/2 265/18 277/25 285/20	56/22 75/8 75/16 85/4	289/23 290/2	<b>ESQ [4]</b> 1/17 1/18 1/20	317/4
293/20 303/14 306/20	89/1 90/2 106/8 106/9	endorsed [1] 204/5	1/21	event [4] 28/25 261/20
eager [1] 162/9	126/14 144/17 157/22	endorses [1] 258/20	essentially [5] 6/7	310/16 310/22
ear [6] 142/13 194/16	158/21 164/18 165/24	endoscopies [2] 286/9	12/12 40/22 50/9	events [1] 300/2
233/8 236/23 236/23	171/15 194/8 200/8	289/15	127/13	eventually [2] 168/2
238/10	216/24 216/24 244/21	endured [2] 181/20	establish [2] 58/25	239/2
earlier [6] 40/16 53/16	260/24 264/20 276/15	183/25	179/2	ever [21] 63/24 78/14
77/16 77/25 87/10	306/10 306/21 310/23	enema [1] 286/11	establishes [1] 178/21	100/15 110/19 116/5
161/25	else's [2] 76/9 76/10	enemas [1] 286/12	esteem [1] 183/16	120/20 122/13 124/10
early [3] 195/12 241/25	<b>email [26]</b> 80/15 81/9 82/1 82/1 88/7 90/17	enemy [1] 42/9 enforcement [6] 72/21	estimating [1] 65/3 et [4] 43/20 54/9 60/14	166/18 178/4 178/6 180/19 183/12 184/1
271/15	90/19 90/20 111/3	74/3 74/14 74/22 79/21	247/23	185/7 186/5 198/2
earned [1] 207/22	112/10 124/8 124/8	87/14	ETA [1] 48/2	231/9 233/9 241/13
ears [2] 168/23 181/11	130/9 130/11 141/10	enhance [1] 140/9	evaluate [1] 163/8	273/24
ease [1] 99/18	141/11 160/7 160/8	enjoyed [1] 234/11	evaluating [5] 103/1	every [63] 9/3 24/12
easier [1] 214/9	160/10 215/6 215/12	enough [28] 30/10	106/24 122/11 148/22	82/15 115/4 115/8
easiest [1] 304/21	215/19 215/20 226/3	47/6 47/6 82/20 129/3	190/24	115/13 127/12 127/23
easily [3] 33/13 45/17 304/25	250/20 251/2	139/23 147/15 147/17	<b>evaluation [1]</b> 264/12	134/8 137/24 163/7
easy [4] 11/1 55/17	emails [15] 81/4	156/3 157/7 157/13	<b>evaporate</b> [1] 190/7	164/9 167/2 167/2
283/23 283/24	123/12 124/9 124/10	169/22 174/24 177/18	even [151] 8/21 12/9	167/3 170/22 171/1
eat [5] 98/15 157/15	147/19 163/15 163/16	214/4 236/17 238/19	13/14 20/10 20/11	171/16 173/14 190/22
291/21 300/10 313/24	163/17 215/9 215/11	238/22 244/21 248/21	21/24 22/3 22/17 23/15	193/20 195/10 195/10
eaten [1] 228/11	215/25 216/1 216/3	249/1 255/6 255/7	23/18 26/9 34/14 36/13	196/13 196/15 203/17
eating [9] 157/5 247/24	246/6 250/16 embarrass [1] 145/8	255/14 272/10 276/9 289/8 314/3	42/3 42/15 45/8 47/8 47/8 49/15 55/9 56/15	203/19 206/10 207/25 210/21 210/22 210/23
247/25 248/2 262/24	embarrassed [2]	enrollment [1] 244/19	58/15 59/24 60/3 63/9	211/8 211/8 211/20
278/4 291/13 291/14	158/17 160/18	entered [2] 173/23	65/8 70/19 75/5 75/9	215/10 215/11 219/16
291/23	embarrassing [5]	208/5	75/13 76/7 79/21 87/8	219/16 239/12 239/23
Ebrahim [11] 71/6 71/7	146/25 216/21 227/8	entering [7] 70/23 93/6	87/22 102/20 103/20	251/17 251/17 252/5
71/12 71/23 84/19	270/16 295/12	99/2 185/24 194/14	103/20 105/9 105/17	258/13 259/23 263/22
212/17 212/17 213/7	emergency [1] 286/11	242/10 262/5	110/9 110/13 111/25	276/3 278/14 279/25
213/9 213/14 250/18	Emery [4] 48/7 70/21	entertained [1] 5/22	114/15 115/23 117/8	280/14 280/22 283/18
editing [1] 19/17 education [1] 132/7	188/22 220/24	entertains [1] 107/24	119/25 120/20 120/20	285/18 292/6 292/12
effect [8] 9/4 148/10	emotional [2] 174/25	entire [3] 168/18	121/11 123/3 123/4	295/6 295/9 295/18
164/19 212/10 297/17	281/6	220/18 224/21	124/25 124/25 125/9	300/3 305/15 305/21
306/11 306/15 307/4	emotionally [1] 184/22		125/13 125/19 129/12	313/3
effectively [1] 298/9	empathy [1] 254/15	entitled [16] 7/16 45/21	130/9 134/13 135/6	everybody [11] 29/7
effort [1] 227/14	emphasized [2] 249/10		135/21 136/3 136/4	31/16 53/9 93/13
efforts [3] 199/24	249/10	105/25 106/4 106/6	136/15 137/8 138/20	119/22 119/23 203/16
233/19 257/21	employed [2] 72/3	107/16 152/1 154/16	138/22 141/1 144/7	252/25 264/20 281/24
eight [3] 114/17 218/9	145/6	242/20 273/3 281/8	145/11 146/11 146/18	294/20
253/19	<b>employee [2]</b> 47/16 47/17	317/7 entity [3] 72/11 74/15	146/22 147/16 147/24 148/5 148/19 150/3	<b>everybody's [4]</b> 70/6 93/8 205/11 292/6
either [31] 6/24 12/11	employees [3] 47/13	74/18	148/5 148/19 150/3 150/13 151/11 152/21	everyday [1] 300/16
40/23 43/17 47/11 54/7	202/10 246/7	entry [2] 197/7 197/19	153/4 154/6 155/1	everyday [1] 300/16 everyone [5] 144/5
54/24 66/21 74/3 74/10	employer [2] 176/16	enumerated [2] 25/17	155/3 155/7 155/9	161/23 170/7 176/13
104/16 104/18 105/6	181/19	36/4	156/14 156/14 157/25	257/16
106/19 108/2 109/14	employers [1] 44/3	enuresis [3] 183/11	158/4 175/18 176/21	everything [33] 15/14
128/3 128/7 131/2	employment [1]	251/18 264/13	185/7 185/16 188/18	28/4 39/19 47/2 59/21
131/15 131/17 131/25	167/15	environment [11]	188/24 189/17 189/25	68/3 70/5 75/16 100/17
		_ <u></u> _		5247
1	İ			

E	4
everything [24]	e
106/2 123/18 123/23 136/18 151/5 158/21	
158/23 162/2 164/7	е
198/11 198/12 215/8	
216/24 222/5 234/3	e
245/1 247/23 248/19 259/7 274/23 275/21	е
289/10 297/1 305/22	4
everywhere [4] 24/13	4
102/9 146/3 197/11	2
evidence [170] 5/6 8/4 10/13 10/15 10/19 14/1	
18/24 19/5 22/5 22/6	e
22/8 24/8 24/16 24/20	é
24/23 24/25 25/2 26/2 30/8 40/7 40/8 40/22	2
41/3 41/4 42/18 42/18	:
43/4 43/9 47/6 47/7	e
47/11 50/4 58/3 59/4 74/15 89/20 94/13	е
97/14 101/2 101/18	
101/20 101/21 102/12	e
102/18 106/7 107/19 110/3 111/9 111/15	(
111/16 111/18 111/19	
111/23 111/24 112/1	
116/16 116/23 119/22 119/23 120/12 120/14	
120/25 121/3 121/20	
123/24 134/25 135/9	e
137/13 142/2 149/23 156/20 157/20 160/7	e
161/21 162/13 163/10	e
163/16 163/23 166/12	
169/7 169/8 170/4 172/14 173/15 174/11	١.
174/15 177/10 177/16	4
177/17 178/3 185/6 185/8 186/1 192/3	é
192/4 194/13 199/15	е
199/22 200/10 201/5	e
201/6 201/8 201/9 201/12 203/1 203/15	е
205/12 208/14 209/23	2
211/7 213/19 215/17	e
216/4 216/5 218/19 219/6 219/7 220/21	
220/23 221/21 221/25	
222/1 222/1 222/6	
222/22 226/1 226/2 227/3 229/7 229/8	:
229/9 231/23 232/17	е
232/22 233/1 233/9	e
234/22 235/22 237/9 237/14 242/5 242/22	е
244/7 244/14 244/15	(
244/18 245/23 246/5	e
248/6 257/6 258/9 259/2 259/12 260/15	
268/2 268/13 276/10	]
277/8 279/10 279/11	2
283/12 290/14 290/15 290/20 290/25 292/19	2
312/14 312/15 312/15	e
312/20	e
evil [3] 168/9 172/12	:

228/6 exact [6] 9/3 32/18 61/16 108/19 240/15 296/5 exactly [5] 21/25 99/11 151/17 190/15 213/10 exaggerate [3] 210/16 254/18 282/24 exaggerated [13] 47/12 186/22 210/10 210/11 210/20 218/4 230/9 257/8 258/11 259/2 259/15 299/17 302/17 exaggerating [1] 227/19 exaggeration [5] 230/3 231/23 232/18 232/22 238/23 exaggerations [1] 241/4 exam [4] 3/25 4/4 4/14 185/24 examination [22] 2/7 2/8 2/9 17/13 17/14 63/12 71/21 85/23 88/3 115/18 119/12 182/22 183/4 187/14 194/19 244/8 253/21 313/4 313/18 314/1 315/17 315/19 examine [3] 140/12 259/20 315/22 examined [1] 300/2 example [14] 19/21 20/12 101/18 123/18 131/10 144/12 151/25 151/25 157/12 232/6 244/11 247/2 256/4 284/11 examples [1] 162/10 exams [1] 208/25 except [4] 12/16 15/23 16/2 297/2 exception [3] 89/13 288/3 288/4 excessive [18] 133/17 133/20 134/19 136/21 137/19 137/23 138/1 138/2 142/20 142/23 154/9 154/11 154/11 183/20 184/20 201/2 208/4 208/15 excessively [1] 183/16 excited [1] 160/11 exclusion [1] 293/19 exculpatory [3] 66/22 66/22 67/7 excuse [18] 159/4 161/1 171/3 172/25 176/22 178/22 181/25 184/3 209/5 235/15 244/9 247/24 251/17 276/13 279/23 285/22 297/3 299/1 excused [2] 89/9 306/18 execute [2] 279/1 279/4

**exhausted** [1] 54/10 exhibit [11] 64/22 64/23 65/10 65/14 66/18 67/16 80/19 81/4 243/7 316/19 316/20 exhibited [1] 289/21 **exhibits** [6] 65/18 89/12 140/11 307/23 316/22 317/2 exist [3] 11/4 40/13 194/13 existed [1] 40/14 **existence** [1] 178/25 exit [2] 306/4 307/15 exited [1] 269/1 exiting [1] 307/17 expand [1] 168/3 expanded [1] 225/10 expect [1] 211/11 **expecting [2]** 193/23 200/15 experience [8] 76/9 76/9 84/5 141/7 177/14 210/14 243/16 255/25 experienced [2] 76/10 192/12 expert [6] 7/22 61/11 193/25 219/19 314/4 315/20 **expertise** [1] 118/9 explain [7] 119/14 140/21 189/16 206/14 207/4 207/5 248/2 **explained [11]** 109/23 114/18 114/22 125/13 125/22 145/16 159/23 241/20 247/19 247/22 296/6 explains [1] 247/17 **explanation** [2] 157/25 160/5 explicit [2] 43/17 44/25 **explicitly [5]** 44/5 50/2 50/5 58/12 202/13 exploitation [1] 131/18 **expose [1]** 249/25 exposed [3] 142/11 237/3 259/22 **expound [1]** 99/12 **express [4]** 90/6 164/25 261/3 307/5 **expressed [5]** 100/23 156/17 212/1 243/23 249/6 **extended** [9] 136/2 203/24 203/25 204/23 205/5 209/17 210/5 210/6 210/10 extensively [1] 127/9 extent [8] 11/3 11/6 42/15 44/25 50/9 142/18 142/21 178/20 extra [4] 15/8 267/2 267/2 271/16 **extreme [3]** 168/19 174/21 247/3 **extremely [3]** 66/22 141/22 184/11 eye [21] 133/10 138/8

153/14 153/20 189/6 189/7 198/2 231/13 241/9 241/10 247/19 284/3 eyebrow [1] 270/11 102/20 168/23 231/7 234/11 296/10 eyewitnesses [2] 134/25 137/6 **F-a-i-z-a [2]** 71/12 71/17 fabricated [1] 233/13 fabrication [3] 224/3 224/4 236/9 face [15] 138/15 153/16 156/21 187/2 187/4 197/20 201/7 231/2 235/21 235/24 270/11 274/10 faces [2] 230/6 274/9 facilities [1] 249/14 facility [1] 249/17 facsimile [1] 65/25 205/24 212/5 212/12 264/25 265/9 266/20 273/21 274/6 281/1 284/19 285/9 285/10 288/22 300/6 factors [2] 106/24 241/25 facts [8] 7/21 86/13 102/13 108/1 112/18 115/2 142/1 279/10 factual [3] 9/20 11/23 13/24 fail [2] 143/20 258/25 96/25 165/23 165/24 169/8 184/13 184/17 196/24 258/24 260/4 297/23 157/10 215/2 215/3 failure [16] 40/17 144/13 150/25 151/2 152/4 157/13 157/14 157/15 165/20 176/4 178/4 184/18 184/19 237/7 245/9 249/25 failures [2] 197/4 244/23 fair [5] 51/24 60/4 72/13 76/2 82/20 5/22 6/5 18/13 18/22

231/15 231/19 231/21 eyes [7] 101/17 101/20 248/10 254/25 254/25 fact [33] 4/21 7/4 23/1 40/20 44/7 87/4 160/11 168/11 169/19 199/13 217/11 217/12 220/17 224/21 236/10 257/21 266/24 267/13 270/18 failed [12] 36/17 40/23 failing [5] 146/15 151/1 faith [36] 3/9 5/16 5/17 19/20 19/25 20/7 20/15

138/9 138/16 139/6

139/9 139/14 153/13

312/22 217/12 192/13 254/20 315/17 247/25 fears [2] 220/8 268/18 **feathers [1]** 175/9 February [8] 72/3 188/2 197/6 251/3 251/4 251/6 252/25 254/5 feces [4] 246/23 247/2 247/9 256/17 fed [3] 174/3 198/15

5248

22/16 23/12 24/6 26/16 26/18 26/22 45/4 45/7 45/14 45/16 45/19 49/19 107/9 107/12 107/17 107/25 117/11 119/2 202/11 203/6 Faiza [18] 16/16 16/18 17/14 27/13 30/1 30/10 48/2 49/2 55/13 55/13 56/16 59/8 67/20 68/15 71/5 71/7 71/12 250/18 Faiza's [1] 67/19 fake [2] 177/11 255/15 faking [1] 186/16 fall [5] 120/23 229/4 229/9 274/8 298/19 falling [2] 241/8 254/22 false [1] 243/25 falsely [2] 184/23 familiar [2] 182/2 family [24] 40/23 44/2 44/23 77/16 78/22 79/3 80/13 97/12 135/18 165/21 165/23 168/3 168/19 181/12 185/9 193/12 196/24 200/4 202/8 232/14 251/2 262/24 298/8 299/3 fan [2] 43/3 151/23 fans [12] 151/10 162/19 225/2 226/10 226/12 226/13 257/23 274/4 274/4 274/5 274/9 285/19 fantastic [1] 253/11 fantastical [2] 221/14 far [13] 13/24 40/5 57/5 120/25 122/19 133/18 138/23 172/2 204/22 257/2 299/18 305/23 Farm [2] 209/25 233/22 fashioned [1] 30/23 **faster [1]** 91/18 faucet [1] 140/1 fault [2] 206/12 221/4 faults [2] 132/11 144/1 favorite [2] 218/2 faxing [1] 178/1 fear [10] 108/15 128/6 129/20 151/7 162/3 162/4 162/5 207/7 255/20 256/23 fearful [1] 187/22

20/24 21/13 22/7 22/15

F	256/18 275/11 283/19	312/24 315/25	297/5	176/19 176/25 177/6
	filling [4] 139/24 156/3		foods [3] 157/5 208/12	177/23 177/24 178/1
fed [1] 201/22	235/20 254/24	149/1 249/6	247/25	178/17 179/2 179/9
feed [2] 201/21 213/16			*	
feeding [2] 156/9 184/5	final [4] 250/6 250/7	fits [1] 44/7	fool [1] 251/7	179/14 179/15 179/15
feel [25] 14/6 26/8 28/3		five [8] 15/20 123/13	footage [1] 279/8	179/17 179/18 179/23
35/17 41/8 43/25 44/20	finalized [2] 68/17	172/4 173/19 215/21	forbid [2] 306/11	186/4 186/8 187/18
	247/1	218/9 253/19 275/10	307/13	189/20 189/25 196/2
77/4 101/9 115/14	finally [5] 41/22 82/7	fix [4] 212/3 222/6	force [12] 95/17 106/13	
115/19 119/16 125/10	141/8 211/10 274/22	242/21 278/8	108/9 126/10 126/13	215/3 229/13 229/14
125/11 162/9 181/3				
254/15 254/15 270/6	financial [3] 280/20	fixed [3] 169/19 169/22		233/20 233/21 234/3
270/23 270/24 280/24	280/22 281/8	308/9	134/20 167/17 168/1	242/15 242/21 243/2
281/7 284/6 301/20	find [35] 22/16 30/10	fixing [1] 287/9	228/9	243/7 243/8 243/10
	32/6 33/13 33/17 33/18	flag [1] 199/2	forced [9] 138/11	243/15 243/19 243/24
feeling [2] 145/22	33/19 34/3 34/9 34/10	flags [1] 226/20	161/16 164/2 227/4	243/25 244/2 244/11
179/19	34/12 54/16 55/14	Flanagan [1] 309/15	228/22 233/4 233/11	244/12 244/24 245/18
feelings [4] 100/17				246/8 246/21 247/7
151/7 220/9 268/19	55/17 55/18 55/25 56/6	fleeting [2] 256/23	233/13 238/14	
feels [4] 7/12 41/6 50/3	96/7 106/4 127/23	256/24	Forcing [2] 146/13	247/17 249/4 249/5
77/11	127/24 131/7 137/17	flight [2] 229/4 229/9	161/6	249/13 249/22 249/24
	155/10 155/15 164/9	flights [2] 154/11 211/5	foreigner [1] 153/2	250/2 251/20 253/7
fees [1] 244/19	191/1 191/2 193/15	flip [1] 124/14	forensic [35] 15/6	260/3 263/13 263/13
fell [2] 229/23 298/19	210/7 226/14 258/13	floor [12] 112/17 115/5		263/17 263/18 263/19
felt [17] 13/16 25/18	279/8 282/3 305/19		72/18 72/20 73/7 74/2	263/22 264/4 266/6
40/16 109/19 114/20		158/7 158/9 162/17		
125/5 125/11 125/12	finding [4] 55/10	230/5 230/14 233/12	74/23 75/3 76/7 76/16	266/6 268/24 268/25
264/15 264/15 270/24	220/22 269/1 305/20	235/9 254/21 270/15	77/9 78/16 78/21 80/3	280/23 282/6 298/22
270/24 271/1 271/19	fine [42] 5/3 5/4 9/19	283/8	82/4 82/7 82/16 84/10	304/24 313/24
	15/1 18/4 18/12 19/14	Florida [14] 77/19 78/1	87/11 88/16 88/21	fostering [2] 180/1
271/20 274/15 279/18	20/25 24/3 26/20 30/12	189/15 189/19 212/14	194/19 204/25 212/17	247/19
female [3] 105/12	34/13 36/10 36/10	213/3 213/24 231/18	213/4 213/25 217/25	fought [2] 115/4 188/5
105/22 300/19				
few [8] 85/25 130/24	36/11 42/24 42/24 43/3	251/5 252/24 252/25	224/18 241/16 250/17	found [12] 33/22 55/4
144/21 180/25 270/8	50/12 50/13 50/14	254/4 269/1 299/24	253/24 254/5	96/15 153/10 153/18
277/10 294/24 314/21	50/19 50/20 50/22 51/5	flown [1] 77/19	forever [1] 253/9	169/25 176/11 189/19
	52/3 53/9 66/11 67/10	flows [1] 21/25	forget [4] 25/13 143/2	244/16 260/6 284/14
fewer [1] 258/7	69/12 70/11 70/20 94/8	focus [10] 32/10	200/11 275/21	286/6
field [3] 167/17 168/1	94/10 94/21 97/3 97/10	175/13 175/14 175/15	forgetting [2] 132/15	four [23] 15/19 87/19
299/9	97/11 130/21 162/2	192/8 225/8 251/13	186/9	88/5 114/2 114/11
fight [5] 18/8 22/22				
114/24 121/11 236/17	180/13 310/3	262/19 303/1 303/2	forgive [2] 34/14 41/11	
fighting [7] 108/3	finger [1] 301/24	focusing [2] 85/2	form [19] 10/24 32/10	160/22 167/9 167/11
127/10 219/16 236/19	fingerprinting [1]	175/17	90/6 97/25 98/3 104/10	212/16 218/10 229/14
	168/21	folks [9] 48/8 48/22	144/10 145/13 146/14	252/9 258/23 272/17
277/13 280/12 303/20	fingerprints [1] 268/1	110/25 111/7 111/18	154/10 154/14 157/9	272/21 281/7 293/9
fights [3] 184/9 184/9	fingertips [1] 32/18	114/6 134/18 148/21	161/13 161/13 164/25	299/7 300/2 304/17
184/10				
FIGLER [18] 1/21 2/7	finish [8] 14/24 14/25	161/12	166/6 192/23 256/25	fracture [1] 233/10
2/9 8/15 11/13 12/1	15/4 15/16 16/4 31/25	follow [18] 90/10 99/25		fractures [6] 229/7
14/22 15/24 27/1 48/9	67/21 293/23	119/19 162/15 164/14	formal [1] 10/23	229/8 231/12 241/8
	finished [2] 248/1	165/1 168/25 168/25	format [1] 68/3	241/9 241/9
53/6 56/22 61/21 64/2	261/23	171/5 171/7 184/22	formed [1] 47/13	fragile [1] 161/22
65/19 66/5 216/1	finishing [1] 48/10	261/4 280/10 280/10	forms [3] 195/7 195/16	
310/18	Finnegan [12] 43/9	286/15 297/6 306/4	257/22	130/13 185/17
figure [6] 92/22 131/8				
167/20 240/11 246/12	43/11 46/10 149/12	307/9	forth [4] 99/21 99/23	Frances [1] 48/5
268/9	152/24 198/6 198/10	follow-up [3] 280/10	215/6 312/5	frankly [4] 63/12 68/19
figured [3] 29/14 50/3	201/21 238/8 238/8	280/10 297/6	forthcoming [2] 244/6	311/24 313/5
299/2	264/24 280/5	followed [3] 89/22	244/9	fraud [1] 49/14
	fired [4] 176/10 176/14	196/22 265/3	Forty [1] 48/17	freak [1] 4/3
figuring [2] 254/9		following [2] 277/15	forwarded [3] 82/1	free [3] 53/7 77/11
301/19	1 1/b/15 Znn/8			
file [3] 41/14 65/15	176/15 266/8 first [48] 19/14 37/9		88/8 88/11	Ι 1 <i>47/</i> 7
	first [48] 19/14 37/9	289/11	88/8 88/11	147/7
93/21	<b>first [48]</b> 19/14 37/9 38/7 38/19 38/21 38/22	289/11 follows [1] 71/9	forwarding [1] 81/13	frequent [1] 184/20
	first [48] 19/14 37/9 38/7 38/19 38/21 38/22 45/22 52/19 71/8 71/11	289/11 follows [1] 71/9 font [1] 242/25	forwarding [1] 81/13 forwards [2] 250/20	frequent [1] 184/20 frequently [2] 236/14
filed [9] 32/17 32/20	<b>first [48]</b> 19/14 37/9 38/7 38/19 38/21 38/22	289/11 follows [1] 71/9 font [1] 242/25 food [36] 44/16 46/12	forwarding [1] 81/13 forwards [2] 250/20 251/2	frequent [1] 184/20 frequently [2] 236/14 236/14
filed [9] 32/17 32/20 36/24 92/17 261/23	first [48] 19/14 37/9 38/7 38/19 38/21 38/22 45/22 52/19 71/8 71/11	289/11 follows [1] 71/9 font [1] 242/25	forwarding [1] 81/13 forwards [2] 250/20	frequent [1] 184/20 frequently [2] 236/14 236/14
36/24 92/17 261/23 311/2 311/3 311/7	first [48] 19/14 37/9 38/7 38/19 38/21 38/22 45/22 52/19 71/8 71/11 71/17 109/3 109/10 112/6 118/22 130/24	289/11 follows [1] 71/9 font [1] 242/25 food [36] 44/16 46/12 46/15 46/17 50/14	forwarding [1] 81/13 forwards [2] 250/20 251/2 foster [107] 12/19 41/2	frequent [1] 184/20 frequently [2] 236/14 236/14 fresh [5] 181/23 194/1
filed [9] 32/17 32/20 36/24 92/17 261/23 311/2 311/3 311/7 312/3	first [48] 19/14 37/9 38/7 38/19 38/21 38/22 45/22 52/19 71/8 71/11 71/17 109/3 109/10 112/6 118/22 130/24 135/18 148/12 150/4	289/11 follows [1] 71/9 font [1] 242/25 food [36] 44/16 46/12 46/15 46/17 50/14 100/21 132/7 154/21	forwarding [1] 81/13 forwards [2] 250/20 251/2 foster [107] 12/19 41/2 54/5 57/5 145/9 149/9	frequent [1] 184/20 frequently [2] 236/14 236/14 fresh [5] 181/23 194/1 231/7 233/8 238/10
filed [9] 32/17 32/20 36/24 92/17 261/23 311/2 311/3 311/7 312/3	first [48] 19/14 37/9 38/7 38/19 38/21 38/22 45/22 52/19 71/8 71/11 71/17 109/3 109/10 112/6 118/22 130/24 135/18 148/12 150/4 153/16 153/24 172/11	289/11 follows [1] 71/9 font [1] 242/25 food [36] 44/16 46/12 46/15 46/17 50/14 100/21 132/7 154/21 155/4 155/14 155/15	forwarding [1] 81/13 forwards [2] 250/20 251/2 foster [107] 12/19 41/2 54/5 57/5 145/9 149/9 160/11 160/14 166/7	frequent [1] 184/20 frequently [2] 236/14 236/14 fresh [5] 181/23 194/1 231/7 233/8 238/10 Friday [8] 8/8 16/21
filed [9] 32/17 32/20 36/24 92/17 261/23 311/2 311/3 311/7 312/3 files [1] 316/16	first [48] 19/14 37/9 38/7 38/19 38/21 38/22 45/22 52/19 71/8 71/11 71/17 109/3 109/10 112/6 118/22 130/24 135/18 148/12 150/4 153/16 153/24 172/11 175/13 181/17 197/5	289/11 follows [1] 71/9 font [1] 242/25 food [36] 44/16 46/12 46/15 46/17 50/14 100/21 132/7 154/21 155/4 155/14 155/15 155/16 155/17 155/18	forwarding [1] 81/13 forwards [2] 250/20 251/2 foster [107] 12/19 41/2 54/5 57/5 145/9 149/9 160/11 160/14 166/7 166/10 168/6 168/13	frequent [1] 184/20 frequently [2] 236/14 236/14 fresh [5] 181/23 194/1 231/7 233/8 238/10 Friday [8] 8/8 16/21 28/6 57/9 57/11 58/19
filed [9] 32/17 32/20 36/24 92/17 261/23 311/2 311/3 311/7 312/3 files [1] 316/16 filing [9] 57/12 92/15	first [48] 19/14 37/9 38/7 38/19 38/21 38/22 45/22 52/19 71/8 71/11 71/17 109/3 109/10 112/6 118/22 130/24 135/18 148/12 150/4 153/16 153/24 172/11 175/13 181/17 197/5 204/25 212/13 213/3	289/11 follows [1] 71/9 font [1] 242/25 food [36] 44/16 46/12 46/15 46/17 50/14 100/21 132/7 154/21 155/4 155/14 155/15 155/16 155/17 155/18 162/22 174/24 204/10	forwarding [1] 81/13 forwards [2] 250/20 251/2 foster [107] 12/19 41/2 54/5 57/5 145/9 149/9 160/11 160/14 166/7 166/10 168/6 168/13 168/17 168/23 169/9	frequent [1] 184/20 frequently [2] 236/14 236/14 fresh [5] 181/23 194/1 231/7 233/8 238/10 Friday [8] 8/8 16/21 28/6 57/9 57/11 58/19 60/23 312/3
filed [9] 32/17 32/20 36/24 92/17 261/23 311/2 311/3 311/7 312/3 files [1] 316/16 filing [9] 57/12 92/15 311/4 311/11 311/13	first [48] 19/14 37/9 38/7 38/19 38/21 38/22 45/22 52/19 71/8 71/11 71/17 109/3 109/10 112/6 118/22 130/24 135/18 148/12 150/4 153/16 153/24 172/11 175/13 181/17 197/5	289/11 follows [1] 71/9 font [1] 242/25 food [36] 44/16 46/12 46/15 46/17 50/14 100/21 132/7 154/21 155/4 155/14 155/15 155/16 155/17 155/18	forwarding [1] 81/13 forwards [2] 250/20 251/2 foster [107] 12/19 41/2 54/5 57/5 145/9 149/9 160/11 160/14 166/7 166/10 168/6 168/13	frequent [1] 184/20 frequently [2] 236/14 236/14 fresh [5] 181/23 194/1 231/7 233/8 238/10 Friday [8] 8/8 16/21 28/6 57/9 57/11 58/19
filed [9] 32/17 32/20 36/24 92/17 261/23 311/2 311/3 311/7 312/3 files [1] 316/16 filing [9] 57/12 92/15 311/4 311/11 311/13 312/4 312/9 315/9	first [48] 19/14 37/9 38/7 38/19 38/21 38/22 45/22 52/19 71/8 71/11 71/17 109/3 109/10 112/6 118/22 130/24 135/18 148/12 150/4 153/16 153/24 172/11 175/13 181/17 197/5 204/25 212/13 213/3	289/11 follows [1] 71/9 font [1] 242/25 food [36] 44/16 46/12 46/15 46/17 50/14 100/21 132/7 154/21 155/4 155/14 155/15 155/16 155/17 155/18 162/22 174/24 204/10	forwarding [1] 81/13 forwards [2] 250/20 251/2 foster [107] 12/19 41/2 54/5 57/5 145/9 149/9 160/11 160/14 166/7 166/10 168/6 168/13 168/17 168/23 169/9	frequent [1] 184/20 frequently [2] 236/14 236/14 fresh [5] 181/23 194/1 231/7 233/8 238/10 Friday [8] 8/8 16/21 28/6 57/9 57/11 58/19 60/23 312/3 fridge [1] 195/6
filed [9] 32/17 32/20 36/24 92/17 261/23 311/2 311/3 311/7 312/3 files [1] 316/16 filing [9] 57/12 92/15 311/4 311/11 311/13 312/4 312/9 315/9 316/1	first [48] 19/14 37/9 38/7 38/19 38/21 38/22 45/22 52/19 71/8 71/11 71/17 109/3 109/10 112/6 118/22 130/24 135/18 148/12 150/4 153/16 153/24 172/11 175/13 181/17 197/5 204/25 212/13 213/3 213/12 232/25 235/9 236/5 240/6 241/13	289/11 follows [1] 71/9 font [1] 242/25 food [36] 44/16 46/12 46/15 46/17 50/14 100/21 132/7 154/21 155/4 155/14 155/15 155/16 155/17 155/18 162/22 174/24 204/10 204/16 204/23 208/7 208/14 209/2 210/23	forwarding [1] 81/13 forwards [2] 250/20 251/2 foster [107] 12/19 41/2 54/5 57/5 145/9 149/9 160/11 160/14 166/7 166/10 168/6 168/13 168/17 168/23 169/9 170/6 170/7 170/8 170/10 170/13 170/13	frequent [1] 184/20 frequently [2] 236/14 236/14 fresh [5] 181/23 194/1 231/7 233/8 238/10 Friday [8] 8/8 16/21 28/6 57/9 57/11 58/19 60/23 312/3 fridge [1] 195/6 frighten [2] 6/19 124/2
filed [9] 32/17 32/20 36/24 92/17 261/23 311/2 311/3 311/7 312/3 files [1] 316/16 filing [9] 57/12 92/15 311/4 311/11 311/13 312/4 312/9 315/9 316/1 fill [2] 198/8 208/24	first [48] 19/14 37/9 38/7 38/19 38/21 38/22 45/22 52/19 71/8 71/11 71/17 109/3 109/10 112/6 118/22 130/24 135/18 148/12 150/4 153/16 153/24 172/11 175/13 181/17 197/5 204/25 212/13 213/3 213/12 232/25 235/9 236/5 240/6 241/13 246/10 264/7 264/22	289/11  follows [1] 71/9  font [1] 242/25  food [36] 44/16 46/12  46/15 46/17 50/14  100/21 132/7 154/21  155/4 155/14 155/15  155/16 155/17 155/18  162/22 174/24 204/10  204/16 204/23 208/7  208/14 209/2 210/23  242/4 246/15 246/17	forwarding [1] 81/13 forwards [2] 250/20 251/2 foster [107] 12/19 41/2 54/5 57/5 145/9 149/9 160/11 160/14 166/7 166/10 168/6 168/13 168/17 168/23 169/9 170/6 170/7 170/8 170/10 170/13 170/13 171/4 171/9 171/12	frequent [1] 184/20 frequently [2] 236/14 236/14 fresh [5] 181/23 194/1 231/7 233/8 238/10 Friday [8] 8/8 16/21 28/6 57/9 57/11 58/19 60/23 312/3 fridge [1] 195/6 frighten [2] 6/19 124/2 front [10] 52/19 63/13
filed [9] 32/17 32/20 36/24 92/17 261/23 311/2 311/3 311/7 312/3 files [1] 316/16 filing [9] 57/12 92/15 311/4 311/11 311/13 312/4 312/9 315/9 316/1 fill [2] 198/8 208/24	first [48] 19/14 37/9 38/7 38/19 38/21 38/22 45/22 52/19 71/8 71/11 71/17 109/3 109/10 112/6 118/22 130/24 135/18 148/12 150/4 153/16 153/24 172/11 175/13 181/17 197/5 204/25 212/13 213/3 213/12 232/25 235/9 236/5 240/6 241/13 246/10 264/7 264/22 268/22 268/23 292/16	289/11  follows [1] 71/9  font [1] 242/25  food [36] 44/16 46/12  46/15 46/17 50/14  100/21 132/7 154/21  155/4 155/14 155/15  155/16 155/17 155/18  162/22 174/24 204/10  204/16 204/23 208/7  208/14 209/2 210/23  242/4 246/15 246/17  252/6 276/5 278/4	forwarding [1] 81/13 forwards [2] 250/20 251/2 foster [107] 12/19 41/2 54/5 57/5 145/9 149/9 160/11 160/14 166/7 166/10 168/6 168/13 168/17 168/23 169/9 170/6 170/7 170/8 170/10 170/13 170/13 171/4 171/9 171/12 171/12 171/14 173/8	frequent [1] 184/20 frequently [2] 236/14 236/14 fresh [5] 181/23 194/17 231/7 233/8 238/10 Friday [8] 8/8 16/21 28/6 57/9 57/11 58/19 60/23 312/3 fridge [1] 195/6 frighten [2] 6/19 124/2 front [10] 52/19 63/13 64/8 64/17 122/13
filed [9] 32/17 32/20 36/24 92/17 261/23 311/2 311/3 311/7 312/3 files [1] 316/16 filing [9] 57/12 92/15 311/4 311/11 311/13 312/4 312/9 315/9 316/1 fill [2] 198/8 208/24	first [48] 19/14 37/9 38/7 38/19 38/21 38/22 45/22 52/19 71/8 71/11 71/17 109/3 109/10 112/6 118/22 130/24 135/18 148/12 150/4 153/16 153/24 172/11 175/13 181/17 197/5 204/25 212/13 213/3 213/12 232/25 235/9 236/5 240/6 241/13 246/10 264/7 264/22 268/22 268/23 302/15	289/11  follows [1] 71/9  font [1] 242/25  food [36] 44/16 46/12  46/15 46/17 50/14  100/21 132/7 154/21  155/4 155/14 155/15  155/16 155/17 155/18  162/22 174/24 204/10  204/16 204/23 208/7  208/14 209/2 210/23  242/4 246/15 246/17  252/6 276/5 278/4  281/19 291/10 291/13	forwarding [1] 81/13 forwards [2] 250/20 251/2 foster [107] 12/19 41/2 54/5 57/5 145/9 149/9 160/11 160/14 166/7 166/10 168/6 168/13 168/17 168/23 169/9 170/6 170/7 170/8 170/10 170/13 170/13 171/4 171/9 171/12 171/12 171/14 173/8 174/2 174/6 175/1	frequent [1] 184/20 frequently [2] 236/14 236/14 fresh [5] 181/23 194/17 231/7 233/8 238/10 Friday [8] 8/8 16/21 28/6 57/9 57/11 58/19 60/23 312/3 fridge [1] 195/6 frighten [2] 6/19 124/2 front [10] 52/19 63/13 64/8 64/17 122/13 227/7 228/23 235/23
filed [9] 32/17 32/20 36/24 92/17 261/23 311/2 311/3 311/7 312/3 files [1] 316/16 filing [9] 57/12 92/15 311/4 311/11 311/13 312/4 312/9 315/9 316/1 fill [2] 198/8 208/24 filled [8] 29/23 111/7	first [48] 19/14 37/9 38/7 38/19 38/21 38/22 45/22 52/19 71/8 71/11 71/17 109/3 109/10 112/6 118/22 130/24 135/18 148/12 150/4 153/16 153/24 172/11 175/13 181/17 197/5 204/25 212/13 213/3 213/12 232/25 235/9 236/5 240/6 241/13 246/10 264/7 264/22 268/22 268/23 292/16	289/11  follows [1] 71/9  font [1] 242/25  food [36] 44/16 46/12  46/15 46/17 50/14  100/21 132/7 154/21  155/4 155/14 155/15  155/16 155/17 155/18  162/22 174/24 204/10  204/16 204/23 208/7  208/14 209/2 210/23  242/4 246/15 246/17  252/6 276/5 278/4	forwarding [1] 81/13 forwards [2] 250/20 251/2 foster [107] 12/19 41/2 54/5 57/5 145/9 149/9 160/11 160/14 166/7 166/10 168/6 168/13 168/17 168/23 169/9 170/6 170/7 170/8 170/10 170/13 170/13 171/4 171/9 171/12 171/12 171/14 173/8	frequent [1] 184/20 frequently [2] 236/14 236/14 fresh [5] 181/23 194/17 231/7 233/8 238/10 Friday [8] 8/8 16/21 28/6 57/9 57/11 58/19 60/23 312/3 fridge [1] 195/6 frighten [2] 6/19 124/2 front [10] 52/19 63/13 64/8 64/17 122/13 227/7 228/23 235/23 274/9 313/21
filed [9] 32/17 32/20 36/24 92/17 261/23 311/2 311/3 311/7 312/3 files [1] 316/16 filing [9] 57/12 92/15 311/4 311/11 311/13 312/4 312/9 315/9 316/1 fill [2] 198/8 208/24 filled [8] 29/23 111/7	first [48] 19/14 37/9 38/7 38/19 38/21 38/22 45/22 52/19 71/8 71/11 71/17 109/3 109/10 112/6 118/22 130/24 135/18 148/12 150/4 153/16 153/24 172/11 175/13 181/17 197/5 204/25 212/13 213/3 213/12 232/25 235/9 236/5 240/6 241/13 246/10 264/7 264/22 268/22 268/23 302/15	289/11  follows [1] 71/9  font [1] 242/25  food [36] 44/16 46/12  46/15 46/17 50/14  100/21 132/7 154/21  155/4 155/14 155/15  155/16 155/17 155/18  162/22 174/24 204/10  204/16 204/23 208/7  208/14 209/2 210/23  242/4 246/15 246/17  252/6 276/5 278/4  281/19 291/10 291/13	forwarding [1] 81/13 forwards [2] 250/20 251/2 foster [107] 12/19 41/2 54/5 57/5 145/9 149/9 160/11 160/14 166/7 166/10 168/6 168/13 168/17 168/23 169/9 170/6 170/7 170/8 170/10 170/13 170/13 171/4 171/9 171/12 171/12 171/14 173/8 174/2 174/6 175/1	frequent [1] 184/20 frequently [2] 236/14 236/14 fresh [5] 181/23 194/1 231/7 233/8 238/10 Friday [8] 8/8 16/21 28/6 57/9 57/11 58/19 60/23 312/3 fridge [1] 195/6 frighten [2] 6/19 124/2 front [10] 52/19 63/13 64/8 64/17 122/13 227/7 228/23 235/23

F	168/1
frozen [1] 239/18	genetic [2] 241/25
frustrated [1] 104/6	289/12 genital [12] 104/4
frustrating [1] 216/21	104/8 105/2 105/7
frustration [2] 100/24 151/7	105/8 105/10 105/19
full [14] 50/9 52/1	108/25 109/25 110/7
60/19 82/9 130/12	119/17 127/7 genitalia [1] 105/12
156/6 161/4 161/16 235/11 263/19 286/18	genitals [1] 105/21
293/14 293/14 298/2	gentlemen [37] 71/3
full-page [1] 82/9	89/18 99/8 99/9 99/20 100/3 100/7 100/18
full-time [1] 263/19	101/17 105/18 109/18
<b>fully [4]</b> 155/17 156/13 173/22 181/20	111/12 112/17 113/11
function [3] 132/1	118/4 119/1 120/22
191/20 223/12	121/22 140/7 141/18 164/12 165/13 165/19
further [11] 11/25	171/25 180/10 185/1
54/18 59/22 87/24 88/24 89/14 129/12	190/6 195/19 211/2
137/9 141/11 182/7	218/11 218/22 221/10
244/22	222/22 223/18 262/10 288/13 306/3
future [1] 232/3	genuine [1] 245/1
<b>futures [1]</b> 187/22 <b>fuzzy [1]</b> 122/6	gesturing [1] 309/23
	<b>get [161]</b> 5/10 5/11 6/11 10/5 15/14 15/14
G . M . 207/46	16/17 16/25 17/9 17/17
<b>G.I [1]</b> 287/16 <b>gaga [1]</b> 159/17	25/7 27/13 37/2 41/17
Gail [13] 43/22 144/7	45/9 49/11 52/6 54/11
144/7 170/21 199/12	55/13 60/12 66/15 67/16 68/17 69/12
199/19 203/12 248/23	69/20 72/22 73/9 75/2
248/25 279/18 280/25 281/4 297/8	75/4 76/8 82/9 83/23
gained [2] 208/13	86/1 91/5 91/21 100/25
208/14	101/9 101/13 101/20 102/2 102/17 103/5
game [3] 60/4 225/13 225/14	106/11 108/1 109/2
games [1] 263/21	110/12 110/16 111/3
gander [1] 145/4	112/10 112/24 115/1 115/3 116/24 117/10
garbage [6] 160/20	125/7 125/17 126/19
160/23 161/4 248/1 291/14 291/23	126/22 128/8 131/11
garments [1] 227/17	133/5 134/21 135/7
gas [1] 268/5	138/17 140/19 140/23 147/24 148/7 149/1
gastroenterologist [1] 289/25	149/17 150/9 151/23
gastrointestinal [3]	152/9 152/10 153/2
276/25 288/25 292/15	154/2 154/4 155/15 155/19 156/5 158/5
gate [3] 147/22 147/22	160/3 168/14 169/17
226/1 gates [4] 274/3 274/5	171/1 174/1 174/6
281/18 293/19	174/11 174/18 176/10
gathering [3] 101/8	178/13 182/16 182/17 195/13 196/12 200/9
102/1 166/6 gauge [1] 248/22	202/16 203/20 203/21
gave [19] 44/25 101/3	214/13 214/17 214/25
114/15 122/23 122/23	217/15 217/24 219/12
142/8 163/10 186/12	221/8 221/9 221/10 221/17 227/24 229/17
198/16 198/22 214/20 234/8 234/9 255/3	231/20 232/15 233/19
265/19 267/20 285/16	235/3 236/17 238/2
304/3 304/14	238/19 245/6 245/7 245/8 245/21 250/7
<b>general [8]</b> 6/2 21/22 113/18 114/15 154/1	250/8 254/9 254/10
185/17 219/9 245/9	254/13 254/18 255/8
generally [5] 13/25	255/12 255/13 256/4
110/10 150/18 167/17	256/7 256/17 266/8 271/14 274/20 274/22

278/5 279/16 281/17 281/21 283/8 284/5 286/16 287/4 287/18 294/22 294/22 295/5 295/6 295/7 295/9 297/14 297/15 297/16 297/24 307/14 308/6 309/3 313/24 gets [7] 57/24 92/20 112/10 154/4 176/2 246/11 284/5 getting [30] 30/3 45/15 68/22 83/14 93/9 101/7 101/13 101/23 124/7 135/9 137/25 143/22 156/2 157/13 166/7 169/20 198/15 208/9 235/18 245/15 245/16 246/10 269/1 273/12 278/3 279/19 281/2 287/8 287/10 298/2 GI [1] 150/23 gigabytes [1] 65/1 girl [13] 9/3 10/17 12/17 129/24 134/3 144/5 214/8 225/11 271/1 271/1 283/17 283/19 301/15 girl's [2] 104/8 183/14 girls [280] 7/24 8/5 8/10 9/13 10/5 11/16 12/17 17/15 17/24 37/15 43/2 58/23 76/13 76/17 76/22 77/2 78/10 78/14 78/15 84/5 87/1 88/18 88/19 100/19 103/4 103/6 103/9 103/25 106/1 106/25 107/2 108/20 112/12 114/21 116/6 116/18 117/25 121/5 121/8 121/14 121/17 121/18 123/4 123/24 124/4 129/4 134/4 134/24 136/1 137/7 137/7 137/10 143/6 144/6 144/23 145/1 145/7 145/15 149/8 149/10 149/15 149/18 149/24 151/6 151/9 151/11 151/12 154/21 154/22 155/1 155/6 157/1 157/1 157/4 157/19 159/12 159/12 159/19 160/3 160/6 160/13 161/21 162/5 165/25 166/2 166/15 166/17 166/21 172/13 172/15 172/22 173/25 174/9 177/5 180/4 180/20 180/23 180/24 180/25 181/3 181/4 181/13 181/14 181/21 182/13 182/22 182/24 183/2 183/5 183/25 184/4 184/8 184/10 185/9 185/19 185/23 185/24 186/4 186/20 188/4 188/13 189/9 189/10

189/14 189/16 189/18 189/21 189/22 189/25 190/4 190/20 193/18 193/19 194/11 194/14 194/20 194/21 194/25 195/8 196/5 196/7 196/17 197/16 197/20 198/14 200/13 201/5 201/7 201/8 201/9 201/21 201/22 202/19 202/21 203/16 203/22 204/6 204/11 204/17 204/19 204/20 205/4 205/10 205/11 205/13 209/16 210/21 210/21 211/20 211/22 212/15 212/25 213/3 214/4 214/6 214/19 214/21 216/14 217/20 220/23 221/3 221/4 221/11 222/14 222/24 223/2 224/12 225/4 225/12 225/15 225/18 225/20 226/14 226/21 227/6 227/18 228/22 229/1 229/11 230/2 230/21 231/16 231/17 236/16 236/17 241/20 244/16 245/2 246/3 246/4 249/8 249/11 249/11 249/21 250/19 251/6 251/23 252/1 252/5 252/8 252/22 254/8 254/10 254/19 255/2 255/2 255/11 256/9 256/20 257/4 257/7 257/21 258/3 258/4 258/17 260/5 262/15 264/3 264/19 264/21 265/6 266/2 266/19 269/5 269/6 272/17 273/11 275/2 275/12 276/8 277/25 278/2 278/6 278/13 278/15 278/15 278/20 282/12 289/11 291/11 292/1 292/14 293/1 293/20 294/6 294/7 296/6 297/21 299/23 301/1 301/10 301/14 302/4 302/10 303/14 305/3 305/10 305/11 305/19 313/13 girls' [10] 81/23 118/18 135/6 173/16 185/15 185/20 185/21 204/13 225/17 227/16 give [45] 19/17 20/2 22/17 25/13 25/14 36/14 36/19 37/24 63/25 66/2 66/10 66/12 66/17 67/13 67/15 67/24 69/7 75/14 106/20 108/19 116/22 143/20 150/9 155/2 156/13 166/6 180/17 181/5 185/17 199/14 214/22 221/13 241/1 249/18 250/4 255/24

286/13 286/18 286/19 298/5 298/14 310/5 given [25] 22/1 27/3 45/2 61/16 62/9 66/4 73/5 74/21 147/15 150/20 150/22 152/6 155/1 165/25 168/9 196/8 196/15 207/14 213/23 232/1 232/1 232/2 264/10 281/13 311/3 gives [3] 75/10 221/5 248/7 giving [7] 50/12 83/24 155/16 156/12 157/7 184/17 234/12 glad [1] 16/25 glaring [1] 298/14 glasses [3] 138/17 189/8 231/20 glean [1] 191/21 **gloss** [1] 257/3 **go [125]** 4/9 4/15 7/12 7/14 7/16 11/22 12/5 12/23 21/7 32/22 38/10 38/19 48/25 56/18 56/21 56/21 56/21 59/23 59/24 67/11 67/22 68/17 69/17 73/13 73/23 75/12 75/15 81/25 87/14 89/19 90/7 93/7 96/15 98/14 100/14 101/1 101/7 101/14 102/3 104/9 105/18 107/13 110/11 110/16 112/3 112/14 112/25 113/24 115/9 119/5 119/5 119/15 119/16 119/19 123/2 124/14 124/14 127/9 127/15 133/12 133/18 135/8 137/4 138/12 139/14 139/18 140/14 140/23 142/7 142/14 147/5 148/16 148/18 148/19 148/20 153/9 162/6 164/12 169/4 171/17 172/7 176/1 186/19 195/12 196/12 196/13 196/16 196/17 198/9 200/11 217/24 219/1 221/7 221/9 222/25 227/16 229/17 232/16 239/17 239/17 239/19 239/22 240/7 242/22 246/15 261/14 261/15 265/16 267/16 273/21 275/13 276/2 278/16 278/22 280/22 284/6 288/20 289/5 295/12 297/17 300/3 301/7 305/17 308/17 316/21 goal [3] 105/3 128/25 214/10 God [2] 306/11 307/12 goes [25] 21/25 26/10 101/5 101/22 122/6

5250

271/11 278/6 284/11