

**Drew Peterson Trial 2012 - Murder of Kathleen Savio
People of the State of Illinois v. Drew Peterson (09CF-1048)
Will County, Joliet, Illinois**

Kristin Anderson Testified August 8, 2012

**A Personal Collection of Found Materials ("as is")
(Note: This is "not" an official legal court transcript)
(Dialog spacing done below for format and reading ease)**

08/08/12: Defense issues regarding "Hearsay Statements"

In Session

<https://www.facebook.com/InSession>

August 8

WATCH THIS THREAD FOR LIVE UPDATES FROM THE DREW PETERSON MURDER TRIAL

The next witness will be Kristin Anderson.

Prosecutor Glasgow: "She is one of the hearsay statement witnesses that Judge White made a finding to exclude. Her statement is, 'I can kill you and make it look like an accident.'"

Greenberg then notes that Anderson "cannot lay any foundation as to when this statement might have been made by Mr. Peterson... this statement could have been made in 1995, 1996."

As far as the foundational question goes, Judge Burmila finds for the prosecution.

Greenberg then moves to the issue of reliability. "The ruling of Judge White is that these statements are unreliable as to time content and circumstances... and the interests of justice."

Prosecutor Colleen Griffin replies: "In a question of forfeiture by wrongdoing, there is no hearsay problem. The defendant forfeits his right to object on that ground. This very issue has been discussed. Griffin then goes on to cite case law on this issue. "None of the statements that Judge White kept out are facially unreliable... that does not make the statements unreliable under due process."

In Session

Prosecutor Griffin continues to argue why the hearsay statement of Kristin Anderson should be admissible.

"She called the State Police three times directly following the death of Kathleen Savio... we

would ask that Your Honor deny the [defense] motion.”

Judge Burmila then questions the prosecutor about her argument.

Judge: “This case is completely unique; there will never be another case like this in the history of Illinois... Judge White made these findings, and there was a hearing... how do I completely ignore the findings that Judge White made? Do I just make off he didn’t make them? ...He found that some of these statements are unreliable. What do I do with Judge White’s rulings?”

Griffin: “I don’t believe this court has to ignore Judge White’s ruling to find that these statements are not inadmissible under the due process clause.”

At this point, there is a lengthy exchange between prosecutor Griffin and Judge Burmila regarding this issue.

August 8 at 4:25pm · Like · 5

In Session

Judge: “Tell me what the State’s position is on whether Judge White’s rulings were right or wrong. Are you refusing to tell me that?”

Griffin: “I’m saying that it doesn’t matter.”

August 8 at 4:27pm · Like · 5

In Session

The exchange between Judge Burmila and prosecutor Colleen Griffin continues on and on.

Judge: “I’m telling you... the judge made four rulings. You asked him to make the rulings. Can I completely ignore the findings you asked him to make?”

Griffin: “Your Honor can ignore them under the due process rules.”

Glasgow now joins the discussion” “This is an incredibly important ruling in this case... this evidence should have life. Judge White’s rulings are void in this proceeding.”

The judge is very calm, but Glasgow sounds very excited, and quite worked up.

“Judge White’s rulings on this are void...”

Glasgow is now practically yelling, and honestly becoming somewhat shrill. Finally, he concludes his part of the argument.

Glasgow: “Thank you.”

Judge: "You're welcome."

August 8 at 4:40pm · Like · 11

In Session

Attorney Steve Greenberg now argues the defense position in this matter.

"The appellate court was quite clear in saying the forfeiture by wrongdoing did not require this reliability factor. We're not disputing that... the State keeps coming back to this... we keep coming back to this footnote... the State has never been able to give you a reason to ignore Judge White's rulings, nor have they argued that they're incorrect. Because they're not incorrect! ...What more is left? ...the fact is, we have the law on our side on this issue... it's unreliable, Judge. And that can't be changed."

August 8 at 4:46pm · Like · 4

In Session

Prosecutor Griffin briefly responds. But as before, every time she makes an argument, Judge Burmila jumps in and challenges her.

August 8 at 4:49pm · Like · 8

In Session

Judge: "We're in a situation again here where the State believes the court should take into account more than the law... the State has refused on multiple occasions to answer the Court's questions as to whether or not Judge White's rulings can be ignored; all they do is dance around that issue... Judge White made a series of rulings in this case that the State asked him to make. Now the consequences of those rulings are before this Court... the volume of their argument is unpersuasive. The defense, however, says that Judge White's rulings are based in stone... Judge White made those findings during the hearsay ruling, using a lower standard of proof... and he made the decision that these statements should not be admissible... the application of the due process application is a higher standard, a higher burden for the defendant to meet. The questions becomes, do these rulings reach the level of a due process unreliability. While I recognize how unique this is... in this particular situation, I do not believe that I'm bound by Judge Whites' rulings... it has not been demonstrated to me that the witness' statements are unreliable, and the defense's motion to deny them is denied."

August 8 at 4:57pm · Like · 16

In Session

Judge Burmila has called a five minute break prior to the next witness.

August 8 at 4:58pm · Like · 2

08/08/2012: Prosecutor James Glasgow on direct examination

In Session

August 8

WATCH THIS THREAD FOR LIVE UPDATES FROM THE DREW PETERSON MURDER TRIAL

The jurors are now back in the courtroom.

The prosecution calls its next witness: Kristin Anderson (to be questioned by Prosecutor Glasgow).

She went to North Park University in Chicago, and currently lives in Minooka, Illinois.

She is married (for 23 years), and has three children.

“Have you had an opportunity to work with the developmentally disabled?”

Objection/Sustained.

She works in an elementary school, as a reading teacher

In Session

“We used to live in Bolingbrook. My son Christopher was in second grade when he met Tommy Peterson.”

Through the boys, she met Kathleen Savio, and identifies her photo.

“I did meet her occasionally, yes.”

“You were planning on building a new house about this time?”

“Yes.”

“Did you have a conversation with Kathleen Savio about renting her basement?”

“Yes, I did... in the summer of 2003, I kept bumping into her.”

Greenberg interrupts, and asks for a sidebar..

August 8 at 5:20pm · Like · 4

In Session

The sidebar ends.

“You were caught in one of those situations between a contract to build and a contract to sell?”

“Exactly.”

“So you rented Kathleen’s finished basement?”

“Yes, for two months... with my family. We had two cats, and a dog as well.”

“How did you feed your family?”

“I bought my own food, and we fixed our own meals. But many times we ate together at the kitchen table.”

“Your family shared with hers?”

“Yes, we shared it together.”

August 8 at 5:22pm · Like · 8

In Session

“Did you ever meet Drew Peterson?”

“Not while I was living there. I believe I met him once when I dropped Christopher off for a birthday party.”

“Your husband, Steve, what was his work schedule?”

“He was on a night schedule, from 8:00 at night until 8:00 in the morning. He would leave at 7:00 pm, and get home at 9:00, by which time we were all gone.”

“So there was always someone in the house?”

“Yes, there was always someone in the house.”

August 8 at 5:23pm · Like · 5

In Session

During this time, she had an opportunity to watch Kathleen Savio.

She said that Savio had no balance problems, and never bumped into anything.

“Did you see her playing with her kids?”

“Absolutely. She loved her kids.”

“Did you observe her breathing?”

“Yes.”

“She have any problems breathing?”

“Never.” Objection/Sustained.

After the follow-up question also elicits a sustained objection, Glasgow asks for a sidebar.

August 8 at 5:25pm · Like · 4

In Session

The sidebar ends.

“Can you briefly describes how you saw Kathy Savio physically interact with her kids?”

“I observed her hugging her kids.” Objection/Sustained.

“About midway through your stay there, did you have an occasion to meet with Kathleen Savio in her master bedroom?”

“Yes, I did... Kathy seemed just down, her spirit was down.” Objection/Sustained.

This was approximately in “the beginning of October, 2003.”

“Was anyone else present in the bedroom besides Kathy and you?”

“No... I observed Kathy was upset about something, and I felt concern about her. And my faith is of great importance to me.” Objection/Sustained.

“Did she share something with you?”

“Yes, she did...” Objection/Sustained.

At this point, the witness begins to cry, and the judge asks to have the jury excused from the courtroom.

August 8 at 5:28pm · Like · 5

In Session

The witness continues to cry. Judge Burmila asks her to leave the courtroom, in order to compose herself. Once the witness reaches the hallway, I can hear her sobbing in the hall.

In the meantime, the judge has left the bench, and the court is in a brief recess.

August 8 at 5:30pm · Like · 6

In Session

Judge Burmila is back on the bench.

Attorney Greenberg: "There are some things this witness says, like that Kathleen showed her a knife under her pillow, but she doesn't say that was because of Drew . . . that Drew came into the house and stole jewelry, or Tommy's confirmation money . . . I just want to make sure we're not going to get into that."

Glasgow responds, says he does intend to elicit testimony about the knife.

Greenberg objects.

Judge: "If she confided in this individual that she kept a knife under her pillow, I'm going to let it in . . . I'm going to let them ask the question."

August 8 at 5:38pm · Like · 20

In Session

The witness and the jurors return to the courtroom.

Prosecutor Glasgow continues his direct examination:

"When you were in Kathleen's bedroom, did she confide in you an incident that had occurred to you?"

"Yes . . . she told me that prior to us moving there, Drew had broken into her house, dressed in swat uniform, held her at knifepoint, and said, 'I could kill you, and make it look like an accident.'"

"Did she show you something else in her bedroom?"

"Yes . . . she showed me a knife she kept in between her mattresses, for protection."

“Did you see Kathy Savio every day?”

“Yes, I did.”

“Ever see her under the influence of alcohol?” Objection/Sustained.

“Did you ever meet her boyfriend, Steve Maniaci?”

“Yes, twice.”

“Can you tell us what you observed about their interaction?” Objection.

Glasgow asks for a sidebar.

August 8 at 5:42pm · Like · 8

In Session

The sidebar ends.

“Did it take you very long to move?”

“It did not; we had most of our things in storage.”

“What did you have to move?”

“Just our clothing. That’s it.”

“So you were out during the daytime?”

“We were out, yes.”

“After you left on the 25th of November, did you have any contact with Kathy Savio?”

“Only one time, I ran into her at the school where I was working . . . probably two months after I closed on my house . . . that’s the last time I saw her.”

“Recall learning of her death?”

“Yes, I remember hearing about it on the news. And a friend of my son’s, his mother also called me to tell me what happened to Kathy.”

“Did you attend any services?” Objection/Sustained.

Glasgow then asks for another sidebar.

August 8 at 5:44pm · Like · 3

In Session

The sidebar ends.

“Did you have occasion on March 7, 2004 to make a phone call to Mary Pontarelli?”

“Yes . . . to let he know my concern.” Objection/Overruled.

“I shared with her some of the things Kathy had shared with me. I also shared with her my concern about Kathy’s death, and how it happened.” Objection/Overruled.

“Did you have occasion on March 9 to make two phone calls to the Illinois State Police?”

“Yes, I did.”

“And one call the following day?”

“Yes, I did.”

“After making those three contacts and informing them you had information about the break-in and the threat, you heard nothing back?”

“I heard nothing back.”

August 8 at 5:48pm · Like · 7

In Session

“Then, on December 21, 2007, did you have occasion to speak with someone from the Illinois State Police?”

“Yes.”

“Did you tell them about the statement Kathleen Savio made to you in the bedroom?”

“Yes, I did.” Objection/Overruled.

August 8 at 5:48pm · Like · 9

In Session

“You called two different numbers for the State Police?”

“Yes, I did.”

The witness is shown some phone records.

“See the three phone calls that you made?”

“Yes, I do.”

“and the first phone call you made was at 4:34 on March 9?”

“Yes.”

The second call was made at 4:35 on the 9th, and the third call was on the following day.”

This ends the prosecution’s direct examination.

The defense then asks for a sidebar.

August 8 at 5:51pm · Like · 5

08/08/2012: Defense Attorney Joseph Lopez on cross examination

In Session

The sidebar ends.

Attorney Joe Lopez begins his cross.

The witness repeats that she met Savio through their sons, and that she and her family rented the basement apartment between houses.

“You moved into the basement, with your kids, your dog, and your cats?”

“Yes.”

“You lived there for two months?”

“Yes.”

“And you never once saw Drew in that house?”

“Not while I was living there.”

“You also said you had this conversation with her?”

“Yes.”

“When was that conversation?”

“Probably three weeks after we moved in . . . we closed our house mid-September.”

“So when you moved in mid-September, that was sometime the week of September?”

“Approximately.”

August 8 at 5:55pm · Like · 7

In Session

“She told you that Drew had threatened her, and said he would kill her?”

“Yes.”

“And you didn’t move out?”

“No.”

“You stayed, and put your family in harm’s way?”

“No, I didn’t believe my family was in harm’s way.”

“It’s because you didn’t believe her, isn’t it?”

“No, Sir.”

“You did nothing, did you?”

“I stayed there, and I was a good friend.”

“You stayed there, because you didn’t believe her.” Objection/Sustained.

August 8 at 5:58pm · Like · 4

In Session

Anderson says she told her husband about the conversation about a week after it happened.

“Your husband didn’t buy a gun to protect him and your children, did he?”

“No, Sir.”

“You didn’t call law enforcement about this, did you?”

“Who would I call?”

“You didn’t report that statement to anyone other than your husband?”

“That’s true.”

“You didn’t call any type of women’s shelter to come in and intervene?”

“I did not.”

“You did nothing?”

“I was there for her.”

“During the day, she was at that house, as far as you knew?”

“As far as I know . . . when she was there, my husband was sleeping in the basement.”

“Well, sleeping doesn’t help if something happens, does it?”

“No, Sir, it doesn’t.”

“Drew never talked to your husband?”

“No, Sir.”

“Drew never came into the house when your husband was present?”

“That’s correct.”

“You didn’t move until your house was ready?”

“That’s correct.”

August 8 at 6:00pm · Like · 3

In Session

After she moved, she didn’t call or visit Kathy on a daily basis.

“You didn’t do anything, did you?”

“I did. I was there for Kathy . . . it was the first time I went back to work after being home for ten years . . . it was a lot on our plate.”

“So that was more important than your friend’s well-being?”

“No, Sir, that’s not true.”

“But you didn’t call her, did you?”

“No, I didn’t.”

“After you moved out, you didn’t see her until a month later?”

“That’s correct.”

“And she was happier then, wasn’t she?”

“Happier than when I’d last seen her.”

August 8 at 6:02pm · Like · 3

In Session

“You weren’t present in that house at any time on the day that she passed away?”

“No.”

“Eventually, you called the Illinois State Police?”

“Yes.”

“After you talked to Mary Pontarelli?”

“Yes.”

“She gave you the numbers?”

“No, I looked them up in the phone book.”

“You just called the state police, because Mary told you they were investigating this case?”

“No.”

“How did you come to call?”

“Because my heart told me to . . . I was in shock about what had occurred.”

“Any time any friend passes, that’s shocking, isn’t it?”

“But these circumstances are different.”

“Did you feel responsible for her passing, because you moved out of the house?”

“Not at all.”

“Why? Your life is more important than hers?” Objection/Sustained.

“Your family commitments were more important than checking up on her?”

“That’s not true. I prayed for her every day.”

The judge strikes this last response.

August 8 at 6:04pm · Like · 5

In Session

“Just so I understand . . . you only had your clothes at Kathy’s house?”

“Yes, Sir.” “So it only took you a couple of hours to move out?”

“Yes.”

“The State Police came to your house, and you talked to them?”

“That is correct.”

The first time she called the state police, she talked to a female (“I don’t know their name”).

“You didn’t write down the name?”

“No, I didn’t.”

“You talked to them only for a couple of minutes?”

“Yes . . . I introduced myself, and told them that I had lived with Kathy for two months.”

“That’s what you told the grand jury, isn’t it?” Objection/Overruled.

August 8 at 6:12pm · Like · 7

In Session

“When you called the State Police, that call was made at 4:34?”

“Yes.”

“And that call lasted a little over two minutes?”

“Yes.”

“You never mentioned on that call that Kathy was threatened by her husband?”

“No.”

“The second call was on the same day, at 4:35?”

“Yes”

“That call lasted three minutes . . . who did you talk to?”

“I can’t recall the name . . . it was someone different, a male. The first person referred me to the second person. And I shared what Kathy had shared with me, about the SWAT incident. She said it was before I moved in.”

“You don’t know month that was?”

“No.”

August 8 at 6:35pm · Like · 6

In Session

When the witness lived in Savio’s basement, she believed that Drew and Kathy were still going through their divorce.

“She told me that they were in the process of getting a divorced . . . separated, but not married, not living [together] . . . it wasn’t finalized.” Objection/Sustained.

“She never told you at any time that she was legally divorced from Drew Peterson?”

“No, just that she was in the process of getting a divorce.”

“Would it surprise you to know that they were already divorced when you were living there?”

“It wouldn’t divorce me, given that Drew was already living with Stacy.”

August 8 at 6:37pm · Like · 6

In Session

“There was only one incident that she described to you where he came into the house with this SWAT incident?”

“That’s right.”

“And only one incident where he made this threatening incident?”

“Yes.”

August 8 at 6:38pm · Like · 5

In Session

“Is it your testimony that the State Police never came to your house to follow up with you?”

“That is correct . . . they ignored me . . . I was expecting for someone to call me back and question me more about this incident. And no one called . . . no one talked to me with regards to the Kathy Savio case. I believe I was put on hold, and then I left a message . . . no one ever called me back.”

“Did you send a letter to anybody?”

“No, Sir.”

“Did you e-mail anybody?”

“No, Sir.”

“You didn’t do anything in 2005, send any letter in 2005?”

“No, I didn’t.”

“And you did nothing in 2006, either?”

“No one came to talk to me, no.”

“And you didn’t call at all in 2006, did you?”

“In 2006, I did not call.”

August 8 at 6:38pm · Like · 4

In Session

Finally, in 2007, she had a visit from two state police officers.

“You didn’t tell them about the knife, did you?”

“Yes, I did.”

“You know the word ‘knife’ does not appear in that report?”

“I do.”

“Are you accusing the state police of suppressing evidence?”

“I’m accusing them of not writing everything down that I shared.”

“You testified in 2008?”

“Yes.”

“In 2008, you knew the word ‘knife’ wasn’t in there?”

“Yes.”

“Didn’t you want to make the record clear that they got this wrong?”

“I didn’t know that that was my job, to correct them.”

“Well, do you have a job in regards to this investigation?”

“Not at all.”

“Or an agenda?”

“Not at all.”

“And at no time did you mention the SWAT uniform?”

“I mentioned everything that I mentioned today. They did not write everything down. I do not know why . . . they did not include everything that I stated.”

“You’d think that would be in their report, if you reported it?”

The State then asks for a sidebar.

August 8 at 6:38pm · Like · 7

In Session

The sidebar ends.

“Did you know that on October 10, 2003 . . . were you living in Kathy’s house?:”

“Yes.”

“Did you know that she came to this building and the court entered a ruling ending her marriage on that day?”

“No.”

August 8 at 6:38pm · Like · 4

In Session

“During your preparation for the prior hearing and this hearing, you met with the State’s Attorney, and read the reports yourself?”

“Correct.”

“When you had this interview with these two agents from the state police, your husband wasn’t there?”

“He was there; they interviewed us independently.”

“And they were taking notes?”

“I saw them taking notes. There were two of them.”

“And they asked what you knew about Kathleen Savio and her relationship with Drew Peterson?”

“They were asking me questions.”

“And you observed these two officers writing things down on notepads?”

“Correct.”

August 8 at 6:38pm · Like · 4

In Session

The witness is asked about a third interview she had with an ISP special agent.

“I don’t remember her.”

“On October 27, 2008, at approximately 10:00 am?”

“I don’t remember her.”

The witness is shown a copy of the report from third interview.

“That looks familiar, but I don’t remember her . . . I can’t remember that date; I’m sorry.”

She says she has not seen this report prior to today.

“There’s nothing about a knife or SWAT or anything?”

“That’s correct, in what I just read.”

August 8 at 6:38pm · Like · 4

In Session

You also had another conversation on Dec. 7, 2008?”

“I’m not familiar with that date.”

“Remember coming to the State’s Attorney’s office, and meeting with John Connor and Mr. Glasgow?”

“I do remember that.”

“And you stated again about the knife?”

“To the best of my knowledge, I did.”

“This is the first time you see this in a document?”

“I said it every time.”

This ends the cross-examination of this witness.

August 8 at 6:38pm · Like · 6

08/08/2012: Prosecutor James Glasgow on redirect examination

In Session

Prosecutor Glasgow begins his redirect.

“With all these state police reports, you were never asked to sign off on them before they were published?”

“No.”

“And each and every time you told them that he was dressed in a SWAT uniform, and he said he could kill her and make it look like an accident?”

“Yes, I did.”

“What did they question you about on October 27, 2008?”

“I don’t know.”

The witness is then shown a document to refresh her recollection.

“What was the purpose of this interview?” Objection/Overruled.

“I don’t know what the purpose was.”

Glasgow then asks for another sidebar.

August 8 at 6:39pm · Like · 4

In Session

The sidebar ends, and the judge asks the jurors to leave the courtroom.

August 8 at 6:39pm · Like · 3

In Session

The jurors are now gone.

Prosecutor Glasgow says that he would like to ask the witness about why she didn’t call the police in 2007, and that she would say it was because Stacy Peterson was missing.

“I believe they opened the door for that.”

Greenberg says he doesn’t believe that the defense crossed that line.

The judge asks the court reporter to check her notes to see what the defense actually asked.

The judge then leaves the stand, to give the court reporter a chance to find this passage, and the court is in a brief recess.

August 8 at 6:43pm · Like · 8

In Session

Judge Burmila is back on the bench.

The witness is asked to return to the courtroom, and the jurors return as well.

Glasgow states that he has no further questions for this witness.

August 8 at 6:47pm · Like · 5

In Session

The defense also has no further questions for the witness, and she is excused.

Judge Burmila tells the jurors that the trial is now finished for today, and they leave the courtroom.

August 8 at 6:47pm · Like · 6
