

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

**Patrick Collins Testified on 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)**

---

**08/07/12: Defense issues regarding witness Patrick Collins**

---

In Session

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

Before the next witness can be called, the State has some issues it would like to discuss.

The jurors are removed from the courtroom.

Prosecutor Connor says the next witness will be Patrick Collins, and Connor wants to discuss possible hearsay issues regarding this issue.

Attorney Greenberg jumps in, says the hearsay issue here involves Stacy Peterson, and is something that Judge White previously excluded.

“Judge White ruled that there wasn’t going to be any false alibi testimony . . . I don’t know any evidence that has come in that would change the prior ruling on the motion in limine that we presented in 2010.”

August 7 at 5:14pm · Like · 3

---

In Session

Connor also notes that there were computer dispatch calls made by Kathleen Savio in 2002 and 2003 regarding visitation problems.

“Two of them in particular are calls from Kathleen Savio that she might be running a little late . . . some are from the defendant, saying he’d been refused to receive the children. The foundational elements have been stipulated to already. We’re offering them to show the state of mind of Kathleen Savio.”

Greenberg: “I thought her state of mind was irrelevant.”

Judge: “What is relevant about her state of mind?”

Connor says the point is only that Savio documented these exchanges.

Greenberg: "I still don't see what the relevancy is . . . the first is a dispute as to when the children should be returned. The second is that he dropped the kids off 30 minutes late. And the third is that Stacy called her names when the children were dropped off . . . and then she calls the police department to say the kids are sick, and the police should notify Drew that he cannot have his visitation . . . she may be late for her 5:00 pick-up, that she sent Stacy Cales a certified letter warning her to stay away, that she is complaining about the physical condition of the children when they were returned. Then there's a call that she refused to release the children to Drew at 5:00, and then Drew calling in a battery on her. They go up to November of 2003; most of them are in 2002. I don't know what that has to do with anything in this case."

Judge: "The phone calls regarding the transportation of the children will be admissible. The phone calls regarding the name calling will not be admissible."

Greenberg: "These calls are her not returning the children, not Mr. Peterson . . . we didn't think this was coming in because of the prior hearings . . . the last one is the only one dealing with visitation times, and on that one they apparently had a dispute about what time the children were to be returned."

Judge: "The State has to demonstrate whether this was a homicide, regardless of whether Mr. Peterson committed the homicide. So these phone calls are going to be admitted for that."

Connor wants to have a police dispatcher read summaries of what the calls were;

Greenberg complains that the actual calls are not available.

August 7 at 5:23pm · Like · 5

---

In Session

Greenberg insists that the original phone conversations with police dispatch have been destroyed, and all that are left are summaries.

Connor: "Again, it's not offered for the truth of the matter asserted . . . the issue is what was her state of mind when she made her calls? As Your Honor has previously ruled on habit testimony, specific acts of conduct are admissible . . . we're offering it to show she is documenting return and drop-off issues with the Bolingbrook Police Department."

Greenberg: "Again, I just don't understand . . . they have no authority. Do they have a case that says they can do this? . . . how can we cross-examine about what was said? It totally violates everything."

Judge Burmila goes over some of the reports, decides that most are inadmissible.

For three, however, he will allow the State to ask dispatchers if calls were made, but not go into details about them.

August 7 at 5:26pm · Like · 3

---

In Session

The judge and attorneys return to the first issue.

“You want to use the actual words that she told the police?”

“Connor: “Correct, Your Honor . . . basically, his ruling was that we had to approach before we put this on.”

Greenberg: “Yes, that they had to approach the explain the reason for it.”

Judge: “And now you want to use the actual alibi?”

Connor: “Yes.”

Judge: “What is the relevance of what she actually told the police?”

Connor: “Her statement mirrors the defendant’s almost exactly. And there will be testimony about the defendant’s presence during her statement.”

Judge: “Why is this actual statement relevant?”

Connor: “Well, she’s been instructed to lie . . . obviously, if she were to come in and tell the truth and the story she tells is basically unrelated to anything the defendant says, that would be a significant issue.”

Judge: “But is it relevant whether she followed through or not?”

Connor: “As the defendant is sitting with her in this interview, helping her to come up with answers, what those answers are obviously becomes relevant.”

August 7 at 5:30pm · Like · 3

---

In Session

Greenberg: “They have no evidence that this is a false alibi. Absolutely none.”

Judge: “That’s what troubles me.”

Connor: “It’s not just the defendant or Neil Shori, or the defendant’s statement the day before . . . receipts maintained for three years. That was a time frame he wanted an alibi for.”

Greenberg: “Because he has evidence of his alibi it must be false? That’s what I’m hearing.

How can you put in a false alibi that's the truth?"

August 7 at 5:33pm · Like · 3

---

In Session

Judge Burmila makes his ruling: "I'm with you [the State] about 95% . . . I agree it's admissible that the defendant asked for a professional courtesy and wanted to sit in with his wife . . . we don't know if she subsequently lied, just that he asked her to lie. Her statement to the police at this point is inadmissible. If the defendant testifies and it becomes relevant, we'll revisit it."

Connor then asks the defense to look at some phone records he'd like to introduce through the next witness.

Judge: "How long will this next witness be?"

Connor: "At least 45 minutes on direct."

The judge suggests that everyone stay late tonight to finish the direct of Pat Collins . . . but after a conference with the other prosecutors, Connor reports that "we have a shorter witness we could put on."

With that, the judge sends for the jurors.

August 7 at 5:38pm · Like · 3

---

In Session

A new thread will start when the next witness is called.

August 7 at 5:39pm · Like · 5

---

## **08/08/12: More Defense issues regarding witness Patrick Collins**

---

In Session

Prosecutor Connor says there's another issue that might be addressed at this time. But since it doesn't affect the next witness, the judge decides to proceed with the witness at this time. Connor notes that the witness has been instructed not to mention any of Stacy Peterson's statements in his testimony.

Attorney Greenberg says that he has an issue with that plan, but the judge sides with the prosecution on this one.

Connor: "And there was some discussion about alibi documents; we'd be asking this witness if these documents were turned over during this investigation, prior to the search warrant in

2007.”

Judge: “OK.”

Greenberg: “That would be the false alibi.”

Judge: “I don’t know. But if they seized the documents, they’re allowed to show them to a witness.”

August 8 at 10:43am · Like · 4

---

In Session

Brodsky requests a few minutes prior to the next witness, so that the defendant can speak to all of his attorneys at the same time.

“He has something about this witness he wants to tell us.”

Judge: “OK.”

So the trial is on hold for a few minutes to allow the defendant to confer with his attorneys.

August 8 at 10:44am · Like · 3

---

In Session

August 8

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

Judge Burmila is back on the stand.

Attorney Brodsky confirms that the defense had an appropriate chance to talk to the defendant, and the judge asks the prosecution to call its next witness (which will be Pat Collins).

The judge also sends for the jury.

---

**08/08/12: Prosecutor John Connor on direct examination**

---

In Session

The jurors are now back in the courtroom, and the prosecution calls its next witness:

Patrick Collins (questioned by prosecutor Connor).

“I’m unemployed right now. I’m retired from the Illinois State Police.”

He works part time for a security company that transports state witnesses to hospital visits.

He retired from the ISP at the rank of sergeant.

He briefly goes over his history with that organization.

August 8 at 11:00am · Like · 4

---

In Session

By March 2004, he had been in general investigations for approximately three years.

“Prior to March 1, 2004, how many homicide cases that were not traffic related had you investigated?”

“Zero... those investigations were traffic-related. Or, at one time, there was a dead body found along the expressway; the victim had had a heart attack.”

On March 1, 2004, “I received a call from my supervisor, who told me that it appeared that a police officer from Bolingbrook’s wife had been found in a bathtub. It appeared to be accidental.”

“That evening, he used the term ‘accident’ when he talked to you?”

“Yes... I went to the location, 392 Pheasant Chase Drive... I entered the house, and was greeted by two Bolingbrook commanders. They told me all the other state police personnel were up in the bathroom... it was crime scene investigator Bob Deel, and Troop Falat.”

“Did you have command authority over Robert Deel?”

“I had the ability to give him orders, but he was not under my command.”

August 8 at 11:05am · Like · 2

---

In Session

Deel “had arrived before I had arrived. So I was just getting a briefing from him... basically, Deel said it appeared to be an accidental situation.”

This happened approximately ten minutes before the witness arrived on the scene.

“What did you ask Mr. Deel to do with you during that discussion?”

"After meeting Deel and getting a brief summary, I asked, 'Can we walk through the scene of the house, to see if there was any evidence there?'

" It was also a learning experience for me. I asked Deel if there was any evidence that needed to be obtained, and he said no. I asked if there was any sign of a break-in, and Sgt. Deel said no."

The walk around the house lasted "five to seven minutes, walking slowly."

August 8 at 11:11am · Like · 2

---

In Session

"At some point later, did you assist with the removal of the body out of the house?"

"Yes... prior to me assisting removing the body, I went back in the bathroom to look at he body one more time. At which time I observed a gash on the back of her head. I asked Deel how did Kathleen Savio receive that gash, and he said possibly it was from a slip in the tub. That was a concern of mine. After that, the deputy coroner [and] Deel had placed the body in a body bag... I assisted in taking the body out of the building."

"Did you bounce the body against anything when you were taking the body out?"

"No, I did not."

August 8 at 11:12am · Like · 4

---

In Session

The witness says that he told the Bolingbrook police officers who were present that "eventually I'd have to talk to Drew. They said OK."

He then went to neighbor Steve Carcerano's home, to conduct interviews.

"I arrived at the house between 1:00 and 1:15 in the morning... they [the interviews] had to start approximately 2:00-ish in the morning."

"Those interviews took some length of time?"

"Yes... to see if somebody knew something, or had possibly heard something."

Once the interviews were completed, "I went outside, and someone informed one of the commanders that we needed to speak to Drew at that time... the interview with Drew Peterson was at the Bolingbrook Police Department."

"And that began at approximately 6:00 in the morning?"

“Yes.”

August 8 at 11:14am · Like · 2

---

In Session

“I think I initially told Falat that I wanted to do the interview at the house [Drew’s house]. Falat objected... and we agreed to do it at the Bolingbrook Police Department.”

“When you arrived at the Bolingbrook P.D., where did you set up for the interview?”

“They had interview rooms that we utilized.”

“When you began the interview, who was present?”

“Myself, Trooper Falat, and Mr. Drew Peterson.”

The witness then identifies the defendant in the courtroom.

August 8 at 11:16am · Like

---

In Session

The witness says he began the interview by asking Peterson if he knew why he was interviewed (he said yes).

“I asked him how his relationship with Kathy was going; he said pretty good, despite the fact that they were in the final stages of their divorce... as part of his divorce at that time, the divorce would allow Drew to remarry, and Kathy to remarry.”

“Did the defendant indicate anything to you about where the divorce was at?”

“He said the divorce was going along fine despite the facts that the financial aspects of the divorce hadn’t been finalized.”

“Did he explain anything to you about the house?”

“I asked Drew, ‘Well, how would you benefit from the death of Kathy Savio?’”

Drew responded that he and Kathy had joint custody of the house, which was paid off and worth about \$300,000... he said he would received half.

And then he said, ‘Oh, I guess now I’ll get the whole value of the house.’”

August 8 at 11:21am · Like · 6



---

In Session

“He stated he would not benefit from any insurance policy, because she had changed the paperwork and left that as a trust to the kids.”

“So the insurance policy was going to the children?”

“Yes, he did.”

“Did you ask him about the last time he spoke to Kathy?”

“The last time he picked up the kids, it was Friday, at about 5:00 pm.... Kathy indicated to Drew that she had made plans for the weekend, but didn’t indicate anything in particular.”

“He indicated to you the last time he saw or spoke to her was on Friday?”

“At 5:00, when he picked up the kids. He said she appeared to be fine physically, and also mentally.”

“Did you ask him if Kathy might have contemplated suicide?” Objection/Overruled.

“He said no way. He could never see her living without the kids.”

“Did you ask about any medications?”

“He informed me that she was on some kind of antidepressant... because of the stress of the divorce, because she had a feeling of being abandoned, and in her childhood she had incidents in which she was molested and physically abused.”

August 8 at 11:24am · Like · 3

---

In Session

“I asked Drew to describe the events of that particular weekend... Saturday was the day he hung out with the kids, and did normal family things. Just spent time around the house... nothing in particular.”

“Did he indicate anything about Saturday night?”

“Saturday night... I’d have to reflect back to my report on that one.”

The witness is shown a copy of his report relating to his interview of the defendant.

“Saturday night he was still with the kids... he just spent the day with the kids on Saturday.”

August 8 at 11:26am · Like · 2

---

In Session

“On Sunday, Drew had told me they planned to go to the Shedd Aquarium. He went to Krispy Kreme; he returned home, and his wife [Stacy] made breakfast. At 11:00 they left, and headed to the Shedd Aquarium... Drew stated to me they returned at approximately 4:15 pm; he liked to be prepared for work by 5:00 pm. He didn't have to go to work that day until 5:30... he arrived home, he attempted to take the kids back. He went to work at 5:30, and returned home around dinner time, at which time he attempted to return the kids. That led to negative results, because no one answered the bell or answered the phone. The kids rang the bell as he attempted to call on his phone... when he got no response, he returned home, returned the kids to his residence, and proceeded to go back to work.”

According to this witness, Drew told him that he realized it was a three-day weekend, and he thought perhaps Kathy and her boyfriend had gone off for an extra day.

August 8 at 11:29am · Like · 3

---

In Session

“On Monday, he woke up, and made several attempts to contact Kathy, with negative results.”

“Did he indicate that at some point he went to one of Kathy's neighbors?”

“When he went down to the location, he went to a neighbor, Mary Pontarelli, and he asked Mary when was the last time she saw Kathy. She indicated she has saw [sic] Kath on Saturday afternoon.”

“That's information the defendant provided to you on the morning of March 2?”

“Yes.”

“Did he give you any time at which he went to Mary Pontarelli's house?”

“It was approximately 7:00 pm.”

“What happened after that?”

“He said he was somewhat concerned, and he was thinking about contacting a locksmith.”

Once again, the witness asks to see a copy of his report, with which he is provided.

August 8 at 11:36am · Like · 2

---

In Session

“He had mentioned to Mary that if he had not heard from Kathy by Tuesday, he would contact a locksmith. Then, at approximately 9:45 pm, Mary’s son had contacted Kathy’s boyfriend...”  
Objection/Sustained.

“When it was known that an individual had spoken to Kathy’s boyfriend, then Mary told Drew to call the locksmith... he contacted a locksmith, who arrived, gained entrance to the house, at which time the neighbors went into the house.”

“Did the defendant tell you where he was?”

“Drew indicated to me that he remained outside... Mary Pontarelli, Thomas Pontarelli, and Steve Carcerano entered the house. Several moments later, Drew said he heard a scream. He proceeded in the house, upstairs to the bathroom... he saw the body of his ex-wife, lifeless.”

August 8 at 11:36am · Like · 2

---

In Session

“Drew advised me that at that time he panicked.”

“Did he indicate how long he remained on the scene, or what he did after that?”

“No.”

“Was there ever an occasion when you spoke to him again?”

“Yes, I advised Drew that we would have to speak to his wife.”

“After you spoke to him at Bolingbrook that morning?”

“Can’t recall.”

“What did he indicate?”

“He just said contact him and let him know.”

“Did you subsequently make arrangements to speak to Stacy Peterson after that?”

“Yes... I contacted Mr. Drew Peterson, asked him what would be a good time to talk to his wife. We agreed on a time, and I went to his residence.”

“So that took place in a house, not in a police station?”

“Yes, yes.”

“When you went to that residence, could you describe what happened when you arrived?”

“I went to the residence, at 6 Pheasant Chase Drive, rang the bell. The door was opened by Mr. Drew Peterson... he knew what he was there for... then Drew instructed one of the older kids to take the kids, because he had to take care of some business. Drew directed us down to the basement. On our way down, Drew asked me personally, said Stacy was real nervous, and asked me if he could sit in on the interview, as a professional courtesy.”

“He made that request to you. Was that in Trooper Falat’s presence?”

“Trooper Falat should have been there... [but] that was more directed to me.”

August 8 at 11:42am · Like · 4

---

In Session

“His basement was finished; it was a pretty nice basement. He had set an area where four chairs were set up, to conduct the interview.”

“What type of chairs were they?”

“Card table chairs... myself and Trooper Falat were facing [the Petersons]; Stacy and Drew Peterson’s chairs were very close... he sat very close to Stacy as we proceeded to ask her questions.”

“What did you observe of the defendant during the course of that interview?”

“Drew was sitting very close to Stacy, as to be in a supportive mood... he had his hand on her leg, and his arm around her. I guessed that was to give her moral support.”

“Did the defendant help answer any questions?”

“There was one particular question when he did, when he had to refresh her memory... I asked the question...”

Before Collins can continue, attorney Greenberg asks for a sidebar.

August 8 at 11:43am · Like · 2

---

In Session

The sidebar ends.

Connor: “Can you describe how the defendant helped answer her question?”

“He leaned over and said, ‘You remember what you cooked for breakfast that morning’... [and started naming] what was prepared for breakfast... Drew had a mannerism, when you ask him a question he would kind of lean and kind of rub his eyes.”

“Were there any other things you observed that the defendant did during the interview of Stacy Peterson?”

“No, not as much as leaning over to her, kind of supportive.”

“Allowing one witness to sit in on the interview of another, was that something you’d ever done in an investigation before that?”

“No.”

“Ever do it after that?”

“Initially, no.”

“What happened at the end of that interview?”

“As it was being conducted, she became very upset, very shaken, and started to cry... after we got the information we wanted, we kind of shut the interview down.”

“The more upset she got, the closer you got to finishing?”

“Right.”

August 8 at 11:47am · Like · 4

---

### In Session

In 2004, the witness was appointed to be a grand jury investigator in this case. In that capacity, he requested some phone records.

“Which individuals did you receive phone records back from?”

“Kathy Savio, and I can’t recall all of them... we subpoenaed everyone’s records.”

“Did you receive any records back from Drew Peterson?”

“Some records we received late, yes.”

“But did you ever receive any calls just relating to Drew Peterson’s cell phone or land line?”

“I can’t recall.”

August 8 at 11:48am · Like · 2

---

In Session

ISP special agent Herb Hardy (?) conducted follow-up interviews of Savio's neighbors.

"Did he have anything else to do with the investigation, other than that neighborhood canvas?"

"No."

August 8 at 11:50am · Like · 2

---

In Session

"At some point during your investigation, was there a discussion of whether or not to speak to the defendant's children?"

"Yes... that discussion was brought up in the office." Objection/Overruled.

"That was a matter taken up with one of my supervisors, to inquire whether we should interview Drew Peterson's kids. I was instructed to wait to see how the investigation was going before we had to get the kids involved."

"Did you obtain records from the Bolingbrook P.D. regarding dispatch calls?"

"Yes."

"Did they reflect calls to the department from the defendant regarding visitation?"

"I can't remember every one that I reviewed."

The witness is shown the pertinent records to refresh his memory.

"Do you recognize that document?"

"Yes... it indicates a dispatch at 6:29 pm."

"And that refers to Kathleen Savio not releasing the children to him?"

"Yes."

"What date is on that document, as to when the call was received?"

"6/25/2002."

August 8 at 11:57am · Like · 2

---

In Session

Another dispatch/call record is handed to the witness.

“It was 7/11/2002, at 5:22 pm.”

“And there’s an indication that it had to do with visitation?”

“Yes.”

Yet another record is given to the witness.

“This call was received on 12/05/02, at 9:12 pm... ‘refused visitation,’ Kathy Peterson refused visitation. Drew Peterson is the caller.”

August 8 at 11:58am · Like · 2

---

In Session

“After the day you met with the defendant and Stacy Peterson, did you or Trooper Falat ever have occasion to interview Stacy Peterson again?”

“No.”

August 8 at 11:59am · Like · 3

---

In Session

The State apparently needs a minute before it can continue, so Judge Burmila decides to take “a quick break” at this time.

He excuses the jurors from the courtroom.

August 8 at 12:02pm · Like · 2

---

In Session

The jurors and witness have now left the courtroom.

Judge Burmila announces that we’re in “a brief recess,” and leaves the bench.

August 8 at 12:02pm · Like · 2

---

In Session

August 8

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

The jurors and the witness have returned to the courtroom. Prosecutor Connor resumes his direct examination.

“Did you attend the autopsy of Kathleen Savio in 2004?”

“No.”

“Did you conduct some follow-up interviews with the medical technicians who handled her body that night?”

“As part of the follow-up investigation, yes.”

“You did not ask for the phone records until April, 2004?”

“Yes.”

“And received them sometime after that?”

“Yes.”

---

In Session

“After you received those phone records, were there any follow-up interviews regarding those phone records?”

“That I personally conducted, no.”

August 8 at 12:35pm · Like · 2

---

In Session

The witness is handed some of the phone records in question.

“Is there anything on that document that gives you an idea of when you received it?”

“Yes, it’s a FAX... 5/17/2004, at 12:18 pm.”

“Whose records were received, based on that exhibit?”



"Kathleen S. Peterson... work number and home number."

"Which number did you subpoena records for?"

"A mobile telephone number" (he reads the number aloud).

The witness is then handed another phone record, which has a highlighted call at 2/27/04, at 6:09 pm.

"During the course of your investigation, did you determine that phone number was Drew Peterson's cell phone number?"

"Yes."

"And that call was placed from the cell phone of Kathleen Savio to the cell phone of Drew Peterson?"

"Yes."

"So you received a record on May 14, 2004, that reflected a phone call from the cell of Kathleen Savio to the cell phone of Drew Peterson on Friday?"

"Yes . . . that question was asked at the time of the initial interview of Drew Peterson."

"And you never went back and asked about this?"

"No..."

August 8 at 12:35pm · Edited · Like · 3

---

In Session

The witness is handed some additional documents. Objection/Overruled.

"Have you ever seen this document before?"

"No."

"Was it ever given to you in 2004 by the defendant?" Objection/Sustained.

The witness is then handed the second document.

"Do you recognize that document at all?"

"No."

“Never seen it before?”

“No.”

The witness also says he has never seen the third of the three documents.”

“In 2004, did the defendant give you any documents in the course of your investigation?”

“No.”

“At some point, did you provide information to the State’s Attorney’s office, in order to figure out how to proceed with your investigation?”

“Yes.”

“Recall how you were able to close this file out?”

“I took this file to the Will County State’s Attorney’s Office... a couple weeks later I gave them a call, and they advised me that I had permission to close out the case.”

(Note: This was during the tenure of the former Will Co. State’s Attorney, not James Glasgow.)

“I asked you about the early morning hours of March 2, when you interviewed the neighbors... were there any subsequent interviews with those particular individuals?”

“Myself, no, personally. Some of my co-workers might have interviewed some of those.”

“Did you or Trooper Falat ever speak to either of the children the defendant had with Kathleen Savio?”

“No.”

“Were they ever asked to be taken to the child advocacy center?” Objection/Sustained.

August 8 at 12:35pm · Like · 3

---

In Session

“When you interviewed the first responders, the paramedics, did you show them photographs of the scene?”

“Me, personally, no.”

That ends the direct examination of this witness.

August 8 at 12:35pm · Like · 3

---

## 08/08/12: Defense Attorney Joel Brodsky on cross examination

---

In Session

Attorney Brodsky begins his cross-examination.

The witness says he's been retired since May of 2008.

"That just means you're not working for the Illinois State Police anymore?"

"Right."

"You're still active in your field?"

"Somewhat, yes."

He worked for the ISP for "28 years, six months... that's when we can retire with benefits."

The witness confirms he graduated from the University of Wisconsin, with a degree in Education.

"Your first assignment as an investigator was doing what?"

"The drug unit."

"Drug investigations?"

"Yes, Sir... drug buys, drug conspiracies."

"Would you do undercover work?"

"Yes, Sir."

"And you'd build cases?"

"Yes, Sir."

"That's where you started learning how to become an investigator?"

"Yes, Sir."

"You took all the courses in investigations?"

"The ones that were assigned, yes, Sir."

"And you had to take proficiency exams?"

"We took tests for several things."

“And you passed them?”

“Yes, Sir.”

August 8 at 12:37pm · Like · 2

---

In Session

The witness continues to be questioned about his work in the Illinois State Police. He went from drug investigations to gaming investigations to general investigations.

“Over your career, you’ve kind of developed a sixth sense?”

“That’s kind of up to the investigator... at times.”

“That’s something that helps you in investigating whatever you’re assigned to look into?”

“Yes.”

“You investigated some vehicular homicides?”

“I assisted in several.”

August 8 at 12:40pm · Like · 2

---

In Session

“You did investigations in shootings, correct?”

“Yes.”

“Burglaries, forgeries, all that kind of stuff?”

“Some... not all that you just mentioned.”

“Remember being sworn before the grand jury in this case, on July 10, 2008?”

“Yes.”

“You were sworn to tell the truth, and you did, in fact, tell the truth to the grand jury?”

“Yes.”

At this point, the attorneys approach the bench for a sidebar.

In Session

The sidebar has now ended.

“In your general investigations, did you investigate forgery cases?”

“It’s possible; I can’t recall.”

“How about burglary cases?”

“Possible; I can’t recall.”

“Identity thefts?”

“Yes.”

“Vehicular thefts?”

“I can’t recall.”

Brodsky then reads from the witness’ grand jury testimony, where he was asked about what kinds of investigations he had participated in during his career.

“So you did do vehicular homicides, and burglaries, and forgeries?”

“That’s the kind of cases the unit would get assigned all the time, not necessarily me, personally... I could have assisted; I don’t remember.”

“You’ve been interviewed by the State’s Attorney’s Office in this case?”

“I’ve talked to them.”

“How many times since 2008?”

“Probably five to six times.”

“When was the last time?”

“Yesterday.”

“And you went over all your testimony?”

“NO.”

“Go over your reports with them?”

“Some.”

“When was the last time before yesterday?”

“Monday.”

“So twice in the same week?”

“Yes.”

August 8 at 12:46pm · Like · 3

---

In Session

“In his interview, you asked Mr. Peterson if he was going to benefit from Kathleen Savio’s death?”

“Yes.”

“And he said he was going to benefit from half of the house, which was worth \$300,000?”

“Yes.”

“And you took that to mean he was going to benefit by one half, \$150,000?”

“Yes.”

Once again, the witness is asked about his previous testimony, in which he indicted that Peterson “never stated anything like that.”

“Remember being asked that question and giving that answer?”

“Yes.”

August 8 at 12:48pm · Like · 2

---

In Session

When he arrived at the Savio house, the defendant was not present.

“I briefly spoke to the two Bolingbrook commanders... and then I proceeded upstairs.”

“That’s when you talked to CSI Deel?”

“Yes, Sir.”

“And he led you around the house, and showed you where he had taken pictures?”

“Yes, Sir.”

“And he gave you his impressions?”

“Upstairs, yes.”

“He said it appeared to be an accident?”

“He said it appeared to be an accident; that’s what he stated.”

“Nothing to indicate any foul play?”

“That’s correct.”

“And that’s what investigators do, start exchanging theories?”

“I asked for his opinion, yes.”

“So him saying it’s an accident is just part of the investigative procedure?”

“Yes, Sir.”

August 8 at 12:52pm · Like · 2

---

In Session

“When he said it was an accident, you were still investigating?”

“Yes.”

“So you still had an open mind?”

“I didn’t close the door completely... I was still conducting the investigation, with that sixth sense you said I should have.”

At this last comment, there is a chuckle throughout the courtroom.

August 8 at 12:52pm · Like · 3

---

In Session

“You noticed at some point a laceration on the back of Kathleen Savio’s head?”

“Yes, Sir... that was before the body was moved... I looked, observed the body, and I could see the back of the head... I did see the laceration at the back of her head, that was matted with blood.”

“Did you have to kneel on the side of the tub to see that?”

“No.”

He repeats that Savio’s hair was matted with blood around the laceration.

“I asked him how the laceration occurred. He gave me a statement.”

“But that was just his opinion?”

“Yes.”

“You didn’t see any blood spatter, or anything out of place, did you?”

“No... I asked Sgt. Deel if there were any struggle marks... I didn’t see anything out of the ordinary.”

“Nothing that would indicate she’d been in a fight, or a serious struggle?”

“No.”

“You didn’t see any sign of forced entry?”

“That was one of my main concerns, yes... there was nothing at that particular time in disarray.”

August 8 at 12:56pm · Like · 3

---

In Session

He told the Bolingbrook police commanders who were at the scene “that I would have to talk to Drew eventually.”

“Because you were still investigating?”

“Yes, Sir.”

“That’s just common sense?”

“Yes, Sir.”

“The commanders told you that Drew had gone home?”



“They didn’t get into details... they didn’t say he was at home, or in the station, or anything like that.”

Once again, Brodsky refers back to the witness’ grand jury testimony, which indicates that the commander had sent Peterson home.

“So they told you Drew was at his house... but you decided you wanted to interview Drew at the police station?”

“I assumed that we would interview Drew at the house. Trooper Falat said that wouldn’t be a good idea... we had a discussion, and we agreed to have Drew interviewed at the Bolingbrook Police Department.”

August 8 at 12:59pm · Like · 2

---

In Session

Judge Burmila decides that this would be an appropriate place to break, since the jurors’ lunch is almost here.

“We’ll be in recess then until 1:30.”

The judge leaves the bench, and the trial is in recess until 1:30 CT/2:30 ET.

August 8 at 1:01pm · Like · 1

---

In Session

August 8

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

The courtroom doors have opened, and people are going in to the Peterson courtroom.

The trial should be resuming before too long.

---

In Session

Judge Burmila has returned to the bench.

The parties are ready to proceed, so the judge sends for the witness and the jury.

Attorney Greenberg reminds the Court that there may be some issues that need to be discussed prior to the next witness.

August 8 at 2:37pm · Like · 2

---

In Session

The jurors are now back inside the courtroom, and attorney Joel Brodsky resumes his cross-examination of witness Patrick Collins.

“In this case, you interviewed a number of people in addition to Drew Peterson?”

“Yes.”

“You interviewed Thomas Pontarelli, Mary Pontarelli, and Steve Carcerano?”

“Yes, Sir.”

“That was not problematic, your interviewing them in a basement?”

“NO.”

“And later on, you interviewed the EMTs, the paramedics?”

“They were interviewed... I did not do all the interviews of the EMTs.”

“But you did at least one?”

“Yes.”

“Where did you interview him?”

“I cannot recall.”

He also interviewed locksmith Robert Akin. The witness clarifies, however, that he did not interview every person in this case, and that other agents handled some of these interviews.

August 8 at 2:45pm · Like · 6

---

In Session

Collins repeats that Peterson has “mannerisms” when he was being interviewed.

“It was something that I noticed on several occasions.”

“It was just you and him in that interview room?”

“And Trooper Falat.”

“This is a very significant part of your story, the interview and all of the mannerisms?”  
Objection/Sustained.

“That mannerism was observed at another time, also. That’s what made me reflect on it.”

August 8 at 2:50pm · Like · 4

---

In Session

In 2008, when he testified at the grand jury, the witness acknowledges his memory was probably better than it is today.

August 8 at 2:50pm · Edited · Like · 2

---

In Session

“You asked Drew if he had spent the entire weekend with his kids, or ever left them for any period of time, and he said no?”

“That’s correct.”

“You know he had two boys, and also a newborn baby?”

“Yes.”

“And he said he was with them all weekend?”

“Yes.”

“At 10:00 on Sunday, he went out to Krispy Kreme?”

“Yes.”

“Then the family had breakfast, after which they went to the Shedd Aquarium?”

“Yes.”

“That’s a place with video cameras all over the place?”

“Yes.”

August 8 at 2:52pm · Like · 4

---

In Session

“He told you he went to return the children at the allotted time, but got no response?”

“Yes... he attempted to contact her.”

“And then he realized this was a three-day weekend?”

“He mentioned that, yes.”

“And so he talked about what happened the next day, when he tried to return the children on Monday night?”

“Yes... he generalized that he was the kids, having fun; he didn’t give details.”

“He was home with everybody?”

“He said he was home, doing normal stuff with the kids, hanging out with them.”

“He brought the kids back at 7:00?”

“He attempted to take the kids back to Kathy’s at 7:00.”

“And when he couldn’t get a hold of her, he went to see the next door neighbor, Mary Pontarelli?”

“Yes.”

“He tells Mary he’s going to get a locksmith and go in on Tuesday if nobody can get a hold of Kathy?”

“Yes.”

“And then he told you that Mary’s son, Nick, got a hold of Steve Mariaci, and found out Kathy wasn’t with her boyfriend?”

“Yes.”

“So it wasn’t Drew’s idea to go in on Monday night?”

“Drew originally mentioned the locksmith for Tuesday... for that particular night [Monday], Mary is the one who suggested the locksmith.”

August 8 at 2:57pm · Like · 2

---

In Session

“You’re asking these questions because you’re still conducting this investigation with an open

mind?"

"Yes."

"How long did you spend with him, a little bit over an hour?"

"Yes."

"You weren't rushed; you had all the time you needed?"

"Yes."

"He didn't say he needed to get a lawyer?"

"No."

August 8 at 2:59pm · Like · 3

---

In Session

"There were some phone records, about a call from Kathy to Drew at 6:00 on Friday?"

"Yes."

The witness is shown a T-Mobile cell phone record that reflects this call at 6:08 pm.

"We don't know if T-Mobile is on Eastern Time, or Mountain Time?"

"No."

"But just assuming this is Central Time, there's no indication that Drew ever received that phone call?"

"No."

"Or ever answered that call?"

"No."

"We don't know if it even connected?"

"No."

August 8 at 3:00pm · Like · 6

---

In Session

“Now, we talk about the interview of Drew’s wife... that occurred at Drew’s house?”

“Yes.”

“When you arrived at Mr. Peterson’s house to interview her, you explained why you were there?”

“Yes, we had made an agreement on the time... he understood from previous phone calls that we had set up a time to interview Stacy.”

“You showed up, and explained you were there for the interview?”

“Did I use those words that day, Mr. Brodsky? I don’ t know.”

August 8 at 3:04pm · Like · 4

---

In Session

“At that time, Drew asked you if he could be present?”

“He said could he sit in, because she was real shaken, real afraid, and was aware of the tragedy that had happened with Kathy, because she was going to have to take on some new responsibility.”

“The term ‘professional courtesy’ is yours?”

“He used the words ‘a little professionalism.’”

“He was holding the baby in his arms while the interview was going on?”

“I can’t remember if he was or Stacy was... but the baby was there.”

“This young woman now had a total of four children she was responsible for. That was a big shock to her?”

“Yes.”

“It was very emotional to her that she now had all this extra responsibility?”

“Yes.” Objection.

The prosecution asks for a sidebar.

August 8 at 3:05pm · Like · 3

---

In Session

The sidebar ends.

“Everything that Drew told you about the reasons he wanted to be present, they were all true?” Objection/Overruled.

“Yes.”

“Drew’s presence was nothing more than that of a concerned husband?”

“Support.”

“And you stated that Mr. Peterson helped Stacy answer just one question?”

“The one that was asked of me by the State’s Attorneys, yes.”

“The fact that Mr. Peterson helped Stacy answer a question, that’s not indicated in any of your reports?”

“You don’t always write things verbatim. It brings back your memory.”

“Isn’t it true that the report is not just for your recollection? Others rely on them?”

“Yes... if I read my report, I can reflect back in far more detail.”

“What if you’re not available? That’s a purpose of a report?”

“Yes.”

August 8 at 3:09pm · Like · 3

---

In Session

“You also interviewed Kathy’s boyfriend, Mr. Maniaci, and he accounted for his time over the weekend?” Objection/Sustained.

“After his interview, you checked out some of the things he told you?”

“I can’t recall right now.”

“But information he gave you was checked out?”

“Yes, Sir... his alibi was clean.”

“You also got the autopsy inquest, and put that in your file?”

“Yes.”

“And the phone records?”

“I subpoenaed the records; I did not receive all of the records at the same time.”

“And all this information was the package that you took over to the State’s Attorney’s office and gave them your review?”

“Yes.”

August 8 at 3:13pm · Like · 3

---

In Session

The witness repeats that he interviewed Savio’s boyfriend.

“Did you ask him if Kathy complained about Drew Peterson showing up in her house, unannounced?” Objection/Sustained.

“It’s true that nobody told you...” Objection/Sustained.

August 8 at 3:13pm · Like · 2

---

In Session

“By the way, you never heard from the Savios, any of Kathy’s family?” Objection/Overruled.

“No.”

“They never came to the death scene while you were there?”

“No.”

“They never reached out to you?”

“Correct.”

“You never got any indication from any of these people that Kathy Savio was afraid of Drew Peterson?” Objection/Sustained.

August 8 at 3:15pm · Like · 2

---

In Session



The witness repeats that needed to update his case file, and so he contacted the Will County State's Attorney's Office.

"They told me it could be closed out... they said, 'You can close it.'"

August 8 at 3:15pm · Like · 3

---

In Session

Once again, the witness is asked about the three dispatch call records in this case.

"These are all from incidents that occurred in 2002?"

"Yes."

"And when you interviewed Mr. Peterson, he said they were getting along much better in 2002?"

"Yes."

"And that was confirmed by the Pontarellis, and Mr. Carcerano?"

"Yes."

August 8 at 3:18pm · Like · 3

---

In Session

"Just to know, your report of the interview with Stacy Peterson... according to your report, Drew was present, correct?"

"It's not my report, it's Trooper Falat's report. I was present during the interview."

"You agree it's not in the report of the interview of Stacy Peterson that Drew Peterson was present?"

"I'd have to look at it."

The witness is shown the report.

"Again, this report was written by Trooper Falat, not myself... no, it's not in there."

"You reviewed and initialed the report that leaves out that Drew was present when Stacy was interviewed?"

"Yes."

August 8 at 3:23pm · Like · 3

---

In Session

“Did you check out Drew’s work schedule for Sunday, February 29, 2004?”

“Did I personally? No.”

“Did anybody?”

“Not that I recall... what the schedule reflects, I can’t attest to. But that schedule was retained at a later date.”

Brodsky attempts to show the defendant’s work records to the witness.

The prosecution, however, objects, and asks for a sidebar.

August 8 at 3:23pm · Like · 5

---

In Session

The sidebar ends.

The witness is shown the defendant’s work records.

“This was not attained during the Kathy Savio investigation.”

“Did you ever learn that Mr. Peterson did not work on Sunday night, February 29, 2004?”

“No.”

“Even though your report states that does?”

“The report reflects what he told me.”

This ends the cross-examination of this witness.

The judge then calls the attorneys to a sidebar.

August 8 at 3:31pm · Like · 5

---

In Session

The prosecution has asked for a few minutes prior to the beginning of its redirect.

The judge excuses the jury.

Judge: "We'll take a few minutes, everyone."

Judge Burmila leaves the bench, and the trial is in recess.

August 8 at 3:31pm · Like · 7

---

---

## **08/08/12: Prosecutor John Connor on redirect examination**

---

---

In Session

August 8

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

The judge is back on the bench.

Connor makes an argument that the defense has opened the door to additional records that the judge had previously ruled inadmissible. Brodsky disagrees.

Judge: "I think the State's observation is an acute one... but I think those records are prejudicial, and so I'm not going to let them in. But you want to be careful in the future where you tread, counsel."

With that, Judge Burmila sends for the jury.

---

---

In Session

The witness is back on the stand, and the jurors have returned to the courtroom.

Prosecutor Connor begins his redirect examination.

"Opposing counsel asked you some questions about your pension..." Objection/Sustained.

"Can you remember what the defendant told you about his pension?" Objection/Overruled.

"He did not mention anything about his pension."

"Did he mention anything about his child support obligations?"

"He did not mention that at all, either."

"What about maintenance payments?"

“They were not mentioned at all.”

Connor then asks for a sidebar.

August 8 at 3:42pm · Like · 3

---

In Session

The sidebar is now over.

“Counsel asked you some questions about your conclusions you reached being on the scene on March 2, 2004. You indicated in your answer you didn’t close the door completely on the issue of homicide?”

“Yes.”

“But the conclusion of accident was reached rather quickly when you met up with Trooper Deel and Trooper Falat?” Objection/Sustained.

“Did you ever reach a conclusion which you shared with someone?”

“Yes.”

Connor then tries to hand the witness a document.

But Judge Burmila instead sends the jurors from the courtroom.

August 8 at 3:45pm · Like · 3

---

In Session

The jurors and the witness have now left the courtroom.

Judge: “What’s the relevance of this document?”

Connor says that this is just to confirm the witness’ conclusion.

Judge: “Are you impeaching your own witness?”

Brodksy jumps in: “It’s like a leading question... I think the manner should be dropped.”

Judge Burmila says he doesn’t see the relevance of this question, and the witness and the jurors return to the courtroom.

August 8 at 3:50pm · Like · 2

---

In Session

Connor continues his redirect:

“Can you tell the jury the exact day you interviewed Stacy Peterson?”

“No.”

“Is there anything that would refresh your recollection?”

“A copy of the report... she was interviewed on March 3, 2004.”

“One day after you interviewed the defendant?”

“Yes.”

August 8 at 3:51pm · Like · 5

---

In Session

“You indicated the defendant told you the financial aspects of the divorce were still uncertain?”

“Yes, he said they were still summarizing the financial part of the divorce.”

“At that house that night, did you check the windows?”

“No, not personally.”

“Did you ever contact any of Kathleen Peterson’s family members?”

“No.”

“Did you ask him who Kathleen Peterson’s divorce attorney was, so you could talk to him?”

“No”

“Did you subsequently talk to Kathleen Peterson’s divorce attorney?”

“I received a call from him, yes.”

August 8 at 3:54pm · Like · 6

---

In Session

“Were the other interviews that were conducted, did anyone else ever sit in on those

interviews?”

“No.”

“You were asked what the defendant explained to you what his reasons were for wanting to sit in on Stacy’s interview . . . did you ever attempt to verify the reasons he gave you for that?”

“I didn’t have to verify it; she was shaken, upset. It was obvious.”

August 8 at 3:58pm · Like · 4

---

In Session

“Do you have an independent recollection if whether the defendant was present during the interview of Stacy Peterson?”

“Yes.”

“And did he sit in on that interview?”

“Yes.”

August 8 at 3:59pm · Like · 3

---

In Session

“Were you aware that the initial people who were in the house did not notice a blue towel in the bathroom?” Objection/Sustained.

August 8 at 4:00pm · Like · 2

---

In Session

Connor asks for a moment.

He then says that he has nothing further at this time.

August 8 at 4:00pm · Like · 3

---

## **08/08/12: Defense Attorney Joel Brodsky on recross examination**

---

In Session

Brodsky begins his recross.

“You didn’t ask him about the financial burden that having two more children inside his household was going to be, did you?”

“No.”

“You didn’t even ask him if he wanted that?”

“No, I didn’t ask him that.”

August 8 at 4:02pm · Like · 1

---

In Session

The witness repeats that he asked Deel if there were any signs of forced entry into Savio’s house, and was told there were none.

“You were looking for signs of forced entry, illicit entry?”

“Yes.”

“Including the windows?”

“Yes.”

“And you didn’t see anything to indicate that there was anything wrong with those windows?”

“Yes.”

August 8 at 4:08pm · Like · 2

---

In Session

“You also were asked if you needed to verify any of the reasons Mr. Peterson gave you for needing to be present when Stacy was interviewed... she was obviously shaken up?”

“Yes.”

“Everything was readily apparent to you, right?”

“Yes.”

“And you called the State’s Attorney’s Office about five months after Kathy’s death, and they told you to close the file?”

“Yes.”

“You didn’t do anything to indicate that you disagreed with that decision?”

“No.”

That ends the examination of this witness, and he is excused.

August 8 at 4:08pm · Like · 2

---

In Session

The attorneys need to discuss some legal matters prior to the next witness.

So the jurors are excused from the courtroom.

August 8 at 4:08pm · Like · 2

---