

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

Mary Parks Testified August 9, 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)**

08/09/12: Defense issues regarding "Hearsay Statements" & Dr. Baden

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

August 9

Will County Coroner Pat O'Neil is expected to testify Thursday in the Drew Peterson murder trial about why he had Peterson's ex-wife exhumed three years after her death. Another witness who may take the stand on Thursday is Mary Parks, who was a nursing student with Kathleen Savio. I

In Session is live from Joliet, Illinois to bring you all the news from the trial.

In Session

August 9

Watch this thread for live updates from the Drew Peterson murder trial!

Here are today's expected witnesses. First up will be Mary Parks, who was a nursing student along with Kathleen Savio. After Parks, we should hear from coroner Pat O'Neil, and pathologist Larry Blum (who conducted Savio's second autopsy).

In Session

Judge Burmila has taken the bench.

"Good morning, everyone . . . I received a letter yesterday from an inmate in the IL Dept. of Corrections that he has information linking this case with Abraham Lincoln's assassination and the Zimmerman case. I won't be communicating with him."

August 9 at 10:19am · Like · 12

In Session

Attorney Greenberg addresses the court, says the defense has issues with the upcoming hearsay testimony of Mary Parks. However, the Prosecution claims that the statement in question was one that was approved by earlier judge Stephen White, and so Judge Burmila says that he will also allow it.

August 9 at 10:21am · Like · 14

In Session

Prosecutor Koch reads from Judge White's decision.

Parks' statement apparently has to do with something Kathleen Savio told her about Drew Peterson "grabbing her by the throat."

There will also be a statement to the effect that Peterson "wanted everything [in the divorce], including the bar and the children."

August 9 at 10:24am · Like · 10

In Session

Steve Greenberg responds: "She [Savio] felt because of Drew's ego he would want everything, and they would be unable to work anything out . . . I believe those are Savio's perceptions of the divorce proceedings, not anything Drew told her, and therefore not relevant . . . I don't think any of it's relevant."

Judge: "The defendant's motion is denied in part, and granted in part. It's granted at this time regarding whatever her sense or impression might be as to the property distribution. If you find something on that, you can approach the bench and I'll revisit the ruling."

August 9 at 10:28am · Like · 8

In Session

Koch: "We also have Dr. Baden's motion, which I think we are ready to address."

Greenberg: "The motion is a discovery motion in many respects . . . the fact is we've got evidence that Dr. Baden formed his opinion before he ever did any autopsy; that is what Mark Furhman, of all people, said on TV the other day. Judge White said the prosecution was supposed to look into Dr. Baden's interaction with FOX, and how that all came about. My understanding is he was paid to do this autopsy for FOX . . . at the risk of dispelling the notion that they are absolutely fair and balanced, my understanding is that a producer will say 'We

are doing a show about this, and we need somebody to take this angle.' That seems to be what happened in this case."

In short, Greenberg is afraid that Dr. Blum's findings might have been influenced by Dr. Baden.

August 9 at 10:33am · Like · 3

In Session

Colleen Griffin responds for the State. "I don't know of any case where somebody's been barred from testifying because they might be subject to cross-examination . . . additionally, just out of fairness, we believe two of the proposed experts that the defendant is going to have testify can be impeached by prior statements they have made . . . I just don't think there's any legal basis whatsoever for this motion, and we ask that it be denied."

August 9 at 10:37am · Like · 9

In Session

Judge: "You don't have any additional reports of Dr. Baden that you didn't turn over, or any indication of the formulation of the opinion prior to the autopsy?"

"Nothing other than what we've provided."

Greenberg: "They didn't ask for it. That's the problem."

Judge: "What proof do you have that any e-mails exist between Dr. Baden and Mr. Furhman?"

Greenberg: "I don't know if they exist . . . but they have an obligation to inquire about the materials, and to produce those. We've asked them to make the inquiry . . . and they never asked."

Griffin: "Again, we do not have any materials."

August 9 at 10:37am · Like · 6

In Session

Judge: "The question is not for the court to ask one side, 'Did you do what the other side wants you to do?' . . . you're making an allegation that you really can't support that these things are in existence. But if you have some good faith basis for that, when Dr. Baden gets here and you have this television program, it's certainly fertile ground for cross-examination. And if you want to make an offer of proof before Dr. Baden testifies, we can always do it that way."

August 9 at 10:38am · Like · 7

In Session

Both sides look at a proposed instruction regarding the testimony of upcoming witness Mary Parks.

Joel Brodsky: "We would object to anything involving intent."

Judge: "I think [for] the appropriate instruction in the midst of a trial . . . I think it's better that we use the word 'conduct' rather than words 'intent' or 'motive' "

This issue involves what Parks may or may not have told the police.

Judge: "If there's an error, I find it to be harmless, and the defendant's motion is overruled."

August 9 at 10:42am · Like · 6

In Session

Court is in a brief recess, waiting until the proposed instruction can be typed up.

Judge: "Let me know as soon as that instruction is done."

He leaves the bench.

August 9 at 10:42am · Like · 6

In Session

Everyone is heading back into the courtroom.

The trial should be resuming momentarily.

August 9 at 11:05am · Like · 5

In Session

We started a new thread!

August 9 at 11:07am · Like · 2

In Session

August 9

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

Judge Burmila is back on the bench.

“We’re back on the record.”

He sends for the jurors.

08/09/12: Prosecutor James Glasgow on direct examination

In Session

The jurors enter the courtroom, and the judge gives them an instruction:

“Evidence will be received that the defendant has been involved in conduct other than that charged in the indictment . . . it is for you to determine if the defendant was involved in that conduct, and what weight should be given to that evidence on the matter of weight and motive.”

The State then calls its first witness of the day:

Mary Parks (questioned by prosecutor James Glasgow).

She is a registered nurse, currently pursuing a degree as a family nurse practitioner.

“Did you have occasion in the fall of 2002 to take courses in nursing at Joliet Junior College?”

“Yes . . . I guess I’m what could be called a late bloomer.”

“Did you have occasion to meet a fellow student, Kathleen Savio Peterson?”

“Yes, I did.”

August 9 at 11:12am · Like · 8

In Session

The witness identifies a photograph of Savio.

“That’s Kathleen Savio, or, as I knew her, Kathy Peterson.”

“Did you take any classes with her?”

“Yes, I did. The first class we took was the first nursing class, and that was in the fall of 2002.”

“Did you subsequently take a pharmacology class with her?”

“Yes, the next semester.” Objection/Sustained.

“Did you have occasion to study with her?”

“Frequently.”

“Could you discuss briefly the nursing program?”

That question leads to a sidebar.

August 9 at 11:14am · Like · 6

In Session

The sidebar ends.

“Did you have occasion to work with her in a lab?”

“Yes, I did.”

“Did you see Kathy performing physical tasks in the laboratory?”

“Yes, I did . . . the tasks involved learning how to perform blood pressure, moving a patient in a bed as you change the bed, raising and lowering hospital beds.”

“Is that physically demanding?”

“Yes.” Objection/Sustained.

“Did you watch her perform those duties?”

“Yes, I did.”

“How did she perform them?”

“Kathy was very competent at performing all of those things.”

August 9 at 11:20am · Like · 2

In Session

“Did you have an occasion in the fall of '03 to meet with Kathleen Savio in the laboratory area of Joliet Junior College?”

“Yes.”

“Where she confided something in you?”

“Yes . . . right before Thanksgiving.”

“What year was this?”

“2003 . . . she was wearing a long sleeve fleece-type top, with a collar . . . the collar was zipped, and the collar was up . . . she was . . . she was . . . she looked as if she was in shock.”

“Did you have a conversation with her at that time?”

“Yes, I did . . . during that conversation, before she said anything, she unzipped her top.”
Objection/Overruled.

“Did you see anything?”

“Yes, I did. As I unzipped the top it opened, and I saw marks on her neck . . . a dark red color . . . there was a mark on either side of the neck, and one in the middle. So it was three marks on the neck.”

“Did she tell you anything?”

“Yes, she did.” Objection/Overruled.

August 9 at 11:21am · Like · 3

In Session

“She told me that the evening before she was coming down the stairs and her husband came in the house and he grabbed her by the neck and pinned her down.”

“Did he say anything when he did that?:”

“Yes, he did . . . Kathy told me, she said that her husband said, and I quote . . . she said her husband said to her, ‘Why don’t you just die?’”

“Do you know her husband’s name?”

“Drew Peterson.”

The witness says she advised Savio to call the police, and also offered for her and her sons

to come and stay at her house.

“Did she take you up on that offer?”

“No, she did not.”

August 9 at 11:22am · Like · 9

In Session

On occasion, the witness walked Savio to her car.

“The time period would have been from October, further into the fall, after Thanksgiving . . . 2003.”

“Do you recall her confiding with you a statement from her husband?” Objection.

The defense asks for a sidebar.

August 9 at 11:23am · Like · 1

08/09/12: Defense accuses Prosecution of Discovery Violation

In Session

The sidebar ends.

The jurors and the witness are excused from the courtroom.

August 9 at 11:23am · Like · 3

In Session

The jurors and the witness are now gone.

Judge: “During the sidebar, the defense is alleging a discovery violation . . . that the information from the walks to the parking lot were disclosed.”

Steve Greenberg addresses the court: “There’s no idea of when these things were said . . . and they were found unreliable under Judge White, because she couldn’t say when these things took place . . . it’s way too prejudicial . . . it’s not a discovery violation in the sense that the statements were in a report . . . but she couldn’t attribute the statements to any particular time.”

August 9 at 11:30am · Like · 2

In Session

Judge: "So the statements were revealed . . . the issue is where they were made?"

Brodsky confirms that the statements were revealed to the defense, just not where they took place.

Connor responds for the State. "This report was tendered three years ago."

Glasgow: "Judge White did not exclude this statement; he admitted this statement."

Judge: "Whether or not the foundation was laid in the past, there was an objection this morning, and the State followed up . . . I don't find that there was a discovery violation. I don't think the statement is unreliable, and the objection to the statement being admitted is overruled."

With that, Judge Burmila sends for the witness and the jury.

August 9 at 11:31am · Like · 9

08/09/12: Prosecutor James Glasgow continues on direct examination

In Session

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

Prosecutor Glasgow continues his direct examination.

"During those walks to the car, did she ever tell you anything that her husband had said to her?"

"Yes, she did . . . Kathy told me that her husband, Drew Peterson, had told her that he could kill her and make her disappear."

"Is that the only statement?" Objection/Sustained.

"Did you have occasion to ever discuss her divorce proceedings with her?"

"Yes, the one time I specifically recall was in October of 2003."

"What did she tell you?" Objection/Sustained.

Glasgow then asks for a sidebar.

August 9 at 11:33am · Like · 3

08/09/12: Prosecutor James Glasgow does an “offer of proof.”

In Session

The sidebar ends.

The jury is excused, and there will now be an offer of proof with this witness.

Glasgow: “I asked you if Kathy Savio had confided some additional information to you regarding the divorce?”

“Yes.”

“I asked you what she had related to her . . . do you remember what her husband, Drew Peterson, said to her?” Objection/Overruled.

“Do you recall what Kathy Savio said to you about her husband’s statement to her about the divorce proceedings?”

“In October of 2003 . . . she told me that he said that he wants it all; he wants the children, he wants the house, he wants the businesses. He wants everything.”

That completes the direct portion of the offer of proof.

Greenberg then begins the cross.

“When did she say this to you?”

“October of 2003.”

Greenberg then asks for a moment.

August 9 at 11:40am · Like · 4

In Session

Greenberg continues.

“You spoke to the state police three times?”

“I don’t remember how many times I spoke to the state police.”

“You spoke to the State’s Attorneys prior to your testimony?”

“Yes.”

“Remember how many times you talked to the State’s Attorneys?”

“No.”

“You first spoke to the police in August, 2008?”

“Yes.”

“During that interview, you never told them that Kathleen Savio told you . . . what was the statement again?”

“That Drew Peterson told him he wanted it all.”

“She told you that she wanted what was due her, and Drew wanted all the money?”

“I don’t know what the state police said that I said . . . I don’t know how to answer that question.”

Greenberg then asks for a sidebar.

August 9 at 11:44am · Like · 5

In Session

The sidebar ends.

“You testified at a prior hearing in this case?”

“Yes.”

“Did you review the transcript of your testimony?”

“Yes . . . once.”

“How many times did you skim it?”

“I don’t even know . . . it’s been months.”

“You didn’t look at it recently?”

“No.”

“Did you see in that hearing where you testified that ‘Kathleen said very clearly that her ex-husband wanted everything’ . . . that’s what you testified to at the hearsay hearing?”

“I believe so.”

“You didn’t say that it was a statement her husband had made?”

“I didn’t say it wasn’t . . . that’s how I phrased it at the time.”

Glasgow then decides to withdraw the question (“in the interest of fairness”).

Judge Burmila subsequently sends for the jury.

August 9 at 11:46am · Like · 3

08/09/12: Prosecutor James Glasgow continues on direct examination

In Session

The offer of proof is over, and the jurors are now back in the courtroom.

Glasgow resumes his direct examination.

“When did the semester end for you in 2003?”

“In the middle of December, around December 13.”

“Did you see Kathy Savio after that?”

“No, I did not . . . I don’t recall talking to her on the phone.”

“Do you recall in March learning of her passing?” Objection/Sustained.

“In the middle of March, 2004, did you have occasion to call the State’s Attorneys’ office?”

“Yes, I did.” Objection/Overruled.

“Why did you make the call?”

“I was trying to determine if there was an investigation into Kathy’s death.”

“And what were you told?” Objection/Sustained.

Once again, Glasgow asks for a sidebar.

August 9 at 11:50am · Like · 4

In Session

The sidebar ends.

“Did you ever meet with anybody at the State’s Attorney’s office after that call?”
Objection/Overruled.

“No, I did not.”

That ends the direct examination of this witness.

August 9 at 11:54am · Like · 4

In Session

We started a new thread!
August 9 at 11:57am · Like · 3

08/09/12: Defense Attorney Steve Greenberg on cross examination

In Session

August 9

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

Attorney Greenberg begins his cross-examination of Mary Parks, a nursing student with Kathleen Savio.

In Session

Attorney Greenberg begins his cross-examination.

“In 2004, you didn’t meet with anyone from the State’s Attorney’s office?”

“No.”

“How many times have you met with the current State’s Attorney’s office before testifying today?”

“I don’t know . . . maybe three times.”

“They went over what you’d be testifying about?”

“Yes.”

“They talked about what you’d told the police?”

“I don’t know if that would be exactly accurate . . . I don’t if it was specifically what I told the

police; they talked about what Kathy told me. And what I saw.”

“What you’ve told the police over the years has not been the same each time, fair statement?”

“No.”

“You testified at a hearing in this case, and what you’re telling us today is not the same, is it?”

“No, I don’t believe that’s true.”

“Do you have a transcript of that grand jury testimony?”

“No, I do not.”

Greenberg then asks for a sidebar.

August 9 at 11:57am · Like · 6

In Session

The sidebar ends.

The witness says that she believes she’s once read her grand jury testimony.

She’s also read her hearsay hearing testimony “perhaps once . . . it would have been months ago.”

“Did anyone bring you into the courtroom, and show you where you’d be sitting?”

“No.”

“I notice you keep looking over at the jury . . . has anyone ever told you to do that?”

“No.”

“Don’t you come from a family of lawyers?”

“I have some lawyers in my family.”

“Didn’t you say you felt comfortable testifying because you come from a family of lawyers?”

“I don’t think anybody’s comfortable testifying . . . perhaps I’m more comfortable than some because of my knowledge of the legal process.”

Greenberg then reads from her grand jury testimony, in which she says she comes from a family of a lot of lawyers.

Judge Burmila to the witness; "Ma'am, don't fence with the attorney."

"So you're comfortable in testifying?"

"Yes, somewhat."

"In fact, you're smiling now, aren't you?"

"It's not about that."

August 9 at 11:58am · Like · 8

In Session

The witness knew Savio as "Kathy Peterson."

"You met her in a pharmacology class?"

"I believe that was my original testimony."

"When you were preparing to testify, and meeting with the State's Attorney, did they ever say, 'Well, that's different from what you told the police'?"

"No."

"In fact, you said that in March of 2004 you reached out to the State's Attorney's office?"

"Yes, I did."

"You did that from your home phone?"

"No, I did not."

"You did that from your cell phone?"

"No . . . I did it from a pay phone at Joliet Junior College."

"Is there a reason you did not use your cell phone?"

"Yes, there is." "Were you afraid someone would trace your call?"

"No."

"Where were the pay phones you used that day?"

"Near the cafeteria . . . it would have been in the afternoon . . . probably between noon and 4:30 or 5:00."

“A lot of people coming and going?”

“Sometimes.”

“Those phones would be pretty busy at times?”

“Sometimes.”

“You wanted to call the State’s Attorney’s office about this matter?”

“Yes . . . I called to determine if there was an investigation into her death.”

“You didn’t the police, the state police, the FBI?”

“No.”

“You called the State’s Attorney’s office, on a pay phone, outside a busy cafeteria?”

“At the time it wasn’t busy.”

“And that call was made to who?”

“To the switchboard.”

“Did you ask the switchboard to put you in touch with anyone?”

“I asked the person who answered the phone if I might speak with someone about Kathy Peterson.”

“And what did they say to you?”

“I was transferred to another person, and it was a woman who told me, ‘That is not under investigation at this time.’ It was something along those lines. I thought about it for a second, and then I said good-bye.”

August 9 at 12:04pm · Like · 9

In Session

“You didn’t tell them anything, other than ‘Thank you for your time’ and ‘Good-bye’?”

“I didn’t even think I said, ‘Thank you for your time.’”

“You talked to the state police in this case for the first time in August, 2008?”

“Yes.”

'And then you spoke to them again in October, 2008?'

"I don't recall . . . I believe so."

"And then in December of 2008, you went into the State's Attorney's office?"

"I honestly don't recall the dates."

"When you talked to the state police the first time, in August, you never told them you'd called the State's Attorney's office, did you?"

"Actually, I believe I did . . . I have not seen the report, or given the opportunity to examine the veracity of the report . . . I'm not responsible for what they wrote . . . it was a female officer, and I believe I did tell her that."

August 9 at 12:06pm · Like · 8

In Session

"The second time you spoke to them, it was the same officer?"

"I don't recall."

"Did you tell her the second time that you called the State's Attorney's office?"

"I don't recall . . . I am not responsible for what she wrote in her report."

"If you read the report, would it help you to recall what you said?"

"No."

"Are you suggesting the state police are doctoring their reports?"

"I am not responsible for a report. I do not know what she wrote in her report . . . I talked to her, she wrote her report, and I don't know what she wrote. She asked a question, and I answered it . . . it seems she made a few notes in a very small notebook."

August 9 at 12:09pm · Like · 10

In Session

"Remember meeting with two state police officers and Mr. Glasgow?"

"I was introduced to Mr. Glasgow and Mr. Connor; I don't recall the roles or position of the other people present were."

“That was in December of 2008?”

“Yes.”

“You told them that it was at the time of the coroner’s inquest that you [first] called?”

“I believe it was right before the inquest, sometime around that time.”

“Are you aware the inquest was in May?”

“No.”

“You also have spoken to Ms. Savio Peterson’s family?”

“Yes.”

“Including Henry, her brother?”

“Yes . . . I spoke to Henry on the day that Kathy’s body was exhumed . . . I don’t know the exact date her body was exhumed.”

“It was before you talked to the state police, wasn’t it?”

“I don’t have a clue what you’re talking about.”

“When you talked to Henry, it was before you talked to the Illinois State Police?”

“I don’t know what order it happened in.”

“When you talked to Henry in 2007, you never told him you had this explosive information?”

“No.”

“You didn’t call the state police?”

“No.”

“You didn’t pick up the phone and call anybody?”

“I don’t think that’s accurate . . . I believe I called the state police hotline . . .they called me as a result of that phone call.”

‘Have you ever told anyone that you called that hotline?’

“The police found me as a result of that . . . they told me it was as a result of my call to the hotline.” Objection/Sustained.

August 9 at 12:14pm · Like · 7

In Session

“The pharmacology class you took was an online course?”

“Yes.”

“So you met her on an online course?”

“We took it on computers in the nursing lab.”

“The statements about Drew coming into the house . . . that was from November, 2003?”

“I believe that was from October of 2003.”

“Were you and she in class together in October or 2003?”

“I don’t know when our classes ended for that first part of that semester.”

“You’re saying that you and Kathleen took a class together in the fall of 2003?”

“More than one.”

“Was it during the classes or between the classes that you were talking?”

“Both.”

August 9 at 12:17pm · Like · 7

In Session

“In the fall of 2003, were you in a class called phlebotomy flow training?”

“No, I was not.”

The witness is shown a document.

“Is that records for your schooling?”

“Yes, it’s an unofficial transcript.”

“Only you can get the official, right?”

“Yes . . . it’s accurate; I’ve seen this before . . . probably about a week ago.”

“Why were you looking at it?”

In Session

“I remember taking Pharmacology with her, yes.”

“Thanksgiving of 2003, right?”

“No. I said this conversation took place when we took Pharmacology . . . and then I misspoke.”

“So both conversations took place in the fall of 2003?”

“Those conversations I’ve testified to today took place in the fall of 2003.”

“And she said it to you when you were sitting next to each other at the computers in Pharmacology?”

“Yes.”

“You were pretty tight with her?”

“I thought we were pretty close.”

Despite that, the witness did not attend Savio’s funeral, or check on her family.

“You were once in an abusive relationship?”

“Yes, I was.”

“So when she told you these things, you felt a connection with her?”

“Yes, I did.”

“You never told her to call the State’s Attorney’s office?”

“I told her to call the police.”

“Did you talk to her about an order of protection?”

“I don’t recall.”

August 9 at 12:28pm · Like · 5

In Session

Once again, the witness insists that Savio told her about being choked by Peterson “in the fall of 2003.”

“Did you know that Ms. Anderson and her kids were living in the house then?”

“I don’t know if they were in on that date or not. At the time, Kathy never told me that they were living there.”

“Did Kathy tell you her kids were present?”

“Yes . . . upstairs.”

“Kathy was angry at Drew, wasn’t she?”

“Initially, she showed some anger and bitterness, yes, she did . . . probably in the fall of 2002.”

“But by 2003, she wasn’t angry anymore?”

“No.”

“Did you know that she and Drew got divorced in the fall of 2003?”

“No . . . she did not tell me the finalization, just that the divorce was pending.”

“She never told you about a knife under her mattress?”

“No.”

“She didn’t tell you that Drew was going to do something to her and make it look like an accident?”

“She was afraid he could do something to her and make it look like an accident.”

“She told you that?”

“Yes.”

“Did you ever tell that to the state police during any of your three interviews?”

“I believe I did . . . the first interview was the longest. I believe it would probably have been in that one . . . that interview was a couple of hours.”

August 9 at 12:32pm · Like · 9

In Session

Savio was “anal” about keeping the house locked up.

“She carried a telephone with her at all times.”

Once again, she repeats that Savio told her that Drew might kill her and make it look like an accident.

“You testified before the grand jury?”

“Yes.”

“It’s much more informal than this, isn’t it?”

“Yes.”

“Remember Mr. Connor asking you, ‘Did she ever use the phrase ‘accident’ at all?’”

“I remember her saying, ‘Drew told me he could do this.’ She did use the words that she was afraid that he could do something, and he could make it look like an accident.”

“But you didn’t tell that to the grand jury, did you?”

“I don’t think I was asked to clarify that answer . . . I didn’t believe it was a direct quote . . . she told me he said something to that effect, yes . . . that he could do something and make it look like an accident . . . she told me.”

“Were you asked about that at the hearsay hearing?”

“I don’t know . . . I do believe I said it when I talked to the state police.”

August 9 at 12:36pm · Like · 6

In Session

“You knew she had a boyfriend?”

“I knew she had a boyfriend, but not the extent of the relationship . . . sometimes women don’t share anything.”

“You never told her to take pictures of the marks?”

“No.”

“She was losing weight in 2003?”

“She was gaunt.”

“Did she seem unhappy to you?”

“She seemed fearful.”

“Did you ever say that before?”

“I don’t believe I’ve used that exact word, no.”

August 9 at 12:38pm · Like · 6

In Session

“At some point, you had a conversation with Kathleen about a business called Fast and Accurate?”

“Yes . . . in the spring of 2003, perhaps.”

“You told the state police that you first met Kathleen Savio Peterson in the spring of 2003?”

“I don’t know . . . I have not seen the report; I don’t know what they wrote . . . I believe I told the state police I met her in our first year of nursing school.”

The witness is shown the report of her first interview with the Illinois State Police.

“I don’t believe this is an accurate statement of what I said. The state police person wrote . . .”
Objection/Sustained.”

“The report says you met her in the spring or fall of 2003?”

“Yes.”

“And that’s not what you told them?”

“No.”

“Did she ever tell you that that business [Fast and Accurate] was actually sold in 1999?”

“No.”

“Do you think she might have told you she was fighting over a business that was sold four years earlier just because she was trying to get sympathy?”

“No.”

August 9 at 12:42pm · Like · 4

In Session

The witness repeats that she “occasionally” or “frequently” walked Savio to her car.

“She was afraid.”

“Because of Drew?”

“Yes.”

‘But you never saw Drew?’

“No, I never saw Drew Peterson?”

“You ever think she might be making that up?”

“No.”

August 9 at 12:42pm · Like · 4

In Session

“She would tell you life at home was bad?”

“I don’t know if she used those exact words . . . that she was having difficulties.”

“Think she might have told you things were so bad at home just to get some sympathy?”

“Not at all. Everything she told me, I have no reason to doubt anything.”

“She told you she thought her male neighbors were spying on her, and reporting back to Drew?”

“No. I don’t remember discussing her male neighbors.”

“Did you tell that to the state police?”

“I told the state police that Kathy thought there were people who were reporting her actions back to Drew . . . I don’t know if I used the word ‘neighbors.’ I know she felt there were people who were reporting what she did back to Drew.”

‘Did she tell you she avoided going to remote places because she was afraid Drew would find her there . . . get her when she was afraid from home?’

“Kathy was very careful, I believe, where she went and what she did. But I don’t recall using the phraseology “remote places” at all . . . I remember telling the state police that she was afraid that Drew would get her away from home; she had told me that.”

“Think she was telling you that to get sympathy?”

“Not at all.”

“Did she tell you that she was afraid he was going to disable her car?”

“Yes . . . she did express fear that it could happen, that it was a possibility that he might do that.”

“I hate to ask this, but did you guys talk about Posi-Traction?”

(The last question is a reference to the movie "My Cousin Vinny")

August 9 at 12:50pm · Like · 5

In Session

“In the fall of 2003, the day that I met Kathy in the lab, I was taking a class. I was in the lab possible for tutoring, or for a class. I just know it was in the morning.”

“Did you tell the state police in 2008 that you had a conversation with Savio before a class in 2003?”

“I’m no sure what I said.”

“Would you like to see a report of that interview?”

“Yes.”

“You told the police that the conversation was during a class in the fall of 2003?”

“They wrote ‘the beginning of a class’ . . . the encounter we had was prior to any classroom activity, or any tutoring.”

“She was already there, and then you arrived ‘for the class’?”

“Yes.”

“And you said she was wearing the fleece top ‘that she usually wore’?”

“That’s what the report says, yes.”

“And the report says she pulled you aside?”

“I remember taking her elbow and pulling her aside.”

“And you saw the marks around her neck, looking like a band?”

“Yes . . . every time that I have discussed these marks, I see three separate marks. It has been consistent, using my hands, using three separate marks . . . I, again, was not able to

review the report to make sure these characterizations were correct. She told me it was the day after the encounter with her husband that caused these marks . . . it happened in the fall of '03."

August 9 at 12:56pm · Like · 5

In Session

The exchange between Greenberg and Ms. Parks seems to be getting a little testy.

"When you talked to the State's Attorneys in 2010, you never mentioned a knife?"

"No."

"Or to the police?"

"No . . . I don't ever remember Kathy mentioning a knife."

That ends the cross-examination, and Judge Burmila decides to call the lunch recess at this time.

August 9 at 12:57pm · Like · 5

In Session

The witness leaves the stand, and the jurors are excused from the courtroom.

The trial is in a lunch recess until 2:15 ET.

August 9 at 1:00pm · Like · 4

In Session

There is a new thread.

August 9 at 2:28pm · Like · 2

In Session

August 9

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

Prosecution PIO Chuck Pelkie has just informed us that coroner Pat O'Neil will now NOT be called to testify this afternoon. Once Mary Parks is finished, the next witness should be pathologist Dr. Larry Blum, who conducted Kathleen Savio's second autopsy.

In Session

According to Greenberg, there is delay due to a proposed stipulation.

August 9 at 2:56pm · Like · 10

In Session

Judge Burmila returns to the stand.

He sends for the witness and the jury.

August 9 at 3:10pm · Like · 5

In Session

We have started a new thread!

August 9 at 3:15pm · Like · 3

In Session

August 9

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

The jurors are now back in the courtroom, and prosecutor Glasgow begins his redirect examination of witness Mary Parks.

08/09/12: Prosecutor James Glasgow on redirect examination

In Session

The jurors are now back in the courtroom, and prosecutor Glasgow begins his redirect examination of witness Mary Parks.

“Why did you call on the pay phone, and not your cell phone?”

"In nursing school, you're penalized if you use your phone in the lab area. So to make that impossible, I didn't want to have that happen. So I didn't bring it to school with me."

"So you used the pay phone because you didn't have your cell phone with you?"

"Correct."

August 9 at 3:14pm · Like · 16

In Session

"Why didn't you attend Kathleen Savio's funeral?"

"I didn't know her family. I didn't know her children. I just knew Kathy."

"Was there anything else that kept you from going to the wake or funeral?"

"Yes, I was prevented from going . . . I would have been penalized at school, because part of my grade included preparing for my clinicals the night before. If I did not prepare, I would have been penalized."

August 9 at 3:17pm · Like · 3

In Session

"You were criticized under cross for not doing more for Kathy?"

"Yes, I was."

"But you did tell Kathy Savio to call the police?"

"Yes, I did."

"And you went so far as to offer your own home as refuge to her and her children?"

"Yes, I did."

August 9 at 3:18pm · Like · 13

In Session

The witness is shown an exhibit.

"Could you read the question . . ." Objection/Overruled.

“August 5, 2008, you talked to the Illinois State Police?”

“Yes, I did.”

“And you told them then that right before Thanksgiving, 2003, Kathy told you that her husband came into the house, grabbed her by the neck, pinned her down, and he told her, ‘You should just die?’” Objection/Sustained.

“Did you see marks on her neck?”

“Yes, I did.” Objection/Overruled.

That completes the redirect examination.

August 9 at 3:22pm · Like · 9

08/09/12: Defense Attorney Steve Greenberg on recross examination

In Session

Attorney Greenberg begins his cross.

“Let’s talk about the phone call. You made the phone call from the . . .”

Producer Michael Christian says he can hear that the witness is now crying.

“Do you need some time?”

“No, I’ll be OK.”

Judge Burmila asks that the jurors be excused from the courtroom.

Judge: “Ma’am, why don’t you take a minute to go out in the hallway and compose yourself. We’ll have you back in a minute.”

The witness leaves the courtroom, and the trial is in a brief recess.

August 9 at 3:27pm · Like · 6

In Session

Judge Burmila is now back on the bench.

The attorneys and the witness return to the courtroom.

The judge then sends for the jury.

August 9 at 3:28pm · Like · 5

In Session

The jurors have now returned to the jury box, and attorney Greenberg resumes his recross.
“This will be brief . . . you said you didn’t bring your cell phone in 2003 to school?”

“Yes, let me think . . . what part of 2003? . . . in the fall of 2003, no, I did not bring my cell phone to school.”

“How about 2004?”

“No, I did not bring my cell phone to school.”

“How did you get the phone number for the State’s Attorney’s office?”

“I looked it up in the phone book in the nursing lab.”

“And you know there’s no record of that call?”

“I don’t know that.”

“And you never told the state police about that call?”

“I don’t know if I said that or not.”

August 9 at 3:31pm · Like · 7

In Session

“You can’t remember when or where it took place, but you remember a conversation with Kathleen Savio?”

“I remember exactly where it took place; I don’t remember when it took place . . . it was right at the classroom.”

“The class that you took together in 2003?”

“No . . . in an empty area of the classroom . . . I don’t recall saying she was there for the class.”

“But she wasn’t at class, was she?”

“She was not at class at that moment at that day, no, she was not.”

“Everything you told has changed, except that you say you remember this conversation?”

"No, that's not right."

August 9 at 3:34pm · Like · 8

In Session

"You didn't go to the funeral or wake because of school?"

"For the most part, yes . . . I did not know her family. I did not know her friends . . . and I did not want to come face to face with her husband."

"But you didn't know her husband, did you?"

"I didn't want to take the risk."

"But he presented no threat to you, did he?"

"Not as far as I knew."

"You didn't need permission to go the funeral or wake, did you?"

"No."

"Didn't need her husband's permission to send a card?"

"No."

"You said you didn't know her family?"

"Yes."

"But you talked to Henry, didn't you?"

"We were on the phone for a while. Most of the conversation was Henry talking to me."

"And Henry told you how they looked in all the closets for a briefcase, and couldn't find it, and finally they found it in her car?" Objection/Overruled.

"Is that what Henry told you?"

"That's what Henry told me."

August 9 at 3:36pm · Like · 8

In Session

The witness is shown a photograph of Kathleen Savio.

“Did you know this is her sitting on the tub?”

“She’s on a tub.”

“Did you know that picture was taken by the 14-year-old boy who lived next door?” Objection/
Sustained.

That ends the testimony of this witness, and she is excused from the stand.

August 9 at 3:38pm · Like · 5

08/09/12: Court discussion issues regarding Harry Smith testifying

In Session

The jurors are now out of the courtroom.

Judge Burmila: “The next witness will be Dr. Blum, and there are some issues that need to be resolved . . . I’m going to give you a brief opportunity to address those issues. If not, we’ll be finished with testimony for the day. But I’ll give you a few more minutes to try to resolve those issues.”

The judge leaves the bench, and the trial is again in a brief recess.

August 9 at 3:39pm · Like · 5

In Session

During this recess, the prosecutors have remained inside the courtroom, and are huddled together at their table.

The defendant has also remained inside the courtroom, and talks to attorney Joseph Lopez.

The other defense attorneys have all left, and are milling around in the hallway.

August 9 at 3:45pm · Like · 6

In Session

Judge Burmila is back on the bench. “Where are we at?”

Connor: “Your Honor, we have not been able to reach an agreement.”

The judge confirms that there will be no further witnesses today.

The bailiff is instructed to discharge the jurors for the day.

August 9 at 3:54pm · Like · 4

In Session

Attorney Greenberg addresses the Court. “The other day, when the State addressed the issue of [attorney] Harry Smith, they started to go into all these areas they want him to testify to. Just to the divorce issues, we don’t think any of it’s relevant, because the divorce case went on, as if nothing had happened. And they have no evidence that Mr. Peterson believed he had anything to gain by Ms. Savio’s death.”

Connor responds: “At the time we first addressed this argument, Your Honor had not heard any statements attributed to the defendant . . . it is, in fact, the belief of the defendant that is in issue in this case . . . in their filing, the defense has conceded that the defendant’s pension might be in a separate category than other issues in the divorce case . . . the defendant made statements about that particular asset, that he did not want Kathleen Savio to receive any portion of that. Because of her death, that pension has not been divided.”

August 9 at 4:01pm · Like · 8

In Session

Judge Burmila questions prosecutor Connor about the relevance of the fact that the original executor of Savio’s will was a relative of the defendant’s.

Connor: “That means that the defendant understood that the individual was going to be a relative of his.”

Judge: “Well, how did he know that he wasn’t going to die first?”

August 9 at 4:02pm · Like · 4

In Session

Greenberg responds: “The reason we raised this was in the context of motive, and the context of Mr. Smith testifying. The appellate court has already ruled that what might have happened in the divorce court was not a subject for expert testimony . . . the fact is that in this case, whether they like it or they don’t, under the law she was considered a living, breathing person under the divorce law. And they can’t now come and say if she was actually living the divorce would have been different . . . there was an executor of her estate who stepped in to control things . . . there was a valid will, and that executor was an executor that she picked . . . Judge O’Leary found it was a fair and just settlement. And now they want to have this jury retry this

divorce case . . . where are they connecting the dots here?”

August 9 at 4:07pm · Like · 5

In Session

Greenberg cites “the Davis case” as case law that he believes supports the defense position. Because the parties were getting divorced is automatically a reason to murder your spouse?”

Attorney Brodsky jumps in, notes that the divorce judge “made a finding that everything was above board and nothing untoward.”

August 9 at 4:11pm · Like · 4

In Session

Brodsky: “I can tell you there are legions of appellate court decision that determine what weight is given to what factor . . . to give that list to the jury is nothing but to confuse them and mislead them. To have Mr. Smith up and there and testifying makes it no less confusing, because he’s putting his twist on it. I don’t see any relevance in giving that laundry list of factors to the jury . . . it’s just there to confuse the jury, to throw smoke and mirrors.”

August 9 at 4:12pm · Like · 4

In Session

Brodsky: “There was a divorce. There was going to be a property settlement. The jury doesn’t need to know more than that . . . to allow the State to admit evidence is nothing more than attempt to muddy up Mr. Peterson, to infer that he’s guilty of murder.”

Prosecutor Koch responds: “That goes to his state of mind, what this defendant went through at the time: that by committing the murder, he would financially gain from that . . . he believed by committing this crime there would be a financial benefit.”

August 9 at 4:18pm · Like · 6

In Session

Judge: “How does Harry Smith’s testimony make any of those statements more believable?”

Koch: “What’s important to know is what the value of the marital state was.”

Judge: “There’s a big difference between A motive and THE motive.”

August 9 at 4:19pm · Like · 4

In Session

Koch: “We’re saying that Harry Smith should be allowed to testify about the factors at the time of the divorce . . . we think that’s relative . . . he was paying temporary support, which was obviously cut off with the death of Ms. Savio . . . I think that’s also relevant as a motive for this offense . . . in addition, Harry Smith is going to testify about the timeline and the documents as they were laid out in the divorce court.. We think it’s relevant to have Harry Smith testimony.”

Greenberg: “I think that the appellate court said it would not be proper to have an attorney get up there and explain what the law was. That’s up to the court . . . it’s only proper if it’s a malpractice case . . . I don’t know if we’re going to get into a little mini-trial if it’s cheaper to pay support, or to have teenage boys at home, eating you out of house and home . . . they want to collaterally attack the proceedings, and it’s just not relevant.”

August 9 at 4:25pm · Like · 3

In Session

Judge: “When we last visited this issue, it was in advance of the trial, and the testimony of Anna Doman . . we now have evidence before this jury that, if believed, demonstrates all the motive the defendant would have to have to kill Kathleen Savio . . . now, once that testimony came in before the jury, I don’t see how anything on the issue of motive that the attorney could add would assist this jury at arriving at a verdict in this case, other than speculating what might have happened in the course of a divorce trial. The law in Illinois is crystal clear: once they were divorced, the pension became a marital asset . . . we could be talking about something as little as a third of a quarter of ten years’ worth of a pension of a defendant with three other wives . . . if the defendant has a malignant heart, what is the condition for the jury to decide? At what level the malignancy in his heart occurs? We cannot have a trial within a trial. The court found in the pension case that it was possible that she might be eligible for any of the pension . . . but the State wants to insist that Harry Smith will be able to clarify to the jury that that was his motivation. You have to contrast that again with the testimony of Anna Doman, when she says the defendant says, ‘You’re not going to get a penny of my pension.’ Anything Harry Smith would testify to now is completely speculative, and again would cause a trial within a trial . . . I think allowing Harry Smith to come in and testify to what issues were before the divorce court, what Miss Savio expected as a financial resolution in this case, is a complete distraction and does not aid in any way if she was murdered, and if she was murdered did the defendant do it. I know Harry Smith has some other issues, and I’m not ruling about that . . . but he will not be able to testify about the substance of the pre-divorce negotiations, or what Ms. Savio expected to get as a result of the divorce. But Harry Smith, for the other issues he may testify about, the State is allowed to call him.”

August 9 at 4:32pm · Like · 8

In Session

The judge now wants to move on to “the lock pick issue.”

He takes a moment to read the State’s written response to the defense’s original motion.

Prosecutor Marie Czech argues that the lock pick found at the defendant’s home at the time of his arrest in 2009 is relevant.

Judge: “Is there any evidence to show he had that in 2004?”

“We have evidence that the defendant had a lock pick in 2003 . . . that shows he had the ability to enter the home, and to commit the murder. The second issue is whether locksmith Chris Wolzen, the partner of Robert Akin, should be called. We believe that he should be called . . . it would be relevant to call Chris Wolzen to testify . . . our position is that the defendant’s behavior that night was highly unusual . . . we think that bypassing the normal procedures for getting a locksmith shows that the defendant was doing something to try to cover up his actions that night.”

August 9 at 4:37pm · Like · 6

In Session

Attorney Greenberg responds. “Unless Robert Akin was somehow conspiring with Mr. Peterson . . . he said he was asked for, he got in locksmith mode, focused on the lock, opened the lock, and when he heard the screams decided to hightail it out of there. It’s just needlessly putting more things in, to say that Mr. Peterson asked for Akin for some reason . . . why the evidence becomes irrelevant about the lock pick set is because the State has no evidence that the lock had been picked beforehand, or that the deadbolt had been picked. So there’s absolutely not connection about the lock pick set that’s found five years later, and the entry into the house . . . the State is saying for the first time that Mr. Peterson did not have a key to the house . . . now they want to speculate about how he got in. Because he has a lock pick set in 2009 suddenly he got in in 2004? What is the circumstantial evidence that a lock was picked? Where is it? They have no evidence at all that the lock was picked.”

Judge: “As to the testimony of the other locksmith, I guess the State could allege there was something nefarious between the defendant and the locksmith who already testified . . . I don’t know why that would be odd, but if the State feels that testimony would be relevant, they can call that individual if they choose to. As to the issue of the lock pick, the State is not going to be able to speculate to this jury that, ‘We have a lock pick set, and we bet that’s how entry was gained.’ Unless the State can place the defendant at the scene and present entry by a lock pick in some fashion, they’re not going to be able to present evidence of the lock pick set.”

August 9 at 4:45pm · Like · 3

In Session

Prosecutor Czech notes that the State is not arguing that Peterson did not have a key to Savio's house. When the judge points out that it's in their pleading, the prosecution asks that that argument be stricken, which the judge grants.

August 9 at 4:45pm · Like · 3

In Session

Brodsky: "Witness after witness after witness has testified about a blue towel. Fine. The EMTs testified that the towel wasn't there..."

Greenberg interrupts: "Judge, I just want to bring him up to speed on something."

Brodsky: "The inference is that somehow Drew Peterson would have moved the towel to cover up the crime scene. Nobody can put Drew Peterson in the bathroom after the EMTs arrived, and didn't see the blue towel . . . so why does the State now want to call witnesses to say they were in the house and didn't see the blue towel? Of what relevance is this? It's of absolutely no relevance. They're going to be asking the jury to speculate. There has to be evidence putting him with that towel, or giving him the opportunity to move it. It's another attempt to make something insignificant significant. There's absolutely nothing to connect Drew Peterson with that towel. I ask you to bar the witnesses, and, in fact, anything to do with that towel."

August 9 at 4:52pm · Like · 3

In Session Glasgow responds:

"It's the intent of the State to call every witness who could have placed that towel there."

Judge: "You absolutely cannot do that . . . that's a direct comment on the defendant's right to remain silent. You cannot do that. You CANNOT do that. That's a direct reflection on his right to remain silent. I'm sorry, but you cannot do that."

Glasgow: "He had opportunity, knowledge of the towel, and the motive to place it."

Judge: "I tell you right now, if the aim of the State is to ask every single person who could have moved that towel, I cannot allow that . . . you will not be able to call a series of witness, have them all say they did not do it, and then point a finger at the defendant and say he must have done it because we didn't hear from him. It's absolutely impermissible."

August 9 at 4:54pm · Like · 5

In Session

That ends the arguments for today.

Judge Burmila leaves the bench, and the trial is in recess until 10:00 ET Friday morning.

August 9 at 4:54pm · Like · 6

In Session

August 9

Judge Burmilla leaves the bench.

The Drew Peterson murder trial is in recess until Friday morning at 10:00 ET.
