

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

Susan McCauley Testified August 10, 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)**

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

August 10

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

Kathleen Savio's boyfriend Steve Maniaci is on the witness stand being questioned by defense attorney Joseph Lopez.

08/17/2012: Court discussion regarding witness Susan McCauley

In Session

Prosecutor Kathy Patton then addresses the court about another upcoming witness Susan McCauley.

"The Court didn't want to go into the fact that she was having an affair with the defendant . . . because of the prejudice it would bring in."

Greenberg: "I won't get into the affair . . . if they want to characterize them as 'good friends' . . ."

Patton: "Then I'd like to get in to what he said about the divorce."

Judge: "I did not want there to be a situation where the defendant misled this witness about getting a divorce. Any questions you want to ask about that, they're out."

Patton continues, says while Peterson was married to Savio, he said to McCauley that Kathleen was not going to get any of his pension.

Greenberg: "We're talking about 1997, these conversations . . . the relationship ended in 1998."

Patton continues, says that McCauley should be allowed to say that Peterson told her "he

would never leave. He would never get a divorce, because he didn't want Kathleen to get half of his pension. And in another statement, he said that Kathleen would never get his pension . . . it was the end of 1997, 1998 when he said these things."

There was also another conversation between McCauley and Peterson at a bowling alley, at which Peterson told her that Savio "was crazy."

August 10 at 12:57pm · Like · 4

In Session

According to Patton, McCauley told Peterson that "you must have a horseshoe somewhere . . . nobody gets that lucky.' And they laughed about it. She didn't understand how it happened, and he said that it was a newer type of bathtub, that after a while automatically drains. He said she was taking medication, and there was a wine glass. That was the sum and substance [of McCauley's testimony]."

Greenberg: "I think you already ruled that the bowling alley conversation was admissible."

Judge: "Right . . . all of the information at the bowling alley stands on its own . . . the portion of the conversation from 1998 that I struck is still stricken. But the conversation from the bowling alley comes in."

Patton presses the judge as to why the other testimony can't come in, assuming the witness does not mention the affair.

Greenberg objects, says it's too remote in time, and it suggests that Peterson had a lifetime obsession with his pension.

"The Court ruled properly before.'

Patton: "We continue to believe he had preconceived ideas about what would happen if he had to go into this settlement . . . Drew had in his mind that he was going to lose this. It goes to his knowledge and his intent."

Judge: "He formulated this desire to commit this murder in 1998? . . . the conversation is remote, and I don't see how it's particularly relevant to the conversation from the bowling alley. I won't reverse my ruling, and the State will not be able to go into that."

August 10 at 1:02pm · Like · 2

08/17/2012: Prosecutor Kathleen Patton on direct examination

In Session

August 10

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

Susan McCauley, Peterson's former employee, is on the witness stand.

In Session

Prosecutor Kathy Patton calls the next witness: Susan McCauley.

“Do you know Drew Peterson?”

“Yes.”

She identifies the defendant.

“Did you ever work for the defendant?”

“Yes, between 1997 and 1990, at Suds Pub in Montgomery.”

“On March 20, 2004, did you see the defendant that night?”

“Yes, at the bowling alley in Bolingbrook . . . he was in uniform . . . sometime between 11:00 and 11:30 pm.”

“I went up to him, gave him a hug, and said I had heard what happened. I asked how were the boys, and he said, ‘Oh, they’ll be fine. She was crazy’ . . . meaning Kathleen Savio. I was taken aback by his response, and said, ‘I still don’t understand how she died in a dry bathtub.’ He said it was a newer type of tub that drains after a while . . . and that she was on medication, anti-depressants, and that there was a wine glass by the tub. I said to him, basically, ‘Well, you must have a lucky horseshoe place somewhere . . . I could have used another word . . . now you don’t have to pay child support, you get the house, you get your pension.’ He laughed it off, and made a couple jokes.”

That ends the direct examination of this witness.

August 10 at 5:04pm · Like · 8

In Session

Attorney Greenberg begins his cross.

The witness admits that she had “a few beers” on the night in question.

“Did you know that he had actually been divorced?”

“I do not recall.”

"Know he'd already been out of the house for a couple of years?"

"Yes."

"You don't know if she was crazy, or what kind of medications she might have been taking?"

"No."

"You found his answer cold?"

"Yes."

"So you told him that he must have a horseshoe up his ass?"

"Yes."

"Did you ever say before that he said the kids would be fine because she was crazy?"

"I don't remember how I phrased it . . . but that's what he said . . . he joked around, and laughed about it . . . I can't remember his exact words after that."

"You were asked about this by state police, at the grand jury, and at an earlier hearing?"

"Yes."

"And you've never told anyone what his jokes were, or that his jokes were agreeing with you?"

"Well, obviously he was agreeing with me . . . if you're joking back with somebody, that's implied."

"But you can't tell us what the jokes were, or anything he said?"

"No."

"And you were drinking that night?"

"I probably had two or three beers."

"He said she had been drinking, and there was a wine glass?"

"Yes."

"Did you ask him how he knew that?"

"He was a police officer in Bolingbrook . . . whether he was there or saw the report, he was somebody who would know that."

"What does 'laugh off' mean?"

“He was making light of it.”

“You were joking about it, weren’t you?”

“I was trying to get more, like information.”

“You said, ‘You must have a horseshoe up you ass’?”

“Yeah.”

“You were joking, right?”

“Yeah.”

“You didn’t really think he had a horseshoe there?”

“No.”

That is the end of the cross examination.

There is no redirect, and the witness is excused.

August 10 at 5:07pm · Like · 6
