

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

Donna Badalamenti “DID NOT” Testify August 14, 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 14

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

In Session

Judge Burmila is now back on the bench.

Defense attorney Joel Brodsky addresses the court, argues against the upcoming testimony of Candace Aikin and Donna Badalamenti.

“I do not see that there is anything relevant about these two ladies . . . what they could potentially testify to breaks down to four categories. They say that in 2007, in some general conversation, the defendant said that he had learned so much being a police officer that he could kill someone and get away with . . . not that he had killed somebody, but that he could . . . it’s not probative of what occurred in 2004; it’s not a confession. And the prejudicial impact of such a statement so outweighs the probative value; it is devastating if it’s allowed.”

Prosecutor Glasgow responds, says that the Prosecution will only attempt to raise the issue just discussed, not other statements allegedly made by the defendant. Glasgow then cites case law which he believes supports the testimony in question.

“In this particular case, Mr. Peterson stands unprompted before two women and says he’s learned so much as a policeman that he could kill someone and get away with it . . . we’ll be presenting to the jury his extensive training records, to show he has the training to do just that. But from his own mouth he’s told us that he can.”

August 14 at 12:48pm · Like · 10

In Session

Glasgow continues; “Her [Savio’s] pre-death statements align with the 2007 statement. This WAS a murder, which makes his statement just about as probative as it could be.”

Brodsky responds: “They already have in the pre-death statements, as to what Mr. Peterson is alleged to have said in the nature of threats . . . however it may have occurred, and whatever the variation of the statement, the word ‘accident’ doesn’t get added until much later... that doesn’t really tell us much. Probably all policemen, probably all State’s Attorneys who do criminal work could make similar statements . . . to take such a common or inconspicuous statement, something we dispute ever took place, and to try to put this spin strains credibility. It’s very prejudicial . . . I think the prejudicial value is so outweighed by any minimal value that I think it should be excluded . . . the State said they were going to attempt to put in Mr. Peterson’s training records . . . that evidence would be inadmissible; how could that possibly be probative? How can that put him in proximity to her? It can’t change anything. It asks this jury to speculate, to say because he has special training more likely than not it’s him. We cannot allow this jury to speculate.”

Judge Burmila: That’s not anything I’m going to comment on right now. The State’s Attorney’s statement of law is generally correct . . . but just because it’s admissible, is it prejudicial? . . . it’s a rather nebulous statement, and it’s post-homicide, remote in time to the event. Balancing those things, I do find in this instance that it is too prejudicial. And the motion to deny the admissibility of that statement by the defendant is allowed.”

August 14 at 12:55pm · Like · 1
