

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

Dr. Larry Blum Testified August 15, 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 15

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

Prosecution PIO Chuck Pelkie has just confirmed that Dr. Larry Blum should be the next prosecution witness.

08/15/2012: Prosecutor James Glasgow on direct examination

In Session

The next prosecution witness is Dr. Larry Blum (questioned by prosecutor Glasgow).

"I'm a medical doctor, specializing in forensic pathology."

He briefly goes over his educational and professional background.

During his residency, starting in 1976, he began to perform autopsies.

He is board-certified in anatomic, clinical, and forensic pathology.

August 15 at 2:35pm · Like · 8

In Session

After his training was completed in 1980, he began to practice as a pathologist.

In 1984, he decided to go into forensic pathology full time.

"So since 1984, I've been involved full time in the practice of forensic pathology."

Since becoming a doctor, he's performed over 10,000 autopsies. "Not counting today," he's been qualified as an expert 587 times.

The witness is now qualified as an expert, without defense objection.

August 15 at 2:40pm · Like · 7

In Session

The witness knew Dr. Bryan Mitchell, who passed away in 2010.

"Were you asked to review a case that Dr. Mitchell had done the original autopsy on, in 2004 . . . the autopsy of Kathleen Savio?"

"Yes."

'And did you review Dr. Mitchell's autopsy protocol?"

"Yes, I did."

August 15 at 2:41pm · Like · 4

In Session

The witness identifies Dr. Mitchell's 3/20/04 autopsy protocol of Kathleen Savio's autopsy.

"Did Dr. Mitchell examine the gross body of Kathleen Savio?"

"Yes, he began with an external examination, noting what she was wearing, a necklace about her neck . . . she weighed 154 pounds, 5'5" in length . . . "

"Did he make a notation as to the development of the body?"

"Yes . . . normal development."

"Was she in good physical condition?"

"Yes . . . adequately nourished and hydrated, which means well-fed and did not appear to be dehydrated."

"Did he make a note as to any fingerprint blanching?"

"Yes . . . over the right medial breast, there were some markings on that that were consistent with her fingers being up against the body before she was found. This is a pattern that can be made with things pressing on the body. He did mention that in his report . . . he said the eyes were initially closed . . . they were brown, and the outer covering of the eyes was cloudy . . .

the eyes, being cloudy, would be considered a defect. But it is a common post-mortem defect.”

August 15 at 2:51pm · Like · 6

In Session

“The nose was intact . . . pulmonary edema fluid had collected at the nose, a small bubbly area . . . he noted that the lips and the frenulum were intact; neither were torn, and otherwise normal. The teeth were intact and in good repair. The tongue was partially clenched between the teeth.”

“Did he examine her chest area?”

“Yes, he noted the chest was symmetrical, and the breasts were of normal development, without tumors.”

Savio’s ‘upper extremities, the arms, were symmetrical, with short, clean fingernails, with water wrinkling, like pruning on the surface of her left hand . . . he notes the external genitalia is that of a normal, adult female, with no signs of injury. The lower extremities were noted again to be symmetrical, with toenails being short and clean . . . the back and the buttocks area were described as being symmetrical, and free of significant injury.”

“Did he note any injury on the left buttocks?”

“Yes, he did . . . that injury was described as a three inch by one inch abrasion’ an abrasion is a scrape or scratch caused by surfaces rubbing together . . . medically, it’s a form of blunt trauma. Lay people call them scratches or scrapes . . . body cavities appeared to be normal; there were no adhesions.”

August 15 at 2:54pm · Like · 4

In Session Savio’s airway and vocal cords were free of injury.

“The heart was a normal weight . . . there was a small amount of fat on the surface of the heart, and that’s perfectly normal . . . no signs of a previous heart attack, or any scarring in the heart . . . the valves were intact and unremarkable, except for a slight thickening of the mitral valve . . . often times, with wear and tear, you can start seeing these valves becoming a little more thickened than a younger valve would be . . . it was loose and floppy, where it would be functionally significant.”

“Should that present a problem of any kind?”

“No.”

August 15 at 2:55pm · Like · 6

In Session

Dr. Blum continues to describe the results of Dr. Mitchell's 2004 autopsy of Kathleen Savio.

"The inner lining of the aorta was very smooth . . . all smooth and normal."

"What did the examination of the respiratory system show?"

"The trachea and bronchi were patent, which means open . . . the lungs were a little heavier than normal, a little on the heavy side."

The inner portion of the lung showed "mild congestion, and moderate edema."

The defense interrupts, and asks for a brief sidebar.

August 15 at 2:58pm · Like · 4

In Session

The sidebar ends.

"Did he continue his examination of the respiratory system?"

"Yes, areas of pneumonia were looked for . . . or fibrosis or scarring. All of those were negative; there was no lung damage."

"Finally, did he find any thromboid emboli?"

"No, he did . . . those can cause sudden death; he found none . . . the esophagus is without special note; the lining of it was gray-white, which is normal."

"Did he look at the stomach?"

"Yes, less than a teaspoon of fluid was present in her stomach at the time of autopsy . . . the stomach's inner lining has folds; nothing remarkable was found . . . normal stomach."

Savio's bowel and colon were also described as "normal."

August 15 at 3:02pm · Like · 5

In Session

"The appendix?" "We've all heard of the appendix. She had hers, and it was normal."

August 15 at 3:02pm · Like · 5

In Session

Savio's endocrine and adrenal glands were also normal. Her skeletal system and her kidneys were also found to be normal.

"No chronic diseases . . . again, a normal finding."

August 15 at 3:04pm · Like · 5

In Session

Savio's bladder was also normal, as was her spleen. Her lymph nodes throughout the body were also normal. And Savio's bone marrow was described as normal, as was her reproductive system.

"No sign of pregnancy."

August 15 at 3:06pm · Like · 6

In Session

Savio's brain showed some "mild swelling . . . there were no hemorrhages, or other pathological abnormalities of the brain, other than the swelling . . . the brain has a very limited capacity or options when it comes to reacting to any kind of injury. One of the most common things it does is swell . . . it's fairly common. It's a non-specific symptom . . . it can, however, be seen with drownings . . . the skull is intact."

August 15 at 3:10pm · Like · 4

In Session

"Could you review what diagnosis Dr. Mitchell made?"

"The diagnosis included cerebral edema; that's the brain swelling we just talked about . . . some moderate pulmonary edema . . . water in the sinuses . . ." Objection/Overruled.

"Congestion is seen in virtually all deaths . . . again, a very non-specific, general finding . . . the laceration to the scalp, the back of the head . . . the mild mitral valve thickening . . . and toxicology is negative."

The witness notes that the toxicology screening was done at St. Louis University, by Christopher Long."

In Session

“Could you go through the drugs listed by Dr. Long’s toxicology report?”

Yes, Sir . . . the first paragraph is an examination of the vitreous . . . all the alcohols were negative; none were found. The second test was of the liver . . . all negative.”

“There’s no indicated of any unknown drugs?”

“Correct.”

“Dr. Mitchell . . . you had an opportunity to examine some of his other autopsy reports?”

“Yes . . . because Dr. Mitchell passed away.”

“He was a board-certified forensic pathologist?”

“Yes.”

“You were hired by the Will County State’s Attorney’s Office to review this case . . . remember when that was?”

“2007 . . . there was an exhumation.”

“Of whom?”

“Kathleen Savio.”

“And did you have occasion to perform a second autopsy?”

“Yes, Sir . . . that was at the Will Country Coroner’s facility.”

“Also present was coroner Pat O’Neil, and your assistants?”

“Yes . . . and Dr. Mitchell . . . the body was brought in . . . we opened the casket, and observed the body lying in there . . . we at that point took some pictures, and started taking samples from the area. There was a lot of water in the casket as well, which marked the deterioration of the tissues of her body.”

“Did you remove any fingernails?”

“Yes, those were obtained right away, before they were subject to being lost. I took ten fingernails, and submitted them to the Illinois State Police. And head hairs, also . . . once the body had been removed from the casket, we had it X-rayed fro head to toe.”

August 15 at 3:21pm · Like · 5

In Session

Some of Savio's remains were "skeletonized."

Other portions were "mummified."

"The X-rays were largely unremarkable; we noted some funeral embalming techniques had been done, with some wires in the mouth . . . but this was all done by the funeral home, to prepare her for visitation. Other than that, the X-rays were pretty unremarkable. In the spine, there was no evidence of fracture or dislocation . . . the sternum had been removed during the first autopsy, but it was back in place, so we got a good look at that . . . no fractures."

August 15 at 3:25pm · Like · 5

In Session

The witness stands, and demonstrates the location of the "right lower quadrant" of the body. Objection/Sustained.

"Did you make an incision in that area?"

"Yes, I did."

"What did you find?"

"A deep bruise . . . hemorrhage into the tissues, which we call a bruise or a contusion."

"Could you tell how severe the bruise was?"

"It went all the way down to the bone, so it was classified as a deep contusion . . . I saw one large area. The original photographs, showed three separate bruises . . . it had more or less coalesced into one large one. The tongue was examined under a microscope, and it appeared normal."

August 15 at 3:25pm · Like · 5

In Session

No bruising was located in Savio's arms.

"Did you have a chance to also make similar incisions into the upper back area?"

“Yes, looking for deep bruises.”

“And what did you find?”

“Nothing, of a bruise nature . . . I made my incisions down to the bone, deep incisions, looking for deep bruises.”

‘Do you feel you made the appropriate number of incisions to find any bruising that might have been there?’

“Yes.”

‘And did you find any?’

“No.”

August 15 at 3:26pm · Like · 6

In Session

The examination of Savio’s spine revealed no deep bruising.

“The original autopsy showed bruising to the left buttocks; that was not apparent at the second autopsy. I made incisions, looking for deep bruises.”

“And did you find any?”

“No.”

“You had a chance to look at the original organs?”

“Yes, those organs were preserved in a viscera bag within the body cavity . . . I removed the bag in one swoop and set it aside. And later on in the day, I went and opened the bag, and each organ came out. Those were in remarkable condition, and could be examined even three years later . . . they all looked very normal . . . they were unremarkable, other than the effects of being interred for that amount of time.”

August 15 at 3:29pm · Like · 6

In Session

Dr. Blum continues to go over the portions of Kathleen Savio’s body that he examined during his 2007 autopsy. He found nothing that didn’t appear to be normal.

“You made slides during that process?”

“Yes.”

“Did you look at those under the microscope?”

“Yes . . . there was no evidence of hemorrhage. I thought possibly there was something in there, but when I looked under the microscope there was not.”

Dr. Mitchell was present during the autopsy, and helped make some tissue slides.

“He had his hospital, or lab prepare all the slides . . . they appeared to be as he described them: no disease or injuries.”

Congestion was found, but Dr. Blum says that is normal.

“It’s just a packing of blood in the blood vessels.”

“The next morning, on November 14, 2007, did you conduct a sexual assault examination?”

“Yes, I did . . . vaginal, rectal, oral [swabs] . . . that had not been done on the 13th. I felt it wise to do that on the following day, so I did.”

August 15 at 3:35pm · Like · 5

In Session

Samples from the second autopsy were also sent out for toxicological testing.

“You just take a block of liver, package it, and send it to the lab.”

The witness then goes over the drug screenings that were done in 2007. The results are all negative for drugs, except for salicylates . . . this is an artifact in a decomposed liver.”

“What does that tell you?”

“Very simply, that there was no indication that she had any drugs or alcohol on board at the time this happened.”

August 15 at 3:38pm · Like · 8

In Session

“Did you have occasion to go to the scene of Kathleen Savio’s passing . . . in her master bathroom?”

“Yes, a week after the autopsy.”

He then identifies a photograph of the Savio bedroom and bathroom.

“Did it look a little different than this?”

“The structure looked the same... what looked different were some of the items on the walls and on the shelves . . . and, obviously, no body in the tub.” Objection/Overruled.

“This photograph is from 2004 . . . you’re indicating the structure of the bathroom was substantially similar to what it is here?”

“That’s correct.”

“In your review of the original autopsy protocol by Dr. Mitchell, you got to review photographs?”

“There were a few. And I did review them, yes.”

He then identifies one of the 2004 photos.

“This is a picture of the bathtub and some of the surrounding items . . . the primary focus for me was the body lying face down on her left side, in this position you see in the photograph.”

“Does the tub appear substantially similar as it did in 2007?”

“Yes.”

August 15 at 3:43pm · Like · 8

In Session

The next photograph shows “the head end of the tub . . . again, showing her position in the tub.”

“These toiletries that appear . . . none of them appear to be knocked over?”
Objection/Sustained.

“Did you observe any items knocked over?”

“This little duck is on its side. But the other items appear to be upright and standing.”

“Does that give any indication whether there might have been a struggle in that area?”
Objection/Sustained.

“In this photograph, do you see any items knocked down?”

“Once again, this little duck. The other items are upright . . .” Objection/Sustained.

“Do you see the abrasion on the buttocks in this photograph?”

“Barely, but I’ll point it out. It was on the left side.”

August 15 at 3:45pm · Like · 8

In Session

The witness points out “a red substance” in the bottom of the tub.

“It’s making at least three streams . . . that blood is coming down from the head wound she sustained to the back of her head. There may be some added fluid; the fluid from the lungs could be missed in there . . . and there is a little circle of blood around the drain.”

“What was Dr. Mitchell’s opinion of the cause of the death?”

“Dr. Mitchell signed the cause of death out as drowning . . . immersion into a fluid, with aspiration, which causes asphyxia. If you’re under too long, death will result.”

August 15 at 3:50pm · Like · 7

In Session

“The right foot is crossed over into the sole of the left foot . . . the heel is up here, on the right foot. What stands out in the photograph is the very sharp angle the toes are in in relation to the rest of her foot. These are virtually 90 degree angles . . . these toes on her right foot are extremely extended, or bent back . . . even causing prevention of lividity in this area of the body.”

“Does that indicate anything to you?”

“It does, yes . . . in the context of this case, for a foot to just float down after loss of consciousness in the drowning process, I don’t believe it could physically do that.”

August 15 at 3:51pm · Like · 14

In Session

“The fingers were up against the breast, giving rise to those fingertip marks. The breast is bluish in color, because of blood settling in the body . . . the hair is puffed up, not all water soaked or anything.” “With regards to the walls of the tub, did you have any observations?”

“Yes, the walls of the tub are smooth, and they are narrow . . . there’s no concentrated blunt edge on this; they’re all smooth contours . . . that’s for a safety’s sake; you don’t want a sharp edge in a bathtub. So a very narrow, very small tub . . . you can see she barely fits.”

Objection/Sustained.

August 15 at 3:53pm · Like · 9

In Session

“I felt the two biggest pieces of evidence in this case were the body and the tub . . . so I felt it was extremely important to examine the scene.”

“What did you determine?”

“Smooth, slippery . . . I did not put any water in the tub myself, I didn’t take a bath or anything, but I crawled in with my regular clothes.” Objection/Sustained.

The judge calls the attorneys to a sidebar.

August 15 at 3:55pm · Like · 5

In Session

The sidebar ends.

The witness and jurors are now out of the courtroom.

The judge says that he denied a State request to have the witness do a demonstration of how he climbed into the tub, and yet it was elicited during the testimony of this witness.

Judge: “It doesn’t appear that any of the orders that I’ve made in this case does the State mention with its witnesses prior to testifying.”

Brodsky: “Can I have two minutes?”

The judge decides to take the afternoon recess at this point.

August 15 at 3:59pm · Like · 5

In Session

Judge Burmila has left the bench.

The court is in a recess for an undetermined length.

August 15 at 3:59pm · Like · 3

In Session

there is a new thread.

August 15 at 4:24pm · Like · 2

In Session

August 15

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

The judge is back on the stand.

08/15/2012: Defense Motion to strike all testimony of Dr. Blum

In Session

The judge is back on the stand (the witness and the jurors are not present).

Defense attorney Ralph Meczyk:

“It’s irrelevant whether or not it was an innocent mistake. With all due respect to the Court, you are not a potted plant . . . there has to be an appropriate and reasonable sanction . . . there was a ruling, and [this was] something they were not supposed to touch upon . . . he entered a prohibited realm that you said they couldn’t go into. This is an avalanche, a tidal wave, a cascading of missteps. There is only one appropriate sanction in this case, and that is to strike in its entirety the direct testimony of this witness. And any witnesses who relied up on this witness, their testimony should also be stricken. This can not go on and on and on . . . the preparation that was does with these witnesses is not good enough . . . a curative instruction; you can’t put the toothpaste back in the tube. The cumulative effect on this jury is devastating; it’s a violation of Mr. Peterson’s right to a fair trial. Now there has to be some real meaning to your words. And the only appropriate sanction is to strike the testimony of this witness in its entirety.”

Prosecutor Glasgow responds, complains about the defense “histrionics . . . he’s simply looking at the bathtub . . . that’s the record, and that’s the testimony. What we just heard, it sounded like something entirely different, but it wasn’t based on facts. These are the facts . . . that last line about getting into the bathtub happened quickly. But we were not getting into a reenactment . . . I would ask the Court to give me another opportunity to admonish him. And I apologize for any confusion.”

August 15 at 4:24pm · Like · 13

In Session

Meczyk: "What inference can the jury possibly draw with his statement that he slipped into that tub? The point is it's the harm that's already been done. I think vigorous coaching of the witness is too late. There have to be some teeth to the rulings you've made. I respectfully ask you to strike the testimony of Dr. Blum."

Judge: "Well there are very few people in this courtroom who remember the person it's named after, Judge Angelo Pistilli. . . when he'd get frustrated, he'd say, 'I guess there's nothing left for me to do except blow my brains out.' I never quite understood that until today . . . we're back in another situation where we were earlier today. The circumstances of this case are creating the aura that the Court is somehow toothless, that we just go forward, ignoring the orders that I have entered or Judge White has entered. I don't care for myself personally, but the disrespect to the Court is shocking to the conscious. The remedy Mr. Peterson urges is to strike the testimony of the doctor, and that's denied. When the jury comes back, I'm going to instruct them to disregard the last testimony of the witness . . . and we are not going to continue to visit the State's disregarding of the Court's orders in this case."

The judge then sends for the witness and the jury.

August 15 at 4:28pm · Like · 10

In Session

The witness and jurors are now back in the courtroom.

The judge addresses the jury: "Ladies and gentlemen, in the doctor's testimony he mentioned that he had climbed into the bathtub. You are to disregard that totally; it is probative of nothing. And it is stricken."

August 15 at 4:31pm · Like · 6

08/15/2012: Prosecutor James Glasgow continues direct examination

In Session

Glasgow resumes his direct examination of the witness.

"Did you have opportunity to look at photographs from the [2004] autopsy?"

"Yes."

The photograph is then offered for publication.

The defense objects, and the parties go to a sidebar.

August 15 at 4:33pm · Like · 6

In Session

The sidebar ends.

The witness points out “a red substance” on Savio’s nose and cheek.

“What would that be?”

“It’s blood.”

“From your examination, did she have an injury to her head as she was laying in the bathtub?”

“Yes, she did . . . the wound was in the up position, to the back of the head.”

“After a person passes away, and the wound is not facing downward, what happens?”

“We call these post-mortem wounds. If a wound occurs after death, and is in a position that gravity will drain blood from it, blood will continue to drip from that wound . . . it can drip for quite some time. The opposite is true when the wound is in an anti-gravity or up position . . . that’s how the position of the body affects post-mortem dripping or seeping of blood.”

August 15 at 4:39pm · Like · 11

In Session

The witness is then shown another photo.

“This is an autopsy picture, depicting the laceration to the back of Kathleen Savio’s head. It is outlined by the L-shaped ruler you see here. The wound is in the scalp area . . . it is a tearing of the tissue, due to blunt trauma.”

“Is that the wound that was facing upward while she was laying in the tub?”

“Yes, Sir . . . the wound was to the back of the left side of head . . . with the bleeding of that wound, it would produce a trickle of blood that came down the side of her forehead here, and come to rest around this eyebrow region . . . she was face down, making contact with the tub; the blood draining from the wound came down, encountered it, and stopped . . . it’s a nice stream of blood that had gone down here.”

“Is there also blood heading toward the nose?”

“Yes, we have another gravity flow pattern . . . it went beneath the eye, and accumulated along the nose on the left side and dried some more. A small trickle went over her lips, to the chin.”

“Does that tell you anything about whether her face was in water?:

“Yes, this gravity flow pattern, it would be impossible for that to occur if her face was down in the water at the time. As blood hits the water, it disperses; it will not make a nice, discreet pattern that we see here.”

“A head wound of this type, what level of bleeding do you get?”

“It will bleed right away, and very profusely. If death occurs, and the heart stops, the blood will stop flowing to that area, and the bleeding will stop.”

“Did you see any blood above her body?”

“No, I did not.”

“The only blood you saw was in the tub, below her body?”

“All the way down to the drain, yes.”

“If her heart had continued to beat, would you have expected to see more blood in the tub?”

“Yes.”

The defense interrupts, and asks for a sidebar.

August 15 at 4:44pm · Like · 13

In Session

The sidebar ends.

“Once the heart stops, how long would the blood continue to flow out of that wound?”

“Minutes. Just a matter of minutes.”

“So if her face was in water during that time, we would not see the dried blood on her face?”

“Absolutely not.”

August 15 at 4:46pm · Like · 26

In Session

“There is an injury to the left breast . . . a bruise . . . I don't see any another particular injuries there.”

Dr. Mitchell found hemorrhage beneath the skin near the clavicle areas.

“Is that a painful injury?” Objection/Sustained.

“Could you describe that injury?”

“When a muscle is injured, if it’s significant there will be bleeding into the muscles . . . what we see typically is the blood, because it’s very easy to see . . . if the person dies, the blood will just stay in them as a bruise or area of hemorrhages. There are nerve endings in the muscles.”

“When you get an injury, what do those muscles do?” Objection/Sustained.

August 15 at 4:51pm · Like · 10

In Session

The witness identifies a photo of the injury to Savio’s left breast.

“It’s what we’ve typically had in our lives, a bruise or contusion. The age of a bruise is very difficult to tell just by looking at the color. However, bruises start out as black and blue . . .” Objection/Overruled.

“After a period of time, we’ve all observed on our own kids these bruises undergo a color change before they fade away. When we see a black and blue or purple bruise, that tell us that it’s fresh. Within the confines of a limited ability of anyone to tell an exact age, we can get an idea based on its color.” “How old would you say this bruise was?”

The defense asks for a sidebar.

August 15 at 4:52pm · Like · 10

In Session

The sidebar ends.

The witness and jurors have been excused from the courtroom.

Attorney Meczyk is objecting to the testimony regarding “the age and color of each bruise . . . it’s a fresh one? It’s an acute one?”

Prosecutor Connor then refers to the witness’ grand jury testimony.

Judge: “Anything else you want me to consider? . . . I don’t know what his grand jury testimony was, so I can’t take that into account . . . the objection is overruled.”

With that, Judge Burmila asks to have the witness and the jury brought back into the

courtroom ("Let's get going!").

August 15 at 5:00pm · Like · 15

In Session

The witness and jurors are now back in the courtroom.

Prosecutor Glasgow resumes his direct examination, and the witness is shown another 2004 autopsy photograph.

"This is the area of the body called the left lower quadrant, over the hip bone in front. The injuries depicted here are the three bruises originally described by Dr. Mitchell in his report . . . these are also blue, bluish-purple in color . . . these are fresh bruises . . . less than 24 hours [old] . . . there were three described by Dr. Mitchell, and I see them there."

In his own 2007 autopsy, he confirmed that there were indeed bruises.

"The bruise is deep, it's to the bone . . . I would say [it would need] a great amount of forced, more than just a slap."

"And are there three separate points of contact?"

"Yes."

August 15 at 5:05pm · Like · 19

In Session

The witness is shown another photo.

"It's another contusion, on the front of the left thigh, a blue-purple contusion . . . it was a fresh bruise, less than 24 hours."

The next photograph shows "a bruising on both shins . . . they were both blue to purple in color."

"Do you have an idea how old they are?" Objection.

The defense asks for a sidebar.

August 15 at 5:06pm · Like · 9

In Session

The sidebar ends.

“As far as the color and age, they’re fresh [bruises], within 24 hours.”

August 15 at 5:09pm · Like · 12

In Session

Dr. Blum is shown a document.

“Is that a demonstrative aid, showing the injuries you’ve just described?” Objection.

The defense asks for a sidebar.

August 15 at 5:11pm · Like · 10

In Session

The sidebar ends.

“Does that demonstrative [aid] fairly represent injuries you’ve just finished testifying to?”
Objection/Sustained.

“Does that demonstrative aid fairly and accurately portray the injuries you just completed testifying to?” Objection/Sustained.

“Recognize areas 13 and 14?” Objection.

Once again, the attorneys approach the bench for a sidebar.

August 15 at 5:14pm · Like · 7

In Session

The sidebar ends.

“The model that appears in that exhibit, would that assist you in your testimony?”

“Yes, it would assist me.”

“Does that demonstrative [aid] accurately portray the location of the injuries on the body?”

“Yes, it does.”

The State then asks to publish the exhibit, which the judge allows.

“Does that accurately portray the locations of the injuries to the body of Kathleen Savio?”

“Yes, Sir . . . the area across the chest demonstrates where the muscular hemorrhage was beneath the skin . . . this is area of the three bruises on the hip bones . . . this is the bruise to the left front of the thigh . . . and these depict the two bruises to the front of the shins, or the front of the lower legs. This shows what we call anterior, or “front of the body” bruising.”

August 15 at 5:19pm · Like · 11

In Session

“Could you describe the extent of that injury?” [I believe this is the laceration to Savio’s head.]

“I forget how long it was; Dr. Mitchell measured it . . . it was one inch in length.”

Glasgow then asks to publish a photograph showing this injury, after which the parties approach the bench for a sidebar.

August 15 at 5:22pm · Like · 11

In Session

The sidebar ends.

“I ask you to describe the hemorrhaged area on the other side of the scalp?”

“This is an area of discoloration, immediately beneath the laceration to the back of the head . . . showing the accompanying bruising that went around with the actual tearing.”

The witness goes on to describe the layers of the scalp (including the skull), all the way down to the brain.

“None of those were injured, except the skin?”

“Correct . . . the laceration did not go through to the bone; it was a partial tear.”

August 15 at 5:26pm · Like · 11

In Session

“what does that tell you about the force that was transmitted to the skin?”

“There was no significant disruption of tearing, and no injury to the other layers, all the way to the brain . . . the impact site resulting in the laceration had sufficient force to partially tear the

scalp, but no other injuries. So it wouldn't be a great deal of force . . . I'd put it more on the lighter end, if you will."

August 15 at 5:29pm · Like · 9

In Session

"What type of object would cause that?"

"It's a laceration, so by definition it's blunt trauma." Objection/Overruled.

"This occurs when an objection, a weapon, a surface, any blunt objection comes into contact with the skin with enough force to cause this injury . . . it's rather complex, and hard to say exactly how much force, or how it's distributed."

"Would this require a more concentrated edge?"

"Yes."

"When you looked around the tub area, did you see such an edge?"

"No, I found no concentrated edges on that tub; they were gentle, contoured, and smooth."

August 15 at 5:33pm · Like · 23

In Session

Another photograph is published.

"The area depicted shows some non-specific, non-pattered abrasions or scratches to the left side of the arm . . . the color is reddish, perhaps a little brown. The age, I found no indication . . . Dr. Mitchell's report doesn't mention scabs on them, meaning they were in the healing phase. So I would classify them as fresh."

The next photo shows "two lesions in the area of the left elbow . . . also appearing fresh, and without scabbing. This I would classify as fresh . . . abrasions can scab over and become reddened at least within an hour. So I would say less than an hour."

"Is this abrasion of a similar type to that you described on the buttocks area?"

"This is not a pattered abrasion; the one on the buttocks is a patterned abrasion."

"It's a rougher surface, abrading away the top layer of skin?"

"Yes."

August 15 at 5:34pm · Like · 14

In Session

Another picture shows “two linear abrasions, very narrow and elongated.”

This photograph apparently is of one of Savio’s hands.

“The top layer of skin is just abraded off . . . a very distinct abrasion. None of these abrasions on the right hand or wrist region showed any indication of scabbing, so I’d say they were fresh . . . again, within an hour or so of death.”

The photograph shows “the right hand . . . at the base of the index finger at the back of the hand, we have a round, oval, almost crater-like abrasion . . . again, there’s no redness or scabbing over the surface . . . an hour or less, I would say.”

August 15 at 5:37pm · Like · 11

In Session

The next photograph shows “It’s an abrasion, the upper part is non-patterned. The lower part has a cylindrical shape to it . . . so we have non-patterned abrasion adjacent to a patterned abrasion.”

“Around the tub, was there anything that could have caused that pattern?”

“Within the tub itself, no . . . [but] where the vertical tiles meet the tub, it was rough and it was linear.” Objection/Sustained.

“Can you describe the tile from the end of the bathtub rim to that tile?”

“The grout, it’s somewhat roughened . . . and it goes down again to the floor. The bathtub sits in that tile.”

“The tiles themselves had a smooth surface?”

“Yes, they did.”

The witness says that there was no indication that this particular abrasion was any older than “an hour or less,” and was caused by something abrasive (“Not a smooth bathtub”).

August 15 at 5:44pm · Like · 10

In Session

The witness identifies another photograph. "This is actually autopsy picture of the internal portion of the chest . . . I would make the same comments I made about aging bruises in general . . . all we can say is probably less than 24 hours, based on the color."

August 15 at 5:45pm · Like · 9

In Session

The witness is shown another photograph.

"This is an autopsy picture of Kathleen Savio's back, going down to about the knee area. It depicts the abrasion to the left buttocks, and some blood smears on her back."

Once again, the witness opines that the abrasions to the left hip appear to be "fresh . . . less than an hour [old]."

August 15 at 5:48pm · Like · 13

In Session

The witness, using a model or diagram now points out the locations of some more of the injuries present on Kathleen Savio's body.

"When you analyze injuries from a fall, are circumstances, the autopsy, and the scene things you consider?"

"Yes."

"Can you discuss how the circumstances come into play?"

"The circumstances that I took into account . . ." Objection/Sustained.

"In accessing whether injuries are consistent on a body from a fall, what are the things you look at?"

"There are three lines of evidence that lead me to my conclusions: the circumstances, the injuries on the body, and the scene. Those are three standards ones that I use, that forensic pathologists in general use."

"Did you take into account the injuries we saw, and analyze those?"

"Yes, I did . . . first of all, I noted their location, size, shape, color, age, pattern, lack of a pattern, and number. Then I looked at the constellation of injuries. I saw that all the bruises on that body were in front. Her scalp laceration and her abrasions were all in the back, with the one exception of the one on the side of the arm."

“Do you take into account alcohol, drugs, and diseases?”

“Yes . . . in assessing the overall mechanism of injury, one looks for risk factors. In this situation . . . one looks for risk factors. And the three risk factors that are published in the literature, I found alcohol, the presence of drugs within the system, and diseases . . . all these risk factors can lead to accidental drownings in healthy females . . . the autopsy showed the distribution of injuries; in my own autopsy, I looked for deep bruises on the back that might go along with a fall, particularly in the buttocks. And I found none there. And the patterned abrasion on the buttocks would not be consistent with someone’s slip and fall . . . so based on the injuries and the circumstances . . .”

The judge interrupts, calls the parties to a sidebar.

August 15 at 5:57pm · Like · 12

In Session

The sidebar ends.

The witness and jurors have been excused.

Judge: “The issue of someone stepping out of a bathtub and slipping on a tile floor, there’s been no evidence of anyone stepping out of a tub and slipping on a floor. Where is the evidence to support that?”

Glasgow: “I don’t know where that came from.”

Judge: “He’s assuming facts that are in evidence.”

The judge then calls for the jury.

August 15 at 6:00pm · Like · 6

In Session

The witness and the jurors are now back in the courtroom.

Judge to jurors: “The doctor mentioned someone stepping out of a bathtub and slipping on the tile floor. You’re to disregard that entirely.”

The judge then tells the jurors that the trial will recess at this time, and the State will resume its direct examination in the morning.

August 15 at 6:02pm · Like · 10

In Session

Judge Burmila has left the bench.

The trial is in recess until 9:00 CT/10:00 ET Thursday morning.

August 15 at 6:03pm · Like · 7

08/16/2012: Prosecutor Glasgow continues direct examination next day

In Session

August 16

The Drew Peterson murder trial starts back up at 10 A.M. ET!

We will have live updates from court here on Facebook!

Do you have any questions about the Peterson trial?

In Session

Prosecution PIO Chuck Pelkie has just given us the expected rundown of today's witness.

After Dr. Larry Blum's testimony is completed, the next prosecution witness will be Scott Rossetto, Stacy Peterson's friend.

August 16 at 10:06am · Like · 11

In Session

The entire prosecution team is inside the courtroom.

The defendant is present, as are most of his attorneys.

August 16 at 10:26am · Like · 7

In Session

August 16

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

Judge Burmila takes the bench. "Good morning, everyone... unfortunately, there was a delay

this morning, a rather serious accident on the Interstate. That's the reason for the delay."

With that, the judge sends for the witness and for the jury.

In Session

Dr. Larry Blum returns to the stand, and prosecutor Glasgow resumes his direct examination.

"Can you explain rigor mortis?"

"Rigor mortis is the tightening of the muscles in the body that occurs after death . . . it's actually a chemical reaction; heat speeds up this process, and heat retards it . . . upon death, the muscles go limp, rigor sets in, they tighten up, and then with the passage of time rigor disappears. That is the general process."

August 16 at 10:51am · Like · 10

In Session

"When someone falls, is there an involuntary movement of the arms?"

"Yes. The body during fall will instinctively, reflexly extend the arms, in an attempt to reestablish balance and control. It's something that you can't help . . . I would characterize it as 'when you fall, you sprawl' . . . you sprawl out in an attempt to stop yourself. And is that why you were looking for bruising on the back of the arms?"

"Yes."

"And you didn't find any?"

"No."

August 16 at 10:53am · Like · 19

In Session

The witness next describes how the coroner's system works in Illinois.

"It would start with a death . . ." Objection/Sustained.

"The coroner would call me upon the death of an individual within their jurisdiction that they deem requires an autopsy . . . then I would go do the autopsy for the coroner . . . as administrator of the coroner's office, it's their responsibility and duty to certify the death as to cause and manner."

"Your involvement with the coroner would only be for cause?"

"Outside of Cook County, yes." Objection/Sustained.

"In the case involving Kathleen Savio, what were they looking for you to do?"

"They wanted my opinion on the cause and manner of her death . . . the cause of death is defined as the disease or injury responsible for initiating the chain of events that result in biochemical and physiological changes in the body that are incompatible with live."

"In this case, what did you determine the cause of death was?"

"It was my opinion that Kathleen Savio died of drowning."

"By inhaling fluid?"

"Yes."

"Is that the same cause of death that Dr. Mitchell had determined in his protocol?"

"Yes."

"And Dr. Mitchell did not address the manner of death?" Objection.

The State asks for a sidebar.

August 16 at 10:57am · Like · 10

In Session

The sidebar ends.

The witness says that Dr. Mitchell's autopsy protocol did not contain a manner of death.

He then describes what happens when someone drowns.

"If the patient is conscious, there will be a voluntary breath holding . . . then the body will force them to take a breath. That causes the throat to spasm up and close off, because of the water hitting the back of the throat. That spasm will close off the airway until there's not enough oxygen in the blood to maintain that reflex. The patient at this time is generally unconscious . . . and then the throat relaxes, a breath is taken, and water rushes into the lungs . . . it goes into the bloodstream, and causes problems. Unless that person has gotten out of the water within three or four minutes, the brain has been without oxygen for too long."

According to Dr. Blum, very few people can survive for more than five minutes under these circumstances.

In Savio's case, 2000 grams of water were found in her lungs, which is a very large amount.

August 16 at 11:00am · Like · 12

In Session

Dr. Blum then moves to the subject of manner of death: natural, accidental, homicide, suicide, and undetermined.

"Did you determine a manner of death in this case?"

"Yes, I did . . . accidental drownings in bathtubs are associated with risk factors . . ."
Objection/Sustained.

"What are those risk factors for drowning?"

"The number one disease is epilepsy. Other diseases associated with drowning would include M.S. and other neuro-degenerative diseases . . . something like Alzheimer's . . . to where a person in the bathtub might drown by accidentally slipping under the surface; they can't control their muscles. Drugs are extremely important, as is alcohol, in accidental drownings of adults . . . it's extremely rare [for an adult to drown] without risk factors . . . the evidence that led me against it being an accident were the absence of risk factors, the lack of certain injuries on her body, and her position in the bathtub."

"Could this have been a suicide?"

"I read the literature on suicides in general that would apply to virtually any suicide, looking for risk factors or associated conditions . . . there was nothing in the history to suggest that she'd ever talked about suicide, or had any suicide ideation. There was no evidence of that . . . no past suicide attempts were noted . . . I ruled out suicide."

August 16 at 11:05am · Like · 9

In Session

The witness next is asked about whether Savio's death could be a homicide.

"You assess an injury pattern, which tells us if it's an accidental event or an inflicted series of injuries. Injuries of people falling down mountains or off their bicycle are certainly different from household activities."

"Did you come to a conclusion about whether or not the laceration to her head occurred in an accident fall?"

"I did come to a conclusion . . . it's my conclusion that it not occur in a fall . . . the laceration to the back of the head was posterior, or on the back side of the body' all the bruises were on

the front side . . . I just couldn't see how that could happen."

"And the three bruises at the front of her hip . . . they were all deep?"

"That's correct."

"Was there any surface in the tub area that you observed that could have caused those three bruises?"

"No, I did not . . . there were three of them there, not just one . . . there was nothing in the tub per se that would cause those three bruises in the pattern in which they were seen there."

"And the position her body was in, would she have come to rest naturally in that position?"

"Yes, especially the feet . . ." Objection/Sustained.

"Were you able to come to a conclusion as to the manner of death of Kathleen Savio?"

"Yes, Sir."

"And what was that?"

"Homicide."

August 16 at 11:13am · Like · 16

In Session

The witness consulted with Dr. Blum during his own autopsy and also at the scene a week later.

"Do you know the result from the lab of the sexual assault kit?"

"I'm aware of it . . . basically negative, no findings."

"And do you know the result of the fingernail scrapings?" Objection.

The attorneys go to a sidebar.

August 16 at 11:13am · Like · 5

In Session

The sidebar ends.

The jurors and the witness are excused from the courtroom.

Judge: "We're going to take a brief recess, to give the defense a look at their discovery."

August 16 at 11:13am · Like · 8

In Session

The judge has left the bench.

The trial is in a recess of undetermined length.

August 16 at 11:14am · Like · 7

In Session

The defense attorneys are returning to the courtroom.

We should be resuming shortly.

August 16 at 11:24am · Like · 7

In Session

Judge Burmila is back on the bench.

Attorney Greenberg withdraws his objection, and so the judge sends for the witness and the jury.

August 16 at 11:25am · Like · 11

08/16/2012: Prosecutor James Glasgow continues direct examination

In Session

The jurors and the witness are now back in the courtroom.

Prosecutor Glasgow continues his direct examination.

"You testified to a general description of how drowning occurs. Could you apply those principles as to how Kathleen Savio drowned?"

"The lungs were very light for a drowning . . . there was water in the sinuses, in the head . . . this is not total proof of drowning, but it does assist in the diagnosis. Drowning is also a

diagnosis of exclusion . . . between his autopsy and mine, I think we reasonably excluded other causes of death. During the first autopsy, a brain examination was performed; there was some swelling, which does go along with the findings”.

“And it’s your opinion, to a degree of scientific certainty, that Kathleen Savio drowned?”

“That’s correct.”

August 16 at 11:30am · Like · 5

In Session

The witness is shown “my 11 page report on the death of Kathleen Savio, which I authored in February, 2008.”

“And there are no additions or deletions?”

“That appears to have all the pages and paragraphs as I wrote them.”

The prosecution then asks to move the witness’ protocol into evidence, but the defense objects.

The parties approach for a sidebar.

August 16 at 11:32am · Like · 7

In Session

The sidebar ends.

The judge asks to have the jurors and witness excused from the courtroom.

There is then a long pause, during which the judge remains on the bench, and it appears each side is conferring with the members of its team.

August 16 at 11:36am · Like · 6

In Session

The judge has finished reading a document, and Brodsky now addresses the Court.

“Dr. Mitchell’s report, as we talked about a couple of days ago, the original protocol can come in. But we can’t call Dr. Mitchell to cross-examine him. [But] Dr. Blum’s second opinion, so to speak . . . there’s no reason that his written opinion should come into evidence and go back with the jury, and ours won’t . . . the State’s asking for an unfair advantage . . . his report

should not be admitted into evidence, and should not go back with the jury . . . he's got his opinion before the jury; they don't need the report."

Glasgow: "We're asking to move this into evidence because the statute allows it . . . we're asking that the report be admitted."

Judge: "Well, what about all of the things in here that he hasn't testified about? It's replete with information. What is the relevance that she had two children, or that she has a rosary in her hands when he first saw the body?"

Glasgow: "I guess we could redact that . . . we'll present a redacted copy to Your Honor."

Judge: "If the State isn't going to ask that it go back to the jury, the defendant's objection is overruled . . . but whether this would be substantive evidence that would ever go back to the jury, that's a different issue altogether . . . that extraneous information must be removed."

August 16 at 11:46am · Like · 5

In Session

Before the jurors and witness can come back to the courtroom, the defense asks for a moment.

Judge: "They need a moment. We'll let them have their moment."

August 16 at 11:46am · Like · 5

In Session

The defense has now had its "moment."

The judge sends for the witness and the jury.

August 16 at 11:54am · Like · 8

In Session

Despite the fact that the judge just sent for the jury, he has now left the bench.

The jurors have apparently been put on hold for a minute.

August 16 at 11:55am · Like · 6

In Session

I have just been informed by In Session's audio engineer inside the courtroom, that the defense needs to set up some sort of equipment that it will be using during Dr. Blum's cross-examination. That's apparently the reason for this unexpected delay. This is expected to take ten minutes or so.

August 16 at 11:59am · Like · 5

In Session

The media has just been informed that Judge Burmila is on his way back to the courtroom from his chambers.

So we should be resuming momentarily.

August 16 at 12:08pm · Like · 4

In Session

According to defense attorney Steve Greenberg, the piece of equipment the defense has been installing in the courtroom is a "projection microscope."

August 16 at 12:14pm · Like · 4

In Session

Judge Burmila is back on the bench.

He sends for the witness and the jury.

August 16 at 12:14pm · Like · 6

In Session

The witness and jurors are now back in the courtroom.

Prosecutor Glasgow announces that he has no further questions.

August 16 at 12:15pm · Like · 7

08/16/2012: Defense Attorney Ralph Meczyk on cross examination

In Session

Defense attorney Ralph Meczyk begins his cross-examination of Dr. Blum.

The witness confirms that Will County, Illinois is still under the coroner system. Objection.

The parties go to a sidebar.

August 16 at 12:17pm · Like · 8

In Session

The sidebar ends.

The witness confirms that it's discretionary in Will County whether or not the coroner wants to empanel a coroner's inquest.

"You were also hired by Mr. Glasgow, besides the coroner of this county?"

"I have submitted bills to both." Objection/Sustained.

"You were hired by the State's Attorney of Will County?" Objection/Overruled.

"I don't know what 'hired' means."

"You spoke to Mr. Glasgow before undertaking this task of examining Kathleen Savio's body?" Objection/Sustained.

August 16 at 12:19pm · Like · 4

In Session

"There did come a time when you spoke to Mr. Glasgow about this case?"

"That's correct."

"And he told you that he wanted you to reexamine the death of Kathleen Savio." Objection/Sustained.

The judge asks the jurors to leave the courtroom (even though the defense attorney attempts to withdraw his question).

August 16 at 12:19pm · Like · 6

08/16/2012: Defense Attorney Ralph Meczyk on "Offer of Proof"

In Session

The jurors and witness are now gone.

Judge: "Mr. Meczyk, you've now told the witness that he had a conversation with Mr. Glasgow. Do you have some way of impeaching the witness if he now denies that conversation?"

"Yes . . . let me make an offer of proof, if I may."

Meczyk produces a transcript from the hearsay hearing, and points out a specific passage to the prosecution. There is a lengthy pause while the prosecution team examines the passage in question. Meczyk then points out the same passage to the judge, who also reads it.

August 16 at 12:24pm · Like · 4

In Session

Judge Burmila has now read the pertinent portion of the hearsay hearing transcript.

Judge: "State, do you have the information now?"

Glasgow: "We're ready,

Judge . . . all I asked for is foundation."

Judge: "That portion of the objection is overruled.

He then asks that the witness and jury be brought back.

August 16 at 12:26pm · Like · 4

08/16/2012: Defense Attorney Ralph Meczyk continues cross examination

In Session

The witness and jurors have returned to the courtroom, and attorney Meczyk resumes his cross-examination.

"I'd like you to assist me with the prosecutors in laying what's known as the foundation . . . did there come a time, Sir, in 2010, do you recall the date you met with the prosecutors?"

"I do not recall; my memory's exhausted on the date."

"Is it fair to say you did, in fact, meet with the coroner and Mr. Glasgow at some point, asking you to revisit the Savio matter?"

"I was asked by the coroner to perform an autopsy, a second autopsy, on Miss Savio . . . I do

not recall specifically any conversations with Mr. Glasgow prior to the autopsy. I'm not saying that I didn't talk to him; I'm just saying I can't recall any conversations I may have had with him."

"This is not the first time you testified about this matter?"

"Yes, you are correct."

"In February of 2010, you came to a courtroom in this building?"

"I don't recall the exact date."

"You came to give testimony?"

"That is correct."

"You were put under oath?" Objection/Overruled.

"Yes, I was under oath."

"You gave your solemn word that you would tell the truth?"

"That is true."

"And you took the same oath yesterday as you did back then in 2010?" Objection/Overruled.

"Yes."

August 16 at 12:32pm · Like · 4

In Session

Meczyk shows the witness a document.

"While you were in this very courthouse, the subject came up about when you were contacted to handle, to revisit the Savio matter?"

"Yes."

In that previous testimony, the witness said that he was contacted by the coroner and the State's Attorney.

"Did I read that correctly?"

"Correct."

"Those are your words, and not mine?"

“Why would you testify to two different things under oath?” Objection/Sustained.

“Mr. Glasgow asked you to review everything, correct?”

“I don’t recall any specific, because of the time lapse. I don’t recall what Mr. Glasgow said or didn’t say prior to the examination. It was the coroner, however, who called me to do this autopsy, not the State’s Attorney.”

“Mr. Glasgow told you he wanted you to examine everything, and come to an unbiased opinion?”

“Yes . . . that is correct.”

“Because Mr. Glasgow knew that in the past you’d given him biased opinions, what he wanted to hear, isn’t that true?”

“I cannot read his mind.”

“You have, in fact, assisted Mr. Glasgow in the past?”

“I have.”

“You’re assisting Mr. Glasgow right now, in another trial?”

“If you’re referring to the [Christopher] Vaughn case, yes . . . he did request me to assist in that case, yes.” Objection/Sustained.

August 16 at 12:38pm · Like · 3

In Session

“Would you say that Dr. Mitchell was an esteemed colleague?”

“You could say that . . . yes.”

“He was trusted among the profession of forensic pathology?”

“Yes, Sir.”

“You’d also agree that when Dr. Mitchell performed the first autopsy upon the remains of Miss Savio, he was in a better position . . . at some point, he did perform the first autopsy?”

“Yes.”

“You’d agree the pathologist looking grossly, eyeballing . . . at the time he examined grossly her remains, those remains were fresh?”

"Yes."

"And any bruises or contusions would be nice and fresh?"

"Yes."

"And you examined the remains three years later, when the remains were not nice and fresh?"

"That is correct."

"And you, of course, are familiar with the late Dr. Mitchell's protocol, his autopsy report?"

"Yes."

"You read his pathological findings?"

"I did read his report . . . I had access to all the records in the coroner's report, and his report was among them."

"You did read his autopsy report?"

"Yes."

"You agree he did a sound job?"

"Under the circumstances."

"Thorough?"

"For the most part."

"He did a orthodox, professional autopsy, in your opinion?" Objection/Overruled.

"Yes, Sir."

"And you're acquainted with his autopsy report?"

"Yes, I am."

"And you know that Dr. Mitchell had a clear opportunity to look at the bruises on the body of Kathleen Savio?"

"Yes."

"And he documented the bruises that he saw?"

"Yes."

“And he enumerates all the bruises or contusions he saw during the first autopsy?”

“They’re in the photographs. There are ones he didn’t enumerate in his report.”

August 16 at 1:05pm · Like · 6

In Session

“He describes what he sees upon gross examination?”

“That’s correct.”

“And at the very end, he examined her back and buttocks, and said, ‘the back and buttocks are symmetrical and free of significant injury’?”

“I remember that.”

“He used the phrase ‘free of significant injury’?”

“Yes, he did.”

August 16 at 1:05pm · Like · 6

In Session

Attorney Meczyk continues to read from Dr. Mitchell’s report.

“Findings made by a respected colleague, stated in that pathological protocol, stated ‘no significant trauma’?”

“Yes.”

“And that would include bruises, trauma, even a laceration?”

“Yes, Sir.”

August 16 at 1:05pm · Like · 6

In Session

The attorney prepares to project the witness’ C.V.

The State objects, and the parties approach for a sidebar.

August 16 at 1:06pm · Like · 6

In Session

The sidebar ends, and Dr. Blum's C.V. is projected.

The witness points out a few changes between the time it was compiled and his current status.

"It was accurate in 2010."

"No significant changes?"

"Right."

"You're familiar with Dr. Mitchell's background?"

"Only briefly . . . not to any degree."

Dr. Bryan Mitchell's C.V. is then projected side-by-side with Dr. Blum's.

"The late Dr. Bryan Mitchell also opined at the very, very end of his detailed autopsy report:

'The laceration to posterior scalp may be related to a fall in which she struck her head'?"

"Correct."

"And his opinion was that her death was related to a fall?" Objection/Overruled.

"His cause of death was drowning."

The witness is handed Dr. Mitchell's four-page autopsy report.

"The laceration to posterior scalp may have been related to a fall in which she struck her head' . . . those were his words?"

"Absolutely."

August 16 at 1:06pm · Like · 5

In Session

The witness confirms that he had access to police reports and other documents in this case.

"You have your own examination, and you have to put context as to why the body was the way it was?"

“Yes.”

“And it’s fair to say that you got thousands of police reports, things of that nature?”

“There were a lot.”

“And part of the burden you had was that you also had opportunity read the defense reports, prepared by Mr. Peterson’s forensic pathologists?”

“Yes.”

“And one of those . . .” Objection/Sustained.

Attorney Meczyk asks for a little guidance in this area.

But the judge decides this is a good time for the lunch recess, and excuses the witness and the jury.

August 16 at 1:07pm · Like · 7

In Session

The jurors and witness are now gone.

Meczyk questions the judge about what exactly was improper about his last question.

“I think it’s certainly fair to inquire from this witness if he disagrees with their findings . . . it might help him form his opinion . . . I think that’s why it’s relevant.”

Judge: “The judge did not say he relied on any of those materials that you named. If he says he did rely on them, then I’m going to let you go into it.”

Meczyk: “Very good.”

August 16 at 1:07pm · Like · 6

In Session Attorney

Greenberg says there may be some issues that need to be addressed before the next witness, Scott Rossetto.

Judge: “OK, we’ll address those then.”

The judge then leaves the bench, and the trial is in recess until 1:15 CT/2:15 ET.

August 16 at 1:08pm · Like · 6

08/16/2012: Judge takes a break for lunch

In Session

Prosecutor Chuck Pelkie has just come into the overflow courtroom.

He says that “it’s possible” that the State will rest “by the end of next week.”

August 16 at 1:09pm · Like · 9

In Session

there is a new thread

August 16 at 2:27pm · Like

In Session

August 16

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

Judge Burmila is back on the bench.

Judge: “There’s one thing I have to comment on . . . during the lunch recess and yesterday, I have gotten so many e-mails from people I know about media reports about me blowing my brains out. . . I didn’t say I wanted to blow my brains out; I said that Judge Pistilli said he wanted to blow his brains out. So to my family and friends, I just want them to know that I am not going to blow my brains out.”

In Session

The attorneys have a brief discussion about the tissue slides that Dr. Blum will be shown by the defense during his cross-examination.

The defense says that all of the slides that it has were given to them by the State.

With that, the judge sends for the witness and the jury.

However, before they can come back, prosecutor Connor once again brings up the slide issue. He says all the slides were made from the same tissue samples, but they’re individual tissue slices.

Connor asks that the defense use only the slides that Dr. Blum has, but the judge says that he will not limit the defense in that way.

Meczyk then asks that Dr. Blum quickly take a look at both sets of slides, to avoid any confusion.

The judge grants that request, so the court is in recess until the witness has had a chance to examine the defense's slides.

The judge leaves the bench.

August 16 at 2:32pm · Like · 7

08/16/2012: Defense Attorney Ralph Meczyk continues cross examination

In Session

The judge is back on the bench.

He sends for the jury.

August 16 at 2:46pm · Like · 5

In Session

The witness and jurors are now in the courtroom.

Attorney Meczyk resumes his cross-examination.

“In the voluminous documents that you inspected before opinion today as well as yesterday, you also read a document that was prepared by an individual by the name of “VanOver, who is a deputy coroner?”

“Yes.”

“He was one of the first individuals to arrive at the scene where Ms. Savio died?”

“Yes.”

“And when he arrived, it was a pristine scene?”

“Yes.”

“When it came to the subject of bruises, deputy coroner VanOver made some very pointed observations regarding bruises?”

“He did, but he didn’t describe any at the scene, as I recall.”

“But he did discuss them, didn’t he?”

“That I don’t recall . . . he did notice the abrasion to the left buttock.”

“And he observed that they had started to heal?” Objection/Overruled.

“Yes, that is correct; he made that statement.”

“He said the wound appeared to be healing?”

“Yes.”

August 16 at 2:50pm · Like · 7

In Session

The late Dr. Bryan Mitchell had the first opportunity to grossly examine the body of Kathleen Savio?”

“Yes.”

“And then he performed the autopsy?”

“Yes, internally.”

“You’re fond of saying that death is like a box of chocolates?”

“Yes.”

“You never know what you’re going to get underneath that Whitman sampler?”

“Exactly . . . often times you’re surprised.”

“And Dr. Mitchell took samples?”

“Yes.”

“And he prepared an autopsy report?”

“Yes, Sir.”

“He didn’t put all his observations in that autopsy report?”

“Yes.”

“And he took photographs that you relied upon?”

“Either he, or the state police person who was there.”

“We’ve agreed that Dr. Mitchell was a competent and highly-respected pathologist?”

“I would go that far, yes.” Objection/Sustained.

“In three years, as far as you know, Dr. Mitchell never changed his opinion?”

“To the best of my knowledge, he did not.”

“He didn’t notify the person who was the coroner of this county that he had any reservations or doubts, correct?” Objection/Sustained.

August 16 at 3:01pm · Like · 6

In Session

“There came a time when you looked at the findings provided to you by the defense from the other forensic pathologists in this matter?”

“Correct.”

“Starting with Dr. Demaio, a very highly respected pathologist . . .” Objection/Sustained.

“You did review the findings of Dr. Spitz?”

“I did read his report.”

“And you read it not just for curiosity? You wanted to know what your peers say, to?”

“I was very interested in what he had to say about the case, yes.”

“And you maintain manner of death to be homicide?”

“Correct.”

Glasgow then shouts out the word “OBJECTION!”

The judge excuses the jury and the witness.

August 16 at 3:01pm · Like · 5

In Session

The witness and jurors are now gone.

Glasgow objects to the defense attorney's attempt to get in the testimony of the defense experts through his questions.

Judge: "If he looked at their reports, he's going to be able to get into those reports."

Glasgow: "Why should they be allowed to bring in these opinions of these experts without ever calling them?"

Judge: "I'm not responsible for what Dr. Blum testified to . . . he said that he reviewed these reports of his peers . . . where this is going to lead us, I don't know. But the doctor said what he said, and they can ask him about it if they want to. If it leads to redirect examination, it leads to redirect examination."

August 16 at 3:01pm · Like · 4

In Session

Greenberg joins the discussion.

"If they want to get into Dr. Mitchell's prior testimony, that's a different issue, because he's deceased."

Judge: "If they want to get into his grand jury testimony, we'll keep that in mind. We'll go from there."

With that, the judge sends for the jurors and the witness.

August 16 at 3:02pm · Like · 4

In Session

The jury is now back in the jury box, and Dr. Blum has returned to the stand.

After a brief sidebar, attorney Meczyk resumes his cross-examination.

"Using as you said peer review of these world-renowned pathologist, despite what Dr. Jentzen wrote in his report, you differ?"

"If he wrote anything other than homicide, then we differ."

"You reviewed Dr. Spitz' report?"

"That's correct."

"You've heard of Dr. Spitz?"

"I actually attended one of his classes about three years ago . . . I got to listen to one of his lectures . . . it was very good."

"You have to be commended for attending lecture."

"We're required." (LAUGHTER).

"Dr. Spitz also had a conclusion about manner of death?"

"I would assume he did . . . I don't recollect that portion."

The witness is then shown a copy of Dr. Spitz' report.

"His opinion is different than yours, correct?"

"Correct."

"180 degrees different? . . . it's the opposite of your opinion?"

"It's quite different, yes."

"He says accident, you say homicide?"

"Yes."

"We're not talking about toMAto and toMAHto?" Objection/Sustained.

"No matter what he says, you still say homicide?"

"Yes."

"You also reviewed Dr. Demaio's report?"

"Yes."

"You wanted to see what they wanted to opine?"

"Yes."

"Sort of a check on what you were doing, a peer review?"

"I would say so."

"And Dr. Demaio comes to a different opinion than you?"

"I believe he calls it an accident as well."

“So now we have three eminent pathologists that say it was an accident . . . despite their opinion, you still say homicide?”

“Well, I haven’t changed my opinion; that’s correct.”

August 16 at 3:12pm · Like · 11

In Session

The defense asks for a moment to mark a few exhibits.

The prosecution then asks for a sidebar.

August 16 at 3:38pm · Like · 4

In Session

The sidebar ends.

The witness is then asked about the bruising that was noted on Savio’s body, and how they could be dated.

“I want to talk to you about signs of healing . . . but not about the gross examination, looking at the body, but the sort of box of chocolates analogy, the wonderful one that you use. But before we talk about that, your conclusion that you stuck with is that the manner of death is homicide?”

“Right.”

“And one of the reasons that you come to this opinion is because of the pattern of bruising?”

“The distribution of injury, yes.”

“And in your view, you can’t have these types of injuries . . .”

“Yes, a fall back to split the head open would not cause the front injuries, in the same fall.”

“It’s not logical, based on your triangle of how you approach these types of cases?”

“That’s correct.”

August 16 at 3:38pm · Like · 6

In Session

“Once a person dies, he or she stops bleeding?”

“Once the heart stops beating, the blood will cease flowing. And the bleeding stops.”

“You took tissue samples?”

“Yes, that is my routine, to take tissues from the autopsy . . . in formaldehyde, the tissues won’t deteriorate.”

“And then they’re put in a plastic container?”

“Yes, Sir.”

“And at some point, alcohol is also applied, to dry out the tissue?”

“Not yet.”

The witness explains how tissue samples are prepared.

“You took a tissue sample from the lower left quadrant, which looked to you like a fresh bruise, nice and fresh?”

“It was fresh, yes.”

“You made an incision, and you went down very, very deep?”

“To the bone.”

“But this is the hip bone . . . there’s not a lot of distance between the flesh and the skin?”

“It’s fairly close to the skin.”

August 16 at 3:39pm · Like · 7

In Session

The witness is now asked about “the healing process . . . the history of a bruise. If a bruise is new or recent, you’d expect to see red blood cells?”

“Yes, that’s what a bruise is.”

“That means upon trauma or impact you have a bursting of whatever vessel carries blood?”

“Yes.”

“And the blood would spill out?”

“Yes.”

“In a slide, you’d expect to see a sea of red blood cells?”

“Yes, blood cells that were outside their vessels. If they’re inside their vessels, that’s not a bruise . . . it’s loose blood cells within the tissue.”

He is then questioned about the structure of a red blood cell.

“It looks like a red lozenge, if you will?”

“Yes, a round one.”

August 16 at 3:39pm · Like · 5

In Session

The topic has turned to hemosiderin, one of the components of red blood cells.

“Hemosiderin is a sure sign that a bruise is starting to heal?”

“I would agree with that.”

“And hemosiderin has no distinct shape?”

“No.”

August 16 at 3:39pm · Like · 4

In Session

At one point, Meczyk asks Dr. Blum if he needs to take a break (which Blum declines).

Meczyk: “I know it’s hot in here. I’m not making you sweat . . . not yet.”

August 16 at 3:39pm · Like · 6

In Session

The witness is asked about a notation in his autopsy report.

“That’s what you wrote in your report, at the request of the coroner and Mr. Glasgow?”

“At the request of the coroner.”

“You did not discuss dark pigmentation in that report?”

“I did . . . it wasn’t very dark.”

The State asks for a sidebar.

August 16 at 3:41pm · Like · 8

In Session

The sidebar ends, and the witness is shown a slide.

“There’s no evidence of red blood cells, right?”

“The report shows multiple areas of dark pigmentation . . . so, no, I did not see any loose red blood cells.” Objection/Sustained.

“I saw some intact red blood cells, but there wasn’t a bruise there.”

“That big nice and fresh bruise that you called it . . .”

“Three bruises, I called it . . . three and a half years after burial, the three bruises had coalesced into a single area.”

“That bruise is about a week old, isn’t it?”

“This bruise when I looked at it was over three years old.”

“No, no . . . if you had to date that bruise, how old is it?”

“That tissue was embalmed.” Objection/Overruled.

“You opined yesterday that this was a fresh bruise. Are you now taking back that that is a fresh bruise?”

“The tissue that it came from represents what a three and a half year old bruise looks like after decomposition and embalming. Yes, that’s a bruise.”

“Is that an old bruise or a fresh bruise? Is it new or is it old?”

“Yes, it’s a very fresh bruise.”

The witness then points out “a decomposition coloring . . . it’s an artifact, basically . . . it’s a common artifact; even with tissue that hasn’t been embalmed, if it sits long enough it can show up like that. So that’s my opinion . . . it is not hemosiderin, in my opinion.”

August 16 at 3:50pm · Like · 8

In Session

“You’re saying that’s something left over from the embalming process?”

“That pigment you’re showing on the screen right now, yes.” Objection/Overruled.

“The description of the artifact isn’t in the body of my report.”

“It’s not in the body of your report?”

“That’s correct.”

“It’s not hemosiderin, correct?”

“That’s my opinion, yes.”

“There’s one way to resolve it once and for all . . . there’s one unequivocal, clear way to resolve it, if those clumps are hemosiderin, the end result, the old bruise or the new bruise. Can you tell the members of the jury that you took that and sent it out for an iron test?”

“I don’t recall.”

“You don’t recall because you never sent it out at all for an iron stain?”

“I don’t remember seeing any iron stains on this.”

“I just want to know very simply whether or not you sent that slide out to be re-stained, to be tested for hemosiderin?”

“No, I did not.”

August 16 at 3:54pm · Like · 5

In Session

The defense asks for a brief recess, and the witness and jury are excused from the courtroom.

Judge Burmila: “We’ll be in recess for ten minutes.”

The judge leaves the bench, and the trial is in recess until approximately 3:00 CT/4:00 ET.

August 16 at 3:55pm · Like · 5

In Session

Judge Burmila is back on the bench.

He sends for the witness and the jury.

August 16 at 4:20pm · Like · 6

In Session

The witness and attorneys are now back in the courtroom.

Ralph Meczyk continues his cross-examination.

“There’s something the prosecutor brought up . . . he didn’t ask you, but I will. You’ve heard the term DNA today, that there were DNA samples taken?”

“With the sexual assault kit, in that context . . . I get the samples, and then submit them to the lab.”

“And you know what the result was, don’t you?”

“I don’t believe there were any positive results.”

“Zero? Negative?” Objection/Overruled.

“Yes.”

“You saw the Illinois State Police report?”

“A two page report, yes.”

The witness is then given a copy of the ISP report.

“Did you see that report before your testimony of the last two days?”

“Let me please look at it . . . I believe this is a duplicate; I only saw a two page report, and there’s four pages here. I did see it, and it is negative.”

“One would expect that during a struggle there would be DNA or tissue underneath the fingernails?”

“If the victim scratched the assailant, there may be, yes . . . in a defensive posture, there may be some of that person’s DNA under the fingernails. Not necessarily, but maybe.”

“No male DNA was identified?”

“That’s correct.”

August 16 at 4:27pm · Like · 6

In Session

“Again, You didn’t do a re-staining for iron stain in this case?”

“No.”

“Because it didn’t fit your nice theory about what happened?” Objection/Overruled.

“The reason I didn’t do it was because there was blood under that area. Three years later, if I checked for iron, there would be iron there, because the red cells would have broken down and released iron. In fact, if it wasn’t there, I would have thought the stains didn’t work right.”

“You don’t do that staining, and then you come up with that lame excuse?”
Objection/Sustained.

August 16 at 4:29pm · Like · 4

In Session

“You know that Ms. Savio had a cat?”

“Yes.”

“And that could very easily have caused the scratches that were seen?”

“It depends on the condition of the claws; some cats are de-clawed. But the scratches could have been caused by a cat.”

August 16 at 4:29pm · Like · 6

In Session

There is a pause, while the defense attorney prepares for his next line of questioning.

August 16 at 4:33pm · Like · 3

In Session

The witness is shown an exhibit (I believe it’s a document that he’s reading to himself).

"This is one of the thousands of documents you reviewed . . . this is Ms. Savio's medical history concerning a dermatological or skin problem?"

"Yes."

"She visited a skin doctor, a dermatologist?"

"Yes."

"And on the form she filled out, she informs her physician, 'I have very sensitive skin. I'm allergic to grass. And I have been breaking out since I have been a kid, mainly on my face and arms. Now my body has been affected, and because of my age I'm beginning to scar . . . my buttocks are all scared up, along with acne/face.' Did I read that correctly?"

"Yes."

"Now we know that she suffered from some scarring in the buttock area, according to her?"

"Yes."

August 16 at 4:37pm · Like · 5

In Session

Dr. Blum is next asked about the toxicological screenings done on Kathleen Savio.

"One of the drugs she was taking was Yasmin?"

"Yes."

"And you know that there are currently over 11,000 wrongful death suits related to Yasmin?"
Objection/Overruled.

"I do not know that."

The prosecution then asks for a sidebar.

August 16 at 4:38pm · Like · 6

In Session

The sidebar ends.

"You didn't attempt to determine what Ms. Savio's day was like, just before she died?"

"I didn't make any attempt to inquire into her 24 hour activity."

"You didn't go to the hospital, to her employer, to see what she did that day?"

"No."

"You don't know if she banged into a drawer, do you?"

"No, I do not."

"You don't know if during the course of having aggressive sexual intercourse with another person, you don't know that, do you?"

"I suppose it's within the realm of possibility, but I don't have an opinion that it was due to that. I don't know, let's put it that way."

"During your review of this entire case, you referred to an article in a foreign forensic medical juror?"

"It's the International Forensic Science Journal, well-respected, yes, I did."

"That was prepared by a former Dade County, Florida medical examiner?"

"That's my understanding, yes."

"You relied on that article, and mentioned it in your report to the prosecutors?"

"To the coroner, yes."

"And the Dade County medical examiner looked at six deaths?"

"There were more than six, I believe. I have the article here, and we can check it."

"There were ten?"

"That sounds better."

"And in that article, there were questions to ask . . . a list of factors that you would consider?"

"That's correct."

August 16 at 4:45pm · Like · 5

In Session

The witness is given a copy of the article. Objection/Overruled.

“You’re acquainted with that article?”

“Oh, yes; I’ve referred to it many times over the years.”

“And it makes no reference to bathtub drownings?”

“That’s correct; they had none in their series.”

“When it comes to every determination of a manner of death . . . for example, if a victim is chased into a pond and he dies, the manner of death is homicide?”

“That’s correct.”

“In every case, there is a key factor, in all the ten cases he studies, a key factor?”

“Yes, that’s how he lists it here in the summary.”

“In the ten case studies, at the end, there’s a key factor . . . that’s the thing that makes the final conclusion of manner of death?”

“I think mine got cut off a little bit.”

The witness is then given another copy of the article.

“In your autopsy report, you don’t list a key factor, do you?” Objection/Sustained.

“A key factor is something that takes it over the top?”

“I think that’s a fair assessment.”

“The thing that distinguishes accident from homicide is a key factor?”

“Not exactly . . . I listed mine; I didn’t copy him directly . . . I didn’t use the word ‘key.’”

“Not in your report . . . not one word?”

“It’s not the word ‘key’ that distinguishes an accident from a homicide. It’s the evidence.”

August 16 at 4:50pm · Like · 6

In Session

The prosecution asks for a sidebar.

August 16 at 4:50pm · Like · 4

In Session

The sidebar ends, and the jurors and witness have left the courtroom.

The judge calls “a brief recess,” and leaves the bench.

August 16 at 4:54pm · Like · 6

In Session

Judge Burmila is now back on the bench.

He sends for the witness and the jury.

August 16 at 5:02pm · Like · 7

In Session

The witness and jurors have returned to the courtroom, and attorney Meczyk announces that “at this time, I have no further examination of Dr. Blum.”

So that concludes the cross-examination.

August 16 at 5:05pm · Like · 5

In Session

There is a new thread

August 16 at 5:11pm · Like · 5

08/16/2012: Prosecutor James Glasgow on redirect examination

In Session

August 16

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

Prosecutor Glasgow begins his redirect of Dr. Larry Blum.

In Session

“With regard to the dramatic slide demonstration that you participated in . . .”
Objection/Sustained.

“With regards to the slide you were testifying to, was there a second sample made by Dr. Michael Baden, from that same area?”

“Yes . . . it showed hemorrhage, showed a bruise.”

“Did that also corroborate the observations you made of the photograph of the bruise taken at the autopsy?”

“Yes . . . it was fresh.”

“Could you explain why Prussian blue stain couldn’t work in this case?”

“It’s a stain for iron; the iron stains blue . . . it would be futile in this case, because we’re taking it from an area where we know there’s a bruise, the hip. And after three and a half years, since iron is in blood cells, they deteriorate over the years. The results would be positive, because we know there’s iron there . . . you can see it on a regular stain; you don’t need a special stain to see it . . . they were fresh; there were no other cells in there . . . these were very, very fresh bruises.”

August 16 at 5:11pm · Like · 20

In Session

“Did you have a chance to review the autopsy protocol of Dr. Michael Baden, for peer review?” Objection/Sustained.

Glasgow then asks for a sidebar.

August 16 at 5:11pm · Like · 7

In Session

The sidebar ends.

“Getting back to the article you referred to . . . you indicated it’s not the key factor, but the evidence?”

“That’s correct.”

“And in this case, you’ve been able to determine that the wound to the head of Kathleen Savio was not caused by a fall in that bathroom?” Objection.

The attorneys approach for another sidebar.

August 16 at 5:13pm · Like · 6

In Session

The sidebar ends.

“My opinion is that it was not caused by a fall to that bathtub. Or in that bathtub.”

August 16 at 5:14pm · Like · 23

In Session

The witness repeats that one of the abrasions on Savio’s body were fresh.

“Dr. Mitchell did not say it was healing in any way, shape, or form . . . it appeared to be a fresh abrasion to me, without signs of healing.”

“Dr. Mitchell mentions an injury to the buttock?”

“Yes.”

“How do you reconcile that?” Objection/Overruled.

“I don’t know if it was a mistake . . .” Objection/Sustained.

“Do you see a conflict between those two statements?”

“Oh, they are contradictory.”

“And you’d consider this abrasion a serious injury?”

“Oh, yes . . . the surface of the tub was smooth and not rough. And if she was taking a bath at the time, it was wet.” Objection/Overruled.

“And it’s your opinion that that abrasion was not caused by a fall in that tub?”

“Yes.” Objection/Sustained.

“At the second autopsy, that you performed, you made a significant effort to determine if there were any significant bruising to the back and arms?”

“Yes . . . I found no bruises in those locations. All the bruises were to the front of her body.”

August 16 at 5:20pm · Like · 12

In Session

Dr. Blum notes that in the initial autopsy, three separate bruises were noted. “Three years, these areas were no longer distinctly three different areas, but were one big mass. That’s the effect of post-mortem effects, making the three into one.”

“But those are three separate contact areas?”

“Yes.”

“Did you see any area, any contact point, that would line up with those three bruises?”

“No, I did not.”

“So would that be another injury that would tell you that that injury did not occur in that bathtub?”

“Yes.”

The judge then calls the parties to a sidebar.

August 16 at 5:26pm · Like · 9

In Session

The sidebar is now over.

“Going to that article, you were asked about key factors?”

“Yes.”

“And you said it’s not the key factor that’s important, it’s the evidence?”

“Yes.”

“And the evidence you look at is what tells you this wasn’t an accident?”

“That’s what I relied on . . . the position of the body in the tub was key. The laceration on the back of the head, her face down in the tub, that’s peculiar. And the position of the toes would negate the floating down of the feet into a position like that.”

August 16 at 5:27pm · Like · 17

In Session

Dr. Blum repeats that if a wound is in the up position, after the heart stops beating “some blood will leak out. But not very much, and not very long . . . that blood tells me that right under her face, there was no water in that bathtub.”

August 16 at 5:27pm · Like · 19

In Session

“You were asked about some testimony you gave in 2010 . . . you said that . . .” Objection.

The parties approach the bench for a sidebar.

August 16 at 5:27pm · Like · 5

In Session

The sidebar ends, and Glasgow continues to read from the witness’ 2010 testimony.

“Well, he didn’t read the rest of your answer, did he?” Objection/Sustained.

“It says that no matter what you come up with, you were asked for your honest opinion?”

“Yes.”

“It had nothing to do with whether you were biased or not?”

“Never.”

“In your career, how many times have you worked with the defense?”

“43 times.”

“As a scientist, you’re available to assess the evidence and take it wherever it goes?”

“Yes, I will look at the case and the evidence. They pay me for my time, but my opinion is free.”

That ends the redirect examination of Dr. Blum.

August 16 at 5:31pm · Like · 17

08/16/2012: Defense Attorney Ralph Meczyk on recross examination

In Session

Attorney Meczyk begins his recross.

“The majority of times you testified is for the prosecutors, correct?”

“I am called by the prosecutors most of the time, because I do the autopsies most of the time.”

“Right now, you are consulting on another matter that will be prosecuted in this courthouse?”
Objection/Sustained.

The witness is then asked about the slides that were made during Dr. Michael Baden’s autopsy. Dr. Blum is handed a document.

“Yes, there were white blood cells among the red blood cells.”

The judge then asks that the jurors be excused from the courtroom.

August 16 at 5:34pm · Like · 7

In Session

The judge has left the bench.

We’re in a brief recess.

August 16 at 5:36pm · Like · 9

In Session

The judge is back on the bench.

He sends for the jury.

August 16 at 5:48pm · Like · 12

In Session

The jurors are now back in the courtroom, and the trial resumes.

Attorney Meczyk: “Mr. Glasgow asked you about the Baden slides . . . you looked at Slide C before your testimony?”

“Correct.”

The witness steps down from the stand and is directed to the well of the courtroom.

“Please look at the [projection] microscope, and see if you can find any red blood cells, and point them out to the jury?”

“Some of them are perfectly preserved concave disks.”

“There also appears in Slide C, prepared by Dr. Baden, the lumps we discussed as to whether hemosiderin or not?”

“Yes.”

“So we have clumps of what I would call hemosiderin . . .” Objection/Sustained.

“Putting the degenerative material away, assuming that this was hemosiderin, the red blood cells could be a remnant?": Objection/Sustained.

“The tissues, before they are cut . . .”

The judge asks the witness to return to the stand.

“The tissues, before it’s cut with the microtone, which is a vey sharp knife, is embedded in paraffin. The sections are micron-thin . . . this cuts it microns-thin, and there’s no dragging or anything.”

August 16 at 5:54pm · Like · 6

In Session

“Last week, you were scheduled to testify?”

“Correct.”

“You were here last Wednesday?” Objection.

The attorneys go to a sidebar.

August 16 at 5:54pm · Like · 5

In Session

The sidebar ends.

The witness is excused from the stand (his testimony is now apparently over).

Judge to the jury: “The presentation of evidence for today is at an end. I’ll see you tomorrow.”

The jurors then leave the courtroom.

August 16 at 5:55pm · Like · 7
