

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

Joseph Steadman Testified August 17, 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 17

Watch this thread for updates from the Drew Peterson murder trial.

Judge Burmila is back on the bench.

Brodsky has a question about some discovery regarding "Dr. Case," who is apparently an upcoming prosecution witness. He complains that there is a "presentation" that Dr. Case was part of that the State has never turned over.

The prosecution responds, and the issue appears to be resolved.

The judge sends for the jury.

In Session

With that, Judge Burmila has banned any further testimony from Scott Rossetto. He orders the State to produce a new witness, and sends for the jurors.

However, before the jury enters, attorney Brodsky brings up another matter, regarding a life insurance policy on the life of Kathy Savio.

"I don't see the relevancy of bringing that before the jury . . . there's very, very little probative value."

Connor responds, says that the witness in question would only testify as to the statements made to him by the defendant. Brodsky continues to insist that this testimony would be more prejudicial than probative, and should be excluded.

Judge: "As to the defendant's statements, I find that they are relevant, and they are admissible . . . so the defendant's objections are overruled, and those statements are admissible."

August 17 at 4:01pm · Like · 13

In Session

Judge Burmila then sends for the jury.

August 17 at 4:04pm · Like · 4

08/17/2012: Prosecutor John Connor on direct examination

In Session

The jurors are now present, and the State calls its next witness:

Joseph Steadman (questioned by prosecutor Connor).

“I was a senior insurance claim adjustor for Old Republic Life Insurance in Chicago” (now retired).

“Did you work on a claim for the death of a woman named Kathleen Savio?”

“Yes.”

The witness says he would normally get a phone call, and then he would immediately create a memo about the claim.

“Would you recognize two of those memos if they were shown to you today?”

“Yes.”

He is shown a document.

“This was my first contact with Mr. Peterson, via telephone.”

“Did you ever meet this individual in person?”

“Someone I spoke to on the phone.”

“You created this entire memo?”

“Yes, Sir.”

“Can you read this sentence?”

“I asked Drew Peterson what she had died from. And he said her death was drug-related, and she had been found dead in her bathtub.” The memo is dated March 16, 2004 (the

conversation took place the day before, on March 15, 2004). “The phone call came in after 3:00 pm; we went home at 4:00. I wrote it the next day.”

August 17 at 4:10pm · Like · 11

In Session

The witness is then shown another document, and then asked to read from it.

“Drew Peterson advised me that he is a Bolingbrook, IL police officer, and he was working the night of her death and was the first person on the scene and found her body. He was not allowed to investigate her death, since he is her ex-husband, and if she was murdered he would be one of the suspects.”

This report is dated April 21, 2004.

“Is there anything in that memo that indicates that the defendant stated to you that her death was drug-related again?” Objection/Overruled.

“No, during this phone conversation, we didn’t discuss the cause of her death.”

August 17 at 4:12pm · Like · 9

In Session

The witness is handed another document.

“There are highlighted phone numbers on that page . . . do you recognize them?”

The witness points out the main phone number for Old Republic Life Insurance.

“The last call was 15:44 . . . 3:44.”

“The defendant was not the only individual that you spoke to?”

“Yes, Sir.”

“Who was the first individual who used the word ‘murder’?” Objection/Sustained.

That ends the direct examination of this witness.

August 17 at 4:15pm · Like · 6

08/17/2012: Defense Attorney Joel Brodsky on cross examination

In Session

Brodsky begins his cross.

“You’re retired now, right?”

“Not by choice . . . but yes.”

“Was Mr. Peterson the first person to call you about this claim?”

“No.”

“Was he the second person?”

“Yes, I believe he was.”

“Who was the first?”

“Mrs. Doman.”

“Anna Doman?”

“Yes.”

“When did she call you?” Objection.

The prosecution asks for a sidebar.

August 17 at 4:18pm · Like · 8

In Session

The sidebar ends.

“When you first spoke to Mr. Peterson, you asked him about his opinion about what was the cause of death of Kathy Peterson?”

“Yes.”

“He wasn’t claiming to be the beneficiary?”

“No, for his two sons . . . he advised me that he was on the scene and discovered her body . . . he told me she was found in a bathtub.” “And he thought it might be drug-related?”

“Yes, Sir.” “He didn’t tell you she had drowned, or anything?”

“No, I believe he used the word ‘drowned’ . . . I advised him that Mrs. Doman . . .”
Objection/Sustained.

August 17 at 4:19pm · Like · 6

In Session

“You next talked to him on April 21st?”

“Could I see it again, please? . . . yes, Sir . . . let me read this a second, please . . . I received the written proofs of loss, and I had questions. So I called him.” Objection/Overruled.

“One of the questions you asked him was whether the case was still under investigation?”

“Yes.”

‘And he told you it was?’

“Yes.”

‘Did you ask him if he was involved in the investigation?’

“No, because in a previous conversation he told me he could not be involved in the investigation.”

“Because he was related to the victim?”

“Yes, Sir . . . I asked him who was investigating the case, and he gave me the name and number of that state trooper . . . he gave me the name of Sgt. Patrick Collins, and Trooper Bryan Falat . . . their phone number, and their extensions.”

“Was he helpful?”

“Oh, yes, he was always a gentleman on the phone.”

August 17 at 4:23pm · Like · 4

In Session

That ends the cross-examination of this witness.

There is no redirect, and so the witness is excused.

Judge Burmila then calls a ten minute recess, and leaves the bench.

Court is in recess until 3:35 CT/4:35 ET.

August 17 at 4:25pm · Like · 4

