

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

Jeffrey Pachter Testified August 22, 2012

**A Personal Collection of Found Materials ("as is")
(Note: This is "not" an official legal court transcript)
(Dialog spacing done below for format and reading ease)**

08/17/2012: Court debate issues regarding Jeffrey Pachter testifying

In Session

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

The jurors are now gone.

The judge calls the attorneys to a sidebar.

August 17 at 5:14pm · Like · 6

In Session

The sidebar ends.

The judge says that he would like to once again address the issue of the possible testimony of prosecution witness Jeff Pachter.

Attorney Greenberg argues that Pachter's testimony should not be allowed, due to a failure to

comply.

Prosecutor Koch says that he believes the State has now complied with all requirements pertaining to this witness.

Judge: "What can I rely on other than your late notice?"

There has to be something more than that . . . to allow for this late filing."

August 17 at 5:22pm · Like · 5

In Session

The judge/attorney exchange continues regarding the proposed testimony of witness Jeff Pachter.

Judge: "I already made a finding that this is a bad act."

Greenberg: "It wasn't until they got caught on their bad acts mistake on opening statement that they went out and searched for another way to get this evidence in . . . it's not good cause; it's just not."

Prosecutor Griffin then offers some case law that she believes supports the State's position.

August 17 at 5:25pm · Like · 13

In Session

Greenberg: "We were into opening statement when we had our first issue. Now they argue that they had a different reason for admissibility . . . you said that it was a bad act . . . for them to now come up and argue that they have some other theory is revisionist theory. They never argued that before; they never mentioned that before. Frankly, I'm offended . . . they messed up. There's a reason they're supposed to give us notice."

Judge Burmila and attorney Greenberg then have a lengthy and spirited exchange.

August 17 at 5:37pm · Like · 5

In Session

Testimony has finished for the day in the drew peterson trial..

The trial will resume tuesday at 10 am ET.

August 17 at 5:56pm via mobile · Like · 6

08/21/2012: Court debate issues regarding Jeffrey Pachter testifying

In Session

August 21

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

Judge Burmila has just taken the bench.

In Session

“Before we bring in the jury, we have the 404(b) hearing with regards to Mr. [Jeff] Pachter’s testimony.”

Prosecutor Koch: “What we’re suggesting to the Court is we intend to introduce this testimony to prove intent, motive, and identity . . . it’s clear that when he [the defendant] is out speaking to Mr. Pachter, offering Mr. Pachter \$25,000 to take care of his wife, it’s very clear as far as intent . . . as far as motive, he tells Mr. Pachter that his wife has information on him, he doesn’t want her to go to the police . . . and identity is also at issue in this case, as to who committed this crime. This evidence helps prove that the defendant is the one who killed Kathleen Savio . . . that is the defendant . . . and we believe it happened in the later months of 2003 . . . because of that, I think that if you take his testimony you certainly have a situation that is close in time to her death, very close in time, in fact.”

August 21 at 10:25am · Like · 24

In Session

Prosecutor Koch: “We do believe it is relevant; it is close in time . . . one witness is sufficient, if found to be credible, to prove that an act was committed . . . obviously, any type of other act is prejudicial; there’s no question of that. But just because it’s prejudicial doesn’t mean that it’s not probative . . . in this case, it is highly relevant, highly probative; it goes directly to the intent of the defendant to commit this crime, to his identity, to his motive. So, we ask that you allow this 404(b) evidence to be admitted into this trial.”

August 21 at 10:28am · Like · 23

In Session

Defense attorney Steve Greenberg responds. “This doesn’t go to motive . . . it doesn’t establish a motive . . . identity is not really an issue, and intent is not really an issue. We’re not saying that Drew was there but it was an accident; we’re saying he wasn’t there. So the

State doesn't really need this extra evidence of intent."

Greenberg cites case law to support the defense's position. "What they want to do is bring in highly, highly prejudicial evidence, which is suspicious anyway. Mr. Pachter said he didn't really believe anyone . . . they don't need it for intent; all of the cases say that intent is not an issue when we're presenting this kind of a defense. So it's irrelevant, it's prejudicial, and it's not relevant of anything in the case. Our defense is it's an accident . . . so what does a hit man have to do with anything? They don't say he hired a hit man; they say he [Peterson] went over there and did this . . . if they can't find an Illinois case; we're in Illinois, Judge . . . they keep sending me [case] law from Massachusetts . . . to come here now and argue that Massachusetts and New Jersey say that it's OK is just preposterous when there's Illinois law right on the issue that says if our defense is it's an accident and he wasn't involved then it doesn't come in."

August 21 at 10:36am · Like · 6

In Session

Koch responds: "Intent goes to the state of mind of the defendant. His state of mind is clearly relevant in this case . . . I'd ask you to take that into consideration when you're making your ruling."

Greenberg then jumps in, disputes the case law that the State has just cited.

"It appears to be a consent defense, which is different from what we're talking about here."

Judge Burmila: "Counsel was correct when he said that the precedent that the State provided to the Court was non-jurisdictional in its nature . . . however, that leaves us with the issue of intent. What is the purpose of this evidence? . . . the issue is, did the defendant intend to kill his wife?, and this testimony goes to that issue. So the jury will be able to consider that, and this evidence will be admissible."

August 21 at 10:41am · Like · 25

In Session

The judge sends for the jury.

He also asks the State to produce its next witness.

August 21 at 10:41am · Like · 11

08/22/2012: Court debate issues regarding Jeffrey Pachter testifying

In Session

August 22

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

Judge Burmila is on the bench.

Before the first witness can be called, defense attorney Brodsky objects to the potential testimony of an upcoming witness named Michael Miles.

However, Prosecutor Patton informs the Court that the State has decided not to call this particular issue, and so the matter is moot.

With that, the judge sends for the jury.

08/22/2012: Prosecutor John Connor on direct examination

In Session

The jurors are now in the courtroom.

The State calls its first witness of the day:

Jeffrey Pachter (questioned by prosecutor Connor).

In 2003, he was working as a technician for a cable company.

“Were you issued a badge at that time that had your picture on it?”

“Yes.”

He identifies his I.D. badge from that time period.

“Was there a place you met in the morning for your job?”

“Yes, we had a central location in Downer’s Grove.”

“Did you have occasion to meet Drew Peterson?”

“Yes, I did.”

He identifies the defendant in the courtroom.

The witness admits that when he was 18 he had a sexual relationship with a 15 year girl; he pled to a misdemeanor, and was ordered to stay away from the girl. He did not stay away, however, and was then forced to register as a sex offender for 10 years.

“I was working in 2003, and it was late summer. I asked him if he could run my background and check it for me; I was having some problems getting a job, and I didn’t know why,

because I was never convicted of a felony.”

“After he did that, did he explain anything?” Objection/Overruled.

“Yes, he told me that he looked into what I asked him to, and he told me I had an FBI number.

He said I could not have an FBI number unless I was a convicted felon.”

“Because of that, were steps taken?”

“Yes.”

“So you were grateful the defendant had helped you?”

“Yes.”

August 22 at 10:26am · Like · 7

In Session

“You indicated the defendant asked you to help find someone to take care of his third wife?”

“Yes.”

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

August 22 at 10:36am · Like · 9

In Session

The jurors and witness are excused from the courtroom.

The judge continues to speak to the attorneys at a sidebar.

August 22 at 10:37am · Like · 9

In Session

The sidebar ends.

The judge has apparently decided to instruct the jurors about something.

He then sends for the witness and the jury.

August 22 at 10:38am · Like · 8

In Session

The witness and jurors return to the courtroom.

Judge Burmila instructs them that the defendant has been charged with conduct other than that in the indictment, and they are to decide what weight should be given to this evidence regarding intent.

Connor: "What did the defendant indicate?"

"He said his ex-wife was causing him some problems."

"He indicated he would give me 25,000, and if I could find somebody to do it for less, I could keep the balance . . . this was November, 2003 . . . he told me that she used to have a drug problem, and she worked at Red Lobster . . . he told me at the end of the ride-along, 'This is something that you will take to your grave.' He said if I called him on the phone to use some kind of key phrase; it had something to do with cookies." Objection/Overruled.

"He asked me if I found somebody to let him know . . . he wanted to make sure that he had an alibi . . . he told me he either wanted to be on vacation out of the country, or at Great America where he'd cause a fight, or something like that . . . so there'd be a record of him being at Great America at the time."

The witness concedes that he's currently in a tax problem with the IRS, and they automatically take his refund.

"Did you call the state police to impart this information?"

"No, I did not."

"Did someone call you from the state police?"

"Yes."

August 22 at 10:40am · Like · 15

In Session

The witness says he spoke to Peterson on the phone in July of 2004.

"The phone call you had with the defendant . . . can you explain what you said?"

"I called the defendant and asked him how his family was doing. And then after that he said, 'The favor that I asked of you, I don't need it anymore.'"

August 22 at 10:43am · Like · 12

08/22/2012: Defense Attorney Joseph Lopez on cross examination

In Session

That concludes the direct examination of this witness.

Attorney Joe Lopez then begins his cross.

The witness concedes that he doesn't remember if he told authorities at the time that Drew told him that he was to take this to his grave.

"That's because you made this up today, didn't you?"

"No."

He denies that he lied to his bookie, but admits that he helped a friend fake a drug test.

"Didn't you commit insurance fraud?"

"I did not commit insurance fraud."

"You can't even pay your taxes?"

"At one time, no."

"You owned over \$25,000 in back taxes at one time, didn't you, Sir?"

"Yes, I did."

August 22 at 10:44am · Like · 8

In Session

Pachter denies that he actually contacted the state police after he'd seen something about the case on the Nancy Grace show.

"You came forward in this case because you expected to make money?"

"No, I did not."

"You expected to get your 15 minutes of fame?"

"No, I did not."

August 22 at 10:44am · Like · 12

In Session

August 22

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

Jeffery Pachter just testified that Peterson tried to hire him to kill Kathleen Savio.

In Session

“On Jan. 23, 2009, remember speaking to some police officers?”

“Yes.”

“Remember telling them that your co-worker asked you to help him with a worker’s comp scam?”

“No, I do not . . . I do not remember that.”

“Is there something wrong with your memory?”

“No.”

“It’s hard to remember when you’re making it up, isn’t it?”

“I am not making it up.”

“You were involved in a worker’s comp scam?”

“I did drive him to the hospital.”

“The person he defrauded was your friend?”

“No.”

“Because that’s your character, isn’t it?”

“No.”

August 22 at 10:48am · Like · 8

In Session

He knew Drew as friendly and hard-working.

"You described him as an honest person?"

"Yes."

"You said that Drew helped you clear up the sex conviction?"

"He got me on the right path."

"You registered for ten years?"

"Yes."

"So when you claim you went on this ride-along, you were a convicted sex offender?"

"Yes."

"And you say you went to the Bolingbrook P.D. and filled out a form?"

"Yes."

"You prepared for your testimony in this case?"

"Yes."

"At no time, have you ever seen that permission slip?"

"No."

"It doesn't exist, as far as you know?"

"No."

"You weren't shown that slip before you testified today?"

"NO."

"How many people have you killed?"

"None."

"You're not in a street gang, are you?"

"No."

"You don't even own a gun, do you?"

"No."

"You don't even know what it's like to plan a killing, do you?"

"No."

"Did Drew ever use the words 'kill my wife'?"

"NO, he did not."

"When he told you this, you didn't go to the FBI?"

"No."

"It was only after you saw Nancy Grace that you came forward?"

"After I saw Nancy Grace, yes."

August 22 at 10:52am · Like · 9

In Session

The witness repeats that he and Drew had "several conversations" about going into a bar/pizzeria business together.

"And it never happened, did it?"

"No."

"You had plenty of personal conversations with Drew at work?"

"Yes . . . we talked almost every day that we were there."

"During those conversations, is it your testimony that Drew never once asked you that question?"

"Not then."

"He only asked you after you signed a document, when he was in uniform?"

"Yes."

"That was the only time he ever did it?"

"Yes."

"And you worked with him for almost two years?"

"I don't recall how long it was; I don't know when he started there . . . I don't remember what

year it was.”

“Anything refresh your memory?”

“No.”

“You’d talk about your wives and your families and other things?”

“Yes.”

‘At work?’

“Yes.”

August 22 at 10:55am · Like · 12

In Session

The witness denies a police report that says Drew asked him to go on a ride-along after the men had gone bowling.

“Remember stating to these state police officers, saying Drew asked you to go on a ride-along after you’d gone bowling?”

“I did not tell them that.”

“Is that wrong?”

“Yes.”

“So they didn’t get that right, either, right?”

“No.”

August 22 at 10:56am · Like · 8

In Session

“What month was this ride-along?”

“November, of 2003.”

“Did you know he was divorced at this time?”

“No.”

“Well, didn’t you previously use the word ‘ex-wife’?”

“I don’t know if I did or not.”

“He didn’t give you a picture of her?”

“No.”

“He didn’t give you an address of where she lived?”

“No.”

“He didn’t give you a personal itinerary?”

“No.”

“Didn’t give you a down payment?”

“No.”

“Didn’t give you a gun?”

“No.”

“But he asked you?”

“He asked me to find somebody else.”

The prosecution has an objection, and so the parties go to a sidebar.

August 22 at 10:58am · Like · 11

In Session

The sidebar ends.

“He never asked you if you committed any murders?”

“No.”

“He didn’t tell you how to break into a house?”

“No.”

“He didn’t drive by her house and point it out to you?”

“Correct.”

“Didn’t tell you if she was Caucasian or not, right?”

“Yes.”

“He didn’t give you any information?”

“Correct.”

“You thought it was a joke, didn’t you?”

“No, I didn’t think it was a joke . . . I didn’t know how to take it.”

“You didn’t know if he was joking?”

“I don’t know.”

“He didn’t call you up any time between when you said he made this statement until you called him?”

“Right.”

“He didn’t do anything?”

“No.”

“And you didn’t do anything?”

“No.”

“Because you didn’t make much of it?”

“Correct.”

“You saw him at work the next day, and he didn’t say anything at work?”

“No.”

August 22 at 11:02am · Like · 8

In Session

“You told the grand jurors that he referred to her as his ‘ex-wife’ . . . those were your words?”

“Yes.”

“During this conversation in the car, he never once mentioned the word ‘pension,’ did he?”

"No."

"He never mentioned property settlement?"

"No."

"Child support?"

"No."

"Maintenance?"

"No."

"You told the grand jury that he said his ex-wife had something on him?"

"Yes."

"She was going to go to the police station?"

"I don't know if she was going to go there, or just call somebody."

"Didn't you say she was going to go to the chief of police?"

"No."

August 22 at 11:04am · Like · 7

In Session

"Are you sure you weren't charged with a felony?"

"Yes."

"Have you seen any documents from your case?"

"I have the original documents."

"Isn't it true the charge was amended to a misdemeanor from a felony?"

"Not that I'm aware of."

"Would you like to see a document to refresh your memory?"

"No, thank you." Objection/Overruled.

"Would you like to see a copy of this document to refresh your memory?"

"No, thank you."

"Agree that says 'felony' at the top of this document?"

"Yes."

"So your case was reduced?"

"Yes."

August 22 at 11:05am · Like · 6

In Session

"You also testified at the hearsay hearing, and told the court that you didn't know why Drew wanted this done?"

"Correct."

"And today you're saying it was because his wife had something on him?"

"He did not tell me why he wanted it done...he said she had something on her, but that's not why he wanted it done."

"Then why did he want it done?"

"I don't know."

"He also said he wanted to start a fight at Great America?"

"Yes."

"With his uniform on?"

"If he wanted to."

"He wanted you to call him and tell him when you found somebody?"

"Yes."

"You could have used that money to pay the IRS off . . . you don't want to pay the IRS off, do you?"

"Yes, I do. I'm in the process of doing that now."

"You never once mentioned in the grand jury or during the hearsay hearing..." Objection.

The prosecution asks for a sidebar.

August 22 at 11:09am · Like · 7

In Session

The sidebar ends.

"Now, you've had several meetings with the Illinois State Police?"

"Yes."

"You've actively cooperated with them?"

"Yes."

"And you hope to be on TV, don't you?"

"No."

"Maybe write a book?"

"No."

"Do you know how to write?"

"Yes, I know how to write."

August 22 at 11:10am · Like · 6

In Session

"The ride-along that you had with him...how many hours was that?"

"About a half hour to 45 minutes...we drove around Bolingbrook."

"You didn't do any police activity?"

"Correct."

August 22 at 11:11am · Like · 5

In Session

"Do you remember when you gave the videotaped interview in November of 2007?"

"Yes."

"It was the second time you talked to the police?"

"Yes."

"Do you remember that you were sleeping at the beginning of the tape?"

"No."

"Remember saying that the last time you talked to Drew was in December of 2003?"

"Yes."

"And you know Ms. Savio passed away in 2004?"

"Yes."

"You also told the grand jurors, 'I didn't think he was really serious about it?'"

"No, I do not remember saying that."

This portion of the grand jury transcript is read back.

"Do you remember giving that answer?"

"I do remember the question... yes, that's the answer I gave."

"During this conversation, he didn't put a time frame on your ability to do this, right?"

"No."

"HE didn't tell you how he was going to pay you?"

"No."

"You didn't know if he was trying to set you up, do you?"

"No."

"But you never talked about it again?"

"Right."

August 22 at 11:16am · Like · 5

In Session

The witness confirms that he had a company phone when he worked for AmeriCable.

“There was no recoding of that phone call, was there?”

“No.”

“And you say during this phone call Kathy was found dead, in a bathtub?”

“Yes.”

“He didn’t tell you he did it?”

“Correct.”

“He didn’t tell you he paid anybody to do that?”

“No.”

“Didn’t say, ‘hey, I took care of it myself’?”

“Correct.”

August 22 at 11:16am · Like · 8

In Session

That concludes the cross-examination of this witness.

Before the redirect can begin, the State asks for a sidebar.

August 22 at 11:17am · Like · 6

08/22/2012: Prosecutor John Connor on redirect examination

In Session

The sidebar ends.

Prosecutor Connor begins his redirect.

The witness says that he has “exhausted his memory” as to whether he told the state police that Peterson told him this was a conversation that he was to take to the grave.

The attorneys then go to another sidebar.

August 22 at 11:20am · Like · 7

In Session

The sidebar ends.

“Is there anything that would refresh your recollection as to whether or not you mentioned that to the state police?”

“No.”

“Counsel asked you a question about your grand jury testimony about whether you thought the defendant was serious?”

“Yes.” Objection/Overruled.

“In fact, you gave a longer answer when you were asked that question at the grand jury?”

“Yes.”

The witness is shown a transcript of his grand jury testimony.

The State then asks for a sidebar.

August 22 at 11:22am · Like · 9

In Session

The sidebar ends.

The witness reads some of his grand jury testimony.

“What was your full answer?”

“It was that his demeanor was very laid back... his demeanor never changed, so you didn't know if he was serious or not.”

“Counsel asked you some questions of whether you made anything of the defendant's request in the car. Had you ever heard a request like this before?” Objection.

The attorneys go to another sidebar.

August 22 at 11:24am · Like · 7

In Session

The sidebar ends.

“Had anyone ever asked you to do anything like this before?”

“No.”

“Before the Illinois state police called you, did you have any intention of coming forward?”

“No, I did not.”

August 22 at 11:26am · Like · 10

In Session

“Counsel asked you about you indicating the last time you talked to Drew was in 2003... did you physically talk to the defendant in person after 2003?” Objection/Overruled

“After the year 2003, only on the phone.”

“Did he tell you specifically about what had happened to his ex-wife?”

“Yes.”

“Did he tell you anything specifically about her head?”

“No, he did not.” Objection/Overruled.

August 22 at 11:27am · Like · 8

08/22/2012: Defense Attorney Joseph Lopez on recross examination

In Session

The redirect is now finished.

Mr. Lopez then begins his recross.

“When you went to the grand jury, the first thing you said was that you didn’t think he was really serious about it?”

“Yes.”

The witness repeats that he last spoke to Peterson in person was in 2003.

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

The judge excuses the jurors for a five minute break prior to the next witness...

August 22 at 11:29am · Like · 7

In Session

Judge Burmila has left the bench.

The trial is in a short recess.

August 22 at 11:30am · Like · 7
