

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

**Norman Ray Clark Testified August 24, 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 24 at 10:39am

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

Judge Edward Burmila takes the bench. He sends for the jury.

---

**08/24/2012: Prosecutor John Connor on direct examination**

---

In Session

The jurors have entered the courtroom, and the State calls its first witness of the day:

Norman Ray Clark to be questioned by prosecutor Connor.

"I work for Sprint Nextel. I'm a custodian of records for them . . . I'm responsible for maintaining and retrieving various business documents."

August 24 at 10:42am · Like · 20

---

In Session

The witness is handed a document.

"This is actually a bill for a Nextel phone . . . the billing period was from the 23rd of February to the 22nd of March, 2004 . . . in this particular bill, we're talking about two different phones."

"Can you explain if there's any information in those records about a service called 'Connect Direct'?"

"Yes, there is . . . Connect Direct is often referred to as a 'chirp' . . . it's a one-way communication, much like a walkie-talkie."

“Do both of those phone lines have the Connect Direct feature?”

“Yes, they did.”

“How much usage occurred for that feature during that time frame?”

“There is an area that has total usage of peak and off peak Connect Direct.”

The witness then gives the total number of Connect Direct minutes used by each of those phones, both for peak and off-peak times.

“Is there anything in the record that shows exactly when any of those chirps took place?”

“There isn’t, in any detail.”

“Why would there be no detailed records?”

“Essentially, with Connect Direct phone calls, each time you press the button it registered as a call. So we simply chose to do a summary of minutes used.”

August 24 at 10:48am · Like · 11

---

In Session

“Is there any subscriber information for those two lines?”

“There is some subscriber information . . . according to this bill, the subscriber is Drew Peterson.”

“If a chirp goes out to a phone that’s turned off, would a record be generated?”

“If a chirp was made to a phone that’s turned off, it would simply come back as ‘unanswered.’”

“Is that anything that would show up in the bill?”

“In the bill, no.”

That ends the direct examination of this witness.

August 24 at 10:49am · Like · 6

---

**08/24/2012: Defense Attorney Steve Greenberg on cross examination**

---

In Session

Attorney Steve Greenberg begins his cross.

The witness says the found out yesterday that he would be testifying today.

“That’s what your job is?”

“Yes.”

“This bill has a subscriber on it, and two phones?”

“Correct.”

“You know the account holder is Drew Peterson?”

“Yes.”

“Do you know what phone Drew Peterson used?”

“No, our information merely reflects that he had an account with two phones on it.”

“Did you do a search to see if there were any other accounts in his name?”

“I believe the request was only for this account.”

“If you learned there were four people in the house who had phones, you still couldn’t tell us who had them?”

“The records would not indicate who had which phone, correct.”

August 24 at 10:52am · Like · 3

---

In Session

“This system was like a walkie-talkie?”

“Similar, yes.”

“And the reason people called it a ‘chirp’ was because it had a loud sound?”

“Yes.”

“Do you know where the term ‘chirp’ originated?”

“I believed one of our competitors who had similar technology originated it . . . but we’re bigger, and it became a common usage term.”

“Like Kleenex?”

“Yes.”

August 24 at 10:53am · Like · 4

---

In Session

“In your experience, people didn’t say, ‘I’m going to phone you,’ did they?”

“In my experience, I don’t know how they referred to it.”

The witness repeats that the records don’t reflect to whom a call was chirped, or exactly when a chirp took place.

“But you can tell that in that time frame the sum total of all the 7:00 pm to 7:00 am calls was only seven minutes?”

“That’s right.”

“And for [the other phone] off-peak was 94 minutes?”

“Yes.”

“So can you tell from this bill that one person spent a lot more time on the Connect Direct than the other?”

“Based on the usage, it appears so.”

“You can’t tell when one spoke to the other?”

“That’s correct.”

“You can’t tell if they ever talked?”

“Based on the billing records, no . . . it’s simply not on the bill.”

That concludes the cross-examination.

August 24 at 10:47am · Like · 8

---

## **08/24/2012: Prosecutor John Connor on redirect examination**

---

In Session

Connor begins his redirect.

The witness says the loudness of the phone with regards to chirping is “user defined”

(meaning it's set by the user).

That's the end of the redirect; there is no cross, and so the witness is excused.

August 24 at 10:59am · Like · 7

---