

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

**Drew Peterson Defense Presents Their Case
Court Updates – Wednesday, August 29, 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 29 at 9:43am

The Drew Peterson murder trial is back at 9:45 A.M. this morning!

Thomas Peterson, the eldest son of Kathleen Savio and Drew Peterson, may take the witness stand today.

In Session

Prosecution PIO Chuck Pelkie has just informed the media that – should the defense rest today – experts Dr. Michael Baden and Dr. Larry Blum are on board as prosecution rebuttal witnesses.

August 29 at 9:47am · Like · 24

In Session

Judge Burmila takes the bench.

Before he turns to the Peterson case, he briefly handles a matter pertaining to another case.

August 29 at 10:04am · Like · 8

In Session

August 29 at 10:16am

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

The judge now turns to the Peterson case.

Prosecutor Colleen Griffin argues a motion in limine regarding an incident in which Stacy Peterson allegedly asked attorney Harry Smith if she could get more money out of Drew Peterson if she informed the police of what he told her at the time of Savio's death.

In Session

The State argues that this is improper impeachment, should the defense try to call Smith and bring it up.

"We're talking about a conversation with Harry Smith in October of 2007 to somehow impeach a statement Stacy made to Neil Schori . . . it's just an attempt to try to show that Stacy Peterson was a bad person . . . the People assert that if the Court is considering this testimony of Harry Smith, the State should be allowed to bring up other hearsay statements, in order to rehabilitate her."

Judge Burmila: "You have no doubt that Mr. Smith interpreted this conversation as an attempt on her part to commit a crime?"

Griffin: "I believe Mr. Smith told Stacy that she could be arrested for something like that."

Attorney Brodsky then responds.

August 29 at 10:16am · Like · 9

In Session

Judge Burmila makes his ruling.

He says if the defense uses this testimony for impeachment that makes the entire hearsay applicable. However, any reference to Stacy's disappearance will be banned.

August 29 at 10:28am · Like · 13

In Session

Brodsky says the defense has just received some new material this morning from the State.

He asks for a few minutes to study this new material.

The judge grants this request, and so the trial is now in recess.

August 29 at 10:29am · Like · 5

In Session

Judge Burmila is back on the bench.

Attorney Brodsky addresses the Court about what he claims is a prosecution discovery violation relating to upcoming defense witness Thomas Peterson.

August 29 at 11:01am · Like · 7

In Session

Prosecutor Connor responds, concedes that the report was indeed turned over belatedly to the defense. The report pertains to an interview of Thomas Peterson that was done in Pennsylvania at one point.

August 29 at 11:01am · Like · 2

In Session

Judge Burmila is clearly not happy that this information was turned over late.

Prosecution Connor is trying to answer all of the judge's questions.

August 29 at 11:10am · Like · 5

In Session

The judge decides to call the next two witnesses at this time, because they have nothing to do with this report.

He calls for the jury.

August 29 at 11:11am · Like · 5

In Session

New thread

August 29 at 11:15am · Like · 2

08/29/2012: Defense Attorney Steve Greenberg on direct examination

In Session

August 29 at 11:15am

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

The jurors enter the courtroom.

The defense calls its first witness of the day:

Illinois State Police Sgt. Patrick Collins (questioned by attorney Greenberg).

In Session

He previously testified as a prosecution witness.

“I just want to tie up some things about your investigation . . . were you involved in the case after the original investigation in 2004?”

“Yes.”

“When did you stop being involved as an investigator?”

“What case are we talking about? I was involved most of the time, yes, Sir.”

“Did you go out and interview witnesses in 2007, 2008?”

“I can’t recall, but I assume I did.”

August 29 at 11:15am · Like · 11

In Session

The witness is shown a photo of Kathleen Savio (taken by Nick Pontarelli).

“Did you get that photo in the course of your investigation, in 2004?”

“I don’t remember it.”

“You never had a chance to talk to Nick Pontarelli in 2004?”

“Never spoke to the son.”

“You knew he had been there that night?”

“Right.”

“You didn’t know he had taken a container of orange juice and put it back in the refrigerator that night?”

“I never spoke to Nick Pontarelli.”

August 29 at 11:18am · Like · 7

In Session

The witness identifies a photograph of the Savio home.

“Have you and I had a chance to talk about your testimony today?”

“No.”

“Is that how the house appeared when you were there that night?”

“Yes.”

“Can you tell what lights are on in what room?” Objection/Overruled.

“I see a light on, but I cannot testify as to what room that is.”

The witness is then shown another photo of the Savio house, followed by a photo of Savio’s bedroom..

“That’s just another picture of what the house looked like?”

“Yes.”

“This is the photo of the Pontarelli home and the Savio home?”

“I can’t recall whose [sic] house that is on the right . . . those pictures were taken by the crime scene tech . . . he had taken pictures prior to me getting there . . . in case we have to testify in court, to bring back our memories.”

“Did you ever go back to that house?”

“That night, yes.”

“Ever go back any other time?”

“That I can’t recall.”

“But you did go back that night?”

"Yes, to inform Drew Peterson's supervisors that we would have to talk to him."

August 29 at 11:23am · Like · 8

In Session

"Recall anyone bringing anything unusual to your attention?"

"No."

"That's the entrance to the master bedroom?"

"Yes, Sir."

"Do you recall the cat? See those beady little eyes there?"

"No."

"The pictures are taken to preserve what's there?"

"Yes, Sir."

August 29 at 11:23am · Like · 8

In Session

"See this lamp? Nothing appears to be broken there?"

"No."

"And there appears to be stacks of things on that dresser, like that mirror?"

"Yes, I see the items you just mentioned."

"Remember the flowers close to the bed?"

"I can't remember, but evidently they were there."

"You didn't see any broken flowers, anything that looked like it had been grabbed at, torn away?"

"No."

"And the other stuff didn't seem like it had been moved?"

“It wasn’t scattered like it had been knocked over, anything like that.”

August 29 at 11:25am · Like · 5

In Session

Another picture of the bedroom is projected.

“Nothing unusual there?”

“No.”

The witness says only he, Ofc. Deel and Ofc. Falat were with him when he was inside the house.”

“Did you see anyone in there when you first arrived?”

“No.”

“Do you recall if there were things hanging on the wall in that bedroom?”

“I looked for the obvious: things that might have been twisted, turned around . . . things on top of the dressers, pictures on the wall. Things like that.”

August 29 at 11:28am · Like · 6

In Session

The next photograph shows Savio’s body in the bathtub.

“The only people who took pictures were the state police that night?”

“It was crime scene investigator Deel.”

The next photograph shows “the things that are next to the tub. Did you look for signs of a struggle around the tub?”

“Yes.”

August 29 at 11:29am · Like · 6

In Session

“You didn’t see anything that appeared to be moved?”

"I can't say if it was put back. But at the time, it didn't appear to be knocked over."

"Did you look for broken pieces of ceramic?"

"Yes, Sir."

"You didn't find any broken ceramics, or anything like that?"

"No."

"Looked around for things that might show signs of a struggle?"

"Yes."

August 29 at 11:30am · Like · 7

In Session

The witness is now shown a photograph of Savio's kitchen.

"Have you seen this picture before?"

"No."

"When you were preparing for this case, they didn't show you this picture?"

"No."

The defense then asks for a sidebar.

August 29 at 11:32am · Like · 6

In Session

The sidebar ends.

The witness is then shown a photograph of Savio's body.

"There appears to be white tape around her wrists, and then paper sacks, like lunch bags, over her hands?"

"Yes . . . based on the fact that might have been a struggle, she might have something under her nails."

"So it's following procedure to bag her hands?"

“Yes.”

“To preserve fingernail evidence?”

“That was my first homicide. So it was a learning experience for me. I assume that’s what they do.”

“So if anything comes off the hands, it’s saved in the bags?”

“Yes.”

August 29 at 11:37am · Like · 5

In Session

“You spoke to Mr. Peterson, right?”

“Yes, I interviewed him.”

“At the police station?”

“Yes.”

“He told you he’d been home all day Saturday?”

“Yes.”

The witness is handed a copy of his report, which he skims through.

“Did he ever use the word ‘Sunday’ when he said he had gone to work that weekend?”
Objection/Overruled.

“I can’t recall that statement.”

August 29 at 11:39am · Like · 2

In Session

“You had a canvas done of the neighborhood?”

“Yes . . . to see if we can obtain any additional information that might assist in our investigation.”

“By my count, 24 different people were spoken to in that neighborhood?”

“I can’t recall that number . . . if that report reflects that number of people, I’ll defer to it.”

August 29 at 11:41am · Like · 8

In Session

The prosecution objects, and asks for a sidebar.

August 29 at 11:41am · Like · 8

In Session

The sidebar ends.

Using his report, Sgt. Collins confirms that 24 people were canvassed at the time in question.

“In that canvas, did you learn that anyone had observed anything unusual?”

“The agents reported nothing unusual to me.”

As part of his investigation, he obtained the phone records of Steve Maniaci, Drew Peterson, and Kathleen Savio for that day.

“Mr. Maniaci suggested you talk to some other people, and you talked to those people?”

“Not me personally, but other people maybe.”

“The Bolingbrook police officers who arrived before you did prepared reports, and you reviewed those reports?”

“Yes.”

“Agents spoke to them?”

“Yes.”

“And you spoke to Steve Carcerano that night?”

“Yes.”

“Mary Pontarelli?”

“Yes.”

“Tom Pontarelli?”

“Yes.”

“Did you have agents go back and talk to them again?”

“Eventually they were re-interviewed.”

“And all those reports were eventually given to you?”

“Yes.”

“The locksmith and EMTs were interviewed?”

“Yes.”

“Any physical evidence collected by Deel was submitted for testing?”

“He would have submitted it. But the only thing I can recall are the pictures.”

“The autopsy was reviewed by you?”

“Yes.”

“You didn’t get any calls from anyone who was a friend of Miss Savio’s, did you?”

Objection/Sustained.

“Did you get any calls from anyone alerting you to problems between Ms. Savio and Mr. Peterson, during the course of your 2004 investigation?”

“No.”

August 29 at 11:47am · Like · 6

In Session

The defense asks for a sidebar.

August 29 at 11:48am · Like · 5

In Session

The sidebar ends.

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

The trial is currently in recess.

August 29 at 11:49am · Like · 5

In Session

The parties are heading into the courtroom.

We should be resuming shortly.

August 29 at 12:00pm · Like · 7

In Session

Judge Burmila is back on the bench.

He sends for the jury.

August 29 at 12:09pm · Like · 9

08/29/2012: Prosecutor Chris Koch on cross examination

In Session

The jurors are now back in the courtroom, and attorney Greenberg announces that he has completed his direct examination of ISP Sgt. Patrick Collins.

Prosecutor Koch then begins his cross.

“You don’t know how the house looked prior to your arrival?”

“That’s correct.”

“You did not take these photographs?”

“That’s correct.”

“Sgt. Deel uses a flash when he takes photograph?”

“I would assume that.”

August 29 at 12:11pm · Like · 11

In Session

The witness repeats that Savio’s hands were bagged to collect any possible evidence.

"You know that sometimes the hands are bagged and yet no evidence is collected?"

"Correct."

August 29 at 12:13pm · Like · 9

In Session

Sgt. Collins repeats that he was looking for signs of a struggle at Savio's house.

He is shown a photograph.

"There's a can of carpet cleaner?"

"Yes."

"You said you looked at this photo and didn't notice any pictures knocked down?"

"Yes."

"There is something knocked down on that dresser, like a picture that's knocked down?"

"It's down in that picture."

"You were asked about regarding the people who went into the house and found Ms. Savio that night?"

"Yes."

"And then you were asked if they were ever re-interviewed?"

"Yes."

"It wasn't until the case was reopened that they were interviewed again?"

"Yes."

"That was several years later?"

"Yes."

"Did you talk to them when this case was reopened?"

"No."

August 29 at 12:15pm · Like · 13

08/29/2012: Defense Attorney Steve Greenberg on redirect examination

In Session

That concludes the cross-examination.

Greenberg begins his redirect.

“When there’s a struggle, sometimes there’s evidence an sometimes there’s not?”

“Yes.”

“And there were no signs that night that Ms. Savio had been in a struggle?”

“No.”

“Did you see signs of a struggle on Mr. Peterson?” Objection/Sustained.

The defense asks for a sidebar.

August 29 at 12:18pm · Like · 8

In Session

The sidebar ends.

“When you spoke to Sgt. Peterson, you looked at him?”

“Yes.”

“You didn’t see any signs of a struggle on him, either, right?”

“As far as I can see, no.”

August 29 at 12:19pm · Like · 6

In Session

The witness is shown a photograph of Savio’s bedroom.

“Did you see any broken glass there?”

“No.”

“Would you have noted that somewhere?”

“Yes.”

August 29 at 12:19pm · Like · 6

In Session

“If there had been anything unusual about those items, would the crime scene investigator have taken a photograph?”

“I assume he would.”

That ends the redirect examination of Sgt. Collins.

August 29 at 12:20pm · Like · 5

In Session

The State has no recross for this witness.

He is excused, and leaves the stand.

August 29 at 12:20pm · Like · 6

In Session

There is a new thread

August 29 at 12:24pm · Like · 1

08/29/2012: Defense Attorney Steve Greenberg on direct examination

In Session

August 29 at 12:24pm

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

The next defense witness is Eileen Payona.

She is an Illinois State Police officer (for the past 16 years).

She is questioned by attorney Greenberg.

In Session

For the last 13 years, she has worked in the Investigations unit.

As such, she was part of the reinvestigation into Kathleen Savio and Drew Peterson.

“Did you have occasion to interview Mary Parks, in August of 2008?”

“Yes, Sir.”

August 29 at 12:24pm · Like · 6

In Session

The witness says that Parks told her that she and Drew were fighting over Suds Pub.

However, she later learned that Suds Pub had been sold prior to that time.

In all, she spoke to Parks three times.

“Did she ever tell you she had called the State’s Attorneys?”

“No.”

“Not during any of your conversations with her?”

“No.”

She also arranged for another canvas of Savio’s neighborhood.

“As a result of that canvas, did you learn anything suspicious?”

“Not that I recall.”

August 29 at 12:26pm · Like · 5

In Session

Nick Pontarelli told her that he had pictures of Kathleen Savio.

“He had not given those pictures previously to the state police?”

“No.”

“You were aware there was a second autopsy done?”

“Yes, Sir.”

“At that autopsy, there were numerous people from the state police?”

“Yes.”

“You were there?”

“I believe so.”

“Mr. Glasgow was there?”

“I don’t recall.”

The witness is handed a copy of her report.

“Dr. Blum was there?”

“Yes.”

“Dr. Mitchell?”

“Yes.”

She names several more persons who were present at this second autopsy.

“They took fingernail clippings, for testing for DNA?”

“Yes.”

“There was also a religious father?”

“Yes.”

“And the autopsy on that day, it lasted almost three hours?”

“I believe so.”

“At some point, you went back to the house on 392 Pheasant Chase Drive?”

“Yes.”

“Know how many times you went back?”

“No.”

“All of the original witnesses were interviewed again?”

“I believe so.”

“There were dozens and dozens of interviews?”

“I believe so.”

“Additional phone records, work records were collected?”

“Yes.”

“Mr. Peterson’s work records?”

“Yes.”

“Were you allowed to inspect the house?”

“Yes.”

“Was the carpeting from the master bedroom removed?”

“Yes.”

“And before it was removed, it was tested with ultra-scientific techniques?”

“I don’t know.”

“But you’re aware the carpet was taken and inspected?”

“Yes.”

August 29 at 12:33pm · Like · 5

In Session

The witness says the bathroom was inspected, and even the grout was removed and sent in for testing.

The prosecution then asks for a sidebar.

August 29 at 12:33pm · Like · 2

In Session

The sidebar ends.

“In fact, there were some stains recovered from the carpet in the bedroom, and they were submitted for DNA testing?”

“Yes.”

The witness agrees that the carpet samples were negative for anything connected to this case. Hair samples were also submitted, but nothing of evidentiary value was learned from that.

“You reviewed the photos that were originally taken?”

“Yes.”

“And you had available to you not only the services of the Illinois State Police, but also of the FBI?”

“Yes.”

“And the State’s Attorney’s Office investigators?”

“Yes.”

“Did you find anywhere where a will might have been hidden in the floor?”
Objection/Sustained.

“Were you given any documents by Anna Doman in the course of your investigation?”

“No.”

“Do you recall talking to Anna Doman?”

“Yes.”

“But you do not recall being given any documents regarding a will from Ms. Doman?”

“No.”

She is then shown a copy of her report.

“Does that refresh your recollection?”

“Yes, Sir.”

“In December of 2008, you talked to Anna Doman?”

“Yes.”

“And did she give you some documents?”

“Yes.”

“Among those documents was an affidavit to open a safe deposit box?”

“If that’s in the report; I don’t recall . . . yes, Sir.”

“Did she give you an affidavit to get into a safe deposit box?”

“Yes.”

The witness identifies a copy of the affidavit, dated March 10, 2004.

The parties then approach the bench for a sidebar.

August 29 at 12:42pm · Like · 5

In Session

The sidebar ends.

The defense announces it is finished with its direct examination.

But before the State begins its cross, the parties approach the bench for another sidebar.

August 29 at 12:42pm · Like · 2

08/29/2012: Prosecutor Chris Koch on cross examination

In Session

The sidebar ends.

Koch begins his cross.

“You went through a series of individuals who were at the second autopsy?”

“Yes.”

“In fact, they weren’t all present at the autopsy, they were just all in the building?”

“Correct.”

August 29 at 12:44pm · Like · 6

In Session

The witness confirms that another family has been living in Savio’s home since 2004.

“The evidence technicians from the Illinois State Police did remove that bathtub and place it into evidence?”

“Yes.”

That ends the cross.

August 29 at 12:45pm · Like · 6

08/29/2012: Defense Attorney Steve Greenberg on redirect examination

In Session

Greenberg begins his redirect.

“The carpet was taken also from the stairway, leading up to the second floor?”

“I don’t recall.”

The witness is again shown a copy of her report.

“That’s actually the corrected crime scene report?”

“Yes.”

“In fact, the carpeting from the stairway was also removed?”

“Yes.”

“Not only did they take the carpeting and the grout, but they also used their forensic light sources to inspect the walls for any blood?”

“I don’t know, Sir.”

Once more, the witness is directed to her report.

“The walls were also inspected for stains, anything like that?”

“Correct.”

“Just because someone might clean carpet doesn’t mean stains will disappear?”

“I don’t know. I can’t answer that question.”

“The walls, the carpet, the grout . . . all of it was tested in 2007, 2008, and no evidence came back from any of it that points to a crime?”

“Correct.”

“And it was all the original stuff?”

“Yes.”

That ends the redirect.

August 29 at 12:51pm · Like · 2

08/29/2012: Prosecutor Chris Koch on recross examination

In Session

Koch has one quick question on recross, but it is objected to, and the judge sustains the objection.

With that, the witness is excused, and she leaves the courtroom.

The judge excuses the jurors for the lunch recess.

August 29 at 12:51pm · Like · 1

08/29/2012: Attorney's Argue over alledged discovery violation

In Session

The jurors are now gone, but the judge and the attorneys remain.

They return to the issue of the purported discovery violation on the part of the State regarding its interview of Thomas Peterson.

August 29 at 12:52pm · Like · 1

In Session

Prosecutor Brodsky addresses the Court, continues to argue that the State has an ongoing obligation to disclose to the defense at all times.

“What we have here is a witness who was present the weekend Kathleen Savio died, with the accused. The State interrogated this witness for five hours at his college . . . they produce a four-page, five-page single spaced report, and the State doesn't seem fit to reveal it to us? There's a mandatory obligation to disclose to use discovery materials. The only sanction that could possibly apply at this point would be to prevent them from using any statement in that report in their cross-examination of Mr. Tom Peterson.”

August 29 at 12:57pm · Like · 3

In Session

Prosecutor Connor responds, insists that there was no intent not to tender this material to the defense.

“That’s no excuse . . . our argument would be that there is no actual prejudice at this time, Your Honor. It’s a very small amount of material.”

August 29 at 12:58pm · Like · 4

In Session

Judge Burmila makes his ruling: “Well, we definitely have a pattern here. The State violates an order or a rule, and then different people stand up and say, ‘Today it was my fault’ . . . we clearly have a discovery violation here; this person was listed on the list of witnesses. They knew even last week he was going to be a witness, and just a few minutes before the witness is going to get on the stand, they hand over a report and say, ‘here you go’ . . . the defense says there has been contact with Tommy Peterson, and that he’s discussed this report with him. They can’t say they were surprised about the fact of the interview . . . can the officers who prepared this report be here by 5:00 today? . . . the Court finds that it’s a clear discovery violation, but I think the sanction of striking the report is too severe . . . I want those police officers here no later than 5:00 pm today. They’re to be available as long as necessary to be interviewed by defense counsel . . . so get them here. After you’re done interviewing them, if you need to ask for the continuance that’s allowed as a sanction, we’ll take that into consideration at that time. We’ll be in recess.”

August 29 at 1:07pm · Like · 6

In Session

The Drew Peterson murder trial is in recess until 2:15 P.M. ET

August 29 at 1:09pm · Like · 2

In Session

August 29 at 2:31pm

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

Judge Burmila is back on the bench.

One of the police officers who was discussed prior to the lunch recess will be available at 2:00 CT this afternoon. The other one will be available at some point today via phone.

In Session

The judge sends for the jury.

August 29 at 2:32pm · Like · 2

08/29/21012: Defense Attorney Joel Brodsky on direct examination

In Session

The jurors enter the courtroom.

The defense calls its next witness: attorney Harry Smith (questioned by attorney Brodsky).

He has been an attorney since 1993.

“It’s a litigation firm. I handle the family law part of that . . . and I also do some criminal defense work.”

His firm’s name is “Smith and Fuller.”

The witness says that he was formerly a prosecutor (but not in Will County).

“You had a client named Kathleen Savio?”

“That is correct.”

“When did she come to you?”

“I believe 2002 or 2003.”

August 29 at 2:32pm · Like

In Session

The witness is shown some billing records, which show that he first met Kathleen Savio in January, 2002.

“That was a divorce between Kathleen Peterson and Drew Peterson?”

“Yes.”

“At some point in that case, there was a bifurcated divorce?”

“Yes.”

The prosecution objects, and asks for a sidebar.

August 29 at 2:38pm · Like · 1

In Session

The sidebar ends.

“At sometime during these proceedings with Kathy Savio and Drew Peterson, was their marriage dissolved?”

“Yes.”

“Subsequent to that, are you aware Drew Peterson married Stacy Cales?”

“Yes.”

“Did you recall a call in 2007 from Stacy Peterson?”

“I did receive a call from Stacy Peterson; I’m not sure of the specific date.”

The witness is shown a copy of a report, to refresh his recollection.

“Yes . . . she contacted the office on Oct. 24. I just didn’t talk to her that day.”

“The purpose that she called you was for information about a divorce?”

“She told my office she wanted to retain me as a divorce attorney.”

“From Drew Peterson?”

“Yes.”

August 29 at 2:41pm · Like · 2

In Session

Brodsky asks for permission to question Smith as an adverse witness.

The judge then calls the attorneys to a sidebar.

August 29 at 2:41pm · Like

In Session

The jurors are back in the courtroom, and Brodsky continues his direct examination.

“When you spoke to Stacy Peterson, the purpose of her call was to do what?”

“She contacted our office to retain me as an attorney in a divorce proceeding.”

“Did she eventually retain you?”

“No.”

“Why not?”

The witness is hesitant to answer.

The judge then calls the attorneys to a sidebar.

August 29 at 2:47pm · Like · 5

In Session

The sidebar ends.

“Even though there was this conflict of interest, she did ask you questions about divorce?”

“Yes.”

“Did she tell you she had information about Drew Peterson?”

“Those were not her specific words, but she did tell me she had information about Drew Peterson . . .she said she had information regarding Kathleen Peterson she wanted to us.”

“She wanted to use that as leverage in the divorce case?” Objection/Overruled.

“She wanted to know if it, in my opinion, the fact that he’d killed Kathy could be used against him.”

“In the divorce proceeding?”

“Yes . . . she didn’t use the word ‘leverage,; but that certainly was the intimation.”

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

August 29 at 2:50pm · Like · 4

In Session

The witness and the jurors return to the courtroom.

Brodsky continues:

“Isn’t it true when you testified previously you were sworn under oath?”

“Every time I’ve given a statement, I’ve been sworn.”

“And never before have you ever said that Stacy said that Drew killed Kathy?”

“I do not know if the words you just said to me are the way I said it to you.”

The witness is confronted with some of her previous testimony.

“I think you just intimated those were my words. I just want you to know that that is what she said to me. Those aren’t my words.”

“Did I ask you that question, and did you give me that answer?”

“I responded to that question.”

“Did you give that answer?”

“Yes.”

August 29 at 3:07pm · Like

In Session

“Stacy wanted to threaten Drew, in order to get more money out of him in a divorce?”

“She asked me if we could use information to get more money.”

“Not to prosecute him, but to get more money for herself?”

“I don’t know that.”

“So Stacy wanted to say whatever she could in order to get more money out of Drew Peterson?”

“No, she wanted to say that he killed Kathy . . .that was absolutely one of the reasons that she gave.”

“She said, ‘If I give information, give me money’?”

“No, she said, ‘If I threaten to do this, can we get more money.’”

August 29 at 3:07pm · Like · 6

In Session

Brodsky moves to the Savio/Peterson divorce.

“Isn’t it true that if it was Drew Peterson’s visitation weekend, and that happened to be a three-day weekend, he got the kids for the additional day?”

“I remember that being an issue . . . I think they fought over that.”

The witness is asked about his October, 2008 grand jury testimony, in which he indicates that Drew could keep the boys until Monday night on a three-day weekend.

“I would agree with that transcript.”

“So Mondays, like Casimir Pulaski Day, would belong to Drew?”

“No.”

Once again, Brodsky reads from the transcript.

“I again agree that was the question and the answer.”

August 29 at 3:12pm · Like · 3

In Session

“Also in this case, there was a child support order?”

“Yes.”

“So Drew Peterson agreed to pay child support?”

“Yes.”

“And he paid it on time?”

“I do not recall a time when there was a child support order.”

August 29 at 3:13pm · Like · 1

In Session

“Remember some talk in the divorce about a company called Fast & Accurate Printing?”
Objection/Overruled.

“Isn’t it true this company was sold back in 1999?”

“I do not recall.”

The witness is shown a copy of a deposition taken in 2004.

“Fast & Accurate Printing was, in fact, sold back in 1999?”

“That’s what Ms. Peterson said in the deposition.”

“And the profits were already split?”

“I do not recall that, either.”

Once again, the witness is directed to his deposition.

“They divided the money; half went into Mrs. Peterson’s account, and half into Mr. Peterson’s account.”

“If the property was sold before the divorce was filed, and they split the money . . . I don’t remember whether there was an issue about some of the proceeds, honestly.”

August 29 at 3:13pm · Like · 1

In Session

“This was a difficult divorce for Kathy?”

“Yes.”

“Sometimes she would get angry?”

“Yes.”

The defense then asks for a sidebar.

August 29 at 3:13pm · Like · 1

In Session

The sidebar ends.

The jurors are then excused.

Prosecutor Connor states his objection to this line of questioning, says “we’ve gotten WAY beyond financial motive at this time.”

Brodsky: “We’ll withdraw the question.”

The judge sends for the jury.

August 29 at 3:28pm · Like

In Session

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

Brodsky: “I withdraw my last question. And I have no further questions for this witness.”

That concludes the direct examination of Mr. Smith.

August 29 at 3:29pm · Like · 1

In Session

The attorneys head to a sidebar.

August 29 at 3:29pm · Like · 1

08/29/2012: Prosecutor John Connor on cross examination

In Session

The sidebar ends, and prosecutor Connor begins his cross.

“Did she [Stacy] tell you that Drew was pissed at her because he thought that she told Tom that Drew killed Kathy?”

“Yes . . . she told me that he [Drew] had too much shit on her to do anything to her.”

“She specifically used the word ‘how’ he killed Kathy, not just that he killed Kathy, but ‘how’ he killed Kathy?”

“Yes.” Objection.

The parties go to a sidebar.

August 29 at 3:29pm · Like · 7

In Session

The sidebar ends.

“When Stacy referred to ‘Tom,’ did you know who she was referring to?”

“Yes, Drew’s son.”

“Did you hear anyone speak to her during this conversation?”

“Yes.”

“Who was that?”

“Drew . . . he called to her, and asked her what she was doing and who she was talking to.”

“Did he call her a second time?”

“To rush her off the phone and tell her to get ready.”

August 29 at 3:32pm · Like · 1

In Session

At the time of the Peterson/Savio divorce, the property settlement was still to be finalized.

“When you heard the defendant’s voice in the background, was it close by?”

“Further away. Not standing right next to the person.”

“When he spoke to her [Stacy], did you hear her respond to him?”

“I did.”

“Could you describe how loud she was when she responded to him?”

“As I sit here right now, I cannot recall.”

“When he called the second time, did she end the call?”

“Yes.”

The witness is shown a document to refresh his recollection.

“My memory is refreshed as to how she responded to Drew’s first call. She yelled to Drew that

she would be in a minute.”

August 29 at 3:38pm · Like · 1

In Session

“Did Stacy say to you something about a GPS during that conversation?”

“I do not recall.”

Once again, the witness is shown a document to refresh his recollection.

“Did she say to you that she believed he was tracking her [by cell phone]?”

“Yes . . . ‘but now I have a new one he doesn’t know about.’”

The State then asks for a sidebar.

August 29 at 3:41pm · Like · 6

In Session

The sidebar ends.

The jurors are then excused from the courtroom.

The attorneys are arguing over exactly what was said in the witness’ previous grand testimony (regarding Drew’s custody of the boys on “long weekends”).

Glasgow: “I believe he [Harry Smith] was mistaken, and I’d like to be able to show him the court order.”

Brodsky joins in: “I have very clear grand jury testimony by an officer of the court.”

The judge then sends for the jury and the witness.

August 29 at 3:55pm · Like · 2

In Session

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

The prosecution has no further questions for this witness.

August 29 at 3:55pm

08/29/21012: Defense Attorney Joel Brodsky on redirect examination

In Session

Brodsky begins his redirect.

“Isn’t it true that when Stacy Peterson asked you about threatening to tell the police that you told her to be careful because she could be arrested for extortion?”

“During that call, I did tell her to be careful. But it wasn’t about extortion.”

“What were you telling her to be careful for? She could be arrested for telling a falsehood?”

“No, that’s not what I told her.”

“She told you her cell phone had GPS?”

“Yes.”

“Isn’t it true all cell phones have GPS?” Objection/Sustained.

There are no more questions for this witness, and he is excused.

August 29 at 3:57pm · Like

In Session

The judge calls a brief recess at this time.

He leaves the bench.

August 29 at 3:57pm · Like

In Session

New thread

August 29 at 4:36pm · Like

In Session

August 29 at 4:36pm

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

Judge Burmila is back on the bench. He sends for the jury.

08/29/21012: Defense Attorney Joel Brodsky on direct examination

In Session

The jurors are back in the courtroom, and the defense calls its next witness:

Thomas Peterson (questioned by attorney Brodsky).

“My name is Thomas Drew Peterson.”

“Who’s your mom?”

“Kathleen Savio.”

“Who’s your dad?”

“Drew Peterson.”

He identifies the defendant in the courtroom.

The witness is 19, and attends the University of Pennsylvania. He was the valedictorian of high school class at Bolingbrook H.S. He hopes to go to medical school and become a doctor.

“Do you live in a dorm?”

“Yes.”

“At home, where do you live?”

“In the basement of my house.”

“The house you lived with your father?”

“For about eight years.”

“Before your mom passed away, who lived at your dad’s house?”

“My father, Drew Peterson, and Stacy Cales. And I believe Anthony Peterson, and Laci, too. And my brother Kristopher; he’s 18.”

His older brother, Stephen, “also lived at the house for a brief time.”

August 29 at 4:42pm · Like · 1

In Session

“Going back to before your mom passed away, in early 2004, you lived with your mom and had visitation with your dad?”

“That’s correct.”

“At any time after your mom passed away, did you ever tell anybody that you suspected that your dad had killed your mom?”

“I have not once suspected that.”

“If anybody said so, they would be telling a lie?” Objection/Sustained.

August 29 at 4:42pm · Like · 2

In Session

The witness says that it was “only weekends” when he and his brother would visit the defendant.

“My father would come to my mother’s household, and pick up both Kristopher and I. He’d take us back to his house, and we’d spend the weekend with my father, until Sunday night, when he’d bring us back . . . if it was a three-day weekend, I was never fully clear of when we were supposed to be brought back. But if there was a three-day weekend, we would stay until Monday.”

He describes the defendant as “a fun guy . . . we all had a really good time. Stacy was very fun, like my dad was very fun. Just very enjoyable weekends.”

He describes Drew as “very genial, just very happy with his job and his life . . . I was very glad to be over there.”

August 29 at 4:45pm · Like

In Session

“When you would come back from visitations, was your mom’s screen door always locked?”

“Sometimes it was locked.”

“And sometimes it was unlocked?”

“Yes.”

“And if it was unlocked, that wasn’t unusual?”

“That’s right.”

“What time would you come back from visitations, normally?”

“Sometimes it was dark outside, so I’d say around 7:00.”

“Were the lights always on in your mom’s house?”

“It varied; it wasn’t always on or always off.”

“If you came home and all the lights were off, did that mean your mom wasn’t home?”

“More times than not, if all the lights were off it meant she wasn’t home. But we would check anyway . . . I don’t remember coming back and all the lights being on.”

August 29 at 4:48pm · Like · 5

In Session

The weekend that Kathleen died, Drew picked the boys up as usual.

“Did you notice any change in his demeanor in any way . . . any change in his personality at all?”

“There was nothing odd at all. I would remember if there was. But there was nothing out of the ordinary, to my recollection.”

“When he went to drop you off Sunday night, what was your dad’s demeanor?”

“He was a little bit concerned. And then I think we came to the conclusion that we’d forgotten it was a three day weekend, and she was out with a friend or someone else at that time . . . he just took care of us for the rest of the night, and then the day after.”

“Did you notice anything unusual that night about your dad’s demeanor?”

“No . . . we just figured that because it was a three day weekend she was out, and we’d leave her to her business.”

“After spending the holiday with your dad, he again tried to drop you off on Monday?”

“That’s correct.”

“And again your mom didn’t answer the door?”

“Correct . . . he was definitely more concerned, because that was the day we were definitely supposed to be back with my mother . . . he was kind of, like, more concerned about the situation. So he brought us back, told us to go to bed, and said he would try to figure out what was going on.”

“Did you try to call your mom when you got home?”

“Yes. There was no answer.”

August 29 at 4:52pm · Like

In Session

The next morning, Drew informed the witness that Savio was dead.

“My brother and I were both downstairs, and he told us to come upstairs. He brought us into his room, and told us that our mother had died. He was very shaken up about it; I’d never seen anyone so sad . . . it was very troubling to see him so shaken up.”

“He was sincerely shaken up by your mother’s death?”

“Yes.”

“Your mom liked to take baths?”

“Yes.” “Up until a certain age, you used to take baths with her?”

“Yes, both Kristopher and I . . . until we were about five or six. She definitely liked to have hot baths; I wouldn’t say scalding, but very hot.”

“Would she always put her hair up when she was taking a bath?”

“She would sometimes have her hair up; she would sometimes have her hair down . . . when she would get out of the bath, she would put her hair up in a towel . . . I would know that she at least had gotten her hair wet.”

“You’d see her washing her hair in the bathtub?”

“Yes.”

“Are you here voluntarily?”

“I’m here completely voluntarily . . . because I believe my dad is innocent..”

Objection/Sustained.

August 29 at 5:02pm · Like

08/29/21012: Prosecutor Chris Koch on cross examination

In Session

Prosecutor Koch begins his cross.

“Do you recall being in front of the grand jury back in 2008?”

“I do.”

“Recall being asked . . .” Objection/Withdrawn.

“Recall being asked . . .”

The judge asks for the jury to be excused from the courtroom.

August 29 at 5:03pm · Like

In Session

The witness and the jurors are now out of the courtroom.

The attorneys are having a problem agreeing on what exactly is contained in a specific grand jury transcript (from June 26, 2008).

Eventually, they work out the confusion.

However Brodsky then objects to this line of testimony, saying that he does not believe it is impeaching.

Koch: “This is in relationship to the testimony where he said he had seen his mom bathing.”

Judge: “OK, you can ask those questions.”

The judge then sends for the jury.

August 29 at 5:04pm · Like · 9

In Session

The witness and the jurors have returned to the courtroom.

Prosecutor Koch continues his cross-examination.

“Do you recall being asked about your memories of your mother taking a bath, and saying you didn’t recall anything specific?”

“That sounds like a strange answer. I don’t recall.”

“Recall being asked if you’d be in bed before she’d doing that normal, and you answered ‘yeah?’”

“I’m so sorry. I still don’t understand the question.”

The question is repeated.

“It doesn’t sound like a question at all.”

The parties then go to a sidebar.

August 29 at 5:10pm · Like

In Session

The sidebar ends.

“Let me try this again . . . you were asked if you recalled your mom taking a bath, and you said you recalled nothing specific?”

“Yes. I don’t recall that.”

“And you said you guys would normally be in bed before she’d do that?”

Do you remember saying that on June 26, 2008?”

“Yes.”

That ends the cross-examination of this witness.

August 29 at 5:11pm · Like

08/29/21012: Defense Attorney Joel Brodsky on redirect examination

In Session

“What you know about what she did inside the bath is from when you were younger?”

“Yes.”

“When she was older, you probably don’t have any specific memories about her taking baths?”

“That’s correct.”

“But you know she washed her hair, because when she came out her hair was wet?”

“Yes.”

“And you knew she didn’t take a shower, because you didn’t hear the shower running?”

“I wouldn’t know that, if it was a shower or a bath.”

“Your mother sometimes took baths at night, to relax?”

“I wouldn’t know that.”

August 29 at 5:12pm · Like · 3

In Session

“When she would take as bath, she would sometimes have a glass of wine?”

Objection/Sustained.

The judge excuses the jurors.

August 29 at 5:13pm · Like · 3

In Session

The judge calls a brief recess, because another judge in the courthouse needs some equipment that the prosecution is using.

Once that can be accomplished, the Peterson trial should resume.

August 29 at 5:14pm · Like · 2

In Session

Both sides have decided that they have no further questions for Tom Peterson.

So his testimony has ended.

August 29 at 5:30pm · Like · 6

08/29/21012: Attorneys go over exhibits for evidence

In Session

Judge Burmila has just returned to the bench.

He confirms that the defense has no more witnesses for today.

The defense attorneys go over the exhibits that they hope to move into evidence.

August 29 at 5:30pm · Like · 7

In Session

The prosecution objects to one of the defense exhibits, Kathleen Savio's death certificate.

Prosecutor Koch cites case law that he believes supports his argument that this exhibit is not admissible.

August 29 at 5:35pm · Like · 6

In Session

Attorney Greenberg responds, says the death certificate is admissible as an official record.

However, he has forgotten to bring in case law that he believes shores up his position.

Judge: "I'll take this under advisement until I get the other case law . . . we'll put this one on the side."

August 29 at 5:41pm · Like · 1

In Session

The attorneys and Judge Burmila continue to go over prospective defense exhibits.

August 29 at 5:42pm · Like

In Session

At one point, the defense withdraws two prospective exhibits (having to do with the Joliet Junior College records of Kathleen Savio and Mary Parks).

August 29 at 5:44pm · Like

In Session new thread
August 29 at 5:54pm · Like · 1

In Session

August 29 at 5:55pm

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

The discussion of exhibits is now ended. Judge Burmila addresses the defendant: Mr. Peterson, stand please . . . have you reached a position as to whether or not you will testify?"

"I will not testify."

"That is your decision?"

"Yes, Sir."

In Session

The judge sends for the jury.

Attorney Brodsky: "Your Honor, the defense rests."

August 29 at 5:56pm · Like · 9

In Session

August 29 at 5:57pm

The defense has rested in the #DrewPeterson murder trial.

In Session

The prosecution's rebuttal case will begin tomorrow morning.

August 29 at 5:57pm · Like

In Session

The jurors leave the courtroom.

The judge and the attorneys, however, remain in the courtroom.

Attorney Goldberg asks the Court about the rebuttal... "It's not fair for the State to get a second bite of the apple, and I don't want surprises tomorrow morning. I'd like you to instruct the State to truly limit their case to rebuttal."

Prosecutor Connor: "Your Honor, there has been testimony about the manner of death."

Judge: "What are those two witnesses going to rebut? They just can't come back in here and testify about what they've already testified about."

Glasgow responds, says that Dr. Mary Case will talk about possible axonal shearing in Savio's brain. And Dr. Larry Blum will apparently be discussing the issue of the alleged diaphragm injury, and the presence of white blood cells.

August 29 at 6:04pm · Like · 2

In Session

Judge Burmila says that Drs. Case and Blum will be able to testify about the subjects which prosecutor Glasgow has just outlined.

Attorney Goldberg still has problems with the proposed testimony of Dr. Michael Baden.

Judge to prosecution: "There's nothing that would have prevented you from calling Dr. Baden in your case-in-chief. He has to rebut something . . . you're not going to be able to just bring in Dr. Baden and start from scratch; you can't just wait for rebuttal if it's evidence you could have put on in your case-in-chief."

August 29 at 6:07pm · Like

In Session

The judge asks the attorneys to provide him with case law regarding the issue of calling Dr. Baden as a rebuttal witness. He says that he will hear arguments on that subject at 8:45 CT/9:45 ET Thursday morning.

August 29 at 6:08pm · Like · 3
