

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

**Eileen Payona Testified August 29, 2012  
“Defense Witness”**

**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)**

---

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

---

In Session

<https://www.facebook.com/InSession>

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

---