

William Eastwood Case:

Facts Exposing a 21st. Century Witch Hunt in CT, USA.

Nine years served for future crime hypothesis.

Six years served for book to educate humanity.

Educational press silenced.

Education corporation to solve world problems seized.

My perspective of case.

While on my way to Yale Archives after founding a corporation, the New Haven, CT police dragged me out of my van and threw me on the asphalt. My work for humanity was seized and I was brought to prison not knowing why.

After serving nine years for a fabricated “future crime,” I spent six more years in prison for writing my side of this sensational story and rewriting the twice-seized manuscript The Solution to All of Humanity’s Problems.

The state did not want facts known.

The state rejected a statistical analyst as a juror.

The judge reprimanded the state for this decision because it demonstrated that the prosecutor did not want justice or objectivity, the state wanted prejudice and confusion.

The state’s strategy was to gain a conviction for emotional reasons rather than facts.

The state read erroneous fiction for an hour to the jury to create prejudice.

Doing so resulted in an ad hominem conviction.

The hypothesis of the case is that a crime was going to be committed, a crime that never did happen. The theory of intent became the crime.

Proven perjury and fabrication.

Several boys said they were playing around Eastwood's van and walking their pit bull when "it pulled them" (their own words) to his sky-blue and silver Gulfstream conversion van.

In trial, the oldest boy said he saw the man roll down the driver's side window and order him in the van.

The window was push-button controlled, electric and stuck shut, proving the boys' story is false, proving perjury and fabrication.

The Court refused to throw a bad case out.

Clearly written legal procedure calls for throwing a case out once the primary claim is discredited.

Youth's testimony proves fabrication by youth and demands the case be thrown out, yet that never happened.

FBI declines case & official FBI report says nothing of evidentiary value was found.

The FBI, which takes all these types of cases, declined, and filed a report that said nothing illegal or of evidentiary value was found in his van, in the man's property anywhere, or on his two laptops.

Even though the FBI wouldn't charge a crime, the state did.

CT was not deterred by the FBI's ruling, insisting William Eastwood was guilty and ultimately convicting him of attempted kidnapping, three counts, and risk of injury, three counts, based on FICTION rather than fact (An ad-hominem conviction is a type of conviction driven by emotions rather than facts.)

Extensive fabrication by the state.

State claimed a desk light was a tripod in order to hold defendant in prison.

The state told the judge setting bail that they had a tripod which in actuality was a single desk light from Staples.

State claimed the same desk light was high intensity lighting in order to hold defendant in prison.

The state claimed high intensity photo studio lighting was in evidence.

The only thing they had was the same desk light they claimed was a tripod.

The State suggested a plastic disposable camera was part of a photo studio in order to hold the defendant in prison.

The camera was a packed-away, still sealed old-fashioned non-Polaroid camera that required it be taken to the drug store to develop the film.

This camera was not used and was not something illegal pictures could be developed on without a film developer seeing the pictures.

The camera, lighting and tripod was part of the state's attempt to mislead the court through fabrication of evidence.

As a result the Court raised the bail from \$50,000 to \$250,000.

The state told the Court and public I they had a police-type badge that could be used to impersonate an officer to abduct children.

I was a security guard at my investor's construction project and had a security badge. No one at any time ever claimed I showed that badge to anyone or claimed I was an officer of the law.

The state claimed they had about fifty images of child pornography in order to hold defendant in prison.

Bail was again raised to \$350,000. Only after the damage was done did the Court dismiss the pornography charges and realize there was no child pornography or photo studio.

The compounded effects of the falsifications were fatal to the defendant.

The state deceived the court into thinking William's van was an illicit photo studio by claiming the ordinary light was multiple items from a photo studio with a camera and child pornography.

FACTS OF ORIGINAL CASE

The state's witness was a felon on parole

The uncle of the boys who was supposed to be watching them was on parole.

Being on parole is being in state custody. This brings strong motive to go along with the prosecutor to win favor to be released from custody.

He was on parole for heroin distribution and cruelty to animals.

Youth's entire story of what happened is impossible.

The driver's side window of the van was electric, and the electric motor was burned out and as a result the window was stuck shut and could not open (the Court recognized and accepted the fact that the window could not open and was stuck shut).

Both boys did not know that however, and both testified that **ALL** alleged communication between me and them, took place through the open driver's side window.

They testified that in **ALL** communications that occurred over a period of two hours, that they were across the street from the driver's side window of my parked van at all times.

The boys hence discredit their entire claim of attempted abduction (by claiming I told them to get in the van or I would kill them).

In trial when cross examined, the oldest boy said he saw me roll down the driver's side window.

At the time the boy testifying **indicated that he saw me ROLL DOWN the window**, he did not know the window was push-button controlled, electric and stuck shut.

The fact of the electric stuck shut window was established by my attorney and accepted by the court.

The window motor was burned out, thus the boy's claim he saw me roll it down and that all communications took place through that OPEN window is thus an impossibility.

By the laws of science and physics the claims against me are impossible and thus inadmissible.

This testimony proves they were making their story up and is perjury.

Clearly written legal procedure calls for throwing a case out once the primary claim is discredited, yet the court proceeded with the trial and allowed the jury to be prejudiced and misled.

The higher court denied an appeal based on this violation of legal procedure and other violations of state and federal rules of evidence, and then again in other petitions. (See Attorney Michael Zariphes' petition for certification the CT Supreme Court, which they declined to hear.)

The boys told the police they sicced their pit bull on me.

They sicced their pit bull on me after insulting me.

Oldest boy said he insulted me on the numerous occasions he walked past my van. On one occasion he said **his pit-bull pulled him to the van and put its paws on the front door.**

The boys told the police that they were bothered by my presence and insulted me multiple times with foul language.

In sworn statements made incident to arrest, they admitted to degrading comments on multiple occasions.

The prosecutor instructed the youngest boy to say I wanted to kidnap him.

It was brought to the court's attention that the state's prosecutor told the youngest boy to testify that I told him I wanted to take him to Madison.

This happened immediately prior to trial when the prosecutor was alone with the boy in his office.

When questioned on the stand by my attorney, the youngest boy admitted that he had been told to say this. His excuse was he had forgotten that I had said that to him and that the prosecutor was just reminding him.

The court allowed hearsay evidence from a child by falsely claiming a "spontaneous utterance" loophole/exception to the rule of law.

It is against the law to base a legal case on hearsay. Yet this entire case is illegally based on hearsay of hearsay.

The state created a false story by saying the youngest boy ran to his uncle in a state of fear, spontaneously uttering that a man wanted to kidnap him. This allowed them to use the alleged claim of threat of kidnapping as evidence of intent to commit a crime. The hearsay then became only evidence of a alleged crime of intent.

However, this claim conflicts dramatically with what he told the police. Rather than run to his uncle, he said in a police interview incident to arrest that he went to the store to buy chips. His brothers collaborated this: instead of running to his uncle in fear, he went the other way to the store.

The uncle said I invited them to Hammonasset in Madison, & the older boy said everything was “OK.”

The uncle testified that I suggested a legal invitation, indicating that this is what upset him and caused him to call the police.

In a sworn police interview the older boy said that “**everything was Ok,**” and that they didn’t know why I was parked outside, and thought I may be selling drugs (like their uncle did as a heroin distributor) **immediately prior to the uncle calling police.**

He said that their uncle then talked to me, cursed me and called the police (immediately after I made a legal invitation to show that I was a kind-hearted person).¹

Boys said they voluntarily passed the van multiple times (this contradicts spontaneous utterance claim and threat of kidnapping).

Both boys said in the NHP interview that they went to the store to buy chips and then by my van again after I allegedly threatened them and before they said anything to their uncle.

The prosecutor was motivated to fabricate for emotional and career reasons, and the boys were motivated to fabricate for many reasons.

The boys had motive to lie. If their story was believed **they would be seen as heroes rather than juveniles to be punished,** and the prosecutor **would be a hero protecting society from the monster and he would win his case for potential acclaim and promotion.**

¹ See attached NHP interview statement by oldest youth.

The state published fiction and dreams in writing and orally.

Instead of presenting a balanced picture, the state misled the court and jury by reading highly prejudicial, irrelevant and erroneous fictional entries having no connection to the charged crime, including twenty-two dream interpretations and self-studies from my personal records for over an hour in trial.

Part of the objective of the witch hunt was to cover up actual facts surrounding the case.

The jury was never given an option other than that I was a sexual predator.

The whole story and actual circumstances surrounding the event were covered up and I was falsely characterized as something the public fears most.

The fact of my life's main work to educate to help people achieve their goals and dreams in life was suppressed. (See attached documentation)²

My attorney told me not to testify because of a condition of clinical social anxiety made me easy prey to the prosecutor.

Yet the court did not consider the van's actual use and my altruistic professional and personal activities and intents as relevant and refused to allow it in as evidence, and as a result the jury never heard any other interpretation of the events on October 16th, 2000.

The court failed in allowing information revealing that my van was a mobile writer's office used for highly pro-social activities, or that I was acting altruistically to help the family and made an invitation to them through an adult guardian in a legal way.

The actual facts are that days prior I had founded a humanitarian educational C-type stock corporation (for adults) with a mission to educate humanity as to human potential, solve world problems and help individuals achieve their full potential and dreams.

All my stock was confiscated, never mentioned and never returned.

² See attached letter from Harriet Sutfin, and CT proof of incorporation.

The van/RV was a method to travel to Florida and write.

I had two three-drawer filing cabinets with all my writing in the van which was a treasure trove for the state to look through for fiction to use to prejudice and confuse the facts of the case.

As writer's do, I also had records of my personal studies and night dreams, as well as recreational fiction I was legally entitled to (nothing found in my van was illegal).

In terms of evidence the court would allow to be presented, all the facts were suppressed as irrelevant and the fiction was considered relevant.

All my private property within in the van and the van itself was seized based on hearsay of hearsay and never returned. The contents that forever disappeared included: certificates of incorporation and initial shares of **stock for my educational corporation** founded days before my arrest; three file cabinets full of my research and personal self-studied and research, and approximately **50 books on human potential, and solar home plans I designed at age 13.**

(At 13 I had worked with Yale professor Everett Barber on the design of solar inventions. My solar heated and cooled homes were built in Madison while I was a freshman in Guilford high school.)

Everything illegally seized that showed my good character and actual humanitarian work disappeared.

Nothing was returned despite my motion and numerous requests to get all my writing and work associated with my educational corporation returned.³

I couldn't build a case for trial or to appeal because I could not get the evidence and was unable to communicate with the outside world from in prison. Those I did get a letter to never replied due to the stigma of my charges and conviction (and an inmate stamp required on all envelopes indicating the correspondence originated from a felon in prison).

Facts were not considered by the state.

The FBI takes all child abduction-type cases, but refused to take this case.

³ See attached request to retrieve seized items denied by New Haven Court.

How would I kidnap THREE boys? Especially considering that I had no restraints or weapons and all six doors were unlocked.

The key was not in the ignition and I never tried to get away, even when police were called.

Uncle said I invited them all [to Hamonasset State park in Madison]. If you ask an adult's permission and give a destination it does not meet the bar requirement for attempted kidnapping charges.

No adult witnessed any behavior or actions of mine alleged to be illegal.

The third boy and only boy not to testify said in sworn NHP interview that "The guy in the van said he only wanted to help us because we were poor."

At sentencing, Judge Thompson twice stated that there was no evidence of my intent.

No one alleged that I said anything or did anything that indicated sexual intent or that could in any way affect morals, yet I was convicted on three counts of risk of injury of a minor on the morals prong (not bodily harm prong).

I was convicted on three counts of risk of injury to a minor on the morals claim based on nothing.

The prosecutor falsely justified three counts of risk of injury to a minor on the bodily harm prong by telling my attorney that the boys could have gotten in my van and read my journals. Insanely, the Court allowed this charge (times three) to proceed.

The court assumed sexual intent.

A court of law cannot assume intent, yet it did, and it based its decisions on speculation and assumptions with no evidence.

Based on assumption my case was donned a sex case and I was treated as a sex offender. I was put on the sex offender registry and ordered to be subject to treatment.

There is abundant evidence that the prosecutor and police were leading the boys at every stage.

The youngest boy said he smelled alcohol on my breath, yet he simultaneously stated that he was across the street from me at all times. How can he smell my breath from across the street?

The youngest boy said he could SEE a "BIG bed" in my van [from across the street] even though that was absolutely impossible to do. Somebody had to have told him to say that, because there is no way he could see or know there was a bed in the van from across the street. The van's windows were dark tint, with closed curtains and venetian blinds, and the bed (a standard issue fold-down seat), was only eighteen inches off the floor, and not near the windows.

Boys were conditioned to believe they were being kidnapped.

The youngest boy stated in NHP interview that he was told EVERY DAY that he could be kidnapped at any time by his uncles' repeated warnings. His uncle scared them to the point of imagining I was trying to kidnap them.

In police interview the youngest boy said that I LOOKED LIKE a kidnapper.

In police interview he said MY VAN LOOKED LIKE a kidnapper's van.

Recap: A conjured case.

Look at what was false, basically the entire state's case: the fiction writing supplanting facts surrounding the circumstances of the case; fabricated evidence of a tripod, camera, high intensity lighting, police-type badge and child pornography to deceive the Court; spontaneous utterance claim to validate the improper admission of proven false hearsay, and perjured claims of threats through an open window that was in actuality stuck shut.

The never existing tripod and high intensity lighting, absurdly, was ONE ITEM, a single desk light I purchased at Staples. The camera was a packed-away, still sealed old-fashioned non-Polaroid camera that required it be taken to the drug store to develop the film. The badge was a security guard badge I used

when I watched my investors construction site (I had **THREE** jobs). This false evidence was all that the court and jury was presented with. **They had no other scenario or option and intents offered to them.**

Nothing I was doing was illegal.

The van and all its contents were legal and all my paperwork, insurance and license were current.

In the morning of the day I was arrested I was joyfully singing how I could help the world, and because of the recent founding of my corporation I was highly motivated to help people.

I gave up three homes and a lucrative career to squeeze an educational corporation with computers and filing cabinets into a van to save money to make my dream for lifting the race to a higher path come true.

I formed an educational corporation (Earth Network of Altruistic, Autonomous Individuals Inc.) because I had a drive and life's purpose to help the world, and living simply and inexpensively with no bills minimized life's distractions and allowed me to write full time to create the platform and curriculum necessary to convey my message. The state took all of that and never mentioned it or returned it.

An investor offered to pay my way. The van was thus set up as a live-in office so that I could drive to Florida in the winter to write.

Before I drove to Florida, state officials made the van's actual content go away and falsely portrayed evidence of an illicit photo studio.

My actual work and humanitarian intents was erased from the court and public record while fictional writing was used as if it were actual plans and was used as a tool to confuse and prejudice jurors.

A fabricated story of spontaneous utterance in a single incident (allegation) of verbal threat (in which no physical attempt of a crime existed) resulted into six illegal felonies and 15 years in prison and continued destructive and excessive parole conditions that constitute double jeopardy and cruel and unusual punishment (including mind control).

These six felonies for one verbal incident were allowed by the spontaneous utterance exception to the use of hearsay as evidence.

The uncles' hearsay came from the child's hearsay, so in actuality this is hearsay of hearsay of a future crime that never happened.

Six illegal felonies were levied for what the state's attorney speculated I was going to do but did not do.

This is like the movie *Future Crimes*.

My cell phone was not in the police inventory, supporting my theory that the boy's reached in the passenger window and stole it.

I suffered an ad hominem conviction FOR A FABRICATED FUTURE CRIME because IN VIOLATION OF FEDERAL AND STATE RULES OF EVIDENCE my fictional writing was read in court.

My repeated attempts to retrieve my educational work, property, and evidence of character were repeatedly blocked. In effect, MY FREE PRESS, VOICE AND WORK WAS SILENCED AND ERASED BY THE GOVERNMENT. My solar home plans, my educational writing, home, office, vehicle, property were never returned.

On top of a nine-year sentence I SERVED ANOTHER SIX YEARS FOR TRYING TO REWRITE AND PUBLISH THE EDUCATIONAL CONTENT SEIZED FROM MY VAN TO SHOW WHO I AM AND WHAT REALLY HAPPENED. Since this content was never returned and I was not allowed to communicate through my First Amendment rights, no one heard or believed me. Now, after 17 years I am finally able to make my case.

The unconstitutional laws I am fighting, however, still prevent me from using social media and other means to tell my story and prove my innocence.

Currently I am working for a non-profit, CT for One Standard of Justice to improve laws and the quality of justice and life for CT citizens and am challenging illogical laws and stubborn ignorance **THAT HARM ALL CT CITIZENS** directly or indirectly.

My complaint.

My complaint is that I was trying to help humanity, yet I was demonized and spent nine years in prison as a monster. I don't even believe in punishment, I never did, it is a primitive irrational and destructive practice used by ignorant people, and in my opinion, it is as insane and destructive as sacrificing children

to appease an angry god. We live in the 21st century and there is no excuse for it. How do you think I felt being in prison for 15 years being punished like I was a child for trying to solve these problems through education?

To survive this kind of assault and make a come-back takes a lot of strength and resolve.

My efforts to recreate my stolen work, tell my side of the story and contribute to society met with stiff resistance and resulted in six more years prison time after I served my entire nine-year effective sentence.

I cannot personally advertise my book on social media or seek publicity without risking reincarceration.

My books, THE SOLUTION TO ALL OF HUMANITY'S PROBLEMS, & YOU ARE A BEAUTIFUL PERSON, are available through [Lulu.com](https://www.lulu.com).

Supporting documents attached

To Whom It May Concern:

I have known William Eastwood ever since his birth, over 50 years ago. He is my sister's youngest son, and I have watched him grow into a sensitive, caring man who has always been aware of the people around him and the goodness inherent in them. As a young man, one of his interests was the environment and the effect that people had on the world around us. He did some important work in the early field of solar power. He supported himself in those early years in the home building trade, often with his brothers who were builders in CT.

Over the years, William and I have had many conversations about education. (With an earned doctorate in this field and more than 50 years of teaching students up through the graduate level, I can attest to the fact that William understands that people are basically good and need associations with trusting people who can bring out the best in them.)

It seemed only natural that William should eventually want to help us all learn how to bring out the good in people. So he began writing about the good in the world and how this goodness can emerge through people who have been surrounded with positive expectations.

When news of his arrest in 2001, reached me, I was shocked that his humanitarian attempts to improve society were so misunderstood by the New Haven, CT police department. Dishonest accusations by young people caused an incorrect legal case to escalate and turn into a prison sentence for many years. (Over 15 years so far, with no end in sight.)

Now, in 2017, William has had one or more years of Parole and Special Parole. My understanding of Parole is that it is a reintroduction to life in a free society. The Parolee should be helped to find work and to begin to support himself. It seems that William has had so many restrictions put on him that he has no freedom to find work or even to attempt to work.

I would urge the State of Connecticut to help William get respectable employment, not keep him from getting employment. I believe he is trustworthy, highly intelligent, and able to support himself.

Thank you for helping to make a life worthwhile and positive,

Harriet D. Sutfin

Harriet Doolittle Sutfin
Ed.D and Ed.M, Boston University
Certificate of Advanced Study, Harvard University
B.Sc, Southern CT State University

January 21, 2017

200 Tappan St.
Brookline, MA 02445
October 12, 2012

Fred Watton, Parole Manager
Board of Pardons and Paroles
55 West Main St.
Waterbury, CT 06702

Re: Release of William Eastwood


Dear Mr. Watton:

The Eastwood Family has asked me to write in support of William Eastwood, who has been incarcerated for more than nine years. My Doctoral Dissertation at Boston University, 1980, showed the effect of environment on the behavior of young children. I have known William all his life and can assure you that he was raised in a loving and caring home and he has carried these altruistic characteristics from early childhood throughout his life.

I am told that William was arrested in New Haven while working on material to be published, material which would help people, particularly young people, to live better lives and to achieve their dreams. William has always been interested in making the world a better place in which to live. A pacifist, he has always looked for the good in people and has encouraged people to treat others with respect and kindness. It is hard for me to understand why William was arrested when he was involved in trying to make improvements in society.

If I can be of any further help in clarifying any issues concerning William's character and his efforts to improve society, please contact me. I encourage you to release him and give him the freedom to write and make this world a better place in which we all can live.

Respectfully,



Harriet D. Sutfin, Ed.D., Ed.M.
Boston University

CAS in Ed., Harvard University
B.Sc., Southern CT State University

hdsutfin@aol.com
Tel: 617-566-3186

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

NBN CROO-495204T

STATE OF CONNECTICUT : CASE #CROO-495204-S
Vs. : G. A. AT NEW HAVEN
WILLIAM EASTWOOD : OCTOBER 8, 2007

Evidence taken by N.H.P. that I requested from all my attorneys to prove my innocence. Most of it is still unaccounted for.

MOTION TO RELEASE SEIZED ITEMS

Defendant in the above styled action, hereby moves this Honorable Court to order the release of items seized by the New Haven Police Department, and claims and says:

1. On or about, October 16, 2000, agents of the N.H.P.D. seized the following items: a 1987 Ford Econoline van, vin.#N#44592, CT marker 873-CBJ, registered to William Eastwood, and its contents including architectural blueprints of solar homes and modular systems designed by William Eastwood; a carrying case containing one (1) IBM Thinkpad laptop AAFALN9 (7k85E1454483), one (1) Versa Notebook 2430LD NB6350759B; Earth Network of Altruistic Autonomous Individuals Inc. documentation and stock, two floppy disks and 5CD-R^s containing an unpublished manuscript on how to solve global problems such as crime, authored by William Eastwood; two file cabinets containing three educational courses, research on sexuality and human motivation, and seven websites all authored by former president of Earth Network, William Eastwood; approximately 50 educational books, a security badge and construction tools, a printer, and other office equipment items such as a reading light, business card making equipment and supplies such as stickers, all used in a philanthropic capacity. (See: Exhibit "A" attached hereto, and incorporated herewith by reference.)

2. On information and belief, these items remain in the possession of said agents of the N.H.P.D.

2007 MAR - 3 P 12:33
OCT 11 10 07
SUPERIOR COURT
G.A. 23

Judicial District of New Haven
SUPERIOR COURT
FILED

OCT 10 2007

CHIEF CLERK

A-16

44

Business Inquiry**Business Details**

Business Name: **EARTH NETWORK OF AAI, INC.** Citizenship/State Inc: **Domestic/CT**
 Business ID: **0660188** Last Report Filed Year: **NONE**
 Business Address: **1171 MAIN STREET, BRANFORD, CT, 06405** Business Type: **Stock**
 Mailing Address: **NONE** Business Status: **Dissolved**
 Date Inc/Registration: **Aug 30, 2000**

Principals Details

Name/Title	Business Address	Residence Address
WILLIAM EASTWOOD PRESIDENT	1171 MAIN STREET, BRANFORD, CT, 06405	84 RACE HILL ROAD, MADISON, CT, 06443
JOHN A. VIGLIOTTI SECRETARY	1171 MAIN STREET, BRANFORD, CT, 06405	9 WILBRAHAM COURT, BRANFORD, CT, 06405
ALEX VIGLIOTTI TREASURER	1171 MAIN STREET, BRANFORD, CT, 06405	9 WILBRAHAM COURT, BRANFORD, CT, 06405

Agent Summary

Agent Name: **ALEX VIGLIOTTI**
 Agent Business Address: **1171 MAIN STREET, BRANFORD, CT, 06405**
 Agent Residence Address: **26 GRIFFING POND ROAD, BRANFORD, CT, 06405**

N.H. POLICE INTERVIEW

Dbt f !4;1: .dw 12514.DGE!!!Epdvn f ou2!!!D belds 0f 50t at 10m t4: 5pg 12 . 3

~~LEGED ATTEMPTED~~ Statement of: ~~██████████~~ Case: 00-56132 ~~Group AN ATTEMPTED~~

~~BUC~~ Q. AND THEN WHAT HAPPENS? ~~→~~ RAMEL C., oldest youth ~~AGBUETFRON~~

A. THEN MY UNCLE SAID WHAT HAPPENED TO YOU, I SAID IT'S ALRIGHT. HE SAID WELL WHY THE DOG BARK AGAIN I DON'T KNOW AND THE GUY BE UM PROBABLY DRUG DEALER.

Note: They are speculating why I'm there, a fact that contradicts the state's claim that I just tried to kidnap them.

Q. OKAY SO WHO SAID THAT, YOU?

A. MY UNCLE.

Q. YOUR UNCLE THOUGHT THIS GUY MIGHT BE A DRUG DEALER?

A. UH HUH.

Q. OKAY AND THEN WHAT DOES YOUR UNCLE DO?

A. MY UNCLE DO, THEN MY UNCLE TALKED TO HIM THEN HE STILL SHUT THE WINDOW THEN MY UNCLE CALLED THE COPS THEN.

Q. OKAY SO YOUR UNCLE APPROACHED THE GUY?

A. MM HM.

Q. IN THE VAN, DID YOU, WERE YOU ABLE, WERE YOU OUTSIDE THEN AND HEARD WHAT WAS GOING ON?

A. YEAH.

Q. AND WHAT HAPPENED?

evidence of altered document

Uncle swears and calls police.

A. THEN, THEN MY UNCLE SAID, MY UNCLE SAID YOU UNCLE CALLED THE COP, THEN THE COPS CAME.

HE SAID F- YOU THEN MY

Q. OKAY IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE THAT THE MAN IN THE VAN SAID OR DID THAT I MAY HAVE FORGOTTEN TO ASK YOU?

By affixing my signature to this statement, I acknowledge that I have read it and/or have had it read to me and it is true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Witness: _____ Signature: _____

Personally appeared the signer of the foregoing statement and made oath before me to the truth of the matters contained therein.

Subscribed and sworn to before me on this _____ day of _____ under authority of the Connecticut General Statutes, 1-24. _____

©1998 Mountain Computer Design LLC

A-17 43