	BRANCH	3
STATE O	F WISCONSIN,	
	PLAINTIFF,	DECISION
vs.		Case No. 06 CF 88
BRENDAN	R. DASSEY,	
	DEFENDANT.	
DATE:	MAY 12, 2006	
BEFORE:	Hon. Jerome L. Fox Circuit Court Judge	
APPEARAI	NCES:	
	KENNETH R. KRATZ Special Prosecutor On behalf of the State	e of Wisconsin.
	LEONARD D. KACHINSKY Attorney at Law On behalf of the Defer	ndant.
	BRENDAN R. DASSEY Defendant	
	Appeared in person.	
	* * * * *	* *
	TRANSCRIPT OF PI	ROCEEDINGS
	Reported by Jennife	r K. Hau, RPR
	Official Court	Reporter
	•	
•		

THE COURT: Morning, counsel, morning ladies and gentlemen. This is 06 CF 88. State of Wisconsin vs. Brendan R. Dassey. Appearances, please.

1.2

ATTORNEY KRATZ: The State of Wisconsin appears by Ken Kratz, Calumet County D.A., appearing as special prosecutor.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: The defendant appears personally and with Attorney Len Kachinsky.

THE COURT: All right. Um, we are here today for a decision on a motion to suppress. Uh, the defendant, Brendan Dassey, has brought this motion requesting that the Court suppress statements he made to Investigator Mark Wiegert with the Calumet County Sheriff's Department and Agent Thomas Fassbender of the Wisconsin Department of Justice.

The motion brought contends that the statements made by Brendan Dassey were obtained from him involuntarily and should, under the applicable law, be suppressed. The motion was heard in this courtroom last Thursday, May 4.

Court heard testimony from Investigator
Wiegert. It heard testimony from the defendant's
mother, Barb Janda, and Kris
Schoenenberger-Gross, a school psychologist for

the Mishicot School District. The Court also received, five exhibits during the course of the hearing.

In addition, the Court has read the relevant case law cited by the parties in their briefs as well as a number of other pertinent cases.

The Court has also reviewed the DVDs of the interviews, read the transcripts and listened to the audiotapes. The audiotape in the form of a CD. Now, these electronic recordings are all part of Exhibit 5. Based on those exhibits, that testimony, the briefs, and arguments of Counsel, the Court makes the following findings of fact:

Number one. The defendant, Brendan
Dassey, was born October 19, 1989, and was, at
the time of the police interviews in February and
March of 2006, 16 years of age.

Number two. At the time of the police interviews, he was a student at Mishicot High School enrolled in mostly regular classes, but also in some special education classes. Testing, it disclosed, an IQ level in the low average to borderline range. There is no evidence that he suffered from any emotional disorder which made

him unusually susceptible or vulnerable to police pressures.

Three. Prior to his interviews which are the subject of this motion, his only known police contacts were on November 6 and November 10, 2005, when he was questioned in Marinette County about Teresa Halbach.

Number four. The parties have stipulated to the noncustodial nature of the police interviews with Brendan Dassey on February 27, 2006, and March 1, 2006.

Hearing Exhibit No. 1 is a *Miranda*warning and waiver signed and initialed by
Brendan Dassey on February, uh, 27, 2006, at
3:21 p.m. And Exhibit 2 is a *Miranda* warning and
waiver signed and initialed by Brendan Dassey on
March 1, 2006, at 10:10 a.m.

Number five. Investigator Wiegert and Agent Fassbender met with Brendan Dassey on February 27, 2006, at Mishicot High School at approximately 12:30 p.m. He was told by them that he didn't have to answer any questions and he was free to go whenever he wanted. Exhibit 5, transcript page 440.

He was questioned for approximately an

hour and was again told he could stop answering questions and could, quote, walk out anytime, end quote. Exhibit five, transcript page 467.

At the close of that interview, he gave the investigators a written statement. The investigators both complimented him for giving them a voluntary statement telling him they knew how difficult it was to tell -- tell them the details he divulged. The interview ended at 2:14 p.m. He returned to his eighth hour class at Mishicot High School.

Number six. At approximately 3:00 p.m. on February 27, 2006, the same day of the earlier interview, Brendan Dassey and his mother, Barb Janda, met with the investigators at Mishicot High School and agreed that Brendan Dassey could do a videotape interview with the Two Rivers Police Department.

Ms. Janda was asked if she wanted to be present during the interview. She said it was not necessary. And Brendan Dassey said he did not care if his mother was present or not.

After he signed and initialed Exhibit 1, the **Miranda** warnings and waiver, the investigators interview Brendan Dassey about

certain events which he claimed occurred on the night of October 31, 2005.

The interview lasted approximately 41 minutes and was conducted entirely in a conversational tone of voice by the interviewers. At no time during the interview did Brendan Dassey appear visibly stressed or pressured by the questions or conducts — conduct of the interviewers.

Number seven. On March 1, 2006,
Investigators Wiegert and Agent Fassbender sought
and received permission from Brendan Dassey's
mother, Barb Janda, to speak with Brendan. She
was to pick him up at the conclusion of the
interview. Following her grant of permission,
Investigators Wiegert and Fassbender picked up
Brendan Dassey at Mishicot High School at
approximately 10:05 a.m. and transported him to
the Manitowoc County Sheriff's office, stopping
on the way at Brendan Dassey's residence so he
could retrieve a pair of blue jeans that the
investigators wanted for evidentiary purposes.

Number eight. The conversation in the car on the way to the sheriff's office was electronically recorded except for the time spent

in Brendan Dassey's residence. The three arrived at the sheriff's office at approximately 10:43 a.m. and went to a carpeted interview room equipped with videotaping equipment.

Shortly after arriving in the interview room and while the videotape equipment had been activated, Brendan Dassey was asked by Investigator Wiegert whether he remembered his Miranda rights that had been read to him and whether he still wanted to talk to the investigators.

He responded in the affirmative to both questions by saying, quote, yeah, unquote, and nodding his head.

Uh, number nine. The interview between Brendan Dassey and the two investigators lasted approximately three hours during the course of which Brendan Dassey made a number of inculpatory admissions. At no time during the interview was Brendan Dassey handcuffed or otherwise physically restrained.

On several occasions during the course of the interview the investigators offered soda, water, or food to Brendan Dassey and asked him if he wanted to use the bathroom. Throughout the

interview, Brendan Dassey was seated on an upholstered loveseat.

Number 10. At various times during the interview the investigators encouraged Brendan Dassey to provide details to them by appealing to his sense of honesty. Quote, honesty here is the thing that's going to help you, end quote. Exhibit 5, transcript page 541.

Quote, honesty is the only thing that will set you free, uh, end quote. Exhibit 5, uh, transcript 5 -- page 541.

Quote, come on Brendan, be honest. I told you before that's the only thing that's going to help ya here, end quote. Exhibit 5, transcript page 547.

Quote, we just need you to be honest with us. Exhibit 5, transcript page 584.

These are but a few example of admonitions to be honest made to Brendan Dassey by the investigators. The entire interview, including the admonitions, was done by both investigators in a normal speaking tone with no raised voices, no hectoring, or threats of any kind.

Nothing on the videotape visually

depicts Brendan Dassey as being agitated, upset, frightened, or intimidated by the questions of either investigator. His demeanor was steady throughout the actual questioning.

He displayed no difficulty in understanding the questions asked of him. At no time did he ask to stop the interview or request that his mother or a lawyer be present. Instead, he answered the questions put to him.

Sometimes he revised his answers after being prodded to be truthful or being told by his questioners that they knew his answer was either incomplete or untrue and he should be honest.

These appeals to honesty made by the interviewers were nothing more than a reminder to Brendan Dassey that he had a moral duty to tell the truth.

Number 11. On occasion, the interviewers purported to know details which, in fact, were not true or which represented uncorroborated theories of the crime in which they presented to Brendan Dassey as factually accurate in order to draw information from him. In the context of this interview, the Court finds that this tactic of misleading Brendan Dassey by

the interviewers occasionally pretending to know more than they did was neither improper nor coercive because it did not interfere with Brendan Dassey's power to make rational choices.

Number 12. No frank promises of leniency were made by the interviews to -- interviewers to Brendan Dassey. He was told, quote, we can't make any promises, but we'll stand behind you no matter what you did, end quote. Exhibit 5, transcript page 541.

Quote, I want to assure you that Mark and I are both in your corner. We're on your side, end quote. Exhibit 5, uh, transcript page 540.

Quote, we don't get honesty here. I'm your friend right now, but I gotta -- I gotta believe in you, and if I don't believe in you, I can't go to bat for you, end quote. Exhibit 5, page 547.

Quote, we're in your corner, end quote.
Exhibit 5, page 547.

These and similar statements made by the interviewers were an attempt to achieve a rapport with Brendan Dassey and convince him that a truthful account of events would be in his best

interest.

Based on those findings of fact, based on the record, the exhibits in this matter, the Court concludes, as a matter of law, the following:

Under a totality of the circumstances test, which I'm using here, given Brendan
Dassey's relevant personal characteristics as set forth in the previous findings and on the record in this case, the State has met its burden by showing by a preponderance of the evidence that the statements made by Brendan Dassey to
Investigators Wiegert and Fassbender, and which are the subject of this motion, were the product of Brendan Dassey's free and unconstrained will reflecting deliberateness of choice. In short, they were voluntary statements.

Accordingly, the defendant's motion to suppress these statements is denied. And, I might add as a -- as a footnote or, perhaps, more than a footnote here, the parties stipulated to the fact that this was not -- either of these interviews, the 27th of February, March 1 of 2006, were noncustodial interviews.

Uh, the Court, after reviewing the

record, has determined that even had they been custodial interviews, that the appropriate
Miranda warnings were given, were understood by this defendant, and, thus, had they been custodial — had they been custodial interviews, uh, the result, uh, that the statements were voluntary would remain unchanged.

Now, uh, Exhibit 5, which I've alluded to in the preface of — of the findings, as well as during the course of the findings, is, as I noted at the last hearing, uh, an in camera, that means in chambers, uh, exhibit. The Court is going to seal that exhibit, uh, and it will remain sealed until the trial.

The Court believes, given the continuing media scrutiny in this matter, that the dissemination of Exhibit 5, uh, would have, conceivably, a tendency to taint a jury pool. It's my understanding -- And, gentlemen, correct me if I'm wrong. First you, Mr. Kratz, you have no objection to proceeding in that fashion?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: That's correct, Judge.

THE COURT: Mr. Kachinsky?

ATTORNEY KACHINSKY: I don't object either, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Anything else on this before we move on to -- And I'm going to ask you, Mr. Kratz, to draft the order.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: I will -- I will do that,

Judge. Uh, Your Honor, I -- I know that the Court

was reading from a -- a -- a prepared statement. Is

it possible that I can get a copy of that to, uh,

amend or attach that to the order, or would the

Court just prefer I indicate in the order, for

reasons stated on the record.

THE COURT: Um, why don't you put, for reasons stated on the record. Or, I suppose, in the alternative, you can ask the already overworked court reporter to -- to type a transcript here.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: I won't do that, Judge.

I'll just, uh, draft a generic order. That's

fine. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Um, the next item,

I believe, Mr. Kachinsky, is yours. It's -- it's a

motion. Do you want to be heard on your motion to,

uh, revise the terms of -- of the bail?

ATTORNEY KACHINSKY: Um, yes, Your Honor.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Judge, before we get into the -- to the merits of that, I --I wonder if I could be heard just -- just briefly on, uh -- on

that, uh -- on that procedure. Um, because the, um -- one of the factors on any motion to modify bond, uh, directs the Court to consider the, uh, strength of the State's case. Because of, uh, this morning's rulings, uh, it is the State's position that the strength of the State's case has become, uh, significantly, uh, solidified.

Uh, let me also tell the Court that, um, and Mr., uh, Kachinsky, uh, is to be, uh, made aware of this, that additional, uh, forensic conclusions were received. Additional reports were received two days ago in our office which, again, need to be revealed to this Court under seal.

Lastly, Judge, the Manitowoc County, uh, Corporation Counsel in a similar request made by Mr. Avery, uh, made their position known, and I don't know in this case if they've been invited to do so.

With all of those factors, Judge, and with the, uh, bond modification on the State's part being at least an option, uh, I'm wondering whether the Court would grant the State, uh, an opportunity, perhaps five to seven days, to, uh, file those matters with the Court to include, in

camera, uh, the additional information that, uh, we have received, uh, and if the Court would be willing, uh, to allow a, uh, more inclusive bail modification hearing again in the next five to seven days.

That seems to, uh, address those matters that I cannot relay to the Court in open court today, uh, and would provide this Court an opportunity to reflect upon, or at least consider, the relative, uh, strength of the State's case in the bail modification motion.

THE COURT: When were the -- the -- When was the forensic evidence of -- of which you make mention received?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: The 10th. Two days ago, Judge.

ATTORNEY KACHINSKY: Well, Your Honor, this motion was filed, I believe, on the 24th or 25th of -- of April, 2006. Uh, State's aware, from having prosecuted the Avery case as well, at least as to, uh, the values of the property that's -- that's involved, uh, and, uh, other factors relating to bond other than the recent forensics evidence, uh, as to whether or not the motion would be granted

or not. Um, I don't know if the State's forensic evidence would add that much more to what the Court's already ruled today in terms of the admissibility of Mr. Dassey's statements.

So, it would be our -- our preference that the Court, uh, proceed with the motion and -- and make a ruling today.

THE COURT: Well, let me ask you,

Mr. Kratz, is it your intention to, in effect,

request that -- that, uh, bail be revoked here and
no bail be allowed at all?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: No, Judge. But I am going to be asking that bail be increased, uh, having the Court now consider the relative strength of the State's case. That's in -- that's information I didn't have until three minutes ago.

THE COURT: All right. Uh, the -- the

Court -- the Court is inclined, uh -- Since the

State says it -- it -- it has received some

additional information that -- that have -- may have

a bearing on the, uh, uh -- on the outcome of the

motion, the Court is inclined to -- to, uh -- to

adjourn this particular motion today, Mr. Kachinsky,

and -- and set, uh, uh -- set a near date for -- for

hearing on it.

1 Uh, I don't have my calendar with me.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: I can file my motion by Wednesday, if that's okay, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: If the Court can give me five days to do that, I -- I can certainly have that to the Court and Mr. Kachinsky.

THE COURT: So that would be, uh, Wednesday the 17th. Um, all right. Could, um -- Well, I think what we'll -- we'll -- we'll do, uh, following -- uh, following business in this court today is -- is, uh, discuss a motion date in chambers. I have to, uh -- I have to take a look at the calendar and you, gentlemen, probably do have to look at yours as well, and there's some other matters we should be discussing.

So, I am going to, uh, grant the -- the State's motion to adjourn, order that, uh -- order that the revised motion or information be filed by Wednesday, May 17. Um, any other matters to come before the Court today?

ATTORNEY KACHINSKY: Your Honor, perhaps, just to avoid unnecessarily calling, a -- a witness, I don't know if the State disputes at all the value of the property that's involved, I could submit to

the Court, uh, extra copy of the appraisals that were made and, I believe, perhaps, submitted in the Avery case.

If that's not the issue, if the issue is this additional evidence regarding the State's case, if that -- at least that portion of the, uh, motion was taken care of, uh, that would, perhaps, facilitate some of the inconvenience that this delay is going to cause us.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: How about if we do this, Judge, I'm willing to share with Mr. Kachinsky my, uh — my feelings on that after going through the documents and at least alert him whether or not we'll need a witness at that next hearing.

THE COURT: Well, I -- I noticed in his motion -- in Mr. Kachinsky's motion -- he said that he had sent you some documentary, uh, proof as to values that he was claiming in motion.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: He -- he brought some with him today as well.

THE COURT: Yeah. Well, is there any reason we can't just have those marked and be part of the record?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: No. That's fine.

THE COURT: Yeah. Let's do that. And the

1 bailiff was kind enough to bring a calendar here so 2 let's take a look. How about Friday? 3 afternoon? Friday, May 26? ATTORNEY KRATZ: State's available, Judge. 4 5 ATTORNEY KACHINSKY: The only thing -- Uh, 6 I've got something in Chilton, but, perhaps, that 7 can be, uh, taken care of, Your Honor. ATTORNEY KRATZ: I'll see what I can do, 8 9 Judge, to --10 THE COURT: How about 1:15? 11 ATTORNEY KACHINSKY: Sure. 12 THE COURT: Anything else, gentlemen? 13 ATTORNEY KRATZ: Judge, I have to, uh, 14 place on the record, and receive the Court's 15 acquiescence, as the information that I intend to 16 provide certainly has not been publicly disclosed 17 and would, uh, I believe, be the kind of information 18 that the Court, uh, likely would not want disclosed. 19 May I file my motion to amend under seal as well? 20 THE COURT: All right. It -- it will be 21 received as -- as an in camera motion, or at least 22 the exhibits to the motion, and -- and anything in 23 the motion that, uh, would be revelatory will be 24 received as an -- an -- as an in camera motion.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: That's fine, Judge.

25

1	THE COURT: Anything further?
2	ATTORNEY KRATZ: No.
3	ATTORNEY KACHINSKY: And, Your Honor, the,
4	uh, appraisal's been marked. I don't know if we're
5	going to I didn't see what letter you
6	THE CLERK: One.
7	ATTORNEY KACHINSKY: As Exhibit 1.
8	THE COURT: Okay. The appraisal will be,
9	uh, Exhibit 1 and it will be part of the the
10	motion, uh, and, uh, Mr. Kratz, do you have any
11	objection to the appraisal?
12	ATTORNEY KRATZ: No.
13	THE COURT: I mean, you're not
14	ATTORNEY KRATZ: Not to not to its
15	receipt for this hearing, Judge.
16	THE COURT: All right. All right.
17	Anything else?
18	ATTORNEY KRATZ: No. Thank you, Judge.
19	ATTORNEY KACHINSKY: No.
20	THE COURT: Could I see you both in about
21	ten minutes in chambers, please?
22	ATTORNEY KRATZ: Yes, Judge.
23	THE COURT: Thanks. We're adjourned.
24	(PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED.)
25	

ϵ
STATE OF WISCONSIN)
)SS. COUNTY OF MANITOWOC)
-
I, Jennifer K. Hau, Official Court
Reporter for Circuit Court Branch 3 and the State
of Wisconsin, do hereby certify that I reported
the foregoing matter and that the foregoing
transcript has been carefully prepared by me with
my computerized stenographic notes as taken by me
in machine shorthand, and by computer-assisted
transcription thereafter transcribed, and that it
is a true and correct transcript of the
proceedings had in said matter to the best of my
knowledge and ability.
Dated this 29th day of August, 2006.
Sennifer K. Hay
Johnifer K. Hau, RPR Official Court Reporter
Official Court Reporter

21