1	IN THE DISTRICT COURT IN AND FOR TULSA COUNTY STATE OF OKLAHOMA
2	STATE OF ORLANDIA
3	MARQ LEWIS,
4	Plaintiff, Case No.
5	vs. \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \
6	IN RE GRAND JURY,
7) —
8	Defendant) ORIGINAL
9	DISTRICT COURT
10	******
11	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS JAN 2 9 2016
12	HAD ON SALLY HOWE SMITH, COURT CLERK STATE OF CKLA. TULSA COUNTY
13	SEPTEMBER 14, 2015
14	BEFORE THE IMPANELED GRAND JURY
15	********
16	
17	W 29 DRI
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	REPORTED BY:
23	TAMI MORSE, CSR-RPR
24	TAMI MORSE, CSR-RPR 500 S. DENVER, SUITE 111 TULSA, OK 74103 tami.morse@oscn.net
25	tami.morse@oscn.net (918) 596-5371
	_

APPEARANCES FOR THE STATE: Rob Barris Kevin Buchanan Special Appointed Tulsa County District Attorneys 500 S. Denver, Ste. 900 Tulsa, Oklahoma

(Witness and his attorney, Shena Burgess, 2 entered the Grand Jury Room.) 3 GRAND JUROR 9: Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so 4 5 help you God? 6 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. 7 BILLY JOE MCKELVEY, 8 Having been first duly sworn, testified as 9 follows: 10 DIRECT EXAMINATION 11 (BY MR. BARRIS) State your name, please, sir. Q. 12 Billy Joe McKelvey. B-I-L-L-Y, J-O-E, 13 M-C-K-E-L-V-E-Y, Senior. 14 Thank you, sir. And Mr. McKelvey, you're present 15 here with your attorney of record Ms. Burgess, Shena 16l Burgess, is that correct, sir? 17 Α. It is. Okay. And you have met with her prior to today 18I and arranged her representation of you, is that 19 20 correct? 21 A. Yes. Q. Okay. Thank you. 22 Mr. McKelvey, can you tell us where you're 23 241 employed, sir? 25 A. Tulsa County Sheriff's Office.

- 1 Q. How long have you been employed at the Tulsa
- 2 County Sheriff's Department, sir?
- 3 A. Since August 1st of 2008.
- 4 Q. What's your current position within the Sheriff's
- 5 Office?
- 6 A. Deputy.
- Q. And do you have a specific area or job that
- 8 you're assigned to as a deputy?
- 9 A. Yes, sir.
- 10 Q. What is that?
- 11 A. I'm assigned to the Juvenile Bureau of Detention
- 12 Center as a court deputy.
- 13 Q. Okay. Have you held any other positions
- 14 previously within the Sheriff's Office?
- 15 A. Yes.

- 16 Q. What would those positions have been, sir,
- beginning with the first, bringing us up to the time
- that you're now with the Juvenile Bureau.
- 19 A. Okay. In 2008 when I was hired I was a court
- 20 deputy here in the Courthouse. I was then
- 21 transferred to the jail in Training Division as a
- 22 deputy. And then I was transferred as a deputy to
- 23 the Jail Investigation Unit. Then as a deputy I was
- 24 transferred to the Internal Affairs Division.
 - In October of 2010 I was promoted to corporal.

- Then, in October of 2012 I was promoted to captain and transferred back to the jail. And then July 1st of this year was demoted to deputy and transferred to the Juvenile Bureau.
- Q. I'm sorry what date, sir?
- A. I believe it was July 1st.
 - Q. Okay. Thank you.

I want to focus on a couple of specific areas, sir, in regard to your prior service and things of that nature, if I could.

Initially, sir, when you were in the Internal Affairs Division what years did that encompass?

- A. Roughly, June of '10 through October of '12.
- Q. Okay. Was there any other persons assigned to that unit besides yourself during the time you were there?
- 17 A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

- 18 Q. Who would that have been, sir?
- 19 A. At the time Sergeant Rob Lillard. Also, I had
- 20 worked in the unit with Deputy Clint Caskey, Deputy
- 21 Yerton and Corporal Tom Helm.
- 22 Q. Would that be Jeremy Yerton?
- 23 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Is that his name? Did you become aware during
- 25 the time period that you were with the Internal

Affairs Department or part of the Sheriff's Office about a 2009 investigation, Internal Affairs' investigation concerning potential favoritism, or preferential treatment given to a Reserve Deputy by the name of Bob Bates?

A. Yes, sir.

- Q. How did you acquire that knowledge or come into possession of it?
- A. Soon after transferring to the Internal Affairs
 Division. At the time, Rob Lillard, who was my
 sergeant, showed me a copy of it from a training -from -- I took it as a training aspect that he wanted
 to teach me that we do investigations that are, umm,
 sometimes not the most pleasant and politically
 liked, but you still have to do them.

And he was -- he was visibly upset and verbally told me that he was upset because when he submitted the 2009 investigation he, umm -- to then Undersheriff Edwards, Undersheriff Edwards had showed it to Tim Albin and he was -- he was -- it was a learning -- it was a learning thing for me.

He wanted to teach me that when you do these investigations you need to keep your mouth shut, work them close, and just turn them in to who they need to be turned into, and watch out who my friends are

- because you have to do investigations on your friends.
- Q. So, did you actually see at that time a copy of the actual report that Sergeant Lillard had made and provided to the Undersheriff, Brian Edwards?
- A. I had seen it, but not read it in its entirety.
- Q. Okay. And did you have occasion after you saw it to actually acquire possession of it in some form or fashion, either on paper or on digital media?
- 10 A. Yes, sir.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Tell us about that. How did that come about and why did you keep it, sir?
 - A. Okay. Umm, during the time that I was in Internal Affairs one of the problems that I was having was writing conclusions to investigations.
- 16 Q. Okay.
 - A. I was having problems with that and Sergeant
 Lillard was all the time telling me, go read old
 cases. Read old cases. You'll learn -- you'll catch
 it. You'll get it. And I eventually did.

Some of the other duties that we had to do was writing letters for the Undersheriff. Meaning, we would -- a complaint would come in. We'd have to generate a letter and mail it to the complainant.

And once the investigation was over we'd have

to generate another letter and mail it back to the complainant of the findings.

And I did not have a lot of access to those and Rob Lillard was giving them to me, here you need to read this. Here's you another letter, you need to read that. For me to get an understanding on how Brian Edwards wanted these letters written.

From time-to-time Rob would go out of town on training and whatnot and he would leave me his computer access. And I was in his computer in his letter folder one time reading letters. And then I thought to myself I'll just copy his folder, that way I'll have it. He doesn't have to give me -- because we shared documents quite often and I copied his folder. That was late '10, early '11.

And then in 2012 I was going through that folder and I found this -- I found a document named, special investigation, opened it up, and it was the Bates' case.

- Q. Did you recognize what you saw when you opened that part of the folder as being what you had seen previously?
- A. Yes, sir.

- Q. That Mr. Lillard had shown to you?
- A. Yes, sir.

- Q. Okay. You indicated in your testimony a moment ago that when Mr. Lillard first discussed this matter with you that he was upset at the outcome, essentially, is that right or lack of outcome?
 - A. It appeared -- it appeared that he was upset because the Undersheriff had showed it to a person that was in -- highly involved in the case and that was Tim Albin.
 - Q. I see. And he viewed that as being an improper way to do things?
- 11 A. Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

- Q. Okay. During the course of time that you and he served together in the Internal Affairs Unit of the Tulsa County Sheriff's Office, do you recall whether or not he ever made a statement to you concerning Bob Bates and the circumstances surrounding that and its effect, potentially, on the Sheriff?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. What did you -- what do you recall him saying?
- A. He told me that, and I can't quote it because
- 21 it's been so many years, but he told me that Bob
- Bates would be the end of Stanley Glanz.
- Q. Can you tell us about when in this time frame that statement was made and where it was made?
 - A. It was made in the Internal Affairs Office

- 1| between him and I.
- 2 Q. Okay.
- A. It was late 2010, about the same time that I was shown this 2009 investigation.
- Q. So, it was essentially, in some respects, the two were connected with one another, is that right?
- 7 A. Yes.
- Q. When you located in 2012 the copy on the computer, the folder that you had copied from his to your computer, what did you do with that document at that time?
- 12 A. I just closed it out and kept it.
- Q. Okay. Did you maintain it for some period of time thereafter?
- 15 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. I want to fast forward, if I could, a little bit to 2015.
- 18 A. Okay.

- 19 Q. In April of 2015 what was your assigned duty?
- A. I was a captain, the Administrative Captain over the David L. Moss Criminal Justice Center.
- Q. Okay. Did you become aware during the course of your duties in some way about an officer involved shooting that had occurred on April 2nd involving
 - Reserve Deputy Bates and a person by the name of Eric

- 11 Harris?
- 2 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. How did you first become aware of that?
- 4 A. I was sitting in my office and Shannon Clark,
- the -- a major who I reported to at the time, stepped
- in and said, we need to go. We've had an officer
- 7 involved shooting and he said, Bates shot a guy.
- 8 Q. So, this is Shannon Clark --
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. What role or relationship did you have in terms
- 11 of the office with him at that point in time?
- 12 A. At that time Shannon was the major. He was the
- 13 Jail Administrator and I reported directly to him.
- 14 Q. So chain of command he was the next above you?
- 15 A. Yes.
- Q. And he said to you, we need to go because of the
- 17 situation?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Where did you all go?
- 20 A. We went to the shooting scene to primarily handle
- 21 any media relations related issues.
- 22 Q. Did you or he have specific responsibilities or
- 23 duties concerning media relations at that time for
- the Sheriff's Office?
- 25 A. Shannon was the primary Public Information

- Officer and I was secondary.
- Q. Okay. In regard to those duties, were -- was
 that something that you were expected and required to
 do to respond to these types of situations where
 media attention might be drawn to an action of the
 Sheriff's Department?
- 7 A. Yes.
- Q. And that's the purpose that you went to the scene for?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Did you, or to your knowledge did Major Clark
 12 participate in any way in the actual investigation of
 13 the case in terms of collection of evidence, any
 14 anything of that nature?
- 15 A. Nothing.
- Q. Okay. Did you acquire, in order to do your job
 as a secondary Public Information Officer,
 information concerning the facts or what were
 supposed to be the facts of that situation?
- A. What we do is we show up and gather basic information to be able to report a, basically, a sound bite for the media if they are there asking questions.
- Q. Okay. Did you perform those duties and acquire that kind of information?

II A. Yes.

4

5

6

7

- Q. Do you recall who you obtained the information from?
 - A. Tom Huckeby.
 - Q. And as I understand it, and correct me if I'm wrong, at that time Major Huckeby was the person who basically was in charge of the Drug and Violent Crime Task Force?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. Okay. Based on that information, and other
 11 information you may have acquired other places, did
 12 you then participate, throughout the month of April,
 13 in the preparation, or delivery of messages to the
 14 public, releases to the public from the Sheriff's
 15 Office concerning this matter?
- 16 A. Yes.
- Q. Did you have an occasion shortly after the shooting incident on April the 2nd, to meet with any members of Eric Harris' immediate family?
- 20 A. Yes.
- Q. Can you tell us, sir, the circumstances that led to that meeting, if you could.
- A. At the time the Undersheriff, Tim Albin, asked me to go with Chaplain Ken Farnum to meet with the brother of Eric Harris. And he asked me to do two

things. One, was to apologize, umm, for the shooting.

And, two, was to ascertain whether or not he was -- or the family of Eric Harris was currently being represented by an attorney.

- Q. And those were directions, specifically, from the Undersheriff, Mr. Albin, Tim Albin?
- A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

- Q. Okay. Did you have any conversation with anyone else other than Undersheriff Albin about these duties or that request?
- A. It -- was, ahh, during this time, understand, that I had talked with Tim multiple times on the
- 14 telephone.
- 15 Q. That being Mr. Albin?
- 16 A. That would be Albin, yes. My apologies.
- 17 Q. That's okay.
- A. With Albin and -- on my cell phone and on speaker phone in Major Shannon Clark's office. So, I'm under the belief that Major Clark heard the same orders
- 21 that I had received.
- Q. Okay. Did anyone else direct you or give you any instructions other than Undersheriff Albin about what
- 24 was to occur?
- 25 A. No.

- Q. Okay. Where were you to meet the Harris family or the immediate family of Mr. Harris. You say his brother, is that right?
 - A. His brother.

- 5 Q. Okay. Do you know his brother's name by chance?
- 6 A. I cannot remember, no.
- Q. Okay. But -- where were you supposed to meet that person?
- 9 A. We met him at a QuikTrip and I believe it was
 10 129th East Avenue and 41st Street or 51st Street, but
 11 it was a QuikTrip in that vicinity.
- 12 Q. Okay. Was there a time set for this meeting?
- A. Chaplain Farnum reached out to the brother to try
 to meet with him and the brother put us off for
 approximately an hour and a half to two hours. This
 is Eric Harris' brother.
- 17 Q. Okay.
- A. Once Chaplain Farnum had made a contact with the brother and set up a time we went and met with him.
- Q. Do you recall what day it was -- the shooting
 happened April 2nd, let's assume that is true. How
 many days or whatever after that day did you have
 this meeting?
- A. Probably within three to four. I couldn't accurately tell you.

- Q. So three to four days after, is yourrecollection, correct?
 - A. Yes, up to three to four. It could have been the day or so after. It might have been the second or third day. I can't remember.
 - Q. Okay. In terms -- and this is just to help us set time frames.

You're familiar, sir, with the fact that
Mr. Bates was ultimately charged by the District
Attorney of Tulsa County with a crime in this matter,
correct?

12 A. Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

16

18

19

20

21

22

25

- Q. Would your meeting with the Harris family, his brother, have been before or after those charges were filed?
 - A. I believe they was before.
- 17 Q. Before? Okay. Thank you.

So you met, as you indicated, at the QuikTrip at 129th East and maybe 51st Street. Who all was present at that meeting?

- A. It was myself, Chaplain Ken Farnum, and Eric Harris' brother.
- 23 Q. Anyone else?
- 24 A. No.
 - Q. Where did the meeting take place? Was it in the

- 1| parking lot, in the store, where was it?
- 2 A. It was in the parking lot on the far, I believe,
- 3 east end of the parking lot.
- 4 Q. Was it in a vehicle that it occurred?
- 5 A. Mr. Harris was in his vehicle. And how it
- 6 happened is I exited our -- Ken Farnum and myself
- 7 exited my vehicle, went to his, and then I believe he
- 8 ended up exiting his, I think. I think he exited his
- 9 and we talked.
- 10 Q. So you think you talked outside the vehicle?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Okay. What type of vehicle did you drive up in?
- 13 A. I was driving a blue unmarked Dodge Charger
- 14 police car.
- 15 Q. All right. And this is the same vehicle that
- 16 Chaplain Farnum was in as well?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. Okay. What was said at that conversation to the
- 19 best of your recollection, sir?
- 20 A. Umm, I started with, sorry for your loss, type of
- 21 conversation with him. I didn't come out and say we
- 22 are sorry for killing your brother, nothing like
- 23 that, but it was sorry for your loss.
- 24 Q. Okay.
- A. Then, umm, basically, talked with him about how

he was doing. How the family was doing.

He talked a lot about Bible scripture and he waved his Bible around a lot.

I ended up asking him, are you currently or is the family -- I asked him in a manner to -- I asked him in a way to indicate -- asking him did -- are you guys represented by any attorneys yet?

- Q. Okay.
- A. And I, honestly, I told him that attorneys convoluted these type of problems.
- 11 Q. You said that?
- 12 A. Yes.

Q.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

17

25

- 13 Q. What did you mean by that statement?
- A. Previous -- umm, previously in the Internal

 Affairs Division, I had worked a case with -- a death
- case in the jail of Elliott Williams.

Okay.

- A. One of the strategies in that death investigation
 was for the Sheriff's Office to make contact with the
 family members of Elliott Williams and try to get a
- 21 settlement before attorneys get involved because
- it -- it costs a lot more money to defend a civil case and usually the settlements are a lot higher.
- And, so, that was a -- a tactic used in that
 - case and that was what I was told to do in this case

- is to find out if the Eric Harris family was represented by an attorney.
 - Q. Had you been instructed by anyone to specifically enter into that area of conversation to tell them, hey, attorneys can make this more difficult, things of that nature, to attempt to dissuade them from getting an attorney? Did somebody instruct you to do that?
- 9 A. Yes.

4

5

6

7

- 10 Q. Who did?
- 11 A. Tim Albin.
- Q. Was that part of the directive he gave you when he told you to apologize to the family and to inquire about potential attorneys?
- 15 A. Yes.
- Q. During the course of time that you were being given these directives by Undersheriff Albin did he mention any specifics about any attorneys, or was it specific people he was concerned with, or just any attorney in the world? What was his concern? If he expressed that.
- A. He -- he wanted me to find out about if the Eric Harris family had an attorney.
- 24 Q. Uh-huh.
- A. And he didn't -- he didn't come out and say, make

- sure they don't hire XYZ attorney or anything like
 that, but he just wanted me to push to find out if
 they did because if they do not we want to find out
 who the -- his words was, we want to find out who the
 next of kin is so we can approach them.
 - Q. Okay. So, the mission that you had, at least in part was, if they don't have an attorney at this point to report back to Undersheriff Albin so that further action can be taken to try to settle the case with them, basically?
- 11 A. Yes.

7

8

9

- 12 Q. Okay. Was this conversation recorded by you, or Chaplain Farnum?
- 14 A. No.
- 15 Q. To your knowledge was it recorded by anyone?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. Who recorded it, if you know?
- 18 A. Dan Smolen's law firm.
- 19 Q. And how did they do that?
- A. I would imagine that he has private investigators
- 21 that he employs and he probably employed one to have
- Mr. Harris wear a wire and they videotaped it from
- 23 across the street.
- Q. So Mr. Harris, you think, was the one that actually had the recording device on his person?

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. Have you heard or seen a copy of that recording?
- A. I have listened to about 10 seconds of what was shown on the TV.
- 5 Q. In some media release at some point in time?
- 6 A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. You've not seen the actual recording itself or anything of that nature?
- 9 A. No, sir.
- Q. Okay. As I understand it, you correct me if I'm wrong, the concern that Undersheriff Albin had, at
- 12 least in part, was the issue of whether or not the
- family was going to seek legal counsel and a
- 14 potential civil case, correct?
- 15 A. Yes.
- Q. Did he express to you or make any statements to
- 17 you concerning the worry or potential he saw for the
- family getting an attorney in terms of the type of
- award or civil judgment that may occur against the
- 20 county and the Sheriff's Office?
- 21 A. He was not worried about civil. He wasn't
- 22 actually worried about the numbers. He was just
- 23 worried about the suit.
- Q. Okay. Did he make any statement in your presence
- or express any type of concern or statement about the

role or the facts of the case involving Bob Bates himself, whether it was his fault, wasn't his fault, or anything of that nature?

- A. He's -- he's told me several times that the shooting was an accident.
- Q. That's what he's maintained to you throughout the time period you've dealt with him?
- A. Yes.

16l

- Q. Okay. During the time that these events are transpiring, again, I'm referring you to after the time frame of the shooting of Mr. Harris, did the issue of the 2009 internal investigation report come to your attention again?
- A. Yes.
- Q. How did that happen?
 - A. In April there was media outlets that were saying they had a copy of an investigation and Tim Albin was saying, no, there's not one. We've checked our Internal Affair folders.

I knew of this '09-case. I told Major Clark I have a copy of this '09-case. Tim does not need to be saying it doesn't exist because it does exist, meaning Mr. Albin.

Shortly -- it was either the latter part of April, first of May, I printed off two copies of this

- 1 case, because I had a copy of it in a Word document,
- 2 the 2009-case. And I sat down with Undersheriff
- 3 Albin and Major Clark shortly after a morning meeting
- 4 and gave Tim Albin a copy of it.
- Q. At that meeting, what was discussed about the report and its existence at that time?
- 7 A. He looked at it. He told me he had never seen it.
- 9 Q. He being, I'm sorry --
- 10 A. I'm sorry.

15

16

17

18

24

- 11 Q. That's fine.
- A. Tim Albin looked at it. Said he does not remember ever seeing it.
 - I stopped him and told him back in 2010 I was told that you had seen it because Rob was upset that you had -- Rob Lillard was upset that you had seen it. You may not remember it, but you have seen it before.
- Q. What response did you receive from the Undersheriff Albin at that point?
- A. He continued reading the document and I didn't really get any type of verbal response from him after that.
 - Q. What else was discussed, then, as he's reading through the report in this meeting? What occurs?

- 1 A. Umm, he really didn't say too much, but his body
- 2 language was I'm -- oh, shit, this document is out.
- That's how I took his body language.
- 4 Q. Okay. Did he discuss with you, or with Major
- 5 Clark in your presence at that meeting, any of the
- 6 particulars or facts within that report?
- 7 A. No. Only thing he did say was he was going to go show it to Stanley Glanz.
- 9 Q. That he was what, sir?
- 10 A. He was going to meet with Stanley Glanz.
- 11 Q. He was going to meet with Stanley Glanz sometime
- 12 after that meeting?
- 13 A. Soon after that meeting.
- 14 Q. Okay. Are you aware of whether or not there was
- a meeting involving Sheriff Glanz?
- 16 A. No, sir, I'm not.
- 17 Q. Did you ever have an occasion to be present at a
- 18 meeting with Sheriff Glanz?
- 19 A. Yes, sir.
- 20 Q. When did that occur in regard to and in relation
- 21 to the conversation you had with Undersheriff Albin?
- 22 A. A few days after my meeting with Undersheriff
- 23 Albin, Major Clark and myself met with Sheriff Glanz
- in his office and we discussed this document.
- 25 Q. So who all was present at that meeting?

- 1| Yourself, Major Clark, the Sheriff, anyone else?
- 2 A. No.
- Q. Okay. Undersheriff Albin was not present?
- 4 A. No.
- Q. Okay. Was the report that we've been talking
- 6 about, was it discussed?
- 7 A. Yes.
- Q. What do you recall being discussed at that meeting, sir?
- A. It was mainly the Sheriff making comments that he doesn't remember seeing this document.
- Q. Okay. Was any conversation or any statement made to him in your presence by either yourself or Major
 Clark about the concern you had, or that Major Clark
- had, about this report and its existence?
- 16 A. No. Not that I -- not that I recall. No.
- 17 Q. Was there any discussion or conversation about
- whether this information should be released to the
- public, or how it should be handled, and from a
- 20 public information perspective?
- 21 A. Umm, no. It was -- the meeting was very short.
- 22 It was more of the Sheriff saying, I don't remember
- this case. Brian used to do these things all the
- time, meaning Brian Edwards.
- 25 Q. Uh-huh.

- A. And there really wasn't a strategy built that I remember.
- Q. Were you concerned about a strategy being built, or the need for one?
 - A. Umm, Major Clark and myself had discussed on a couple of times that the Sheriff's Office needs to get in front of this information because it was out and we needed to own it and say this is what it is. This is when it was worked. And get in front of --get in front of it versus continuing to say it does not exist and it didn't happen.
 - Q. To that point, to the point where you're talking with Sheriff Glanz at this point, had there been public statements issued by the Sheriff's Office denying the existence of the report?
- 16 A. Yes.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

- Q. Do you know who had made those statements up to that point in time, sir?
- 19 A. Both Undersheriff Albin and Sheriff Glanz.
- Q. They had made statements to the media saying this report did not exist?
- 22 A. That's my -- yes, that's what I remember.
- Q. Sir, I want to show you what's been admitted
 before the Grand Jury as Grand Jury State's Exhibit
- No. 16. Ask you to look that over for a second. I

- want to confirm and be sure whether or not you have seen that document before.
- 3 A. Yes.
- Q. And is that, in fact, the same Internal Affairs investigation report from 2009 that we've been discussing in your testimony that Sergeant Rob
 Lillard had prepared as a part of his duties with the Sheriff's Office back in 2009?
- 9 A. Yes.
- Q. Is that the report that you have been talking about with the Grand Jurors in your testimony that you were aware of back in 2010, had a copy of in 2012, and then it later came to surface again in 2015 after the shooting?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. The same report?
- 17 A. I would with one -- with one different --
- 18 Q. Okay.
- 19 A. The copy that I had was a Word document.
- 20 Meaning, it was in a -- it was in a -- I could go in
- 21 and change it if I wanted to. It was not saved in a
- 22 pdf format like this one was and the reason I say
- 23 that is --
- 24 Q. Okay.
- 25 A. -- this copy has a line in front of it.

- I Q. Yes, sir.
- A. In 2010 when I was in Internal Affairs whenever you printed something off on our big printer it would come out with this line across it.
 - Q. Okay.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A. And so the copy that I have is not -- does not have this line across it.
 - Q. Okay. But as far as contents, the words and things of that nature within the report, ask you to look at that, take a second if you need to.

Is that the same report as the one you've been referring to previously?

- A. It does appear to be, yes.
- Q. And it certainly, would you agree, it deals with the same subject matter that you've been discussing with Sergeant Lillard in the beginning and had access to, is that correct?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Okay. Thank you.

Did you have any further conversations with Undersheriff Albin after the conversation you and Major Clark had with him initially and showed him the report and said, here's this report?

A. I did until -- I had multiple conversations with him until he left the agency.

- Q. When you had those conversations, did he ever have any type of reaction, or appear upset by either the contents or the existence or presence of the report?
- A. Umm, he was obviously upset by the report. Yes. But I don't remember him saying anything -- I don't remember specific conversations where he -- he commented about it.
- Q. Do you recall being asked by him to go to a meeting with general counsel Meredith Baker --
- 11 A. Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

- 12 Q. -- to discuss these matters and to look at some documents?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. Tell us about that. How did that come about?
- A. Undersheriff Albin called me. It was late in the afternoon on a Thursday or Friday. It was the week prior to him resigning from the Sheriff's Office.
- 19 Q. Okay.
- A. He told me that, his words, was the guys in
 Internal Affairs had found a folder in the basement
 containing documents and that he has received
 information that the media has a full copy of what
 the IA officers found in the basement.
- 25 Q. Okay.

- A. He said that the IA investigators put that information on a CD and he asked me to get with Meredith Baker to review the contents of that CD.
- Q. And Ms. Baker, am I correct, was general counsel for the Sheriff's Office?
- 6 A. Yes.
- Q. And serves as a general counsel for the Sheriff's Office on matters?
- 9 A. Yes.
- Q. And you were to get with her to review concerning these materials?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. Where did that meeting take place?
- A. I called her on the phone -- the reason I say it
 was late in the day is I believe I was already going
- 16 home.
- 17 Q. Okay.
- A. I called her on her telephone, on her cell phone,
- and told her that Undersheriff Albin wants me to
- 20 review this CD. She said it was on her desk. She
- 21 would get it and for me to meet her at her house.
- Q. So did you go, then, to her home to meet her to
- review this matter?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. When you got to that residence, who all was

present at that time?

2

5

6

7

8

- A. Myself and Ms. Baker.
- Q. And what were you shown or what did you review at that time?
 - A. Umm, she took this disc and put it in her laptop at her kitchen table and, then, we opened it and I reviewed upwards to 80 pieces of paper contained in this CD.
 - Q. To your recollection what did that CD contain?
- 10 A. From reviewing -- from reviewing the contents of
 11 the CD I believe the CD was a copy of Rob Lillard's
 12 case notes concerning the 2009 investigation.
- Q. Did it specifically relate or have information that related to Reserve Deputy Bates and things of that nature back in 2009?
- 16 A. Yes.
- Q. Did you report back to Undersheriff Albin after you had observed the contents of that CD?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. How did that occur, sir?
- A. It was that same evening. It was either on my cell phone or Meredith's -- Meredith Baker's cell phone. We called him on speaker and we had a conversation via cell phone, speaker cell phone.
- Q. What did you tell Undersheriff Albin at that

11 time?

2

3

4

5

6

7

22

23

24

- A. I told him that it appeared to be Rob Lillard's case notes from the 2009 investigation.
- Q. Did he make any inquiry or ask any questions of you about the contents of those materials or anything of that nature?
- A. He asked me how bad it looked.
- Q. What did you take that question to mean? How bad it looked.
- A. I took it to mean how bad it would look upon the Sheriff's Office.
- Q. And at this time are you still serving as a secondary Public Information Officer for the department?
- 15 A. Yes, and a captain.
- Q. Okay. What did you say to him when he asked you that question?
- 18 A. I told him it was damning.
- Q. Did you make any statement to him about what particular parts of that report may have been, to quote you, damning?
 - A. I told him the -- I told him that the -- that the investigation -- that Rob Lillard's case notes appear that Bob Bates had received preferential treatment as a Reserve Deputy.

Q. Okay. What response, if any, did you get from Undersheriff Albin when you made that statement?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

- A. It was of a negative tone. He didn't like it.
- Q. Okay. Did Mr. -- or Undersheriff Albin ask anything further or make any further statements other than, how bad is it?
- A. That was pretty much it. With Tim Albin when you talk with him on the telephone over these type of issues there's a lot of -- of foul language involved and, so, he was extremely -- when I say there was -- he was just frustrated. He was voicing his frustration and it was vulgar in nature. So, he was just frustrated.
- Q. Were you present during that conversation when

 Ms. Baker made any statements on the phone

 conversation?
- 17 A. She -- she didn't really talk a whole lot that I
 18 remember. It was primarily me telling him this is
 19 what I see.
- Q. Okay. How did that phone conversation come to an end?
- A. Umm, it was a typical, he was done talking, and I
 was done telling him the information and it was
 pretty much, I'll see you tomorrow boss. Bye. I
 mean, it was -- usually conversations with him end

very quickly.

- Q. Do you at this time recall any specifics of what you viewed on that CD that led you to the conclusion of telling him it looks like Reserve Deputy Bates was receiving preferential treatment?
- A. Yes.

- Q. What types of things did you note or observe that led you to that statement or conclusion?
- A. There were -- there were copies of, umm, SOMS related information. SOMS is a database that the Sheriff's Office uses to track their employees and track training.

There was multiple reserve names listed and, specifically, I remember a -- a handwritten spreadsheet in Rob's handwriting that had on the left-hand side column names of reserves.

And then on the top column had things, like, application, background booklet, steps in order to be hired as an employee with the Sheriff's Office.

So, it was a spreadsheet of names on the left hand column and the top column was steps in the hiring process.

Q. Okay. And was there any information contained on that table or format that led you to the conclusion it might be preferential treatment for Mr. Bates? A. Yes.

1|

- Q. What was that?
- A. The -- the list of names -- I recognized a few of the reserves. I didn't recognize all of the names of the reserves. Bates' name was on there.

The top column consisted of an application, background booklet, MMPI, which is a mental aptitude test and an oral board area for a checkmark.

And the reserves, other than Bob Bates, there was a lot of check marks that -- you know, one reserve I remember was Coy Jenkins. Coy had a checkmark for application, had a checkmark for background booklet, had a checkmark for MMPI, and had a checkmark for oral board. And Bob Bates didn't have any checkmarks at all.

- Q. Did you interpret that to mean that, for example, in Mr. Jenkins' circumstances, that Mr. Lillard had concluded he had done all those required measures?

 A. Yes.
- Q. And the lack of a similar response or similar checkmarks on Mr. Bates indicated he could find no records of that as to him?
- A. That's correct.
 - Q. Anything else that you observed or recall from those materials that led you to the conclusion about

- preferential treatment being afforded to Mr. Bates?
- A. Not really. There was just a lot of printouts of a whole bunch of different reserves and their trainings and there was -- there was a printout from Bob's, but I don't remember -- I just really remember that spreadsheet.
- Q. Is it fair to say the overall impression you gained from reviewing those documents was that there was some -- those documents tended to support Sergeant Lillard's conclusion back in 2009 that preferential treatment was, in fact, occurring?
- 12 A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. Other than Undersheriff Albin, did you speak with anyone else concerning what you had observed in your review of those documents?
- 16 A. I believe I talked with Major Clark about it.

 17 Yes.
- Q. Okay. And what information did you relate to him?
 - A. It was just information of it's obvious that Bob Bates received special treatment. Those types of comments.
 - Q. Okay. Were you and Major Clark in that discussion, or other discussions, still working with the premise or the idea that as information officers

you were going to advocate a particular approach to how this report was to be dealt with in the media?

A. We had meetings about how it should be approached, yes --

Q. Okay.

A. -- and, umm, at one point the Sheriff's Office hired a media consultant --

Q. Okay.

A. -- to talk to about positive things with the Sheriff's Office.

One of the things that I was worried about and I believe -- I can't speak for, obviously, Shannon, but I believe he felt the same, was the whole black lives matter thing. We was trying to put a better spin on it so there wouldn't be violence in the City of Tulsa.

- Q. Okay. And you indicated in your earlier testimony, you said something about we need to get out in front of this type situation. What do you mean by that term?
- A. What I mean by it is, is transparency. Get out in front of it, meaning this is what we have. We're being transparent. We're trying to fix the problem. We're trying to address the problem. That's what I mean.

- Q. Okay. Did you -- you said that they were looking at hiring a media consultant. Did they, in fact, do that?
- 4 A. Yes.
- Q. Would that have been a lady by the name of Caswell?
- 7 A. Yes.
- Q. Has Caswell Consulting business here in Tulsa, is that right?
- 10 A. Yes.
- Q. And did she, in fact, provide consultation services to the Sheriff's Office regarding media relations?
- 14 A. Yes. It was -- I think it was, umm, two to three days' worth.
- Q. Okay. To your knowledge and your time with the
 Sheriff's Office, had you ever been aware of or been
 involved in a situation where a media consultant was
 retained by the Sheriff's Office for any other matter
 prior to this one?
- 21 A. No.
- Q. Did you in your duties and role as a secondary
 Public Information Officer ever have a meeting with,
 or receive information or instructions from the media
 consultant, Ms. Caswell?

- A. I was in -- I was involved with some meetings with her and it was -- it was more of things that we can do with social media to highlight positive things with the Sheriff's Office than it was directly related to the shooting.
 - Q. Okay. Do you know whether some or all of those proposals were implemented?
- A. Some were.
- 9 Q. Okay. In regard to the 2015 matter or incident, 10 did your employment or position within the Sheriff's 11 Office change?
- 12 A. Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

- 13 Q. How so?
- A. I've been demoted from captain to deputy and I've been asked to leave the Sheriff's Office.
- 16 Q. By whom?
- 17 A. Stanley Glanz.
- 18 Q. When did that occur?
- 19 A. I was put on administrative leave on June 1st.
- 20 Q. Uh-huh.

21

22

23

24

- A. Went through an Internal Affairs investigation and, then, towards the latter end of June I went through a pre-action, which is an employment hearing where I was demoted.
 - I appealed that. By policy and procedure of

the Sheriff's Office you have the right to appeal the decisions of those type boards. I appealed the decision directly to the Sheriff, Stanley Glanz.

Had a meeting with Stanley Glanz concerning my appeal and turned in a six-page, typed document of why I shouldn't have been demoted. Why I should be reinstated fully.

Q. Okay.

- A. And he took the night to review it. He called me the following morning after staff meeting and verbally told me he wanted me to quit or he was going to fire me.
- 13 Q. That would have been sometime in June?
- 14 A. That was right -- right at the first of July.
- 15 Q. Okay. So we're now into July?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. What response did you give him, or what did you do once he asked for your resignation?
 - A. I told him, umm, that -- I got a little more disrespectful than normal. I'd never really been disrespectful towards the Sheriff verbally. He's my employer.

I did a get a little -- I did get a little disrespectful with him and I did tell him that that was a nice comfort for his employees that when they

- file an appeal that the Sheriff will just fire them.
- 2 So, why follow policy and procedure? Why follow
- these things if you're just going to fire them
- 4 anyway?
- 5 Q. Did you tender a resignation at that time?
- 6 A. No. Tim and I had a conversation on the
- 7 telephone. I told him that if he wanted me to resign
- 8 I would, but I wanted 90 days to find a job and he
- 9 said, I will call you back.
- 10 Q. Okay. Did he call you back?
- 11 A. He did not. The Undersheriff, the new
- 12 Undersheriff Rick Weigel, called me back
- 13 approximately 10 minutes later. Told me that I would
- 14 be transferred to the Juvenile Bureau and that they
- was giving me 90 days to find a job.
- 16 Q. So that clock started sometime in July. That
- 17 90-day clock they gave you?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Okay. Is it your understanding that that's what
- time you have left is 90 days from that date to
- 21 obtain some other employment?
- 22 A. The -- that day I received a letter from the
- 23 Sheriff upholding the decision of the Pre-action
- Board that I would be demoted to deputy and
- transferred to the Juvenile Bureau.

1 2 3

The following day, which is a Thursday, I'm sorry, I don't have a calendar in front of me. I have my phone turned off. I have the dates in my phone.

- Q. That's fine.
- A. The following day, a Thursday, I received a letter from Stanley Glanz from him to me that said, umm, per our telephone conversation yesterday I will accept your resignation on or before September 30th, 2015.

And I marked through it and wrote October 31st, 2015, with the belief that if I didn't sign that document that another document that would be sent out later that day of my termination.

- Q. Did you return that document, the one where you'd changed the date to October 31st, back to the Sheriff?
- A. Yes.
- Q. You said that you were subject to an investigation, is that correct?
- A. Yes.
- Q. What was the basis or allegations, for lack of a better term, in that investigation concerning you?
- A. Umm, there were a couple of allegations concerning me and I'll go through them in order.

Q. Sure.

A. The first was Sergeant Randy Pierce, he worked under my direct span of control from, roughly, September of '14 until I was transferred to the jail in December of '14.

He filed a complaint at the end of July of '15 that I, umm, created a hostile work environment while he was working under me.

- Q. Okay.
- A. His primary complaint was -- Randy Pierce, he was a sergeant, had been shot back in 2004, 2005 area and had damage to his hand. And he was all the time making gestures and jokes about his crippled hand and how his finger is crooked.

And I had made jokes back to him about his crooked finger. And he never told me that it offended him or nothing until he filed this complaint in July, or in May, first of June.

- Q. Okay.
- A. Umm, and I admitted to doing that. I didn't lie about it. That's true. I did tease him about his finger. He'd tease back. So did a slew of other people, but I did do that.
- Q. Okay.
- A. The second complaint was, umm, a lady by the name

of Phyllis Langley in April of 2014, when I was first transferred to the courthouse to run the Courthouse Division, I had to transfer a lot of people outside, or out from underneath my span of control by orders of the Undersheriff.

I had a meeting with Tim Albin, the Undersheriff, and Shannon Clark, who had been in this position previously, concerning who to transfer because of the budget. The courthouse was under the -- was -- was grossly outside of budget. So we had to cut personnel and transfer them back to the jail.

Phyllis Langley was one of these people that was transferred. She didn't like it. Her position stayed the same. She was a extraditions deputy that flew around the country picking up inmates. Her position stayed the same, but her reporting location changed to the jail.

Then, when I was transferred to the jail in September of '14, her sergeant, who she reported to, Jerry Holloway, came to me and said, I can't handle her anymore. I don't want her. She is, ahh, she's a bad seed for the unit that he controls. I want her gone.

So I facilitated her being transferred back to

3

5

7

10

9

1112

13

15

14

1617

18

1920

21

2223

24

25

the courthouse and she was transferred back to the courthouse and she took that personal.

During my IA investigation, I asked the IA investigators to interview Jerry Holloway and I was exonerated on that complaint. That Jerry Holloway said that he wanted her gone and I made that happen.

The third complaint was Joe Peters. I worked, umm, two investigations on Deputy Joe Peters when I was in Internal Affairs.

He made a complaint that while I was in Internal Affairs I told him that this was going to be his last paycheck. That he shouldn't show up, back up for work.

I actually -- I worked the cases, but one of the cases was primarily worked by Jeremy Yerton and I asked that Jeremy Yerton be contacted because I didn't say any of these things.

And Jeremy Yerton was not contacted and that complaint was not sustained. Meaning they couldn't prove it happened or didn't.

Q. Okay.

A. Those was the three complaints against me. And, umm, the problem is that I had worked two cases on -- on Randy Pierce in Internal Affairs that resulted in him being transferred and being punished. And I

- asked the Internal Affairs investigators to interview every supervisor under my direct span of control at the jail to get a better idea of what type of captain and supervisor I am and to my knowledge nobody was interviewed.
- Q. This Internal Affairs investigation and the six-page response you gave that you shared with Sheriff Glanz on the appeal process, things of that nature, that was all in written form, was it not?
- 10 A. Yes, sir.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

- 11 Q. And there are records of that?
- 12 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. I assume the Sheriff's Office keeps records of Internal Affairs investigations, based on your
- previous experience in that unit?
- 16 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Did you keep copies of all those records
- 18 yourself?
- 19 A. Yes, I did.
- 20 Q. Okay. So you have a complete set as well?
- 21 A. I'm sorry?
- Q. You have a complete set, you believe as well, of those things?
- A. Well, I'm a bit confused on your question.
- 25 Q. Okay. That's fine.

- A. One of the -- one of the portions of the investigation also centered around me keeping copies of Internal Affairs cases and I did. I kept all of my own work product out of the Internal Affairs office that I did. You name it, I kept my work product. And the Sheriff did not like the fact that I kept my work product.
- Q. Was that found to be a basis or reason for an action to be taken against you?
- A. If you're asking me my opinion, I'm going to say that was not an action to be taken against me, but I believe -- and I don't think -- I don't think -- personally, I believe that the Sheriff believes that that was the reason for my demotion.
- Q. Okay. Before I get there, to clarify my question and I apologize for confusing you earlier.

My question was simply this: I'm trying to see how, if I need to, or if the Grand Jury sees a need to, to get copies of what happened in your Internal Affairs investigation.

And you're telling me you believe the Sheriff's Office would have a copy of that, correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And my question to you was: Do you have a record as well that you'd be willing to provide to this

- Grand Jury, if they request it, so we can compare and contrast to see if they are the same?
- 3 A. I have a copy of everything that was given to me.
- I do not have a copy of the formal written -- this type of a report.
- 6 Q. Okay.
- 7 A. And I do not have copies of all the audio tapes.
- But I do have copies of everything that was given to me and I will be happy, if the Grand Jury wants them,
- 10 I would be happy to give them.
- 11 Q. So, in the event that was something they would
- require, or see necessary, you'd be willing to
- 13 provide those through your attorney? Would that be
- 14 the way to proceed with that, then?
- 15 A. Yes.

18

19

20

21

- 16 Q. Okay. Very good. Thank you.
 - I take it from what I've understood from other evidence as well as your statements today, there were certain people that were placed on this review board that made a decision that you then appealed directly to the Sheriff, is that correct?
- 22 A. Yes.
- Q. Who was on the original board that made those determinations?
 - A. Umm, the people that was on the board was newly

- appointed Chief Deputy John Bowman. There was three
 other captains, which is Capt. Derrick Devow, John
 Bryant and Paul Tryon.
- 4 Q. Tryon?
- 5 A. T-R-Y-0-N.
- 6 Q. All right.
- 7 A. And this particular pre-action was the first 8 style of this pre-action because they changed policy.
- 9 Q. Okay. During the time that you were with the 10 Sheriff's Office, did you have occasion to have 11 direct access to Sheriff Glanz?
- 12 A. Yes.

- Q. Was it your practice or your situation where you would, on occasion, go directly to him and speak to him in his office?
- 16 A. I would from time-to-time. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Were there any requirements about going through chain of command before you spoke with the Sheriff?
- A. The times that I went directly to the Sheriff, I
 was officed next door to him, and my duties here in
 the courthouse was to take care of my courthouse
 responsibilities and the Sheriff.
 - Q. All right. You stated a moment ago that you had some opinion or belief about the reason for your

- actual adverse ruling within the Internal Affairs investigation. Is that a fair statement?
- A. Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

- Q. What is your belief?
- A. Umm, while on administrative leave just prior to my pre-action hearing, umm, I had to, umm -- well, I volunteered. I was subpoenaed to a deposition with the office of Dan Smolen and Clark Brewster's office.

During that deposition Dan Smolen told me that Stanley Glanz had did a deposition the week prior and during that deposition he admitted to the fact that he believed, Stanley Glanz believes, that Shannon Clark and/or myself released this 2009 document to the media trying to get him out of office.

- Q. Did he ever directly ask you that question?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. When did that occur, specifically?
- A. Umm, shortly after my deposition -- when I received this information from Dan Smolen that
- 20 Stanley Glanz believes that I received this
- information I believe that deposition was on a
- 22 Monday --
- 23 Q. Okay.
- A. -- I contacted Rick Wiegel, the Undersheriff, and told the Undersheriff that, umm, Stanley Glanz talks

2 wit

about having an open-door policy. I want to talk with Stanley Glanz. I went through, basically, my chain of command.

And the following Wednesday or Thursday I had a closed door meeting with Stanley Glanz where I told him emphatically I did not do this. And he said, did Shannon do it? And I said, I don't believe Shannon released this documentation.

And I have asked upwards of 10 times to take a polygraph examination to clear my name concerning the release of any documents, this one and any other documents, outside of the Sheriff's Office control.

And I have not received a polygraph examination as of yet.

- Q. Did you make that request to the Sheriff or to someone else?
- A. I made the request to three different people, that being the Internal Affairs investigator over the investigation. I made it in writing to the Undersheriff, Rick Weigel, and I made it verbally, again, to Stanley Glanz both that day and the day of my appeal on recording.
- Q. So that topic was discussed that day as well between you and Sheriff Glanz?
- A. Yes.

- Q. Did he, again, ask you or make a statement concerning the release of the report?
 - A. On that -- I can't -- that conversation -- I primarily gave him a copy of my written appeal --
- Q. Okay.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

A. -- and he read -- well, he read some of it. He perused the rest.

And I told him, I said, I wanted -- and I verbally said, I want a polygraph to clear my name on this. I don't deserve any of this punishment that I've received and he said he would get back with me.

- Q. And just to be clear, the release of that document was not part of the Internal Affairs investigation formally, was it?
- 15 A. No, sir, it was not.
- Q. That was never broached or mentioned in any way, shape or form, in the IA investigation itself,
- 18 correct?
- 19 A. No, sir, it was not.
- Q. Sir, you spoke with the Oklahoma State Bureau of Investigation recently, did you not?
- 22 A. Yes.
- Q. And they came and interviewed you in preparation and summary for your testimony here today, is that a fair statement?

- A. They asked me to come to their office and I went to them, yes.
- Q. In that discussion did you share with them a concern, or information concerning an issue concerning a stipend that was being received by the Sheriff personally?
- A. Yes.

- Q. Can you tell us about what that was about and why you were concerned about it, please.
- A. When I received the information that the Grand Jury was actually going to be seated, I talked with Shannon Clark concerning has Stanley Glanz done anything wrong? And Shannon said, well, umm, the vehicle stipend that he gets.

And I said, basically, do what? And he said, he gets a vehicle stipend and he has a vehicle assigned to him. And Shannon said that was illegal.

And I said, how is that illegal? And Shannon said that he had went through the Sheriff's Academy that was put on by the Oklahoma Sheriff's Association earlier in the year and that it is illegal to receive a vehicle stipend and a vehicle to drive.

Q. So, essentially, just so I'm clear, the Grand

Jurors are clear, in Oklahoma law if you're an

elected county official you can either receive a set

- number or amount of money per month to compensate you for your vehicle expense, gas, wear and tear, things of that nature on your personal vehicle, or you can have a vehicle purchased by the county that you have access to use, but you can't do both, is that correct?
- A. That is my understanding.
- Q. Okay. So, what was the issue about the stipend as far as the Sheriff was concerned?
- A. From my understanding the Sheriff has been receiving a vehicle stipend for a number of years, meaning 10 years plus, and earlier this year they bought him a new 2015 Tahoe to drive.
 - Q. And based on that, you and Major Clark, in your discussion, you felt that might be a concern or might be an issue, is that right?
- 17 A. Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

14

15

- Q. Had you ever heard the Sheriff himself speak
 about the stipend or say anything about the stipend
 in your presence?
- 21 A. Yes.
- Q. Tell us about, first of all, when that happened.
- A. It was earlier this year. It was in a staff meeting that -- the Sheriff's Office has a staff meeting every day at 8:30. It rotates monthly

between two buildings.

During the staff meeting it was brought up -it was about the time the city and the county was in
heated negotiations concerning payment of city
inmates in the county jail.

And the Sheriff made a comment in this meeting that one of these days they're going to come after me for my vehicle stipend.

- Q. And was that statement made to you directly?
- 10 A. No.

11

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

- 11 Q. But you heard him make the statement?
- 12 A. Yes.
- Q. Do you know who he directed that statement to or made that statement to?
- 15 A. I believe he made it to Christina Belda who is 16 the fiscal office for the county or the Sheriff's 17 Office.
- Q. Do you know how Ms. Belda's last name is spelled?
- 19 A. No.

- 20 Q. Okay. But it's Belda?
- A. No, I'm sorry. Her name -- her last name has since changed. It's Morrison, Christina Morrison.
- Q. All right. Was anyone else present at that conversation or statement other than yourself and
 - Ms. Morrison and the Sheriff?

- A. Umm, I cannot remember who all was there, but there was a full table, but I don't remember the exact players. More than likely the Undersheriff was there, Tim Albin, Rick Weigel, Michelle Robinette, normal command staff members.
- Q. What role or job does Michelle Robinette have?
- A. She's a Chief Deputy assigned to -- here at the courthouse and jail operations.
 - Q. Okay. And it's your belief that she would have been at that table, is that correct?
- 11 A. Yes.

- Q. Anyone else besides Undersheriff Albin, nowUndersheriff Weigel, and Chief Robinette?
 - A. It's a hit and miss. Tom Huckeby could have been there.
- 16 It's a hit and miss.
- 17 Q. You don't specifically remember anybody else.
 18 Okay. That's fine.

Backtracking for just a second. Back to the conversations you had, first, with Undersheriff Albin and then with Sheriff Glanz about this report, when it initially became discussed early on in this matter.

Did you ever discuss or make any statement or hear Shannon Clark make any statement to the Sheriff

- about Undersheriff Albin having been shown that report back in 2009?
- A. In our -- in our meeting that Major Clark and myself had with Stanley Glanz, I believe that was discussed, yes, but it was more -- it was more me telling the Sheriff he seen it back in '09.

I know -- quite honestly, I know Tim well enough he probably -- if he did see it he very well may not remember and that's what -- and that's what I told the Sheriff.

- Q. But you specifically communicated that information to the Sheriff at that meeting?
- 13 A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

22

23

24

25

- 14 Q. One more blast from the past.
- 15 A. Okay.
- Q. Your phone conversation you had with Undersheriff
- 17 Albin from Ms. Baker's home on the speaker phone.
- 18 A. Yes.
- Q. Did you give him specifics about what was contained in the contents of the CD other than the statement that it was damning?
 - A. I honestly don't remember. I truly do not remember if I told him about the spreadsheet or not.

My guess is, is I did, because he would have asked me, why do you think that, and I would have

2 3 4 believe I did. 5 6 Right. Α. 7 Q. Okay. Very well. 8 9 10 11 12 13 A. Okay. 14 15 16 all this took place? 17 the Sheriff. 18 19 20 21 nature? 22 23

24

25

told him because that's how our conversations went. I would tell him what I think and he'd ask me why, but I don't really, truly remember telling him, but I You just don't have a recollection at this time? Sir, I think that's all the questions that I have for you. Appreciate your time. The Grand Jurors may have some questions to ask you, to either follow-up or explore other areas. If that's okay with you. GRAND JUROR 16: Juror 16. How would you describe your relationship with the Sheriff before THE WITNESS: I had a pretty good rapport with GRAND JUROR 16: Strictly professional or outside, did you go fishing or anything of that THE WITNESS: I had never been fishing with Umm, I'd been to his house a couple times. him. I've been to his house in Whitefield a couple times.

He allowed me to go deer hunting on his land down in

Whitefield. I took it to be a pretty good relationship that you would have with your employer. 2 3 GRAND JUROR 16: So you felt like he trusted 4 you? 5 THE WITNESS: Yes. GRAND JUROR 16: How about a relationship with 6 7 Bob Bates? THE WITNESS: I know Bob. I've talked with 8 him on occasions, but I've never -- I don't even know 9 where he lives. I cannot even remember having lunch 10 11 with him. 12 GRAND JUROR 16: So you're saying you never 13 had lunch with Bob? THE WITNESS: I don't -- no. Honestly, I 14 don't believe I have. I don't believe I have. 15 GRAND JUROR 16: Well, you stated earlier that 16 your office was right next to the Sheriff's Office --17 THE WITNESS: Yes. 18 GRAND JUROR 16: -- am I correct? Did you 19 ever have a chance to see Bob interact with the 20 21 Sheriff? 22 THE WITNESS: I just seen him, umm, walk by, say hi, stop in say hi to the Sheriff, and that was 23 24 about it. GRAND JUROR 16: So you never overheard any of 25

the conversations that they had?

THE WITNESS: No.

GRAND JUROR 16: Have you ever heard of anyone talking about their relationship between the two of those, the Sheriff and ...

THE WITNESS: I know -- I officed next to the Sheriff between April of '14 until December 1st of '14 and I know that they went on some fishing trips together, but I don't -- I don't have -- I didn't keep his calendar or nothing. I just know that they had gone fishing.

GRAND JUROR 16: I'll come back to you. I've got some other things.

GRAND JUROR 13: 13. Do you feel that the demotion was more retaliatory in terms of the information being leaked to the media?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

GRAND JUROR 13: In terms of the report being brought up in terms of Randy Pierce, do you think that was a way to just throw a little mud on you or why was that brought up?

THE WITNESS: Umm, one of the things that was brought up in the IA investigation, or when I was interviewed, at least, was the fact that I kept Randy out -- Randy Pierce out of Stanley Glanz's office and

I did.

Meaning, when I was transferred to the courthouse I was under direct orders of Tim Albin to keep Randy Pierce out of Stanley's office.

And I sat Randy down and told him that. I'm under orders to keep you out of Stanley's office because he's got enough on his plate versus you running in there like the sky's falling because that's the type of guy Randy is.

Randy is very ADHD. He's really bouncy. He talks -- he flutters his hands a lot when he talks and that has a tendency to raise blood pressures in people. And Tim Albin told me to keep him out of the office. I kept him out of the office. I think he took that personally.

Joe Peters, and Phyllis Langley -- Phyllis Langley worked directly for Randy. Joe works in the courthouse and sees Randy all the time.

I believe it was -- I believe it was brought up to tarnish me, yes, because all I have is accolades in my folder. My performance evaluations, my last four have been 3 -- 3.9s and one 4.0 out of a 4.0 scale.

I've never been disciplined. I've never been written up. I've never been written up for being

tardy or late.

And now I go from -- I was actually -- I was actually -- had to do two depositions for the Sheriff's Office where I was designated as an expert for the Sheriff's Office in Federal Court called a 30-B-6 to demotion and termination.

GRAND JUROR 9: Juror No. 9. Regarding the demotion. Given the statements or the investigation items, you gave us three examples or three stated items here, have you ever been involved in somebody else's disciplinary action either as an investigator or witness, umm, of this type?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

GRAND JUROR 9: Okay. And what was the outcome of that?

THE WITNESS: It's more of those.

GRAND JUROR 9: Well, of those what I'm looking for is --

THE WITNESS: Okay.

GRAND JUROR 9: -- generally, if you've been involved with other, umm, cases or other disciplinary hearings of this type, umm, was the outcome as severe as what has happened to you?

THE WITNESS: I've been in -- I've been in the pre-action hearings. I'm going to guesstimate

upwards to 75 hearings.

GRAND JUROR 9: Okay.

THE WITNESS: Within my tenure in the Internal Affairs Division. And I've witnessed people -- umm, at a Pre-Action Hearing nothing can happen, meaning, the hearing is convened, the panel says, no punishment, to termination. And I've been involved in all of those, but I do not believe mine raised to this level. No.

GRAND JUROR 9: Okay. And I think that pretty well answered my question. I'm just trying to get to the -- what you're showing me is, or what you've stated on the record, would barely warrant a letter in your record.

THE WITNESS: That's actually what I asked for in my appeal letter to the Sheriff was in my conclusion, this doesn't warrant anything. Give me a letter of reprimand. If you're going to demote me demote me back down to my next level that I was at, corporal, but it does not warrant any of this. And I put that in my letter.

GRAND JUROR 9: Is there any policy regarding the direction of the review boards?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

GRAND JUROR 9: And was the outcome of your

)

review board within the policy?

THE WITNESS: I -- obviously, I'm the one being demoted. No, it doesn't fall -- I don't believe it falls within the heart of the policy or the intent of the policy.

GRAND JUROR 9: Okay. Real quickly.

Regarding your keeping of work product, is there any policy in what you can or cannot keep as work product?

THE WITNESS: Umm, there is a policy that talks about keeping -- keeping folders and taking folders out of the -- out of the Internal Affairs investigation office. I took that as being the actual full case work, everything we couldn't take.

I've always kept all of my own work product from when I was a basic patrolman. I've kept it for years. I've since destroyed some of it. Through my Internal Affairs case, all of my criminal investigations, I've kept copies of it.

And the one meeting that I had with the Sheriff right after my pre-action I wanted a face-to-face with him to talk to him about this. He openly admitted that his attic is full of old case work and he didn't think that that was a big deal. But I did keep it.

1 2 3

GRAND JUROR 9: Okay. Are there -- so there are policies -- are there any policies that says you can't keep it?

THE WITNESS: There's policies that talks about taking -- taking Sheriff's Office product as far as the actual case folder itself. That's how I took it. I didn't take it as far as taking my personal notes.

GRAND JUROR 9: Okay.

GRAND JUROR 8: Juror No 8. To kind of piggyback on the question where they asked you about your demotion and I hate to keep talking about that, but can you give us any more specific circumstances of another individual where their accusations towards them in their report were more severe and they came out with a less severe punishment as far as like comparison for the Grand Jury?

THE WITNESS: Umm, there was a couple. I worked a case with Sergeant Judy Pounds where she was alleged to have, umm, committed a hostile work environment on a lady called -- by the name of McFadden, Vanessa McFadden, I believe.

I personally investigated that. I personally believed that Judy Pounds was creating a hostile work environment. Didn't have any proof. So, I had to

exonerate her and they took that exoneration.

Derek Devoe, one of the captains that sat on my review board actually had an affair with a coworker, a subordinate of his, that reported directly to him, that ultimately caused a divorce. That was never investigated and to me that's more damning than this.

GRAND JUROR 8: And he was not demoted over that and there was no investigation?

THE WITNESS: There was -- it was all swept under the -- for lack of a better word, it was all swept under the rug.

GRAND JUROR 8: I guess what I'm trying to get at, if there was an example that we could review where the case was opposite of your's and somebody didn't get as severe a demotion and they had a more severe charge.

THE WITNESS: There is a, umm, an Internal Affairs case that the -- in the Internal Affairs Office concerning the theft of five firearms that the board probably should review that shows that the firearms were actually property of the Sheriff's Office, but under orders of Tim Albin that they be removed and given away, in essence. Roughly about \$25,000 worth of property.

GRAND JUROR 8: Who was the subject of that investigation, or was it just an office --

THE WITNESS: There was not a -- a true subject. It was, umm, it was brought to the attention of the Undersheriff at the time, Brian Edwards, that five firearms was donated and given to the Sheriff's Office from a company.

And then later these firearms was removed from property and given away and I believe Tim Albin was part of the subject of that investigation, so was a retired employee by the name of Larry Merchant, who was the subject of that.

And the person -- I was the supervisor over the Internal Affairs unit at the time. The person that worked it was Clint Caskey.

As soon as Brian Edwards was -- as soon as Brian Edwards retired and Tim Albin was promoted to Undersheriff, Clint Caskey was transferred to the jail to work day shift booking and he ultimately quit because he was transferred.

- Q. (BY MR. BARRIS) To follow-up on the juror's question. Is this matter referring to some rifles?

 A. Yes.
- Q. That were donated to the Sheriff's Office to have been awards for some sort of SWAT training

- competition?
- A. Yes.

- Q. And just so the Grand Jury will know the little
 bit I've heard about that. There was some sort of
 competition held here in Tulsa, international type
 competition, with various law enforcement agencies
 that had SWAT teams that came and competed under
 certain standards to see who had the best operations,
 essentially. Is that a fair statement?
- 10 A. Yes. It was called the National SWAT
 11 Competition.
- Q. And a team from, I believe Germany, was the winning team?
- A. No. A, umm, of these particular rifles the winning team was the Canadian, umm, Power Plant Team.
- 16 Q. Okay.
- A. They was awarded five rifles from a company called Patriot Ordinance Factory, POF for short.
- 19 Q. Okay.

24

- A. They was awarded the guns. The first year that
 the SWAT competition was in Tulsa. The SWAT
 competition was in Tulsa for three years, consecutive
 years, before it moved to another city.
 - They was awarded the rifles from what I remember the first year. There was an agreement in

place that the guns would be held in the Sheriff's Office property room and that team could use them for the three years.

And that at the end of the three years the owner of POF awarded those rifles, gave those rifles to the Sheriff's Office in a written letter saying, congratulations, these guns have been awarded to you.

Mainly because the Power Plant Team in Canada could not do the paperwork to get the guns transferred from one country to another.

- Q. Do you recall what years this would have occurred? The three years that were involved.
- A. It was either '08, '09 and '10, or '9, '10, and '11. The case was worked -- Internal Affairs case was worked latter part of '11 into '12.
- Q. 2011?
- A. Yes.
 - Q. I'm sorry. I apologize.

GRAND JUROR 8: That's fine. Are you aware of anyone other than Bates that received special treatment?

THE WITNESS: No.

GRAND JUROR 8: To that level?

THE WITNESS: No. I am not.

GRAND JUROR 8: And I think that you've

I heard you right, because I wasn't hearing the dates in your internal investigation as far as when the dates that they were alleging things happened. It seemed highly coincidental. Is that what you were speaking of whenever you think that Mr. Pierce maybe collaborated with some other people to do these accusations at the same time?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

GRAND JUROR 8: Do you think that that had anything because I see this as coincidental, I would wonder if they were directed by someone to do that, or do you think it was coincidental along with --

THE WITNESS: I believe Sheriff Glanz -- my personal belief is Sheriff Glanz thinks I released this '09 document. And his way of getting rid of me is this Pierce case.

And in my appeal letter to the Sheriff -- we have policies at the Sheriff's Office that says if you're a subject to a harassment you have to report it. You have to tell, you can jump chain of command, you can do all of these things to include that when you do your annual evaluation you sign off on it that you have knowledge of the policy and you have no

knowledge of any harassment.

And my argument back to the Sheriff was, if I was truly doing this, Randy should have followed policy and filed the complaint back when he was under my span of control, not eight to nine months later now. That was my argument.

GRAND JUROR 8: I think that's all I have. Thank you.

GRAND JUROR 16: I have a question. So within that time span Mr. Pierce had received an appraisal?

THE WITNESS: Evaluation?

GRAND JUROR 16: Evaluation.

THE WITNESS: I don't know. That was part of my argument was he should have received it. It's not a part of the investigation. I don't know if he had received it or not.

GRAND JUROR 16: Generally, when do they give their evaluations?

THE WITNESS: Usually a few months after your anniversary date. Like, my anniversary date is August 1st. I would have mine probably September, October, November'ish.

GRAND JUROR 16: Okay.

GRAND JUROR 9: Juror No. 9. Are you aware of any other cases where the Sheriff has exercised,

1|

basically, ultimate rule contrary to policy?

THE WITNESS: Are you concerning in an appeal?

GRAND JUROR 9: Yeah. Umm, we've heard

several times that the Sheriff has an open-door

policy. Yeah -- straight answer, yeah, concerning

any appeals where he's just basically said, yeah, I

know this is the policy.

That's what I'm hearing from your testimony is, you know, you've been in the process of actually doing, umm, these investigations and I don't necessarily know they came straight out that your boards have always followed policy directly.

But in this case you've got an appeal, you're well out -- it sounds like it's well outside policy what's happened to you. Can you give any other instances where the Sheriff has, basically, said, yeah, I know that's the policy, but this is the way I'm going to sign off on it.

THE WITNESS: Let me answer that question this way: Prior to my pre-action, all pre-actions are held in this manner. Okay.

An IA case is investigated. The IA case is turned over to the Undersheriff to review. The Undersheriff will review it and make a determination if anything should happen.

If something should happen it has to go to a Pre-action Board. The Pre-action Board, prior to me, consisted of the Undersheriff, the Chief Deputy that's over that particular division, the captain over that particular division, the sergeant, so on, of the affected employee. Okay.

In my case, at that time of the pre-action it should have been Undersheriff Rick Weigel chairing the board. It should have been Michelle Robinette in the room. It should have been Eric Kitch in the room to hear my -- my pre-action and to make the determination if anything should happen to me.

Prior to my pre-action the board made recommendations to the chair, being the Undersheriff, to say a person should be demoted or a person should receive five days suspension or a person should be terminated. They make that recommendation to the Undersheriff and the Undersheriff would make a ultimate decision of whatever the punishment is.

In my case, I came in, I sat down in the pre-action and was informed that things were changing. That the new Undersheriff wanted it to be a unanimous board decision.

I asked why Eric Kitch was not there, who was my acting major because he replaced Shannon Clark.

They said that Eric Kitch was not there because Eric Kitch had been keeping -- had kept all of his work product when he was in Internal Affairs and in the Criminal Investigative Unit and he recused himself because he did one of the things that I was being accused of and he has been doing it. So he didn't think it was fair.

Michelle Robinette, they told me, recused because she did Shannon Clark's investigation and didn't feel like she could be impartial towards me in any way.

That's why the board was convened the way it was. And I was told it was a unanimous decision amongst all the board members. Meaning, that all the board members had to agree that I was to be -- I was to be demoted versus given a recommendation to the chair of the board.

And so I made that argument as well to the Sheriff that past practice has been all of this and now we have changed things in the middle and I've had an adverse effect because of it.

Mainly, because I had worked Internal Affairs investigations on Derek Devoe, on him personally. I actually wrote his reprimand letter back in 2011 when he was reprimanded out of an Internal Affairs case.

John Bryant, the midnight shift captain that sat on my board, openly said he didn't think I should have been promoted when I was promoted.

So I have two members of the board that I have either worked a case on or been told I shouldn't be a captain from and so I made those arguments to the Sheriff.

GRAND JUROR 9: Okay.

THE WITNESS: Mainly, what happens at an appeal was -- was people get punished, get terminated, whatever. Most of the time when a person appeals the decision they've been terminated.

They appeal it to the Sheriff. They go sit down with the Sheriff and the Sheriff says, I'll be happy to accept your resignation.

And the Sheriff sets aside the termination and accepts the resignation because some people they would prefer to have a resignation on their record per se versus a termination.

But the Sheriff's position is if I receive a resignation I'm not likely to be sued if I terminate. So he accepts the resignations.

I've never seen -- I've never seen anybody appeal this type of punishment to the Sheriff. I've never seen anybody appeal a five-day suspension to

the Sheriff. I've never seen that happen. Mine was the only one I've ever known.

GRAND JUROR 9: Okay. Are you aware of -- you brought the car to light of the stipend. Are you aware of any other areas of fiscal malfeasance that could have occurred or that have occurred around the Sheriff's Office itself?

THE WITNESS: In -- in 2013 I applied to attend Leadership Tulsa. Leadership Tulsa is a nonprofit organization that provides trainings to up and coming leaders of numerous organizations.

You have to apply for it and actually turn in a written response to four questions. They're looking for roughly 500-word responses, too. Plus, a signing off by your, by your company leaders that they support you in this endeavor because it costs the county 24, \$2,500. It costs 24, \$2500 for an employer to send an employee to this type of training.

I was accepted. I went to the training in 2014 and in June of this year, during a deposition with Dan Smolen, he made me aware that they paid for my training to attend Leadership Tulsa out of the office supply fund. Basically, the fund that you buy pens and paper and whatnot out of. They took the

\$2500 out of -- 24, \$2500 out of that fund to pay for my training versus out of the training budget.

GRAND JUROR 8: Juror 8. You've testified that you were willing to give a polygraph that you didn't release that document. Do you have information on who did or a theory?

THE WITNESS: I -- while I was off, and after I had heard this information about the Sheriff believing that I released it, I called Lori Fullbright, the news reporter with Channel 6. I have her phone number because being a secondary PIO.

I called her -- actually I texted her, said, would you please call me when you have time. She called me later that night.

I asked her, umm, who released this document? I said, Lori, who released it? Umm, I need to know who released it. It will be kept between you and me type of conversation I had with her.

And I said, I need to throw the Sheriff a bone because I didn't release it and my head is on the chopping block here.

She told me that, umm, she does not know who released it. That they believe -- that the media, in general, believes that whomever released this document gave it to Dan Smolen's law firm and that

Dan Smolen's law firm leaked it to an affiliate of theirs.

GRAND JUROR 8: Was that law firm the same one that was representing Eric Harris?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

GRAND JUROR 8: And when he gave -- when Glanz gave the deposition, basically accusing you of doing it, was that document in paper or recording or anything like that?

THE WITNESS: Yes. It was under a polygrapher and video recorded.

GRAND JUROR 8: Thank you.

GRAND JUROR 9: Juror No. 9. You, basically, made a statement that you and Major Clark had told the Sheriff that you as the public affairs and the Sheriff need to get ahead and stay ahead of this.

Can you think of any example or any action that was taken that showed the Sheriff was willing to do any of that?

THE WITNESS: No, umm, I haven't -- I haven't seen that, no.

We told -- we told -- we told the Sheriff he needed to get in front of it and for whatever reason he has -- he had -- I don't believe he ever has.

Now, understand something, though, once I

went off on admin leave, on administrative leave, I cut off all ties with the Sheriff's Office. I cut off all ties with the media. I didn't watch Channel 6 News. I didn't watch anything. So I don't know what has happened in that time frame.

I did not -- I did not -- Shannon Clark is, besides being my supervisor, is also a friend. I've pretty much -- I've talked to him two or three times, but while I was off for that six weeks I didn't talk to anybody.

GRAND JUROR 9: Can you -- you may have already explained it. What was the purpose for the admin leave?

THE WITNESS: Admin leave is to, is to separate the subject of the investigation from the office so you can't interfere with the investigation.

GRAND JUROR 9: Okay.

THE WITNESS: You go home on paid leave.

GRAND JUROR 9: And what was the purpose of that? This IA investigation?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

GRAND JUROR 9: And what time did that start?

THE WITNESS: June 1st.

GRAND JUROR 9: Of this year?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

GRAND JUROR 1: Juror 1. Is that standard to go on that admin leave if there's not an investigation?

THE WITNESS: It depends on the severity of it and the, lack of better words, of the players involved. It was -- with this type of an allegation it did not surprise me that I went off. No.

GRAND JUROR 1: So, for example, the IA investigation of Robert Bates in 2009, considering some of the key players in that, like, Albin, since he was kind of involved with some of that shouldn't he have been on administration leave?

THE WITNESS: I don't think he did.

GRAND JUROR 1: Okay.

THE WITNESS: I don't think anybody in that case went on admin leave. No.

GRAND JUROR 13: Juror 13. In terms of access to the information turned over to the firm, to turn it over to the media, who else other than you?

THE WITNESS: Umm, gosh, myself, Rob Lillard, Scott Dean, Judy Pounds, anybody that had access to the basement because this is where this report was kept, was in a hard copy form, was in the basement. Randy Chapman, probably eight or 10 more people had access to where this was at.

GRAND JUROR 13: Would you say that the likelihood of the reasoning behind it had more to do with disciplinary action taken against that particular individual in the past? It could have been sort of retaliatory in terms of what has happened to them and what the Sheriff has done to them in the past?

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Can you ask that again?

GRAND JUROR 13: If -- say that who else -- other persons that may have had access to that document, did it for reasons because of disciplinary reasons against them by the Sheriff in the past?

MR. BARRIS: Let me just interject. I'm sorry, Juror 13. I think what you're asking him is what motivations of the person he doesn't know --

GRAND JUROR 13: Yes.

MR. BARRIS: -- why they did something he doesn't know who did it? I think you -- and the reason I'm asking, to see if that's what you're asking. I'm afraid what you're asking is for him to speculate about somebody he doesn't even know released the report. I think that would be a difficult question for him to answer.

GRAND JUROR 13: I guess what I'm really

trying to ask if -- if out of the others that may have had access could you think of anyone else that had motive?

THE WITNESS: Umm, what -- what I believe may be a stretch, I don't know. I'll tell you what I believe. Okay. I believe someone found this document years ago and they knew of its existence years ago.

It's never -- it's never been a secret that Shannon Clark was going to make a play to run for Sheriff this next cycle.

My personal belief is whoever had a copy of it, meaning someone who did not like Shannon, and there's a lot of people that don't like Shannon at the Sheriff's Office, had a copy of it and when he was going to run for Sheriff was going to hurt him by releasing it. That's what I believe.

And this shooting with Eric Harris and Bob

Bates just -- it happened, and this was an

opportunity to release it to the media. That's what

I believe.

GRAND JUROR 16: Juror 16. In light of the recovery of the '09 investigation that you're very ---would you say you're very familiar with it?

THE WITNESS: No, I would not. I've read it.

When I initially was given it I read the front page, maybe a page and a half.

When I printed it off and gave it to Tim
Albin I still hadn't read it and I didn't read it up
until maybe a week, 10 days ago, and I pulled it off
of OSCN is where I read it from, because I no longer
have a copy of it.

GRAND JUROR 16: But your words stating that they are damning makes you somewhat familiar, then.

THE WITNESS: The case that I reviewed, that was Rob Lillard's handwritten notes, was damning, that wrote this report, yes.

GRAND JUROR 16: Okay. So you agree that there was partiality towards Bates?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

GRAND JUROR 16: Okay. So with that being said, can I ask you a series of questions for yes or no? I'm going to ask you a few questions.

Would you say there was willful neglect of duty in the Sheriff's Office?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

GRAND JUROR 16: Would you say that there is gross partiality in the Sheriff's Office?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

GRAND JUROR 16: Would you say that there was

oppression in the Sheriff's Office? 2 THE WITNESS: Oppression? 3 GRAND JUROR 16: Oppression. 4 THE WITNESS: Yes. GRAND JUROR 16: Would you say that there was 5 6 corruption? 7 THE WITNESS: Umm, in the -- in the --8 without -- without examples I would say, no. 9 As far as other than what I've testified to I don't -- I don't believe Stanley was taking money and 10 seeding other people with it. I don't know, but... 11 12 GRAND JUROR 16: Well, let me ask you a 13 question, were you familiar with Bates' Christmas 14 presents? 15 THE WITNESS: Yes. 16 GRAND JUROR 16: So you know about the expensive pistols and other items? What else are you 17 18 aware of? THE WITNESS: I'm aware that he -- and this is 19 20 all secondhand information. I didn't see it 21 personally. I was aware that he bought all members of the 22 Violent Crime Drug Task Force customized pistols for 23 24 a Christmas gift.

I'm aware that Bates and Stanley went on

multiple fishing trips. I don't know who paid for those fishing trips. I honestly don't know.

I would, ahh, I had a conversation early on with Bates, it was, ahh, a conversation me, him, and Tom Helm had in the investigation office and Bob was boasting about his -- about his boat in Florida.

About taking out attorneys and doctors on his boats and then idling back to the dock and filling his boat back up and when the dollar amount hit \$10,000, because the doctors and the attorneys would say, well, you took me out on your boat. I'll cover the fuel expense.

And then when the fuel expense started to exceed \$10,000 the doctors would always say, how big is the gas tank? And Bob would say, oh, don't worry about it. I have an account here for my gas, my fuel. And he would boast about those type things.

So being that -- I would believe that he would pay for Stanley's trip, but I don't know that.

GRAND JUROR 16: I appreciate your candidness.

Did you ever hear anything about a home in Colorado?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

GRAND JUROR 16: What -- can you elaborate?

THE WITNESS: I know he has a -- I don't know where it's at or how big or how extravagant. I know

he -- from word of mouth he has a home there and I've been told that Tom Huckeby and Tim Albin and Stanley has all went there and spent time.

GRAND JUROR 16: With all this being said, is there anything else that you can tell us along those lines?

THE WITNESS: The only thing that I have heard through these years of rumors at the Sheriff's Office is that Bob Bates has paid Tom Huckeby's student loans off, but that's the only -- I don't know. That's a question for them.

GRAND JUROR 16: That's all I have for right now.

MR. BARRIS: Does anybody have any further questions?

Sir, I appreciate it. You're free to go at this time.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

MR. BARRIS: Sir, you talked a moment ago about some records. You're still okay if I talk to your attorney concerning if we need some of those records?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. BARRIS: Okay. Thank you very much, sir. (The witness and his attorney left the Grand

```
Jury Room.)
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	
4	STATE OF OKLAHOMA) SS.
5	COUNTY OF TULSA
6	
7	I, Tami Morse, Official Court
8	Reporter, within and for the State of Oklahoma, do
9	hereby certify that on September 14, 2015, before the
10	impaneled Grand Jury in the District Court of Tulsa
11	County, State of Oklahoma, I reported in machine
12	shorthand the proceedings had and the evidence given,
13	and the above and foregoing is a full, true, correct
14	and complete transcript of the proceedings had and
15	testimony given, taken at said time and place.
16	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto
17	set my hand and official seal this 38 th Amuary
18	2016.
19	TAMI MORSE, CSR-RPR
20	CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER
21	Tami Morse
22	Sease of Oklahoma
23	CSR # 1973
24	MM. Carmifficance Exprinces 12-31-16
25	

1	IN THE DISTRICT COURT IN AND FOR TULSA COUNTY STATE OF OKLAHOMA
2	STATE OF SICE WISHING
3	MARQ LEWIS,
4	Plaintiff, Case No.
5	vs. \ \(\text{GJ-2015-1} \)
6	IN RE GRAND JURY,
7	Defendant. ORIGINAL
8	
9	DISTRICT COURT
10	
11	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS JAN 2 9 2016
12	HAD ON SALLY HOWE SMITH, COURT CLERK STATE OF OKLA. TULSA COUNTY
13	SEPTEMBER 6, 2015
14	BEFORE THE IMPANELED GRAND JURY
15	*******
16	
17	
18	129 129
19	
20	The part of the pa
21	
22	REPORTED BY:
23	TAMI MORSE, CSR-RPR
24	TAMI MORSE, CSR-RPR 500 S. DENVER, SUITE 111 TULSA, OK 74103 tami.morse@oscn.net (918) 596-5371
25	tami.morse@osch.net (918) 596-5371
	*-

APPEARANCES FOR THE STATE: Rob Barris Kevin Buchanan Special Appointed Tulsa County District Attorneys 500 S. Denver, Ste. 900 Tulsa, Oklahoma

PROCEEDINGS MR. BARRIS: All right. It's 1:38 p.m. on 2 3 August 6th, 2015. The Grand Jury is present in the Grand Jury 4 room as are all the alternates, myself, and Kevin 5 6 Buchanan as legal advisors. I believe our next witness will be -- he's now 7 8 captain, right? Captain Rob Lillard. (Witness enters Grand Jury Room.) 9 GRAND JUROR 9: Do you swear or affirm that 10 the testimony you are about to give will be the 11 truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so 12 13 help you God? THE WITNESS: I do. 14 ROBBIE LILLARD, 15 Having been first duly sworn, testified as 16 17 follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION 18 19 (BY MR. BUCHANAN) Can you tell us your name, Q. 20 please. 21 A. Robbie Lillard. And what's your occupation? 22 Q. I'm a deputy. 23 Α. 24 Q. With ... 25 Tulsa County Sheriff's Office. Α.

- Q. All right. And what is your current rank or designation within the Sheriff's Office?
- A. My current rank is I am an Acting Major for the Uniformed Operations Division.
- 5 Q. Acting ...
- 6 A. Major.
- Q. Major. All right. You kind of have a soft voice.
- 9 A. Okay.
- Q. So, I'm just going to, for the benefit of us clear back here, and that's why we're kind of back here, so everybody can hear. If you just kind of --
- 14 A. I do.

15 Q. -- a command voice.

surely you've got --

- 16 A. I do.
- 17 Q. All right. So tell us what that -- your current designation entails that you do.
- A. I am responsible for the patrol shifts, Civil
- 20 Division, and the Detective Division and an ancillary
- 21 group of individuals. We do security for Tulsa
- Technology. It's a group of 17 deputies. I'm in
- charge of that.
- Q. Okay. And how long have you had this particular assignment?

- 1 A. Two months.
- 2 Q. What was your position April 2nd, 2015 -- were
- you still employed with the Sheriff's Office on
- 4 April 2nd of 2015?
- 5 A. I was.
- 6 Q. What was your designation or your assignment,
- 7 then?
- 8 A. Captain over the same.
- 9 Q. Okay.
- 10 A. Except for I didn't have two additional patrol
- 11 shifts. That's really the only difference that I
- 12 have now.
- 13 Q. Okay. And is there any particular reason that
- 14 your position has changed since April 16th that
- 15 you're aware of?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. What is that?
- 18 A. Umm, people have been either terminated or
- 19 resigned their post.
- 20 Q. Okay.
- 21 A. I think I'm, like, an interim Band-Aid, for lack
- of a better word.
- 23 Q. Okay. All right.
- And we have heard significant amount of
- testimony thus far about an incident that occurred on

- April 2nd, 2015, involving members of the Sheriff's Office, a shooting incident, Bob Bates who shot an Eric Harris. You're familiar with that incident?

 A. I am.
- Q. Tell us what, if any, role you had in the investigation of that incident, either as an investigator or supervisor.

A. Well, I didn't -- that particular day I was working a secondary job. So I wasn't in my official capacity.

And I received a call from Sergeant Roberts, who was over the Drug Task Force that day, and he indicated to me that a shooting had occurred.

After several minutes of talking to him I was able to get from him -- he was distraught. I was able to get from him that we had done the shooting.

And, so, I immediately told him to hold the scene and I contacted Internal Affairs and the Criminal Investigations Unit to respond to it.

- Q. All right. And did you -- did you go to the scene?
- A. I did not. I was not working that day.
 - Q. Did you conduct any investigation -- any investigative duties, as a result of the shooting, into the shooting itself?

- A. I did not. The -- the Criminal Investigation Division is under me, so they did. And then they report back to me and file charges, et cetera.
- Q. All right. Were you a participant in any meetings related to this shooting as the investigation -- in other words, CID Division was investigating and at a point in time they turned their information, the results of their investigation, over to the District Attorney's Office. We've been made aware of that.
- 11 A. Yes.

- Q. In between the beginning of the investigation and the time it was turned over to the DA's Office, were you a party to any meetings between your subordinates and anyone else in the Sheriff's Office?
- A. Yes.
- 17 Q. What meetings did you attend?
 - A. Well, in -- in investigating matters it's customary for me, the sergeant, and the other guys to do, like, a round-table like you're doing now, and discuss information that's found, or directions that we may go and, umm, so that occurred.

And it was our belief at the time that, that this event, based on knowledge of statute, and what it was, was a crime. That -- that changed quickly there in the environment.

Major Huckeby, and I'm not aware -- not Tim

Albin, but Major Huckeby was present for the meetings
that we had.

And, umm, I think I had two, if it serves me right, two meetings. And the focus of that meeting was telling him the findings of where we were in the investigation and what we were going to do. And that, it seemed unacceptable. That that wasn't it. More of a convincing that it's more than likely this. He brought research to those investigators for a different statute, which would be justifiable homicide.

So I talked to the sergeant after one of those meetings and I sent him over to talk to the DA on the weekend. That was a conversation between me and him, Sergeant Hess. I want you to go over and talk to the DA and tell him what we are -- where we're at on this and get his take on this.

He did. And he came back and it was the DA's opinion, told to me through Sergeant Hess, that this is -- this is manslaughter. Okay. Very good.

So, we knew right then that regardless of what was going on in-house and what people wanted, umm, and to be quite, you know, frank about it, I think

16

17

181920

2223

21

2425

they were trying to -- trying to put the civil side of this ahead of the criminal or intertwine the two, if that makes sense.

- Q. When you say they were trying to do that. Who are you referring to?
- A. I'm referring to the Undersheriff and Major Huckeby. That's all I know. I don't know whomever else would be party to that, but that's what it seemed to me.

So Sergeant Hess went ahead and let Detective Heisten write it up. And, you know, he articulated it to where it could fit that, but ultimately it was a DA's responsibility to charge or not to charge, or to change or make what they feel -- they have the ultimate responsibility for charging crimes and he -- and he did, ultimately.

So we knew that and, you know, in fact after that, after he wrote it all up, umm, knowing the knowledge that the DA had told us that's fine. Send it up.

That clears these people away from what we're doing here and we know what's ultimately going to happen, which was better for everybody at the time.

Major Huckeby and Tim Albin had a meeting with Detective Heisten and Sergeant Hess and myself after that, before it came up. And gave specific instructions on their argument why it should be what Michael wrote, which would be the justifiable homicide. And sent us to the DA to have a meeting, which we did, and sat down and we did what we were told.

And that meeting was with Steve Kunzweiler and David Luten and they weren't having any part of that. We already knew that. This is what this is going to be and that was the end of that. Those were the only meetings I had.

- Q. Okay. How -- was it usual or unusual for Undersheriff Albin and -- is it Major Huckeby?
- 14 A. Yes.

16l

- Q. Is that correct? How usual or unusual is it, or was it up to that point in time, for them to involve themselves to that degree in an investigation?
- A. Very unusual. They would inquire about significant ones, you know, if there was a death, or, you know, major crimes. It was customary for them to ask and they should have, but in this particular case, I had not seen that before.
- Q. All right. And I assume, to be fair, officer involved shootings with the Tulsa County Sheriff's Office are rare?

- 11 A. Yes.
- Q. So, this was an unusual circumstance?
- 3 A. Yes.
- Q. All right. Did you feel as though they were trying to direct the investigation or the results of the investigation in a particular way?
- 7 A. Yes.
- Q. All right. And you felt like that was, in part, motivated to help with the -- what they believed to be the coming civil suit?
- A. I believe so. That and I had a unique
 perspective on one of the participants in that event
 and -- and a perspective on the general feeling about
 this person from their point of view.
- 15 Q. And are we referring to Robert Bates?
- 16 A. We are.
- Q. Okay. So you felt like that was -- it wasn't just the protection of the Sheriff's Office for civil purposes, but, also, personal allegiance to
- 20 Mr. Bates?
- 21 A. If you're asking my opinion, yes.
- Q. Okay. And that's what -- I am asking your opinion.
- 24 A. Yes.
- Q. All right. That was your feeling?

A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Okay. Well, that leads into the next area I want to get into.

You said you had some personal insight into, I assume you were referring to Mr. Bates?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And his position within the Sheriff's Department?
- A. Yes.
- Q. All right. Generally, how did you come by this insight?
- 11 A. It was my job function at the time.
- 12 Q. All right. And I believe what you and I are
 13 probably referring to is a 2009 report that you
 14 were -- that you put together, which was the result
 15 of an investigation you were asked to perform?
- 16 A. Correct.
- Q. All right. Tell us how that investigation came about; who asked you to do it; what were the perimeters supposed to be?
 - A. Okay. At that time I was a sergeant over Internal Affairs. It was my job to investigate internal matters. And that could range from -- from talking ugly to someone, to engaging in criminal acts. I'm talking solely about deputies, officers, that was my function, or complaints from the general

public.

Two gentlemen had an issue with Mr. Bates.
Well, I say two gentlemen. This is how I got the information, how I got started. Sergeant Kitch and Sergeant Chapman worked in the Reserve Program. They were over it jointly together at the time and Eric was more of the administrator of it and Randy was more the hands-on guy. The field guy for the program.

And both of them had issues with -- with

Deputy Bates and his participation, or his

requirements to participate in the program. And I

knew about some of those. And they directed those
issues through their chain of command.

I don't know. I think Captain Merchant might have been one of the chain. I don't know all the chain back then because it was really -- I just knew of it and they went through their chain of command.

Well, as a result of going through that chain of command nothing happened. Nothing happened. They were told, umm, you know, leave this guy alone. These kind of things.

So, Sergeant Kitch came into the Internal
Affairs Office and he produced a memorandum detailing
the problems or some of the problems associated with

the -- with Bates and the programs.

I read those things. It was my job at that time to facilitate things from employees to the staff, if there was an issue like grievances or things like that, and this fell into that category.

So, I took the memorandums and if I remember right, one of them was from Randy and one of them was from Eric, to then Undersheriff Brian Edwards.

And we had a discussion about it and he wanted me from that point to take a cursory look into this situation to find out if there was any validity. And he had specific questions that he wanted answered. There was two of them.

- Q. Okay. Just so we're clear. He wanted questions answered. Who's he?
- A. Brian Edwards --
- 17 Q. All right.

A. -- the Undersheriff. He said, I want you to take a look at this and I want these two questions answered, which was normal.

Generally when problems come, with the exception of external citizen complaints, those are -- and I'm trying to find the words to explain this properly. Most things have a cursory look. You want to find out if there's any validity to them. If

there is, they are associated with a case number, an Internal Affairs' case number.

Citizen complaints, however, get case numbers. They get case numbers. Unless it's so unbelievable a cursory look might be warranted and then the -- if the validity is found, a case number is attached to it and a full investigation ensues therein. So this was normal.

Here you're bringing this to me. This is inside the house. I want you to take a look at this thing and I want you to answer these two questions and I delineated those two questions on the front of the investigation. I don't know word-for-word. I'd have to look at it to read it to you.

Q. I'll have you identify it here in just a second.

A. Okay. So I did that. And I conducted research.

I gathered records and what I found was validity. I found validity with the two questions that he asked for.

And one of them was, and I'm remembering, was Deputy Bates treated differently than the hiring practice versus any other Ex-Police Officers that joined the Reserve Program? That was the one question.

The second one was, was he shown favoritism or

were people intimidated to benefit Robert Bates in this respect? Those words, or the like. Those were the two questions and I found that, yes, on number two.

Number one, a little bit, but I found validity with it and I took it back to him for disposition.

- Q. Okay. And so I -- make sure we're clear.
- A. Okay.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

15

16

17

18

19

20

- Q. Internal Affairs receives a report from a citizen outside the department?
- 11 A. Uh-huh.
- Q. It is immediately -- unless it's completely obviously on its face not valid, it's going to receive an Internal Affairs' case number?
 - A. Most of the time, yes, unless it's so outrageous that it's unbelievable. I mean, you know, unless it's, like, he, he cussed at me. You know, that may be addressed, a cursory look. They write me a memorandum, did that occur? Do I have any video to look at, anything of that nature, and if there's
- validity, yes. Most of the time they get immediate
- 22 numbers.
- 23 Q. Okay. In-house there's a cursory look --
- 24 A. Yes.
 - Q. -- and then a decision is made as to whether or

- not to open an official investigation, which would then be assigned a number?
 - A. Well, it would be considered the -- the precursor to an official investigation because it is official.
- I'm writing; I've been directed; I'm looking at it; and here's what I found. Yes.
- 7 Q. Okay.

4

8

9

10

11

12

- A. It's a cursory look.
 - Q. All right. And so we know what the big picture is before we get into the detail.
- Then, who makes the decision that this is, in fact, valid? We do need to open a case. We do need to assign it a number.
- 14 A. The Undersheriff.
- 15 Q. The Undersheriff does that?
- 16 A. Yes.
- Q. All right. And in this case your report was --
- did you give it back to Undersheriff Edwards at the
- 19 time?
- 20 A. I did.
- 21 Q. And was it ever assigned a case number?
- 22 A. No.
- 23 Q. All right. Did that surprise you?
- 24 A. Yes.
- Q. Umm, how did that affect your perception of the

- people involved with -- particularly involved with Mr. Bates as determined by your investigation?
- A. Well, it certainly made what I found, to tell me that, yes, and there's probably friendship and all sorts of other things involved in this.
- Q. Would it be fair to say that the fact that this was not assigned a case number may have been further evidence that, in fact, there was favoritism being shown? Is that a fair conclusion or not? Your words.
- A. I believe that would be a fair conclusion, yes.
- Q. Okay. All right. I'm going to give you a number of exhibits.

Before we do this, you're aware that a Grand Jury subpoena had been sent to the Sheriff's Office relating to this 2009 report and any documents that you have that supported your investigation, right?

A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- Q. And we received a notebook with your report and 20 289 supporting documents.
- 21 A. That sounds about right.
- Q. And have you -- have you had an opportunity to go through this notebook prior to today?
- 24 A. I have.
 - Q. All right. Did you go through it before it was

- 1| sent to the Grand Jury?
- 2 A. I did.
- Q. Okay. Sir, let's start with what I'm going to
- 4 mark as Grand Jury or State's Exhibit No. 16. Will
- you take a look at that and see if you are familiar
- 6 with that document.
- 7 A. I'm familiar with it.
- Q. All right. And just so that we can identify, on
- 9 the bottom of each of the pages of that exhibit
- there's some -- and your's I believe, has some red
- 11 ink?
- 12 A. It does.
- Q. And, specifically, there's some notations GJ-2009
- 14 Lillard Investigation and there's some numbers,
- 15 correct?
- 16 A. Yeah. Looks like it numbers the pages.
- 17 Q. Numbers the pages.
- 18 A. Correct.
- 19 Q. All right. And so this particular copy that
- you're holding in your hand came straight from the
- 21 Sheriff's Office?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. Not through any third-party?
- 24 A. No. I think this is the one that I looked at.
- Q. Okay. Just the -- I want everybody to

understand, and if the record could show we've provided each Grand Juror a copy of Exhibit No. 16.

Now, you previously indicated that you had delineated or noted questions that Undersheriff Edwards wanted answered.

A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

- Q. Do you see those there on page one?
- 8 A. I do.
- Q. Are you happy with the description you gave us,
- or do you want to revise that in any way?
- 11 A. The only other thing was I said ex-officers in
- 12 the first question. It was ex-officers or other
- 13 Reserve Deputies.
- 14 Q. Okay.
- 15 A. But the rest is the same. Was any pressure
- 16 exerted on any employees or by supervisors to aid
- 17 Deputy Bates in this regard? So it's pretty much the
- 18 same thing.
- 19 Q. Okay. And during the course of this
- 20 investigation, did you enlist the aid of any other
- officers to do some research for you, or --
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. -- do some background into other Reserve
- 24 Officers, either their training records, or their
- 25 application process?

- 1 A. Yes.
- Q. Would a Mr. -- Deputy Tryon, is that a familiar
- 3 name?
- 4 A. Yep. Sergeant Tryon. He was sergeant.
- Q. I'm trying to get to that page. Did he complete
- a report for you of what he had found after reviewing
- 7 Reserve Deputy application records and training
- 8 records?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. And I'm going to ask you to take a look at that
- 11 next exhibit. It's going to be No. 17. Is that the
- 12 letter that you received from Sergeant Tryon?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. And what's the date on that?
- 15 A. August 3rd, 2009.
- 16 Q. All right. Do you remember when this
- investigation began, roughly?
- 18 A. July, August, right there at the end.
- 19 Q. I think the front page of Exhibit 16 may actually
- 20 have a date on it.
- 21 A. That's August 12th. That would be the day -- or
- 22 I'm sorry. Yeah, July 27th he asked me to begin it,
- 23 so ...
- 24 Q. Okay. All right.
- 25 What generally were the findings, or,

- generally, what was the information that Sergeant Tryon was able to relate to you regarding the application process and the training process of the -- well, I guess, this is just really more the application process of Reserve Deputies.
- A. It looks like he just -- in reference to Mr. Bates, or the entirety?
- Q. No. Actually in reference, because I believe this report, you correct me if I'm wrong, Exhibit No.
 - 17, does it not apply to numerous records of applications for Reserve Deputies?
- 12 A. Yes.

3

4

5

10

11

15

16

17

18

19

- Q. And, generally, can you tell us what was the conclusion drawn from that review of those records?
 - A. Well, it would appear that several of them did not meet the requirements, or testing process.
 - Q. Okay. Were you able to determine if there were policies in place that were supposed to be followed for anybody that applied to become a deputy or Reserve Deputy with the Tulsa County Sheriff's
- 21 Office?
- 22 A. Yes.
- Q. And did you review those policies to compare what these records showed?
- 25 A. I did.

- 1 Q. All right. I'm going to get these out of order,
- 2 but ...
- 3 A. Okay.
- Q. I promise you guys I have numbered them correctly.
- If you look on the bottom of that stack, No.
- 7 24.
- 8 A. Okay.
- 9 Q. Is that one of the policies which you compared
- 10 the review of the records against?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. And what policy is that?
- 13 A. That's 4-02 Application Selection.
- 14 Q. All right. And so what does that policy cover?
- 15 A. It covers the selection process and the
- requirements therein to become a reserve or a deputy.
- 17 Q. Okay. And, generally, was there testing both
- physical and mental or emotional testing that was
- 19 required?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. And did Sergeant Tryon's report indicate that
- that testing was consistently done with applicants?
- 23 A. No, not consistently.
- 24 Q. All right. And, so -- and by that we mean some
- people had to take the test and some people didn't?

A. Exactly.

- Q. All right. Specifically, do we know if Mr. Bates was required to take any of the testing that we're talking about here?
- A. Umm, I think he -- and I'm just going to go back to what I wrote.
- Q. Sure.
- A. I say -- I say -- I think there were four that I found. A check of the related files revealed that this office failed to comply with the written policy regarding testing background investigation. Some of the four Reserve Deputies have been subject to some of the requirements, but not all.

Specifically, given the inconsistencies of our practices, Reserve Deputy Bates was not shown favor in the selection process. With regard to training, though, a review of the file showed that he only acquired so many training hours.

- Q. Okay. So your finding of no preferential treatment regarding Mr. Bates in the application process was based upon the fact that the policy really didn't seem to be in force consistently at all?
- A. Yeah.
- Q. So, other people, also, were allowed to enter the

- 1| program without doing the testing just like
- 2 Mr. Bates?
- 3 A. A few.
- 4 Q. A few?
- 5 A. Yes.

8

9

6 Q. Okay. All right.

Just so that we can -- if you'll look at Exhibit No. 25 while we're on the issue of policies.

- A. Okay.
- 10 Q. What is Exhibit No. 25?
- 11 A. That is 16-04 -- policy 16-04 Reserve Deputy
- 12 Program.
- Q. So this would cover how one becomes a reserve,
- who's eligible, what they're going to be allowed to
- 15 do based on classification?
- 16 A. Yep. Their chain of command and requirements.
- 17 Q. All right. And as to both of these policies,
- both Exhibits 24 and 25, were these the policies that
- were in place at the time that Mr. Bates was in the
- 20 process of becoming a Reserve Deputy?
- 21 A. Yes.
- Q. All right. And these were the ones that were in
- 23 place during the time of your investigation?
- A. Yes, but I might add that I also did -- we are an
- accredited agency and we have CALEA, and a couple of

other accreditations, and those brought forth new requirements.

Some of those guys were subjected to the newer requirements, whereas the older ones were not because it wasn't relevant. Does that make sense?

- Q. Well, it does. And I think what you're telling us is requirements do, over time, change?
- A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

- Q. And, so, and that's why I think we were -- we wanted to particularly look at the policies in place at the time Mr. Bates was going through this process.
- 12 A. These are those.
- 13 Q. Okay. All right. Good.

Let's -- let's look at, specifically,

- 15 Mr. Bates and his background and/or training.
- 16 A. Okay.
- 17 Q. If I could direct your attention to Exhibit
- 18 No. 18.
- 19 A. Okay.
- 20 Q. Can you tell us what that is?
- 21 A. That is, ahh, the training record of Robert
- 22 Bates.
- Q. And in whose form? Whose record is this?
- 24 A. The Sheriff's Office reporting.
- 25 Q. Okay. And what would this particular document --

when is it dated?

- A. It is dated 8-12 of 2009 when it was printed.
- Q. All right. And this was right at the time you're doing your report?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. All right. And so what -- what type of information are we seeing here? What is this telling us about Mr. Bates' training?
- A. Well, on the right the word "CLEET" appears.

 Those are the classes that you -- the State has a requirement for Peace Officers, no matter where you are. You have to take so many mandatory hours per year. These would be those classes.

You get CLEET credit for some classes.

Wherein the next category says, in-service, these are things that you don't or don't fall into that category.

The one hot range you do get credit for, weapons training. So, all the rest are in-house training or classes that you don't receive CLEET credit for.

- Q. All right. And the bottom part, where it says weapons.
- A. Uh-huh.
 - Q. Explain that to us.

A. These are mandatory qualifications that he is -- appeared to go. On the right you can see the dates when he went. He got no credit for those.

And on -- where it says, score, that is his proficiency with those firearms.

Q. Okay.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

- A. Or whatever weapon he shot that day.
- Q. I assume you have to qualify with your weapon periodically?
- 10 A. Annually. Annually.
- 11 Q. Would 100 be a perfect score on the range?
- 12 A. Perfect score.
- Q. And what do you have to be -- what score do you
- 14 have to have to qualify?
- 15 A. 70.
- 16 Q. 70?
- 17 A. CLEET sets that mandate. You must be proficient
- at least 70 percent annually.
- 19 Q. Okay. And let's look, then, at No. 19.
- 20 A. Okay.
- 21 Q. Is this a document collected during your
- 22 investigation?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. And where would this document be -- do you recall
- where it was found, where you -- how you got ahold of

- 1 this document?
- 2 A. Umm, I either got it from his background book or
- I got it from the Sheriff.
- 4 Q. Okay.
- 5 A. Because that's who it's addressed to.
- 6 Q. Okay. So tell us --
- 7 A. Maybe his personnel file. Could have been there.
- Q. And that's where I was going. So, does everybody have a personnel file?
- 10 A. They do.
- 11 Q. All right. So, what is this letter?
- 12 A. This letter is indicating to me that
- 13 Mr. Wilbanks, attorney at law, is telling the Sheriff
- 14 that Deputy Bates attended the Tulsa Police
- Department Basic Approved Training Program in 1964.
- 16 Q. Okay. And does Mr. Wilbanks indicate how he was
- 17 aware of that information?
- 18 A. At that time he was assigned to the office of
- 19 Chief of Police. So, he had relevant knowledge at
- 20 the time of it.
- 21 Q. Okay.
- 22 A. So he said he was there for it. Is what I'm
- 23 taking from it.
- 24 Q. So, Mr. Wilbanks is saying he had personal
- 25 knowledge about his --

- 1 A. Correct.
- 2 Q. -- position with the Tulsa Police Department?
- 3 A. Correct.

- Q. Way back in 1964?
- 5 A. Unbelievable as that may sound. It's hard to get records from '64.
 - Q. Right. And what's the date of this letter?
- 8 A. This letter is 29th of May, 2008.
- 9 Q. Okay. Let's look at, then, the State's Exhibit
- 10 No. 20.
- 11 A. Okay. Okay.
- 12 Q. And can you tell me what that is?
- 13 A. That is State of Oklahoma Council on Law
- 14 Enforcement Education and Training, or CLEET. That
- is their -- this is an official record of a law
- enforcement officer. This is for Robert Bates. This
- 17 is what he's done, wherever he's done it. This is
- 18 his -- his official record.
- 19 Q. Okay. And that was going to be my next question.
- 20 A. Like a transcript from a college.
- 21 Q. Is CLEET the ultimate repository of official
- records of training for officers in Oklahoma?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. All right. So, we've seen an earlier example of
- what the Sheriff's Office maintains as record, but

- 1 there are some of those classes, courses, whatever
- they are, that are not reported to CLEET?
- 3 A. Correct.
- 4 Q. Or you don't get credit for them?
- 5 A. Correct.
- Q. I assume those classes or those courses were
- 7 required by the Sheriff's Office?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Okay. So it's in addition to CLEET?
- 10 A. Additional training, not mandated. This would be
- 11 mandated for him.
- 12 Q. And then CLEET -- these are -- it's either
- mandatory training or it's courses that they give
- 14 credit for towards whatever your hours to initially
- be certified or to stay up with your yearly training
- 16 requirements?
- 17 A. Correct.
- 18 Q. Okay. So this -- this would be what I -- would
- it be proper to say this is the official record?
- 20 A. Official record.
- 21 Q. All right. And what's the date of this?
- 22 A. This is, umm -- I'm not finding the date.
- Q. Maybe what I can do is back up.
- 24 A. Okay.
- Q. If you look down at the bottom of that again.

- This was something you acquired as a result of your investigation?
- 3 A. Yes.

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

22

23

24

25

- Q. And what date do you see?
- 5 A. 8-12 of 2009.
- Q. And is this something that you -- you requested from CLEET, or you could get online and with your authorization get to it?
 - A. I could have, but I'm not sure if I got it directly or I had Tryon, who was over training, get it for me.
- 12 Q. Okay. All right.

And is there any reference in the official CLEET records of Mr. Bates having been a member of the Tulsa Police Department?

- A. There is.
- 17 Q. And what does it indicate?
- A. It indicates from 1-1-1964 to 1-1-1965, he worked for the Tulsa Police Department as an officer.
- 20 That's what this tells me.
- 21 Q. Okay. All right.

So, if there's been any question, whatsoever, about whether he did or did not at some time belong to the Tulsa Police Department do you have any doubt about that?

1 A. No.

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

- Q. All right. You accept that as fact?
- 3 A. I do.
 - Q. Okay. All right.

Okay. Let's go -- now, your report, which we've got as State's Exhibit 16. The way you've broken this down, obviously, you did interviews of various individuals?

- A. I did.
- Q. I'm assuming those people that you interviewed, information came to you somehow that they might have matters of interest in this investigation?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. So you sat down and interviewed them?
- 15 A. I did.
- Q. Okay. I will tell you that some of the people that you have interviewed we intend to bring later before the Grand Jury.
- 19 A. Okay.

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. So, I don't intend to really belabor what everybody told you just to bring them in here to say the same thing.

But I do want to identify some documents. You interviewed a Bonnie Fiddler.

A. Correct.

- 1 Q. And what was Ms. Fiddler's position.
- 2 A. She was the clerk over training. So her function
- was to disseminate training information out, collect
- 4 training certificates, documents back, liaison
- 5 between our office and CLEET. Would send things to
- 6 CLEET after training was attended.
- 7 Q. Okay.
- 8 A. That's her function.
- 9 Q. Okay. And in relation to Mr. Bates, did you
- 10 acquire some training records or certificates
- 11 regarding Mr. Bates from her?
- 12 A. I did.
- 13 Q. Let's look at State's Exhibit No. 21.
- 14 A. Okay.
- 15 Q. And what is that?
- 16 A. That is a certificate of training produced from
- our office and it certifies that Robert Bates
- 18 successfully completed eight hours of in-service
- 19 certified training in law enforcement driver
- 20 orientation.
- 21 Q. Okay. What's the date of it?
- 22 A. The date of that is May 28th, 2009.
- 23 Q. Now, did you -- or did Ms. Fiddler give you any
- information, specifically, as to that certificate?
- A. She did.

Q. And, generally, what was her information about that certificate?

- A. Well, she was instructed by then Chief Albin to produce this document at his behest.
- Q. And did she have any reason to believe that there are -- or did she indicate any misgivings about that certificate?
- A. Yeah. That's very unusual. This doesn't occur.

Most of the time -- I'm an instructor for our office as well as for CLEET.

So, if I put on a class there's going to be a training roster. There's going to be associated documents with it. Sign-in sheets for those that attended the training. And, then, at the end of it all I would ask for certificates upon completion.

This was -- she had no knowledge of any classes. No knowledge of anybody attending anything. And it was, hey, I just need you to do this for me is what I got from her, which was unusual.

- Q. Okay. And who signs those certificates?
- A. The Sheriff and the instructor.
- Q. Okay. And I'm going to ask, and I don't know whether you know or don't know, but are either of the signatures on that certificate, are either of those produced by some sort of stamp or electronically, or

- do you know if they're actually physically signed?
- A. I would have to look at the original document, but these appear to be those two signatures or they're stamped or written. I've seen them both.
- Q. Okay. Let me have you go, umm -- let's go back and look at Exhibit No. 18. Keep that one in your hand, but look at No. 18 as well.

Now, No. 18 was the Tulsa County Sheriff's Office Record of Training, correct?

10 A. Correct.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

- Q. Does the 5-28-09 certificate, does that training appear on this record?
- 13 A. It does not.
- Q. And, again just a reminder, this record was printed August 12th of '09?
- 16 A. It should have been entered.
- 17 Q. But it was not?
- 18 A. It was not.
- 19 Q. Okay. All right.
- 20 A. If it -- if the training did occur, it should
- 21 have been entered.
- Q. All right. So, we will talk with Ms. Fiddler
- about that more.
- 24 A. Okay.
- Q. But I wanted to -- I just want to be sure.

- So, again, you acquired that and had this information at the time you wrote your report?
- 3 A. I did.

4

5

6

7

8

9

Q. All right. Let's look at -- well, let's talk about it a little bit first.

There was a corporal that you interviewed as a part of this process by the name of Warren Crittenden.

- A. Correct.
- 10 Q. And is Mr. Crittenden currently employed by the
- 11 Sheriff's Office?
- 12 A. He is not.
- 13 Q. What is Mr. Crittenden's current predicament?
- 14 A. He's incarcerated.
- Q. And, well, let's -- for what, or what status is
- 16 he in at this point?
- 17 A. He has been charged with murder.
- 18 Q. And where is he being held?
- 19 A. I do not know right now where he's being held.
- 20 Q. What county is he charged in?
- 21 A. Tulsa County.
- Q. All right. And has that case come to a
- conclusion, or is it still pending?
- 24 A. It's still pending.
- Q. All right. So, I'm going to go ahead and talk

- with you about your discussions with Mr. Crittenden.
 - A. Okay.

Q. I don't know that we'll see him here in this room.

What was the purpose -- or what was Mr. Crittenden's position at the time of your investigation?

- A. He was the corporal over the Field Training Program.
- Q. Okay. Tell us about that program. What -- we've heard a little bit, but I think we need a little bit of an explanation.

So somebody comes out of CLEET, that does their basic training, comes out of CLEET and then they enter -- as I understand it, would enter the Field Training Program?

- A. Correct.
- Q. And -- in order to complete the full process of becoming fully certified with Tulsa County.
 - A. Right. Most agencies have some sort of field training. It bridges the gap between the basic information that an officer receives at CLEET, just enough to enter the profession and the actuality of how to do that work. It teaches you how to do this work.

You have the knowledge of laws and how to drive and how to shoot and how to research and things like that, but what you don't have is the actuality or the hands-on, if you will, how to do the job.

- Q. So, when Mr. Barris and I got out of law school, thought we knew everything and found that we didn't, it would be kind of the same thing, we needed field training.
- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. All right.

So, what is -- literally, how does the Field Training Program, how does it occur, how does it progress?

- A. In regards to Mr. Bates or for all officers?
- Q. Well, let's stick with Mr. Bates. How should that process have occurred?
- A. His is a little bit unique. Reserves have three statuses, a basic, an intermediate, and advanced.

 And given your status allows you to do different things.

And a requirement for Mr. Bates, or where he wanted to be, was advanced, was to complete 480 hours of Field Training Program. These are reserves that can operate like a normal deputy, stop cars, take reports, answer calls. You have to have completed

- 1 that to do so.
- 2 Q. Okay. So, in regards to Mr. Bates, though, and
- we haven't heard this yet and so we need to clarify.
- 4 Did Mr. Bates in 2008 or so or in that time frame, go
- down to, I believe it's Ada, Oklahoma, and go through
- 6 the CLEET training program?
- 7 A. No.
- 8 Q. Why did he not have to do that?
- 9 A. Umm, I don't know.
- 10 Q. Okay. Did his status as a police officer in 1964
- 11 play any role in that?
- 12 A. I think they may have grandfathered him.
- 13 Q. Okay. So, by that -- when you say, "they", do
- 14 you mean --
- 15 A. The office.
- 16 Q. -- your Tulsa County Office?
- 17 A. Correct.
- 18 Q. Okay.
- 19 A. I mean CLEET. CLEET would grant -- CLEET would
- 20 grandfather him as having met the requirements before
- there were those same ones they are now.
- 22 Like, when I went through CLEET it was
- 23 380 hours. It's 400 and something now. It grows.
- 24 It changes.
- So, they accepted the fact that he was an

officer, then, and he was allowed to apply with us, CLEET did, or it wouldn't be on that record.

Q. Okay. All right.

Is it possible that when that law -- well, I'm not going to speculate on the law.

So, if he's grandfathered in from going to CLEET that allows him to go ahead and just start the Field Training Program? That's what happened.

A. I wouldn't think -- that's what happened. That probably shouldn't have happened.

Most officers that have been out of service for a while have to attend what they call a legal block. A legal block is current law and that's really the only requirement.

If they allow -- if they accept your hours as a previous police officer the law has since changed from 1964 to 2009. All right. Some changes have occurred. What was unlawful may not be now or some new law may have been enacted and they tried to give you a refresher to get you current.

I don't know -- and that bothered me. I never found that. I never found a legal block for Mr. Bates.

Q. Okay. All right.

So, let's get into, then, to be a -- what is

19l

- it a grade three or level three?
 - A. Advanced.
- Q. Advanced Reserve Deputy he needed to complete 480 hours of Field Training Program.
- 5 A. Yeah. I delineated here if it will help --
- 6 Q. Sure.

8

- 7 A. -- on what exactly he had to do.
 - Q. What page of your report are you on?
 - A. I'm getting there. I'm on page 2.
- 10 Q. Okay.
- 11 A. And it's dictated by policy -- in the middle of
- the first paragraph, under policy, it says, policy
- 13 16-04 further states that classifications and
- 14 requirements of the three different levels of Reserve
- 15 Deputy status. Basic, which is CLEET Basic Reserve
- 16 Classification of 240 hours or equivalent. That's
- what CLEET gave him. He got that coming in. You can
- be that.
- 19 Intermediate, having met the basic
- requirements and having a flying arms license.
- 21 That's our requirement. If you want to go to this
- level you have to be able to do transportation, all
- 23 right, and that's a class.
- It's a -- I think it's a two day or three day
- class that you have to learn how to wear a sidearm

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

when you transport a prisoner. That's what that means, flying arms.

And, then, for three you must have met the previous two and you will complete 480 hours --480 hours of the Field Training Program. That is the only way to get it.

- Q. Okay. So, tell us, then, what -- what does one do to get eight, 10, 12, 20 hours of field training What actually happens?
- A. Well, for the reserves it's somewhat unique. For the normal officer that's hired and is a full-time officer that the county pays for, they would immediately go into a program. It would be structured. It would be set-up beginning July 1st and until whenever the hours are completed you will go through these phases of the FTO program, with different instructors, at different intervals, or different shifts to get the full effect of the duties you now will hold. Okay.

For reserves, it's when you could. And, then, he was not the only one that aspired to do that. It was more slow, but it had to be with a certified instructor, an FTO, a Field Training Officer, and it had to be documented. And those documents are called Daily Observation Reports.

Those are generally done in an eight-hour period and they're -- it denotes what you do good; what you do bad; what you should work on; things -- topics that you covered, maybe you conducted a rape investigation, or you conducted a traffic stop and it would cover all of those things.

And there are places on there, on that DOR to say, your strengths, your weaknesses, et cetera, to help aid you in growing to become the officer that you are aspiring to be. Does that make sense?

Q. Uh-huh.

- A. Okay. So if -- let's say, if I was trying to be on the Reserve Program and I worked 30 hours in my job. Maybe two days a week I would try to do that. So maybe he'd get two, eight-hour shifts, two DOR's, right, every week. So that's how long it would take him. It was dependent upon their schedule and their time frame.
- Q. Okay. Now, obviously, I'm assuming you wanted to see Mr. Bates' daily sheets for his FTO training to see how many hours could be verified. Is that a fair statement?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And how many hours were you actually able to find in daily sheets in his file or in the FTO training

- records or otherwise?
- A. 72 hours worth.
- Q. All right. And did you discuss that with
- 4 Mr. Crittenden?
 - A. I did.

- Q. And what did Mr. Crittenden tell you, or what did he represent to be Mr. Bates' number of FTO hours completed?
- A. I think, and I'm referring to what he wrote, or what I wrote. He still needed to complete 320 hours of the program.

They -- he said that he -- during this process, I don't know when it was when Dave came in. He was given two memorandums by then Captain Huckeby to sign that indicated that he had received this training and he was wonderful. One of them -- and I can -- I can read it.

- Q. Well, we're going to get to those here in just a second, but I guess what I'm looking -- I'm looking at the bottom of the page, bate stamp 4, there.
- 21 A. Okay.
- Q. It looks like you had a discussion with him -you indicated you found actual documentation of
 72 hours?
 - A. Correct. I'm with you.

- 1 Q. But did Mr. Crittenden represent that he actually
- 2 had more than that?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. How many did Mr. Crittenden represent that he
- 5 had?
- 6 A. He said that he had documented all 328 hours and
- 7 was told to give those DOR's, that's what I mean by
- 8 reports, to Captain Huckeby.
- 9 Q. Okay. You were not able to find those additional
- 10 reports?
- 11 A. I still can't.
- 12 Q. Okay.
- 13 A. I never have.
- 14 Q. All right. Regardless 328 doesn't equal 420?
- 15 A. It does not.
- 16 Q. Okay. And -- okay.
- So, let's -- now, let's get back to the 328,
- despite the fact you couldn't verify those.
- 19 Mr. Crittenden was of the opinion, as the -- he was
- 20 over the Field Training Program?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. That he had completed 328?
- 23 A. Correct.
- Q. All right. Let's talk about the memos.
- 25 A. Okay.

- Q. I believe that Mr. Crittenden advised you that he had turned in some version of a report about the 328 hours completed by Mr. Bates to the superiors?
- Q. And that report was not what is in the official record, is that correct?
- A. That's correct.

Α.

Yes.

- Q. All right. And what -- and let me have you look at Exhibit No. 22. Tell me what that is.
- A. It's a memorandum, an interoffice memorandum from Chief Albin, from Corporal Crittenden, 5-13 of '09 and he's discussing Robert Bates' FTO status.
- Q. All right. And does he indicate in there, in that memorandum, how many hours Mr. Bates has completed?
- A. He does. He says 328 hours of FTO training provided by Corporal Crittenden himself and other FTO trainers.

And then he further says, as you're aware Bob Bates is a former Tulsa Police Officer and he brings to the Sheriff's Office a wealth of knowledge and experience in the field of law enforcement.

I have personally observed Mr. Bates while in the field and have spoken with others in reference to Mr. Bates' progress and based on their comments I'm

- 1 confident that his progress is such that there is no 2 need for him to continue with the remaining amount of 3 FTO.
- Q. Who would have to approve variation from the
 Field Training Program hours that an officer could go
 ahead and be certified and not meet the minimum
 hours?
- A. Well, I think the policy would have to be changed and that would be the Sheriff, Undersheriff.
- 10 Q. Okay.
- 11 A. They have that authority.
- 12 Q. Well --
- A. The Sheriff has, ultimately -- can change the policy, but it doesn't work that way. I know that sounds vague. It doesn't work that way.
- 16 Q. Well, we know it did in this particular instance.
- 17 A. I know.
- 18 Q. Correct?
- 19 A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. So, again, I think I get back to my
- 21 question is: When -- you're not aware that the
- 22 policy actually changed to 328 hours, correct?
- 23 A. It didn't.
- 24 Q. It stayed 420?
- 25 A. Yes.

- Q. So, who would have the authority, short of a policy change, to allow somebody to not complete the full 420 hours?
 - A. I think the chief tried to do this, okay. But to say he would have that authority would be wrong. I don't think he has that. Only the Sheriff can change policy.
 - Q. Okay. Regardless, Mr. Bates as a result of this and other information, I'm assuming, he was -- he went ahead and was allowed to begin operating as an advanced reserved. Was he not?
- 12 A. Yes, until this investigation.
- 13 Q. Right.
- 14 A. Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Let's look at Exhibit 23. Are you familiar with that?
- 17 A. I am.
- 18 Q. And what is that?
- A. That is a memorandum from Corporal Crittenden to Captain Huckeby discussing Reserve Deputy Bates.

And it informs the reader that this letter -he says that Deputy Bates, who went through the Field
Training Program with Crittenden, has completed
320 hours in the program. At the completion of
320 hours has successfully completed the

- aforementioned program. It is my opinion that he is capable of performing the functions of a patrol deputy.
 - Q. Okay.

7

8

- A. So, again, he's saying he shouldn't have to do any more. He can do it now.
 - Q. All right. Both of these dated May 13, '09, both supposedly from Corporal Crittenden to his superiors?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And did Mr. Crittenden tell you how these two documents actually came into existence?
- 12 A. Yes.
- Q. And tell us how that -- what he represented to you.
- A. He came in -- he was called into a meeting with
 then Captain Huckeby and Captain Huckeby produced
 these two in front of him and told him to initial
 them.
- 19 Q. All right.
- 20 A. He did not author them.
- 21 Q. All right. And when you interviewed
- 22 Mr. Crittenden, you specifically discussed these two
- 23 documents?
- 24 A. I did.
- Q. Did you ask him whether or not the opinions

- 1| expressed in the memorandums were his actual opinion?
- 2 A. I did.
- Q. And what was his response?
- 4 A. Total opposite. He was going to recommend that
- 5 he go through remedial training, if anything.
- 6 Q. Okay. But to your knowledge, remedial training
- 7 did not occur with Mr. Bates?
- 8 A. It did not occur.
- 9 Q. All right.
- 10 A. And there's a reason for that.
- 11 Q. Okay.
- 12 A. Nobody knew this. Okay. Talking to Crittenden
- 13 he felt, for lack of a better word, intimidated or
- threatened or his job would be on the line if he did
- not let it pass. So this is way down the road, okay,
- 16 before I'm looking at it.
- 17 Q. Right.
- 18 A. So at that time nobody, nobody knew it.
- Q. Well, actually we're three months down the road.
- 20 A. Well, three months down the road.
- 21 Q. Right.
- 22 A. At least we're three months.
- 23 Q. Right. Right. Okay.
- Hold on just a second. And in relation to these documents, did you get an opportunity to

- 1 interview Tom Huckeby?
- 2 A. I sat in on an interview that was conducted by
- 3 then Undersheriff Brian Edwards with him.
- 4 Q. Okay. And, I guess, just for my edification and
- the rest of us, you're conducting an Internal Affairs
- 6 investigation?
- 7 A. Uh-huh.
- Q. Does that give you fairly wide latitude into records and interviews and that sort of thing?
- 10 A. Anything I want.
- 11 Q. All right. But when it comes to interviewing one
- of maybe the second, third, fourth in command of the
- whole department is that maybe a little different?
- 14 A. It's a little unusual. Umm, would I have done
- 15 it? Yes. He chose to do it.
- 16 Q. Undersheriff Edwards did?
- 17 A. Uh-huh.
- 18 Q. All right. So you were present?
- 19 A. Yeah.
- 20 Q. And did Mr. Huckeby comment on Exhibits 22 and
- 21 23?
- 22 A. He did.
- Q. What was his representation as to the creation of
- those documents?
- 25 A. He said that, and I'm reading from here. He said

- that he was instructed by then Chief Albin to rewrite
 the memorandums written by Corporal Crittenden to
 include comments that were made between Albin,
 Huckeby, and Crittenden during a meeting about Robert
 Bates.
 - Q. Okay. So -- so his representation was there was a verbal discussion, Crittenden, Albin, Huckeby, about Bob Bates' training and supposedly Crittenden made statements, glowing remarks, about Mr. Bates' abilities that didn't appear in what Mr. Crittenden originally wrote?
- 12 A. That's what he said.

7

8

9

10

11

18

19

20

21

25

- Q. And that Chief Albin instructed Mr. Huckeby to
 draft new documents that included the glowing remarks
 and have Mr. Crittenden sign off on them?
- 16 A. Initial them. Yes.
- 17 Q. Initial them. Okay.

So, now, you have the representations -- at least you've confirmed these two documents were not prepared by Mr. Crittenden, correct?

- A. Correct.
- Q. All right. So Mr. Crittenden was accurate in that representation?
- 24 A. Absolutely.
 - Q. As confirmed by Mr. Huckeby?

- 1 A. Correct.
- Q. All right. So, the only dispute you had, then,
- was between what Mr. Huckeby was telling you
- 4 Mr. Crittenden said and what Mr. Crittenden was
- 5 telling you?
- 6 A. That's correct.
- 7 Q. About Mr. Bates' abilities?
- 8 A. That's correct.
- 9 Q. Okay. All right.
- 10 A. Can I say one thing that will help you?
- 11 Q. Absolutely.
- 12 A. Okay. Also during that interview Captain Huckeby
- was asked, hey, where are the DOR's? And he said he
- 14 never got them.
- 15 Q. Okay. So, according to Crittenden he turned
- in -- I'm not going to try to do math on the fly,
- 17 whatever 328 minus 72 is.
- 18 A. Yeah, good stack.
- 19 Q. Crittenden says those go to Huckeby --
- 20 A. At his request.
- 21 Q. -- at his request? Huckeby says I never got
- 22 those.
- 23 A. Correct.
- Q. So, whatever that difference between those two
- numbers are, is nowhere documented in the Sheriff's

- 1 Office that you were able to determine?
- 2 A. No.
- 3 Q. Okay. Again, there's a lot more in your report.
- 4 A. Yes.

6

7

8

9

10

Q. We're going to have other witnesses here to discuss some of those issues.

Once you finished your investigation and you put your report together, what was your conclusion -- let's talk about -- well, let's answer your questions here.

- 11 A. Okay.
- 12 Q. The two questions that you were told to respond,
- 13 I think you've already told us what number one was.
- 14 A. Yes.
- Q. That Bates was not necessarily given preferential treatment, but it was because those requirements were not enforced for the most part on any of the
- 18 applicants.
- 19 A. Correct.
- 20 Q. Okay.
- 21 A. And as far as number two.
- 22 Q. Now tell us about number two.
- A. I'll just read you what I wrote: I find that
 within the aforementioned scope of this investigation
 policy has been violated, continues to be, by both

- Captain Tom Huckeby and Chief Deputy Albin with regard to special treatment shown to Robert Bates with regard to his field training and with Captain Huckeby and Chief Albin creating an atmosphere in which employees were intimidated to fail to adhere to policies in a manner which benefitted Deputy Bates.
- Q. Okay. You came to that conclusion.
- A. Yes.

1|

- Q. Finished your report and then you, I assume, provided -- did you provide just the report or the report and 289 pages to Undersheriff Edwards?
- A. Just the report, but -- and that is generally -- it was a cursory look. If it was a complete case file, like I mentioned earlier, it all would have been bound in a cover and all of it at the back of it.

I still had it, but for his purpose here I've answered your questions. What would you like to do from here?

- Q. Okay. And you did that on or around August 12th --
- 22 A. Uh-huh.
- Q. -- of 2009. And when did you get a response back, if you recall?
 - A. I don't recall the exact date. I'm thinking

- maybe a week, somewhere in there.
 - Q. All right. And during the course of that week as you're waiting for that response, what was your anticipation the response would be?
 - A. Well, I was gearing up. I thought that I would conduct a -- a -- a full investigation.
 - Q. All right. When you got the response what was it?
 - A. It went to the dead file.
- 10 Q. Nothing was done?
- 11 A. Nothing.
- 12 Q. Not assigned a number?
- 13 A. No.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. And would -- where would a dead file be stored?
- A. Okay, let me tell you about dead files. Make sure everybody understands.

Dead files are everything that had a cursory look. That didn't mean that they didn't get looked at, okay, or what happened as a result of having looked at it.

Generally, those two things are attached to that and they're placed in a file and retained in the event that, let's say, one of you came down, hey, you've never -- I would call you if it was a complaint or something I would give you a call and

say, here's what we found or send you a formal letter. Somehow or another you would be contacted whether you were an employee, a citizen, or whomever, as to what we found. Okay.

Then, they would be placed -- retained -- retained for the future. And I would be a -- I had two file cabinets in there at the time. And one cabinet was numbered cases, either from detention or from uniformed operations. They were two different sets of numbers. And, then, ancillary documents like workers' compensation things, use of force boards, you know, for getting pursuits things like that.

And as those cabinets filled up -- and I had one drawer for a dead file. And as the cabinets filled up I would cycle those things into the basement, into a secure, locked area, and have current things up in the office, because I only had two cabinets.

So, I would, you know, every other year or so I would periodically cycle those things out. That's what happened to it. It went to the dead file.

- Q. And it being a 2009 report would you have expected it to have been moved to the secure area in the basement by --
- A. Yeah, I put it there.

Q. Okay. You did. Okay. All right.

And so that -- and that's where it would have been kept until recently?

A. Until now.

Q. Okay. All right.

After this investigation was complete did you continue to receive or hear of complaints regarding Deputy Bates?

A. I got a few ancillary things, you know. I don't know if I specifically heard -- I knew that the people that -- I was worried for some of the people that were reporting to -- on this matter. And -- and, I guess, I got to kind of explain the environment. It might help.

I've been there 20 years, April. And when you first start out you really don't know a whole lot. And you just kind of go and as you progress in your career, five, 10 years -- like a machinist, when a machinist first starts the job he's more of an apprentice and he learns all the functionalities associated with that job and then the people and the politics associated with it, right. The hierarchy, if you will. I'm not just talking about rank. I'm talking about particular people that may have friendships or things of this nature. You learn

These people, including myself, I wasn't affected adversely from it, but there were some adverse affects as a result of this having been done.

And I -- I -- it wasn't with really the new guys. It was with the people that had been there for some time. The people that have, umm, lived and, you know, senior people. People that couldn't just -- in the police field after a certain age you really don't get to go anywhere because nobody will hire you. You have to be a certain age for a physical.

So after 30, 35, you're pretty much stuck where you're at. And if you have children to feed, you have bills to pay, things of this nature, you develop a tolerance to do whatever it is that these people ask you to do.

And this was a total back-lash of that. I'm not going to do it. Those two people, those two sergeants that reported this matter, tried to do the right thing. And they did. As a result one of them was transferred. And the other one was -- or both of them were told not to have anything to do with this guy.

So now you've taken a guy whose directly under this guy -- these two guys, and said, you don't get

1	to supervise him at all, which is something I've
2	never seen and it's all about the politics of that
3	and what was reported here.
4	Q. Okay. When when I talk about this report's
5	done. It's turned in. We know that it wasn't
6	didn't turn into an official investigation.
7	But to your knowledge did anything regarding
8	Mr. Bates, his classification, what he was or was not
9	allowed to do, did any of that change to your
10	knowledge?
11	A. No.
12	Q. Okay. All right.
13	And the converse, was anybody that tried to
14	enforce the rules paid some price?
15	A. Yes.
16	Q. Okay. All right. Just a second.
17	I'm done with my questions, but we're going to
18	allow if the grand jurors have any questions
19	they're going to ask you some.
20	A. Okay.
21	GRAND JUROR 16: Juror No. 16. I was
22	wondering if we ever found the original supposed
23	memos that had been rewritten?
24	THE WITNESS: No.

GRAND JUROR 13: 13. You've read the initial

```
petition that was filed against the Sheriff?
2
             THE WITNESS: Yes.
3
             GRAND JUROR 13: And you saw the list of
 4
     allegations?
             THE WITNESS: I think when it was printed in
5
 6
     the paper I saw it. Yes.
 7
             GRAND JUROR 13: Do you agree with any of
 8
     them?
9
             THE WITNESS: I'd have to see it now to. I
10
     mean, so much as happened.
             GRAND JUROR 13: Can I show him?
11
12
             MR. BUCHANAN: Yes.
             THE WITNESS: Are you talking about the
13
14
     underlying things?
             GRAND JUROR 13: Yes, sir.
15
             THE WITNESS: I would agree with some of
16
     those, yes, sir.
17
             GRAND JUROR 13: Which ones?
18
             THE WITNESS: Gross partiality, oppression,
19
     umm, maybe willful -- I don't know about willful.
20
     Who are we talking about willful administration?
21
          (BY MR. BUCHANAN) Just for the record, umm, you
22
      Q.
     have been handed a copy of the Grand Jury petition,
23
      is that correct?
24
25
      A. Yes.
```

- 63 And you're looking on about what page? Q. 2 I'm looking on the second page. 3 Second page. Okay. Those would refer to the Q. 4 Sheriff. A. Okay. The Sheriff, I don't know about number 5 6 one. Will you tell us what it is. What the wording 7 8 is. Habitual or willful neglect of duty. 9 Α. 10 Q. Okay. 11 Α. I don't know. Number two says, Second, gross partiality in 12 the office. I'm not sure. 13 14 Is your uncertainty that which you've talked 15 about relating to Mr. Bates here today? A. Yes. 16 17 Q. Okay. Third is oppression. I am -- I'm not sure if him 18 Α. directly, but maybe the people under him. Yes. 19 Corruption? I don't know. 20 Fifth has nothing. 21 22
 - Right. Assume that's not applicable. Q.
 - You're going to find that? Α.

24

25

Six. Willful administration as a Sheriff.

I don't know him directly, but certainly

those -- those that were under him I would say, yes. In this case, yes.

- Q. Well, maybe -- maybe if we ask the question this way: Clearly -- clearly you have expressed opinions about Huckeby and Albin?
- A. Yes.

Q. And do you have an opinion as to whether or not the Sheriff, umm, was aware of or allowed those two to operate as you've outlined in your report?

A. Well, let me start by explaining a little bit to try to answer.

Right before -- right before I came into
Internal Affairs, we suffered one of the most
horrific lawsuits ever as a result of the jail and it
involved Huckeby and some others and there was all
these allegations. It was a huge thing. Huge thing.
So, I came up there and it was right in the middle of
that process, right.

So, then, Undersheriff would take a cursory look at everything. We want things right. We want things right. So, this cursory look was -- was normal.

What was abnormal is that it didn't receive a number based on validity. If you lied during this interim you were gone. There was no integrity here

and I think you have to have integrity to do this work. Okay.

So here -- and I'm preparing the case work for these -- these -- these Internal Affairs' incidents involving our personnel. A lot of people lost their jobs for failure to either follow policy, or -- or outright lying.

But then you have this here. Now, you have the administration doing it. You know, I can tell you I was uncomfortable writing that. This was not fun for me. I was fearful. I'd never experienced anything like this before.

Usually it's somebody lesser, right? A detention officer all the way up to a sergeant, maybe, you know, but never a captain or a chief. Okay.

The Undersheriff would investigate all of those matters or have them investigated, but not here. Including when he did the interview on this, which was not out of the norm. He's a senior officer. This is a senior officer. I'm a sergeant. It's probably better that way, to do it that way. That a way there's that little rough edge, you know, there's no, I'm a captain. You know. You shut your mouth. That kind of thing. None of that. If you

understand what I'm saying. It's much easier from a higher ranking coming down. So that wasn't abnormal.

What was abnormal was nothing happened. Do I think they had conversations? Absolutely.

Q. Who do you mean by "they"?

A. The Undersheriff and the Sheriff. Absolutely, I would think they would have. Why would he not tell him that? I don't know firsthand. I'm not privy to that. You'll have to ask them.

Do I believe it based on what I've seen and what I've lived for the time I've worked there?

Yeah. Absolutely.

But nothing happened here and this to me is -is as bad or worse than some of the things that
people lost their jobs for under this Undersheriff
who didn't tolerate any lying and wanted everything
to be right. What -- what -- I don't know where the
rub is. You know, I don't know what -- where's that
line?

So, you know, this particular case for me, you know, it was kind of my turning point, you know.

I'm -- I'm losing a little faith here. All right.

You profess these things, integrity, honor, but this is in the dead file.

So, it was no secret that I was opinionated in

)

that manner to -- to -- those I worked with. Okay.

And was I nervous about that? Yeah. But, you know, I didn't want to write it. I didn't want anything to do with this.

This is one of those hot potatoes that you don't want to do anything with. And everybody has a take on it. Ahh, it's just your perception. No, it's not. It's factually based and these things occurred. What you going to do? Nothing. Okay. Now, you've shown me who you are, so to speak. Does that make sense?

GRAND JUROR 16: It does.

GRAND JUROR 9: Juror 9. Based on all this, okay, yeah, I know it's tough being in a position, you're writing a report to your superiors. I fully understand that. Yeah, my job could be on the line for this report, et cetera, et cetera.

But in discussion when we're talking about maladministration of the Sheriff, in your opinion with this report did this, as you said, the Sheriff, Undersheriff were going to talk. I imagine an organization this size, at least as Undersheriff is going to be somebody that's probably going to be in his office regularly, in the Sheriff's Office.

So, would the Undersheriff have brought this

to the Sheriff's attention.

THE WITNESS: I would think so. Most people that go through an Internal Affairs investigation and there's validity that is found. Umm, well, you go through a pre-action. I'm sorry. It's where -- it's a board, your supervision team, including the Undersheriff, would render a verdict of what to do with you. Whether that be a letter of reprimand all the way up to termination. It could be anything in between.

Just like there is in most places where people don't follow the rules, right? There's some sort of catch-all.

Those -- the Sheriff is the appeal in all those processes and made aware that this one was terminated or this one got this. He knows those things. This would not be unusual for him not -- to know this.

GRAND JUROR 9: So you say the Sheriff is -in cases of disciplinary or personnel matters of this
level the Sheriff is definitely hands-on, or I mean
aware of them?

THE WITNESS: I'm not saying hands-on. I'm saying he's aware of them. He can either agree with the finding of the board or change it based on what

he thinks of the case work. Okay. He is the ultimate decision maker of this agency. All right. The rest of the people work for him. All right.

He's made aware of all the other things. I thought to myself, why wouldn't he be made aware of this? This involves staff members, not detention officers, not deputies. This is staff.

Staff are appointed. A chief is appointed. Wherein like me a captain or a sergeant has to test. You have to test for that position.

GRAND JUROR 16: Juror 16. One of the documents you stated had two signatures on it, on the exhibits. I'm not familiar with the number.

THE WITNESS: Oh, the training certificate it had Sheriff Glanz and Tim Albin.

GRAND JUROR 16: Okay, excellent. I wasn't clear on who signed them.

THE WITNESS: That's the two.

GRAND JUROR 16: So he was obviously aware of that if he signed it, correct?

THE WITNESS: Either by stamp -- well, he asked Bonnie to produce that certificate. So Tim Albin was definitely aware. I don't know if Stanley signed it or if that's a stamp. I'd have to see the original.

GRAND JUROR 9: Juror 9. On that particular document, while we're on that subject. Did you state 2 that the instructor normally signs it? 3 THE WITNESS: Yeah, Tim was the instructor on 4 5 that. GRAND JUROR 9: Tim Albin was the instructor 6 7 on that one? THE WITNESS: He was. It says Certified 8 9 Instructor and Sheriff. GRAND JUROR 9: And during that period was Tim 10 11 Albin --THE WITNESS: He was a driving instructor. 12 GRAND JUROR 9: -- was a driving instructor? 13 14 THE WITNESS: He was and is. GRAND JUROR 15: Juror No. 15. After all of 15 16 this, because this was in 2009. 17 THE WITNESS: Uh-huh. 18 GRAND JUROR 15: Did you kind of look out and see kind of how Bates was doing? Did you kind of, 19 like, open your eyes to maybe he might be a little 20 bit of a problem or could be unsafe? Did you, 21 22 what --GRAND JUROR 16: I'm sorry. I wouldn't think 23 he would. I mean, keep your head low. 24 THE WITNESS: No, I did not. 25

GRAND JUROR 15: Did --THE WITNESS: I transferred -- I stayed there 2 3 for about four years after '09, '10, I tested and I was gone after that. So I got promoted and was 4 5 moved. GRAND JUROR 15: And you left Internal 6 7 Affairs? 8 THE WITNESS: And other people were. 9 GRAND JUROR 15: Have you had any repercussion 10 because of this report? 11 THE WITNESS: Personally, no. 12 GRAND JUROR 13: 13. When you do your investigations how much access do you have to 13 14 documentation, say, from the bottom up? How far up 15 can you pull? THE WITNESS: As an Internal Affairs' 16 17 investigator? 18 GRAND JUROR 13: Yes, sir. 19 THE WITNESS: All access. GRAND JUROR 13: In terms of the Sheriff, how 20 often does he get reports in terms of activities? 21 it quarterly, fiscally, every day, or when does he 22 23 get to read --THE WITNESS: With respect to the 24 25 investigations?

GRAND JUROR 13: No, just operations in 2 general. 3 THE WITNESS: Every day. GRAND JUROR 13: Or if there is an incident --4 5 THE WITNESS: Every day. GRAND JUROR 13: -- such as, or --6 THE WITNESS: We have a staff meeting every 7 day wherein captains and chiefs and the Undersheriff 8 and the Sheriff daily talk about on-goings in the 9 10 office. And, then, once a week they have a staff 11 meeting and that would be majors and above attend 12 that to discuss new policy limitations, things of 13 that nature, or directions things like that. 14 Investigations, I think, would be a discussion 15 between the Undersheriff and the Sheriff. That 16 information is classified. 17 GRAND JUROR 13: Are minutes kept during those 18 particular --19 THE WITNESS: Of staff meetings? 20 GRAND JUROR 13: Yes. 21 THE WITNESS: Yes. 22 GRAND JUROR 13: So do you go through those as 23 well in terms of minutes? 24 THE WITNESS: What do you mean minutes? Of 25

what people said?

GRAND JUROR 13: Yeah. During -- any documentation saying, for instance, we got -- she's recording everything --

THE WITNESS: There is a secretary in there on the staff meeting that denotes notes of what occurred in the meeting. Yes.

GRAND JUROR 13: Right.

THE WITNESS: Have I ever seen them? No, I've never had to -- the reason to go, hey, can I look at those?

GRAND JUROR 13: Right. I say when those complaints came through and say, for instance, now you're doing your investigation now do you include their documentations?

THE WITNESS: If it was pertinent to an investigation, yes. Again, this was a cursory look. This wasn't a full investigation.

GRAND JUROR 13: Right.

THE WITNESS: This was, hey, check it out.

See if there's any truth to the matter. If there is come back and see me. And that's what happened.

You know, I anticipated that an investigation would ensue. And it might have included some of those things. I might have included conversations

with other people. 11 2 I didn't talk to Chief Albin in this. 3 didn't need to. I didn't see the need to based on 4 the perimeters I was given. You know, if an investigation would have 5 ensued, would I have? Yeah. Are you kidding? Yeah. 6 You made this happen. Yeah. I want to talk to you 7 8 or, allegedly, I need to know. MR. BUCHANAN: Maybe just for everybody's 9 clarification. Is Tim Albin still an employee of the 10 11 Sheriff's Office? THE WITNESS: He's not. 12 MR. BUCHANAN: Is Tom Huckeby an employee of 13 14 the Sheriff's Office? 15 THE WITNESS: He is not. GRAND JUROR 8: Juror 8. On the same note as 16 Undersheriff Edwards resigned after this, 17 that. 18 right? THE WITNESS: I don't know if it was after 19 He -- he pursued another opportunity with 20 this. 21 GRDA. 22 GRAND JUROR 8: Okay. THE WITNESS: So he severed himself from the 23 office. I don't --24 25 GRAND JUROR 8: So there was no pressure? He

had another opportunity.

1|

THE WITNESS: Yeah. He's in charge of GRDA Power Company.

GRAND JUROR 8: Yeah.

GRAND JUROR 16: 16. You mentioned they're no longer with the company. Did they resign or were they terminated?

THE WITNESS: From what I -- Tom Huckeby resigned. And from what I gather Tim Albin did the same. I think they both resigned.

I mean, I'm not in the room with those guys when they did it. I wasn't even here. I was in a training in Oklahoma City. So I saw it on the news. Oh, I don't work here anymore. I don't work here anymore.

JUROR 21: Juror 21. Was that after April?

THE WITNESS: Yeah. This was, like, two

months ago.

GRAND JUROR 9: Juror No. 9. Couple real quick questions regarding some policies and procedures -- or not policies. But the CLEET courses, are those delivered in classroom by CLEET organization?

THE WITNESS: It doesn't work that way.

GRAND JUROR 9: Okay.

THE WITNESS: Most agencies have instructors that have been certified by CLEET to instruct. And the class work that they teach depends. It could be driving, firearms, criminal investigations, as long as it's certified, drug recognition expert program. It could be a variety of things.

So long as you are a CLEET instructor, then, that class you have to get approval from CLEET and they'll say, yes, we'll give you credit for this class. If they do, then, you get CLEET credit for it.

You have to do 24 -- 25 mandatory hours per year and you have to do two mental health hours. So you have to have two, at least, eight hour classes, one little class and another little class for mental health. All right.

GRAND JUROR 9: Okay. Yeah.

THE WITNESS: Most agencies do in-house training to better their officers continually. It never stops.

GRAND JUROR 9: So you will have CLEET officers on your --

THE WITNESS: Most of the time, like me, they would use me or anybody else that's a CLEET instructor. An instructor is an instructor and

that's the way CLEET is.

I can teach everything except for special classes, like, driving or firearms because those are unique animals and you have to go through a certification process for that.

But most other classes a CLEET certified instructor can teach, because CLEET certified you do teach.

GRAND JUROR 9: The curriculum for the class --

THE WITNESS: Yeah, you have to submit that -GRAND JUROR 9: It has to be approved by
CLEET?

THE WITNESS: -- they have a format. And they have to have testing and they have to approve it.

And one of those things is mandatory sign-in sheets.

GRAND JUROR 21: And are those sign-in sheets, those are then put into a database?

THE WITNESS: Yes. Now, I will tell you CLEET gets sometimes behind, you know, for the amount of paperwork they do. And -- and, you know, I don't say that that's for that document that's not in there for the class, that should have well been in there. That was way past when it occurred. I don't understand that. It wasn't there.

GRAND JUROR 9: Do you know of -- sorry.

Juror No. 9 again.

Do you have any knowledge of the length of time that Bob Bates served on Tulsa Police Department?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

GRAND JUROR 9: How long was that?

THE WITNESS: One year --

GRAND JUROR 9: One year?

THE WITNESS: -- from the record I gathered.

GRAND JUROR 9: Okay. I just wanted to see if there was any more than that. That's what I gathered, too.

THE WITNESS: No, the record from that time frame, I mean, I think that's what that letter was in reference to because there was a guy that actually was there at the time. The recordkeeping then and recordkeeping now are two different things.

You didn't have CLEET back then. Okay. You didn't have an agency governing police training and the requirements they should have back in those days. It's different today.

GRAND JUROR 9: So from 1964-1965, let's say, if he left the force in '65 trough 2009 when he joined the force --

THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.

GRAND JUROR 9 -- no record of training during that period of time through CLEET or otherwise?

THE WITNESS: Well, if he wasn't employed by a peace officer he wasn't mandated to.

GRAND JUROR 9: Right. So, umm, I guess what I'm getting at is you've got this huge gap and how much credit was he given for what level? I mean, basic, advanced, otherwise, does he come straight in, in advanced?

THE WITNESS: No, the basic level is a CLEET certification. And what I'm saying in regards to Mr. Bates was CLEET grandfathered him for his year service because, then, Tulsa Police and they still do, have their own academy here. They teach their own officers, but it's CLEET certified. Okay.

And I'm sure they taught him during that -that process there, or they wouldn't have put him
down as having been an officer for one year. You
don't get that unless you've done something. It
doesn't work that way. It doesn't magically appear.
If I didn't complete my training my name would not
appear on the scroll.

You have to -- and that gets you reserve basic status. Period. Because CLEET has certified

you as having had training or been grandfathered for 2 the training you did have as a police officer. GRAND JUROR 9: So did Mr. Bates come in as a 3 4 basic reserve officer based on that? 5 THE WITNESS: Yes. He would be hired in as a 6 basic officer. 7 GRAND JUROR 9: How long did it take him to 8 get from basic to advanced? THE WITNESS: Well, that -- therein lies the 9 10 question. GRAND JUROR 16: Juror 16. Did you ever ask 11 for a maybe -- we talked about an employee file, 12 personnel file, from the TPD or did they even have 13 those in that time frame? 14 THE WITNESS: I think I had to go through 15 CLEET and I got that letter from his personnel file I 16 think and his application process. I don't think 17 there were any records for me to get, truthfully. 18 GRAND JUROR 16: So no one ever gave us any 19 reason why Mr. Bates left the department. 20 THE WITNESS: No. I don't have a reason as to 21 22 why. GRAND JUROR 16: I was curious if he resigned 23 or if he was asked to resign. 24 25 THE WITNESS: You can ask the Tulsa Police

Department. They would be more apt to answer that, than I.

GRAND JUROR 5: Juror No. 5. So after 2009, after you put it in the dead file and everything, do you feel, like, kind of it was, like, a morale changer? I mean, did it kind of change? I mean, people now, like, if we bring something up it's not going to matter. They're going -- I mean, they're going to shoot it down.

But did it kind of -- I mean, from 2009 to 2015, did that kind of -- if there was something going on that people felt crooked inside they kind of just, there's no reason to bring it up because it might not go anywhere anyway.

So did it kind of change the morale of some of the officers, not all of them, maybe, because not everybody knows. But, I mean, kind of change people's views on kind of the Sheriff's Department and the chain of command in the Sheriff Department?

THE WITNESS: It did mine. I would think that, umm, it probably solidified the fact that they were not to mess with this guy. I think that would be a fair assumption.

GRAND JUROR 8: Solidified the fact that...

THE WITNESS: Not to mess with Deputy Bates.

As evident -- and I wrote in that report when, you 2 know, he was questioned by those guys he would run to 3 those other two guys and then they would come back and say -- cuss at them and don't mess with this guy. 4 5 You know, that's evident. You know, it's written 6 down right there. 7 GRAND JUROR 16: Juror 16. I want to thank 8 you for being so forthcoming and ask you this: there anything you feel like you need to say that we 9 10 haven't asked you? THE WITNESS: I don't think so. 11 GRAND JUROR 13: 13. If we need to talk to 12 you again would that be okay? 13 14 THE WITNESS: If you need to. 15 MR. BUCHANAN: Anything else from the Grand Jury? All right. 16 MR. BARRIS: We'll show that it's 3:16 p.m. on 17 August 6th, 2015. We're going to take a brief five 18 19 to 10-minute recess. (End of proceedings.) 20 21 22 23 24 25

1	CERTIFICATE.
2	
3	
4	STATE OF OKLAHOMA)
5	COUNTY OF TULSA SS.
6	
7	I, Tami Morse, Official Court
8	Reporter, within and for the State of Oklahoma, do
9	hereby certify that on September 6, 2015, before the
10	impaneled Grand Jury in the District Court of Tulsa
11	County, State of Oklahoma, I reported in machine
12	shorthand the proceedings had and the evidence given,
13	and the above and foregoing is a full, true, correct
14	and complete transcript of the proceedings had and
15	testimony given, taken at said time and place.
16	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto
17	set my hand and official seal this 38 = of famuary,
18	2016.
19	TAMI MORSE, CSR-RPR
20	CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER
21	120 miles
22	Tami Morse State of Oklahoma
23	Certified Shorthand Reporter
24	CSR # 1973 My Certificate Expires / 2-3/-/6
25	IVI) (Altitude makes

1	IN THE DISTRICT COURT IN AND FOR TULSA COUNTY STATE OF OKLAHOMA
2	STATE OF ORLAHOTIA
3	MARQ LEWIS,
4	Plaintiff, Case No.
5	vs. (GJ-2015-1
6	IN RE GRAND JURY,
7	
8	Defendant. ORIGINAL
9	
10	DISTRICT COURT ***********************************
11	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS JAN 2 9 2016
12	HAD ON SALLY HOWE SMITH, COURT CLERK STATE OF OKLA, TULSA COUNTY
13	SEPTEMBER 14, 2015
14	BEFORE THE IMPANELED GRAND JURY
15	********
16	295 3411 29
17	
18	The state of the s
19	
20	Ži e
21	. *
22	REPORTED BY:
23	TAMI MORSE, CSR-RPR
24	TULSA, OK 74103
25	TAMI MORSE, CSR-RPR 500 S. DENVER, SUITE 111 TULSA, OK 74103 tami.morse@oscn.net (918) 596-5371

APPEARANCES FOR THE STATE: Rob Barris Jared Sigler
Special Appointed Tulsa County
District Attorneys
500 S. Denver, Ste. 900
Tulsa, Oklahoma

PROCEEDINGS MR. BARRIS: It's now 1:02 p.m. on August the 2 3 14th, 2015. The Grand Jury is back in session after the 4 5 luncheon recess. All members of the Grand Jury are present as 6 7 well as all three alternates as well as myself and Mr. Sigler from the Washington County DA's Office as 8 9 legal advisors. Ladies and Gentlemen, our next witness, I 10 believe, is available and waiting for us. His name 11 12 is Shannon Clark if that's all right. Anything preliminary? Are we ready to go? 13 (Witness and his attorney, Eric Stall, entered 14 15 the Grand Jury Room.) GRAND JUROR 9: Do you swear or affirm that 16 the testimony you're about to give will be the truth, 17 the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? 18 THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. 19 GRAND JUROR 9: Have a seat. 20 21 THE WITNESS: Thanks. SHANNON CLARK, 22 Having been first duly sworn, testified as 23 24 follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION 25

- 1 Q. (BY MR. BARRIS) Would you state your name,
- 2 please, sir.

- 3 A. Shannon Clark.
- 4 Q. Okay. And Mr. Clark, you are here today with
- 5 your attorney, is that correct?
- 6 A. That is correct.
- Q. Eric Stall. And you've requested his presence as
- 8 your personal attorney, is that correct, sir?
- 9 A. Yes, I have.
- 10 Q. Okay. Mr. Clark, can you tell us, please, sir,
- 11 what your business or occupation is?
- 12 A. I'm currently on unemployment.
- 13 Q. Okay. What was your previous occupation, sir?
- 14 A. I was a major and Public Information Officer at
- 15 the Tulsa County Sheriff's Office.
- 16 Q. And how long did you serve at the Tulsa County
- 17 Sheriff's Office altogether, sir?
- 18 A. Since November of 2000. It was 14 years,
- 19 six months.
- Q. And you said, I believe, May 29th, 2015, was your
- 21 last day on the job?
- 22 A. That's correct.
- 23 Q. Okay. At that time, sir, what was your rank and
- 24 your duties on that day?
- 25 A. I was a major, Public Information Officer, and

Jail Administrator.

- Q. How long had you served in those positions?
- A. I had been a major for three years. I had been the Jail Administrator for just over a year and I'd been the Public Information Officer for six years.
- Q. Six years?
- A. Yes.

Q. Okay. If I could, sir, I want to initially draw your attention to April the 2nd, 2015.

On that date, am I correct that a shooting incident involving an officer by the name of Bob Bates occurred?

- A. It did.
- Q. What was your role in that particular matter? How did you find out about it, things of that nature.
- A. I received a text message from Major Tom Huckeby saying that Bob had shot someone and I waited for further information, as I typically would do on a scene situation like that. He was alerting me to the fact because, obviously, the media would be calling.

This was a unique situation at this particular shooting because they were using an encrypted channel because it was an undercover operation so it wasn't out on the scanners where the media would pick it up as soon as it happened.

So, I was called -- so, I had decided, once there was a shooting and that they were on a scene, I got Captain Billy McKelvey, which was my Admin Assistant, and Deputy Chris Cook, that was my Admin Assistant, and we both worked in the public information field. They would back me up and assist me in those roles. And we loaded up in a vehicle together and went to the scene.

- Q. Okay. When you arrived at the scene did either yourself or Mr. McKelvey or Mr. Cook participate in any way in the actual investigation of the crime scene, or the area where the shooting had occurred?
- A. We -- we were probably listed in the crime science log because we did enter the area, but we did not participate in the investigation at all.
- Q. What did you do at that time when you arrived at the scene?
- A. I contacted Major Huckeby, which was on scene.

 He was the highest ranking scene commander present.

 And I basically asked for the basic information that

 I needed to give to the media because one of the

 reporters from Fox 23 had arrived. And so I needed

 to give some sound bite, some basic information. So

 I just requested simply for him to explain to me what

 had transpired there.

- Q. And so did you receive a briefing from him at that point as to the basic facts on what had occurred?
- 4 A. Yes.
- Q. And based on that did you then supply information to the media in your role as a Public Information Officer for the Sheriff's Department?
- 8 A. I did.
- 9 Q. During that time period, either right then or
 10 shortly after the shooting, in a matter of a day or
 11 two or so, did you receive any information from Billy
 12 McKelvey concerning a matter, or a document that
 13 might cause problems with the media and the Sheriff's
 14 Office?
- 15 A. Within a day or two?
- Q. Well, roughly around that time, perhaps, a few more days. I don't know when exactly, but during that time period.
- A. Well, I received information about a document, but it was later. It was several -- it was a couple weeks later.
- Q. Okay. Tell us about that. From whom did you receive it? How did you receive that information?
- 24 A. Okay. I'm going to be real candid with you.
- 25 Q. Okay.

A. Basically, long story short, during the Bates' incident I had given some basic preliminary information about the scene.

Now, anybody will tell you that have worked with me for many, many, years a lot of times the scene commanders would know to only give me the basic information because I was of the opinion if I didn't know it, I couldn't say it. I couldn't have a freudian slip and say something improper that I shouldn't say about an investigation.

Now, this was similar in the Bates' situation. I gave the preliminary information. We were doing some updated information that I was getting from the scene command similar to -- it was, what, 12, 24 hours later I found out that there was even a video of the incident. That came in later after the investigation. So I was told to put something out on that.

And, then, later on what -- what I believe he's referring to there was a document -- there was rumors of a document that started to surface in the media about an investigation that had taken place back several years ago, around '09.

And during this time I called over -- I had got some information from several media outlets

asking specific information about this 2009 investigation. I had no knowledge of it.

I contacted Undersheriff Tim Albin and asked him if we had a 2009 investigation. He said, I don't know. Let me look into it.

So, he called me back. He said we have no -no record of a '09 investigation. What are they
referring to? I said, it was an Internal Affairs
investigation. Don't have any -- any evidence of
that.

Okay. So, long story short, as it progresses I'm being told we have no documentable record. There's a media news story with me saying we have no documentable record of this 2009 investigation. I was told that we had no record of a 2009 investigation.

There's three ways that we kept records. We had our original computer we do crime reports on, which we call SOMS or -- and/or Traces, depending on what year it was.

We had another report that we kept and it was called the Sheriff's assignment log, which anything that comes into the Sheriff he gives an assignment log and then depending on what your rank is he will assign you a case. And then you have to respond to

it and send him back the information and his secretary will clear it. If the Sheriff agrees with whatever the deal is. The third way that we track information was through an Internal Affairs' data base.

So the Undersheriff had checked those and said we don't have any -- there's no 2009 document of any kind. The media concern continued to grow about this alleged 2009 investigation.

Now, with my experience with the media some of the reporters that were calling, I believed in my heart, that they knew more than I did about some investigation that had taken place. Otherwise, they're not going to ask those questions.

So, I, again, contacted the Undersheriff.
Said, seriously, we need to be figuring out what's going on. They're really asking about this 2009 report.

I was approached, like, the -- okay, I think the big press release that we did where Sheriff Glanz got in front of all the cameras was like on the 20th. So this would have happened the Tuesday prior to that event.

Billy -- Captain Billy McKelvey had come in my office and he said, I need to go see the

Undersheriff. And, so, I granted permission. And that was typically the way that our office worked. He needed to see him. I didn't ask.

But, he said, I would like for you to come with me. And I had another meeting or another engagement— there was something else going on and I couldn't be there exactly at the time he met, but I did come in later and they were at the Faulkner Building in the conference room.

So I come in. They were in a closed door meeting. I walk in. It's Billy McKelvey and the Undersheriff.

I walk in. Billy is leaned back in a chair. The Undersheriff is leaned back in a chair and you could always tell when the Undersheriff was -- was stressed is because he would take -- he would have certain movements with his glasses and do different things. If you guys get to meet him somewhere down the road you'll see what I'm talking about. If he gets stressed.

And he had laid his glasses back and he was of concern. And I could tell there was something going on and Billy was -- also, you could read on his body language of some concern.

A long story short, he -- Billy had presented

the Undersheriff with a 2009 investigation that was conducted by Robbie Lillard given to, at then, the former Undersheriff Brian Edwards.

Okay. So I kind of come into the end of it. He's kind of wrapping it up. The Undersheriff is showing some grave concern and he says, I've got to get this to the Sheriff.

And, then, that was -- that was kind of the last there was. So we go back to the jail where I officed and where Captain McKelvey officed.

As we sat in our offices Billy came over and I said, what was that all about? He said, there was -- this 2009 investigation they're talking about I have a copy of that.

And I said, how did you get a copy of it and where did it come from?

He said, well, he said, the reason I need to meet with the Undersheriff -- Billy was in Internal Affairs for several years and there was, and I don't mean to be jumping around, but to kind of put it into perspective.

At then, Sergeant Robbie Lillard was the supervisor of Internal Affairs that answered directly to the Undersheriff Brian Edwards. Billy McKelvey was a corporal then that answered to Robbie Lillard.

Then to the Undersheriff.

1]

When Robbie Lillard got promoted to Captain and was transferred to the Detention Division, Billy watched Lillard, so he tells me, he was watching him download things from his Internal Affairs computer on to thumb drives, which made him concerned that he was doing that.

One, it's an unethical practice. Internal Affairs isn't supposed to take documents home. They're not supposed to take things out of the office. He was watching this happen.

So he said after Lillard was promoted and transferred he asked Internal Affairs to recycle that computer, but he wanted a mirror image copy of that machine for Internal Affairs Division to keep it because he didn't know what was on it, but he wanted to make sure that he had all the documents for ongoing investigations and those kind of things.

Which in the mind of a law enforcement officer, you know, he's using his investigative talents or expertise to know I need to have that computer.

He told me that when all this started surfacing that he had went back to look into that computer because the rumor started surfacing about

Robbie Lillard doing some document. So he went back into the computer and found something that was of concern to him and that was the document he took to the Undersheriff.

So after he explained to me what that report was I called the Undersheriff, Tim Albin, and said, what do you want me to do now?

And he goes, well, there's no -- we don't have that in any of our systems. I asked Internal Affairs to pull it. There's nothing. I've looked in all our different data bases. There's nothing.

Continue to tell the media we don't have any documentable record of that report being generated in our office. Hence, the quote that I said to the media. We have no documentable record.

I wasn't lying. It was semantics. We really didn't have a documentable record. There was a record that was produced in a computer, but Robbie did it on a Word document, not under an Internal Affairs number or assignment. It was like a personal investigation for Undersheriff Edwards at the time.

So, as it continued to grow and manifest itself and the media continued to call more and more, my understanding is the Undersheriff met with Sheriff Glanz that Wednesday morning. We -- Billy presented

it to him on Tuesday. The Undersheriff meets with the Sheriff on Wednesday morning. Tells him about it.

The response I get from the Undersheriff is the Sheriff wasn't too concerned with it. He kind of glanced at it. Threw it back on the desk. And said, yeah. Something about so -- so what? Meaning -- and I asked the Undersheriff, what does that mean to you? And he said, it means to me that he already seen it. He didn't need to read it. It's 13 pages long.

Q. Let me stop you for just a minute.

Right in front of you, underneath that stapler, is a document marked as Exhibit No. 16 that's been admitted before this Grand Jury.

A. Yes.

- Q. Can you identify that? Have you seen that document before?
 - A. I believe so. It looks as though it's the document that I've seen before.
 - Q. And is that the 2009 report that you've been referencing in your testimony at this point that there were concerns about difficulties locating, things of that nature?
- 24 A. Yes, it is.
 - Q. When did you first see the report yourself?

- A. About three days after the press conference that was conducted by the Sheriff.
- Q. Which you said was on the 20th?
- A. Right. I believe it was that Wednesday when I actually received a copy of it.

The first copy that I had seen actually come through a media outlet. They actually e-mailed it to me on my computer and then Billy McKelvey had given me a copy of it.

- Q. And taking it the 20th as being the day of this press conference?
- 12 A. Is that on a Monday?
- 13 Q. Yes, sir.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

- 14 A. I believe that's the press conference date.
- Q. You said it was the prior Tuesday that this initial meeting that McKelvey had with Albin and you present had occurred?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Which would have been the 14th?
- 20 A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. So during that time period is when efforts were being made, supposedly, to locate this report, things of that nature, and you were asking about it, asking that you -- Undersheriff Albin how to obtain a
- 25 copy?

A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. When you spoke with Undersheriff Albin about him providing a copy of the report to Sheriff Glanz, did he tell you when that event occurred, when he actually provided him a copy of it or asked him to look at it.
- A. He told me it was the morning following our meeting, which would have been that Wednesday morning. We met on Tuesday. It would have been Wednesday morning.
- Q. So April the 15th?
- 12 A. Yes.
 - Q. Okay. What concern did you observe from the contents of the report itself as the Public Information Officer for the Sheriff?
 - A. Well, because there was allegations raised on Bob Bates' training records and his ability to posses weapons and do those kinds of things, you guys have to kind of -- kind of try to ideologize that it was mass confusion during that period of time. The medias were asking for just absolute tons and tons of information, training records, and all kinds of things.

This kind of raised the red flag that the reason we weren't able to produce certain documents

in a timely manner is they may not even exist. We might not even have those documents, which led me to go a little farther in my search for transparency.

Is -- after I knew that the Sheriff had seen or heard of this report on Wednesday, Captain McKelvey and I were in the courthouse for something completely unrelated and passed by the Sheriff's Office and the Sheriff was in his office.

We stopped to visit. He made light of the fact of, umm, that I was getting hammered by the media. Lots and lots of inquiries.

He made a reference that you're doing a pretty good job. You know, he just knew -- and we were getting national inquiries. I mean, we had talk shows calling. Everybody was calling.

And I had my whole entire group, which was McKelvey -- Billy McKelvey, Chris Cook, Sarah Gadd, Chaplain Ken Farnum. They were all assisting me and making sure we were making responses and things to the media.

So, McKelvey and I took the opportunity to shut the door to visit with the Sheriff. And we told the Sheriff, and I specifically told the Sheriff, that report existed, because we -- he made reference to this report, 2009 report. And he made reference

to me, he didn't know anything about it. I had other knowledge that he had just saw the report less than 24 hours ago, or at least a portion of that report.

And I told him that I -- it was extremely uncomfortable with everything that was going on, the media have it. There are specific reporters in town that are investigative reporters. And I just appeal to you guys that if these people know about it, it's probably there in some degree.

And I asked him to make a statement to the media and he refused. And that's when they were calling for the Sheriff to make a statement.

- Q. What statement did you urge him to make at that time?
- A. I wanted him to -- the statements I encouraged him to make was address the Harris family, somewhat -- either acknowledge the shooting, apologize to the Harris family, whatever the case may be.

My recommendation was to offer some apology.

There was a death that had occurred that was probably negligent. And I asked him to address the Harris family. That was the big cry in the community was, at least, the Sheriff say something. He had not even addressed this community or the Harris family,

whatsoever, at this point in time.

And the other thing I asked him to do was address the 2009 report, either that it existed or it didn't exist, one or the other.

Now, what they were continuing to claim, and as he continued to refuse acknowledgment of this report, then, I told him the exact same story that I shared with you guys a few minutes ago.

That Billy McKelvey had got it. Billy concurred with the story. He got it from a downloaded imaged computer that Robbie Lillard had had. We had a copy of it, but there was no courtesy copies. There was no additional information that would suggest that this report was anywhere in our files or anywhere in our computer systems that we could reference back to.

And that was the only thing I'd asked him to do was address the Harris family and do something about this report.

- Q. At this point in time has the report been officially or publicly released by --
- A. No.

- Q. -- by anyone? The media or anybody at that point in time?
 - A. I believe the media had it.

- Q. But it had not been released to the public?
- 2 A. No.
- Q. Okay. So you were urging him to do that?
- 4 A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. Why would you urge him to do that?
- A. He always preached transparency in our office.
- And the media already knew about it and I knew it was going to come out.

And my problem being a Public Information

Officer is I'm not a press secretary. I was a Public Information Officer. Doing what I'm told. I, basically, regurgitate what I'm told to say, you know. I'm the face of the office. They tell me what to say.

They continued to tell me the report didn't exist. Don't acknowledge the report. Don't say the report exists.

That's why I was trying to use those subjective terms so if -- if ever I was pinned down, either in Court testimony, or by a media outlet, I could say, I didn't lie. I was being truthful. They're telling me we have no documentable record of this report existing. I had no documentable record. They're not claiming any documentable record.

So, after strongly encouraging the Sheriff to

2 3 4

go forward he told me that he had the MC, a Boy Scout event, at noon on that Thursday. And, then, he was leaving to go fishing with his wife. And then they left.

And he -- and I even -- the Sheriff's Office had just recently purchased some very quality camera equipment and it was under my purview. And we had a camera operator.

And I asked the Sheriff if he would just stand and let me do a three to five minute video tape of him acknowledging to the Harris family and acknowledging the report. Something, a prepared statement, anything. And no questions, you know, from the media, those kind of things. He refused that as well.

And I had Billy there with me. I mean, he was right there when we were asking the Sheriff to come forward and say something. He still refused.

So, I can continue on with the story on how we got to where I got a copy of the report.

Q. Well, my question, I guess, in terms of what I was asking you about is, your reasoning behind urging him to release, you said it was, essentially transparency, to act on it before it became a matter that he had to react to, essentially.

- A. Yeah. Absolutely, you know, being ahead of things, being offensive is way better than defensive and I knew that they had something that was eventually going to come out.
- Q. What was the Sheriff's demeanor or attitude toward your suggestion? Describe -- he said, I'm leaving to go do some things. Can you describe what his demeanor was? Was he concerned, happy, sad? What was it?
- A. No. There was a very unique thing that occurred during that meeting. The Sheriff was very nonchalant about the shooting, the report. Didn't seem to really have much emotion towards any of that.

But he did change his focus to reflect on me personally. And started asking me some personal questions about the -- about my future and things that I was going to do in the future.

And he just kind of changed everything to focus on me and then he became agitated as he and I engaged in further conversation.

- Q. What was the topic of that discussion?
- A. He asked me if I was going to stand as a candidate for Sheriff in Tulsa County.
 - Q. Did you respond?
 - A. I did.

Q. What did you say?

- A. I told him that I was looking at the option.

 That I had been approached by several elected officials from a lot of media, a lot of people in the community that I should stand for that open seat when he retires.
- Q. Okay. What response did you receive from him?

 A. He seemed a little agitated at the fact, but this is what perplexes me about this whole conversation.

He asked me if I was going to run. There's a couple of things that really were of significance during this conversation.

He thought that I had hired a consulting firm, which I had not. He thought that I had already done exploratory committee, which I had not. He thought that I had already started raising money, and I had not.

He also knew that I'm not even statutorily qualified to be the Sheriff of Tulsa County. I live in Wagoner County. And I expressed that to him, because he said, why didn't you come and talk to me about it? And I said, it's not time to talk to you about it yet. I still live in Wagoner County. I haven't moved into Tulsa County. I'm still looking at the options.

 My position was, and based on you guys being from Tulsa County, when Steve Kunzweiler run the District Attorney's race, he did that in my belief because Tim Harris was still popular. And they -- us, the people of Tulsa County, the voting community, they wanted somebody to continue that legacy. That office. It was moving in a forward direction. They wanted someone to continue it.

And I told the Sheriff, depending on how all this ferrets out, if you're popular when this is over, then, I'll probably make a look at running for Sheriff.

If you're not popular I'm not going to put my name on the ballot and waste my money because chances are they won't elect anybody from within our office.

But if you're still popular, then, they'll elect somebody from within your office. And he then said, well, I'm not going to endorse you. I don't endorse.

And I said, why wouldn't you endorse? You're not running for reelection. And then he said, well, Tim Harris come out for Steve Kunzweiler and I'm not going to do that for you. I said, okay.

And I said, why would you not do that for me after everything I've done for you? And he said, no

one endorsed me when I ran for Sheriff. It will make you a better man when you run. You need do it on your own merits.

What is perplexing about this whole conversation that he and I had, was in January I had just graduated the Oklahoma Sheriff's Certification Academy, which if you guys know what that is, if you're elected as Sheriff in Oklahoma you have to attend -- by statute you have to attend a two-week academy to be certified as a Sheriff. And it goes over all the aspects of an office.

He had just sent me to the Sheriff's certification school in lieu of me taking office. That's what I've been prepped for, for the last four or five, six years. The idea of making me Public Information Officer was to follow the legacy of Lucky Lemons and the Sheriff over in Rogers County. They were both PIOs for the City of Tulsa, you know.

And that was what was so perplexing is they had been, in a sense, it seemed like the office was kind of pushing me in that direction to take that office. And I was kind of following that lead. And, then, he put these questions out on me.

But it really come into question when I started inquiring about this 2009 report. He really

- changed the focus about my personal goals and objectives.
- Q. So at that point in time the report is not released. You're not authorized to make a statement pertaining to it. Is that correct?
- A. That's correct.

- Q. Okay. In terms of the media, did that continue to be an issue with the media in the days following that meeting?
- A. It continued to grow in significance. And what I had told the Undersheriff was, after the meeting with the Sheriff, I told the Undersheriff that in a sense I didn't know what else to say. I was running out of things to say. And I did not want to compromise my integrity that I had in the community to make any more statements about this 2009 report, because in my mind I knew it existed.

Publicly, I wasn't allowed to discuss it, which that is an ethical dilemma that I have, personally. And I didn't know what to do.

So I told the Undersheriff, I don't know what -- you know, I don't know what statements to make. You're going to have to make it. The Sheriff won't.

Well, the Undersheriff did not want to do it,

- but at that time we started entering into some discussions about hiring a consulting firm, a media strategist to come in and try to help with this.
- Q. When you say "we" who is we?
- A. There was a meeting called, and my memory serves me correct, it was myself, Undersheriff Tim Albin, Terry Simonson, Meredith Baker. I think Billy McKelvey come in a little later. I think Chaplain Farnum was there. And there might have been one or two others. I can't remember, but it was in the conference room at the Undersheriff's office.
- Q. You made reference to an individual by the name of Terry Simonson?
- 14 A. Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

- Q. Did he have a role, or does he have a role with the Sheriff's Office?
- 17 A. Yes, he does.
- 18 Q. What is that role?
 - A. He is considered -- I think his title is, like, Government Affairs Liaison or something like that.

But, basically, what Terry was brought on for, Terry -- well, Terry was brought on to handle the contract negotiations between Tulsa County and the City of Tulsa over the jail issues.

Terry Simonson had once been the Chief of

19

20

21

22

23

24

Staff for Mayor Dewey Bartlett. He had also been the Public Information Officer and a Chief Deputy for one of the former County Commissioners. So he knew both forms of government.

But in reality, I'll tell you why Terry
Simonson is there. He ran Commissioner Ron Peters'
campaign. And when Commissioner Ron Peters was
elected as County Commissioner, Terry Simonson
thought he was going to be the First Deputy. But
because of Terry Simonson's past history in this
community he didn't want him as First Deputy, because
he had already selected a lady named Vickie.

He called Stanley Glanz, the Sheriff, and asked Stanley if he would give Terry a job to reward him for running the campaign.

The Sheriff didn't have the money in the budget because Terry Simonson is an expensive person. They were paying him a chief salary, which is about a hundred thousand a year, give or take.

So, the Sheriff entered into an agreement with Dennis Semler, another elected official of the county, to split two-thirds Sheriff, one-third, and Dennis Semler is the County Treasurer, I think. They split his salary, but it was -- it was a favor to Commissioner Peters to give Terry a job so they had

to bring Terry in and create a position.

And when I say, "create a position", they had to find him an office. They had to create a position. So he was basically just supposed to look at the contracts, because he's a lawyer. He's still a practicing lawyer.

He was supposed to use his expertise in helping with negotiations, looking at contracts. He was supposed to lobby at the legislature. He was supposed to do things of that nature. So they were just kind of creating a job for him as we went.

Q. So what occurred or transpired at that meeting when you -- when we discussed about a consultant?

A. Unbenounced (sic) to me the consulting firm that

And the reason I knew that is because Jessica Caswell had handled the Tulsa FOP issue between the Tulsa FOP and the City of Tulsa. So she had experience in crisis communication.

I knew of was Jessica Caswell Consulting.

She comes from a law enforcement family. She had a law enforcement background. And I thought she'd be a perfect person to help us through this, because a lot of times law enforcement individuals want to use law enforcement terms that don't resonate to the community as well. And there's softer terms,

easier terms to use to give a better message to the community as a whole.

So, Ms. Caswell come in during this meeting and told the Undersheriff what she could do, what her consulting firm could offer. And, then, during that -- that discussion, she presented a price of the consulting firm. The Undersheriff agreed to hire her and accept the price.

- Q. What was the price?
- A. 25,000 for six months.
- Q. Okay.
- A. To get us through the initial thing, do social media and then she would monitor it, her consulting firm would monitor it for further public damage for six months out, it was \$25,000.
- Q. Okay.
- A. Terry Simonson got up and left the room. As soon as the Undersheriff agreed to those terms Terry Simonson left.

A little bit later, and I apologize, I don't know if it was the same day, or the next morning, things kind of run together. It may have been that afternoon.

Mike Willis is the Chief Deputy for Karen Keith, one of the County Commissioners. He was

contacted by John Smaligo, which is another one of the County Commissioners, that Sheriff Glanz -- or Undersheriff Albin had hired this consulting firm to help us through this process.

So Mike called me and said that there were some significant concerns about the ability to pay for her, because the way the law is, my understanding of it, is if it's anything less than 15,000 you can pay for it. If it's over 15,000 it has to go to bid and you have to go through an entire RFP and bid process, unless it's a sole source or exigent circumstances. So they went over thinking that we were fixing to violate some purchasing rules and things of that nature.

And I asked Mike Willis how he got involved. And he said that Terry Simonson had went over and complained to Smaligo that we were hiring this Caswell consulting firm. That we were going to violate some purchasing rules and we didn't need to be paying for her and such.

I didn't realize that there was a bad relationship between those two and that was more of what sparked that, that whole debate.

Q. So did you have to put an end to that consulting contract?

A. No. It was re -- immediately -- the Undersheriff -- when I called the Undersheriff and explained the situation, he called Jessica Caswell back and they negotiated to do consulting up to \$14,999. And that's as much as she would do.

Now, that included getting through the major incident and then whatever it would take us -- how much farther it would take us. And then when she -- whenever those hourly rates ran out they ran out.

But he could authorize that much money. And if it was going to go over the 15,000, then, they would take it out to RFP. They would actually put out a bid for a consulting firm to come in for additional services.

- Q. To your knowledge did she conduct any consulting work on behalf of the Sheriff's Office after that agreement was reached?
- A. She did. We -- everyone that I mentioned to you before, the Chaplain, Sarah Gadd, Chris Cook, Billy McKelvey, we all got to work about 9:00 o'clock Friday morning, and minus a few hours of rest late Friday night, I think we left after midnight on Friday. We had done 14, 15 hours of work. She developed a new -- first thing that we did was we strategized on a big board in a conference room, they

strategized.

1|

They looked at all the elements, who all was involved, the message that was being portrayed, the message we'd already delivered, the 2009 report. All these things were kind of put into perspective on, where do we go from here?

Q. Okay.

A. And then we worked long hours. We took a break. We come back Saturday. We worked all day Saturday. We took the majority of the time off on Sunday.

Although she was working, preparing a speech, a statement, prepared documents for the Sheriff while I was preparing the press conference that was scheduled for Monday morning at 9:00 o'clock.

- Q. Which would have been April 20th?
- A. Yes.
 - Q. Okay. When April 20th arrived what occurred?
 - A. We were told to arrive at the Faulkner Building's conference room at, I'm sorry, 8:00 o'clock. And then we were going to prep and prepare for the press conference.

I had my assistants getting the cameras in, getting everything set up, getting the room set up. There was a lot of live-wire feeds coming in, live trucks from a lot of the national medias coming in.

It was a big deal.

So we went into the conference room. Jessica was present, I was present, and I can't remember everybody in the room, but, basically, all the players we've talked about, the Undersheriff, the Sheriff, Terry Simonson, Jessica Caswell, myself, Billy McKelvey, Chris Cook, Sarah Gadd, Meredith Baker the staff attorney, and I'm sure there were some other people in that room.

We all started discussing how it was going to go, how we were going to introduce the situation and how long the Sheriff was going to go, because my deal was, I needed to be able to start it and stop it, is, basically, my role in those scenarios. Doing the introduction and then closing it. So we were trying to figure out how that all was going to work.

We had it scripted that the Sheriff was only going to speak just a few minutes on a prepared statement, take no questions and leave. That's how Caswell Consulting had it prepared. And, then, myself or the Undersheriff were going to step back and answer questions.

Terry Simonson had interjected and wanted a panel of people. He wanted each person to talk about something and go down like a panel and he wanted it

to last an hour.

Well, I knew the Sheriff wasn't going last an hour in a press conference like that. And I knew the media didn't have an hour. I wanted to do a quick get in and out kind of thing.

So, basically, the Sheriff, he allocated 30 minutes. He told me he wanted it to last 30 minutes. 9:00 to 9:30 and then he was out.

At the same time we had the groundbreaking ceremony for the expansion of David L. Moss going on at 11:00 o'clock. So we had other things to accomplish that morning.

So, after we started discussing on how it was all going to go and he set the perimeters, Jessica Caswell made an introduction of her prepared documents to the Sheriff. And the Sheriff become very outraged and angry and made a comment something to similar, this isn't my first rodeo. I've been doing this for years. I know what I'm doing.

And, then, I was asked to leave the room.

Basically, everybody was asked to leave the room.

Jessica was asked to leave the room. Subsequently, she was immediately fired just a few minutes thereafter.

I was asked to leave the room. All my

)

assistants were asked and it was, basically, the Sheriff, Terry Simonson, the Undersheriff, and I think Meredith Baker, our staff attorney, remained in the room. I sat outside on the couch by the Undersheriff's secretary along with my staff.

When they exited the room about 20 minutes till 9:00 they come walking by and the Sheriff walked right past me. Never said a word.

And so the Undersheriff and Terry Simonson come by and I stood up and asked them, how do you want me to introduce this thing? Because still yet I've not got any instructions.

And they said, I don't care. Just introduce it. He's been briefed. Just talk about the groundbreaking.

So, if you guys watch it on YouTube that's what I did. I walked up. Said, hey, welcome you all to the groundbreaking. You know, whatever, whatever.

And I said, the Sheriff has been apprised of the situation. He's been briefed. You know, we're going to try to do our best to answer all the questions we can. And that's when I step aside and introduce the Sheriff.

And then the Sheriff took it from there. None of us knew what he was going to say. How he was

going to say it. I just knew that he wanted to be done at 9:30 is what they told me. So that's why you see me step in about 28 minutes after the hour. And say, we're only going to take a couple more questions.

And then I -- then I get him to leave at 9:30 and then he leaves with his group of people.

- Q. In terms of that press conference, do you recall whether the issue of the 2009 report was raised by the media?
- A. It did. And I can tell you it was Ziva
 Branstetter, the reporter with the Tulsa World at the
 time, was the one that raised it.
- Q. And what response, if any, did the Sheriff make to that question?
- A. He acknowledged the 2009 report. He even mentioned Undersheriff Edwards' name about conducting an investigation in 2009.
- Q. Were there any other questions concerning the content, or outcome of that investigation addressed at that press conference to your recollection?
- A. I believe they asked him what the finding -finding results were and I don't -- I believe he
 responded there was no action taken or there was -there was no discipline or no action taken or

- something similar to that.
- Q. Subsequent to that, about a month or so later, the later part of May, 2015, you indicated that you were terminated from the Sheriff's Office, is that correct?
- A. That's correct.

- Q. Can you tell us how that termination took place.
- A. Captain McKelvey and I had flexed some time in the first part of May to go fishing.

I had -- in retrospect, I had just handled four national incidents from the Dallas Fort Worth shooting, to the Deputy that was engaging in sex activities, to the tornado, and now the Bob Bates' deal. So, I was pretty mentally exhausted.

Billy, too. He had been helping me. So we decided we were going to take a week off, flex some time, and go fishing.

And we left on a Sunday, which was April 3rd, and that Friday -- right before, I guess, it would have been April 1st, the Sheriff and I had a very peaceful conversation after --

- Q. I want to correct -- April 1st or May 1st?
- A. May. I'm sorry.
 - Q. Okay. Thank you. Go ahead. I'm sorry.
 - A. The Sheriff and I had a quite peaceful

conversation after our morning meeting. And do you guys know about the morning meetings? I'll share that with you in a minute.

We had a morning meeting and he and I sat around, we talked about fishing. He's an avid fisherman. We sat around and talked about fishing because we were going red fish fishing down on the coast, which is -- for fishermen it's a neat deal. So -- and it was actually for my son's 21st birthday is why we went on that trip.

So we go through the -- and we talked about it and he says you're doing a great job. Things are really going well. Thanks for everything that you're doing. I know the media has really been stressing you, something similar. It was just a peaceful conversation. So I get up and leave.

While I'm gone on vacation -- we're on the way back, driving back on Thursday. So, that would have been the 3rd, 7th, May 7th.

- Q. On a Thursday?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Yeah, it would be the 7th.
- A. Okay. May 7th.

I get a text message from the Sheriff of Wagoner County. And he texted me and said, are you

okay? Is everything going all right? Why are they replacing you as the PIO?

Well, we had discussed, prior to me leaving -and I was under very strict orders, after the Bates'
shooting, that I was not allowed to freelance
anything PIO related if it had to do with Bates or
the 2009 report, that I had to communicate with Terry
Simonson or I had to communicate with Meredith Baker
or the Undersheriff before I could release any
statements. So, he said where why are they replacing
you as the PIO?

And I said, they're not. They're adding another deputy to the PIO ranks. And I don't know how to be politically correct about it, but it was a young deputy, African American Deputy. He didn't want to be involved in the PIO position, but the Sheriff -- and the Sheriff's words to me was, we need to add a little color to the PIO role because of the issues in North Tulsa. He shared that with me before I left.

So, when the Sheriff of Wagoner County sent me a text and said, why are you being replaced? I said, I'm not being replaced. He's just adding another element to the PIO ranks to help. So, he said, I'm a little worried about you. I think something's going

on.

Unbeknownst to me, the Sheriff of Wagoner County had an additional information that I didn't know about until after my termination.

But once I got that text -- everything seemed fine. Then, my assistant, Sarah Gadd, called me on Friday, hysterically crying, very upset, emotional and, obviously, I'm very concerned about her.

She said that she had been contacted by Internal Affairs and had just left a very lengthy meeting about me. Had to do with, and was I being mean to people; was I rude; was I engaging in office practical jokes, things like that. Was I ever mean to her?

And when she said, if my Major asks where I've been what do you want me to tell him? And they said, lie to him. Do not tell him that you were over here at Internal Affairs. As I'm sure she would probably testify under oath. That they wanted her to not reveal that I was being investigated.

So, as the weekend passed, I had some speculation that something was happening. So I showed up on Monday morning to the morning meeting.

And real quick, what our morning meeting was, Monday through Friday, every single day of the week,

we were required to be at a staff meeting at 8:30 in the morning and the Sheriff was present unless he was out of town.

Then, on Wednesdays after the morning meetings, and the morning meetings had every Division Commander in the Sheriff's Office, from Records Division, to accounting, to Chaplain to all the different Division Commanders were in the meeting. And we shared with the Sheriff everything that was going on. Everything from rumors, to innuendos, to actual factual things that were happening.

And then we would just sit around and just kind of socialize for about 30 minutes. So about 9:00 o'clock it would be over.

On Wednesdays there's a staff meeting. Staff meeting is the executive leadership, which is the Sheriff, the Undersheriff, the two Chief Deputies, and the three Majors.

Then, we would sit around and talk about promotions, disciplinary actions, things that we didn't want, like, the Captains or the civilian staff to be involved in, we would say.

And then after our meeting was over, the three Majors were released and then the Sheriff, the Undersheriff, and the two chiefs would have what they

call staff. And staff is the people that run the office. They would make decisions on purchasing, schools, pay raises, things of that nature.

So, we had seven meetings a week. And so we would sit around a lot of times and share different things about each other.

So, I come and show up and at that time the meeting was at the jail and it alternated monthly. You met at the jail for a month. You met at the Faulkner Building for a month.

I went to my office at the jail and as soon as I arrived I got a call from Chief Robinette asking me to come to the Faulkner Building conference room.

And I said, well, I'll come right after staff meeting or the morning meeting. And we call it the morning meeting or captain's meeting. I said, I'll come right after the morning meeting. She told me, no. You need to come now.

So, I drop what I was doing, exited the building, and as I was exiting the jail I pass the Sheriff and Terry Simonson. Terry Simonson was very friendly. The Sheriff was not. He did acknowledge me, but it was not in his typical fashion.

So I got in my car, drove over to the Faulkner Building, walked in. They presented me with a letter

- telling me that I was under investigation for a hostile and intimidating work environment.
- Q. Who presented that letter to you?
- A. Michelle Robinette and Robbie Lillard.
- Q. All right.
- A. Gave me no other information. And, obviously, you know, I'm a 24-year career law enforcement officer with no disciplinaries, ever. Have done quite well in my profession.

So, this was pretty concerning to me. That this was all happening with no, no, umm -- what would I say, no warnings of any kind, or no predicate of what -- why this has happened.

So I asked for more detail and I was told you're not going to get that. Tape recorded meeting.

And I said, well, can you please explain how I conducted these hostile intimidating work environments? She said, you'll be interviewed sometime within the next 30 days. So here's your letter of administrative leave. You're on administrative leave with pay.

- Q. So, at that time you were, essentially, asked to leave the Sheriff's Department building and remain on leave at that point?
- A. They asked for my car keys and they kept my

patrol unit. And then they had one of the Internal Affairs corporals drive me home.

The odd thing is, that was different, is that is not typically how our office works a lot of times in those type of issues. And the other thing is they didn't ask for my commission or my gun.

So -- and those are the two things that are typically taken from you at any time you're put on admin leave they took your badge and your gun and your commission. They can ask for either of those items.

So, in my mind I didn't really quite understand what exactly was -- it wasn't a normal process. So, I was driven home by Internal Affairs.

- Q. Did the investigation, as far as you know, proceed then during the month of May?
- A. It continued, yes.
- Q. Did you ever have an opportunity to be interviewed or to speak in regard to the Internal Affairs investigation?
- 21 A. I did.

1|

- Q. Was there ever what's been referred to by some other testimony as a pre-action meeting or pre-action hearing that occurred?
- A. I didn't have one. No.

- Q. Okay. How did the process proceed for you?
- A. I went to my Internal Affairs interview --
- Q. Uh-huh.
- A. -- and I was presented with allegations, if you will, very similar to what I discussed, horseplaying in the office setting, being rude to people, or intimidating by my rank or my role in the organization, questions of that, which I had a lot of knowledge of some of the things that they were asking, but it was narrowed to a very small group of people. I mean, like, less than five people that they referred to me and I am -- my employees -- my span of control was 440 at the time.

And, so, I pretty much knew of some of the things that they'd asked me, but a lot of them were from -- anywhere from four to 18 months and even one deal they asked me was six years previous that they asked me about. So nothing was current. Nothing was relevant to the immediate time frame or my role as a Jail Administrator. It was all things that had happened while I was a Court -- while I was Division Commander over the Court Division.

So I answered the questions as honestly and as best I could. And at times they would accuse me of lying in my responses. So I asked them, I'll take a

polygraph. I said it a couple times.

I also asked for a secondary interview because they're asking me stuff from a year previous, you know, six months previous. Well, it's hard to remember when you got that many employees and you're over a span of control that big, what you do every day and who you say it to.

So I asked if I could, A, talk to anybody -any of my colleagues to refresh my memory. It was
denied. I asked if I could take a polygraph.

Denied. I asked if I could have a follow-up meeting.
They told me if it was relevant they would call me back in.

I was asked that -- if I could have an opportunity to present text messages, e-mails, or anything on my behalf to discredit the information that they were accusing me of not being truthful. And I did have those items, but I was denied access to do that.

So, approximately a -- almost a month later, the 29th of May, I was asked to be in the Sheriff's Office at 8:30 in the morning. So I showed up in the Sheriff's Office.

- Q. Let me stop you just a minute. I apologize.
- A. Okay.

- Q. You said you kept saying they denied this. They wouldn't let me do this.
- 3 A. Michelle --

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Who was it that conducted the Internal Affairs interview that we're talking about?
 - A. Michelle -- Chief Deputy Michelle Robinette and Captain Robbie Lillard.
 - Q. Okay. I'm sorry, but I just wanted to get those names.

You said then on the 29th you went to a meeting?

- A. Chief Deputy Michelle Robinette called me on the 28th and asked me to be in the Sheriff's Office at 8:30 on the 29th, which would have been a Friday.
- 15 Q. Did you attend the meeting?
- 16 A. I did.
- 17 Q. Who was present at the meeting?
- A. Sheriff Stanley Glanz, at the time Undersheriff
 Rick Wiegle and Chief Deputy Michelle Robinette.
 - Q. What was the topic of discussion at that meeting?
 - A. Michelle -- Chief Deputy Michelle Robinette read some information into the record, a taped recording, after the Sheriff had told me that this was a very different process, because I was an appointed employee. The majors -- the majors are statutorily

protected by law, but were appointed by the Sheriff. It's not a tested position. I don't go through a testing process.

But he said since I was appointed by me, he was going to handle it differently. And that he would administer the discipline not the -- help me -- I said it earlier.

- Q. Pre-action.
- A. The Pre-action Committee. Sorry.
- 10 Q. Okay. So you spoke directly to Sheriff Glanz in these matters?
- 12 A. Yes.

- 13 Q. Okay. What did he tell you?
 - A. He listened to Chief Deputy Michelle Robinette read into the record. He gave me a chance to respond to some of the allegations, which I did.

At one point in time he made a reference that -- something to the fact of, heck, you and I used to be friends. We even fished together.

And I said, something to the fact, paraphrasing, we used to be friends. So is this personal? And, then, his response was, something to the fact of, you're darn right this is personal.

Q. Did he address or say anything specifically to you about the nature of the investigation? This

DISTRICT COURT OF OKLAHOMA - OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT

hostile work environment thing, whether that was true or not true? What he thought about that?

A. He made reference that he thought that I used my position to intimidate and influence people. And, frankly, when he told me -- he didn't tell me I was terminated. He frankly said, you just can't work here any more.

And I said. Are you terminating me? And he said, yes. And I said, for what reason? And he said, because people are scared of you. And they're scared to work for you. And that was about the best I got from him.

And, then, I looked at Chief Wiegle, or
Undersheriff Wiegle -- I'm sorry -- at the time and I
looked at him and said, Rick, you can back me up?
You know this stuff that she just read is not true.
You know it. Because he had been my immediate supervisor.

And all he said was, the report's pretty damaging. And that was -- that was the only real verbiage he made in the record.

Q. Did you ever have an occasion during this conversation where Sheriff Glanz made any reference to the 2009 report and its release to the media?

A. Yes.

- Q. What did he say about that?
- A. He asked me towards the conclusion of the meeting if I had released the documents to the media. And I told him I had not.

And he made some statement that he had -- he didn't either believe it or he had some information contrary to that.

And I told him, put me on a polygraph. And his response was, well, the OSBI is going to come in and they're going to find out who released that document. And you may just have to take a polygraph and I said, I'll be more than happy to talk to the OSBI.

- Q. Okay. During the course of time that this interview or discussion occurred who's office were you seated in?
- 17 A. In my termination hearing?
- 18 Q. Yes, sir.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

- A. The Sheriff's Office. The actual Sheriff Glanz's personal office.
- Q. Were you able to see his desk in his office during that time period?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. Did you note anything of significance on his desk related to your termination?

9

10

11

12

13

15

14

17

16

18 19

21

20

22

24

25

23

A. Well, one thing that I referenced was when he continued to say that people were scared to work for me. I made a reference to, I run the largest -- I run 76 percent of the Sheriff's Office total staffing at the jail. I had the largest -- we have 600 -- they have around 600 employees. I had 440 myself under my span.

And I said, you didn't -- first of all, I alluded to the fact that Chief Deputy Michelle Robinette felt demeaned in the media because I made some significant strides with my cadre and staff at the jail to change the jail. The jail was failing. As the jail is failing now. We made some significant changes and it demeaned the Chief Deputy's character in the media.

And she made reference to that to Major Tom Huckeby. That she wanted to see me gone because she felt like I was taking away from her management style and ability. That's why the Undersheriff, at the time, Tim Albin, moved her out and moved me in.

I made reference to the fact that she wanted me gone and that she didn't interview anybody that I asked her to interview.

You know, I had dozens and dozens of sergeants and corporals and captains and she didn't interview

any of them. And I made reference that you only interviewed a few people, some of which I knew that they had issues with me from previous supervision in the past.

And he had a note laying on his desk and it only had about six or eight names on it. And he goes, heck, he said, I got a whole list of people right here that said that you are mean and intimidating.

And he said, heck, even Kyle Hess says you're mean and intimidating. And I said, Kyle Hess? He's never worked for me. And Kyle had never worked for me. He's the supervisor over investigations, which is in a completely different division. He don't work for me at all. Never has.

And I said, well, he don't even work for me.

And he said, I've heard enough. I've made my

decision and that's pretty much how the meeting ended

up.

- Q. Do you recall talking with the OSBI several days or a week ago about your testimony in this case?
- A. We talked to them a couple weeks ago.
- Q. Do you remember telling them that at that meeting you saw a prepared termination letter for your termination laying on the Sheriff's desk when you

II walked in?

10

11

12

13

14

15

- 2 A. Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, sir, yeah, he did.
- Q. Did that happen?
- 4 A. Yeah. It was already prepared.
- 5 Q. When did you first notice that was there?
- A. A little bit into the conversation. Chief Deputy
 Michelle Robinette had taken it out of her -- she was
 holding a folder with information in it. And she had
 taken it out of the folder during our dialogue and
 - And I could see when I looked up over -- I -- we just -- our prepared memos are in a certain fashion. And I could see what it was. And I knew exactly what it was. That it an was already prepared termination letter.
- 16 Q. And you were, in fact, terminated effective at that time?
- 18 A. So they tell me. Yes.

laid it on his desk.

- 19 Q. Okay. Sir, I want to go back in time a little
- 20 bit. I guess, maybe to some happier times in the
- 21 Sheriff's Office for you.
- 22 A. Okay.
- Q. First of all, do you have a brother that lives in
- the Norman area?
- 25 A. I do.

- Q. And what's his business or occupation?
- A. He owns a home appraisal business.
- Q. In real estate, things of that nature?
- A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. Do you recall a time in or around about 2010, perhaps 2011, when your brother and you had a conversation about possibly him coming to Tulsa for some reason or purpose?
- A. Yes, we did.
- 10 Q. Tell us about that.
 - A. I don't -- the Sheriff employs several appraisers, about 12 appraisers, home appraisers. And it's a coveted position. Many, many people want those positions. They're very lucrative, but you have to have no experience at all.

So everyone in this room is qualified to be a Sheriff's appraiser regardless of your knowledge and ability. But they do make a lot of money and they make a lot of big monetary decisions based on real estate.

My brother does that professionally and I don't know much about it. I can't even tell you the name of his company, actually.

But my brother had called and -- we were in a conversation, a typical family, you know, brother

conversation and I mentioned that we had an appraiser retire. I don't remember the appraiser's name at the time, but one of our appraisers had some health issues or something and left the office. So there

was a spot open.

And my brother said, goodness. I would love to have that position. They are so coveted. I've tried to become an appraiser in, I think Cleveland County, it's Norman. He's tried become an appraiser there, but the Sheriff wouldn't appoint him.

And so he said, if I could come to Tulsa, and I said, well, you have to live in Tulsa. And he said, that's fine. He said, I'll leave someone to run my Norman business and I'll move back home, which we were born and raised in Broken Arrow. And this is our home. So he said, I'll move back home if I can get that position. They're that lucrative.

- Q. Did he ask you to make contact with the Sheriff about it then?
- A. Yes. He asked me how we could do it and I told him I would volunteer a conversation with the Sheriff.
- Q. Had you previously, or around that time, had a conversation with Sheriff Glanz about appraisers? You indicated a moment ago in your testimony they

- didn't require any qualifications. Had Sheriff Glanz ever made any statement in your presence about the types of people or persons he would appoint as appraisers?
- A. Not before that. After that.
- 6 Q. After that?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. When you went to him -- or did you go to him in 2010 or '11 to seek a position for your brother?
- 11 A. I did.
- 12 Q. Tell us about that conversation.
 - A. A very brief conversation. I, basically, went up to the Sheriff and said, in lieu of this appraiser's spot opening up -- and at the time I was a sergeant assigned to Sheriff Glanz. I was the only Sheriff's Deputy that we can remember in the office that ever answered directly to the Sheriff, but it was because of my PIO responsibilities.

I didn't really have -- I continued to carry other responsibilities, U.S. Marshal detail, Immigration, Homeland Security Task Force, I had those employees, but I answered directly to the Sheriff.

And I went to him, as we would have many

conversations throughout every day, and I said to him, with that spot opened up my brother owns a home appraisal business in Norman, as he may have known or didn't know from previous conversations. And I asked him if he would be interested in appointing my brother to that position.

1|

And he said, well, you understand I keep those positions for my contributors. And I said, I totally understand that. Making reference to those people that contribute to his campaign.

Being in this business a long time I already kind of knew that and so'd my brother. He knows that it's a contributing position.

So, he said, well, I keep those for those coveted positions, but I've already appointed my friend Rueben Davis to that position. So, it's not open.

Well, Rueben not only was an attorney for the Sheriff, he's a reserve for the Sheriff. He's a home appraiser for the Sheriff. He's the Sheriff's close friend and ally. I mean, Rueben was a lot of things. So, I was concerned how Rueben became one of the appraisers, but he did.

So, I asked the Sheriff if he would consider my brother for another position if it become

available.

- Q. Another appraiser position?
- A. Yes.

Q. Okay.

A. If we had more people retire. And he told me he would. He said, I'll consider him, but you know he's got to live in Tulsa County. And I said, that's not a problem. He's willing to move.

And he said, well, it's also going to cost him five grand. And I said, okay, knowing -- full well knowing that what he meant by contributors is you got to contribute to my campaign. I knew that, but when he gave the figure, the figure alarmed me a little bit, because that's not a normal figure that you contribute to a Sheriff's campaign. Those campaigns are usually a thousand dollars. I think 2500 might be the max in some cases. So, anyway that was the end of our conversation.

And I called my brother. Told my brother I'd had a conversation with the Sheriff. Expressed what the Sheriff had said and, basically, my brother at that point completely declined any role or for me to continue to seek that position for him at that point. He said he wasn't going to do that.

Q. Another situation I want to discuss with you and

have some questions about. Were you familiar with a change in the phone services provided to the Tulsa County Jail back in 2014?

A. Yes.

1]

Q. And if you could briefly explain for the benefit of all of us here in the room, the jail has phones that are available for use by inmates, is that correct?

A. Correct.

Q. But it's kind of a pay system?

A. Yes. There's two ways to make calls. You can either -- after your initial book-in process, once you go back to the housing units, you can make a call, either a collect call, that is an initial fee to hook -- to hook the call up, or you can buy a calling card from the Sheriff's Office through the commissary and you can use that calling card just like you and I would use it on a normal telephone.

Q. And am I correct in my understanding that private

vendors provide the actual equipment, the technology, things of that nature, to affect these phone calls. And in return for that they give the county certain amounts of money, percentages, things of that nature, off of what revenue is generated by those phones?

A. That's correct.

- Q. Okay. And in 2014, sir, was there a discussion and an effort made to determine whether or not a new provider needed to be put in place there in the phone system?
- A. Yes.

- Q. Can you explain, briefly, how that process occurred within the government.
 - A. Yes. And I kind of come in a little bit later into the process because I was -- I was the Division Commander over the courthouse, but I was still considered part of the executive leadership in the organization.

And, basically, what happens is if we can document errors, or wrongdoing, or the providers are not efficient for -- either they don't keep the phones repaired, or replaced. Or we want a higher commission based percentage of the contract or something of that nature, then we can send it out to our RFP.

And an RFP --

- Q. Yeah. What's RFP stand for?
- A. That is a request for proposal is what that means. And somebody within the county government will do an RFP, basically, it says -- it's a big binder. And it, basically, says, here's everything

that we want you to meet. You got to be able to supply this technology. You got to have technicians on site. You got to be able to repair phones. You've got to do all these things.

And then the RFP goes out for bid. And then all the companies that want to bid will send in a bigger packet of how they can meet all these expectations and why they're the best company around and all the things that they can do. And why they should be the provider.

- Q. Okay. Was that done in 2014 or around that time --
- A. Around that time. Yes.
- Q. -- regarding the phone services?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And is a part of that process, the bid process, or RFP process, am I correct in my understanding that as it relates, at least to the jail and things that are bid on regarding the jail, that at some point in the process, during that bidding process, that a subcommittee is formed to actually evaluate those bids and then make a recommendation to the Jail Trust Board?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. In regard to that particular committee or

- subcommittee on this proposal for a new phone 2 service, were you involved on that subcommittee? 3 Were you a member of it?
 - Kind of. It was a training RFP for me. participated in the scoring sheet on how to score an RFP based on a process that was implemented by Chief Deputy Michelle Robinette, but I didn't go any farther than the scoring process.
- Q. Who else was involved and actually on that 10 subcommittee?
- 11 A. From my understanding it was the executive leadership. It was the Undersheriff, the two Chiefs, 12 the three Majors. 13
- 14 Q. Okay. Give us some names.
- 15 Α. I'm sorry.

}

4

5

6

7

8

9

- I get confused. People change ranks a lot. 16 Q.
- 17 Okay. Undersheriff Tim Albin, Chief Deputy Α.
- Michelle Robinette. 18
- 19 Q. Okay.
- A. At the time it was Chief Deputy Rick Wiegle. 20 Huckeby, which was a Major. Myself and Major John 21
- 22 Bowman.
- And I -- I believe, my memory serves me 23 correctly, one of your legal advisors, I think 24
- 25 Meredith Baker, the staff attorney, had to look at

= }

- it. And if there was any others given out I don't know who that would be.
- Q. What, in a general sense -- you made some reference to some sort of scoring sheet?
- A. Yes.
- Q. What are you talking about there?
- A. Well, it was my first one to participate in. So it was kind of like a break-in thing for me and I had just taken over operations at the jail and that's why they were kind of training me on the RFP.

And, basically, what Chief Deputy Michelle Robinette told me was this was a Tulsa County made form and it just had technology, availability, percentage of income generation, you know, all those -- it had different kinds of scoring levels.

You're supposed to read the RFP and then you're supposed to compare it to all the other RFP's and then you give it a grade.

Like if -- if I offered more technology than you offered, then I got a better score. If I offered a higher percentage than you offered, I got a better score.

And then you kind of scored them, and the scoring was very unscientific. It was just kind of a grading scale. And it was -- it was like grading an

 oral presentation. You just -- if you like it you put a number on it. If you didn't like it you put a number on it.

And you filled out the sheets and, then, I had to e-mail them to Chief Deputy Michelle Robinette when I was complete with them.

- Q. Okay. Prior, or during that process, did Sheriff Glanz himself inject any opinions or directions to the subcommittee to your knowledge?
- A. Well, the subcommittee never met as a group, but we are -- everybody on that group was of the executive leadership.

I can tell you personally, and I wasn't involved at the beginning, but I can personally tell you we already knew who was going to get the phone contract months before it ever come, months before it was started.

- Q. How did you know that?
- A. Because -- okay. The company that is at the jail now is a subsidiary of a huge business that runs jails and prisons and -- LaSalle Corrections. It's a big, big, company and they own, like, 28 subsidiaries.

LaSalle never participated in phone contracts until Rick Ferguson joined the company. Rick

2 3 4

Ferguson is -- was our leading representative with Global Telelinks, which was the phone provider that we changed out when we brought in Correct Solutions, which is the provider they have now.

Rick Ferguson left Global Telelinks and eventually went to LaSalle Corrections. And, then, he used his resources and abilities to start a phone company called Correct Solutions for LaSalle Corrections.

And Rick Ferguson and the Sheriff are very close friends. I'm friends with Rick. And there's another guy, Skip Smith, that is another representative and I'm friends with Rick -- or Skip and Rick both, but they -- they have all stayed in contact.

Now, Skip left GTL and he went over to Tiger Commissary, which is out of Jenks. It's a commissary company for jails and prisons.

And, then, eventually he was recruited by LaSalle Corrections to come join the team, which him and Rick were at, like, Southwestern Bell or something years ago together. And they just kind of follow each other in their professions. And they're older, more established gentlemen.

But I knew because of the relationship that

- Sheriff Glanz had with Rick Ferguson that we were getting Correct Solutions before it ever started.
- Q. Well, you say you knew that because of those connections. My question goes to, was anything ever said in your presence, or told to you from Sheriff Glanz that that was going to be how it went?
- A. We talked about it frequently in our morning meetings.
- Q. You and the Sheriff?

- A. All of us. When I say "all of us", the executive staff.
- Q. And what was said at those meetings?
 - A. Some time ago, but to paraphrase, we would just discuss, one, the relationship with Rick Ferguson.

Two, what I remember more specifically than anything else is they were going to offer a new type of technology that had never been introduced into jails and prisons and it was going to be a leading -- it was going to be the pilot program for what they believed was going to be a global market in technology to jails and prisons. And we would talk about this technology frequently. When I say "we", again, that executive leadership I talked about.

- Q. And Sheriff Glanz?
- A. Absolutely. Sheriff Glanz would kind of lead off

- on those conversations. We talked about them frequently.
 - Q. Did he indicate in your presence that verbally he was in favor of this company getting the contract?
 - A. Oh, very much so.
 - Q. Okay. When the contracts were let, or the request for proposal by RFPs were let, did you receive more than one of those back from somebody bidding for this service?
- 10 A. Six, I think, six is what I had to estimate.
- 11 Q. Was Correct Solutions one of the ones?
- 12 A. Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

- 13 Q. So it was evaluated along with the others?
- 14 A. Yes.
- Q. And if I understand correctly, and you correct me
 if I'm wrong, the purpose of the subcommittee is to
 review those and determine which is the lowest and
- 18 best bid, correct?
- 19 A. We never really were told to look at lowest bid.
- 20 We were supposed to score it based on a lot of
- 21 different perimeters, technology, percentage, because
- there's really -- there really was no out cost. It
- was more of what we got back. So it would have been
- 24 more the highest bidder than the lowest bidder,
- because we wanted who was going to give us the

highest percentage back.

- Q. The highest bid in terms of your percentage?
- A. That was the only money component. The rest of it was technology, technicians, after hours, you know, what if the phones went down, you know, how could we communicate?

Because when the phones go down -- in a jail setting when you've got 1700 inmates, when the phones go down you're on the cliff of a potential riot, because that is -- that is one thing that they hold -- that's their only communication to the outside word. And you really got to get them back up fast. So it is of a concern.

And that's one of the things that I really focused on was technician availability, did we have an onsite technician; how quick could we get the phones up; who could we call in lieu of the phones going down, those kind of things.

- Q. The scoring sheets or documents that you're talking about, are they maintained or kept anywhere for somebody to go back and look at? Say, to see what the scoring was?
- A. You know, I'm not sure, because I was told that was an internal document that they used. And, again, I had to -- mine are on my e-mail server with the

- 1 county, because I e-mailed mine to Chief Deputy 2 Michelle Robinette.
- Q. Okay. Did you see anyone else's?
 - A. No.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q. But you're aware that Correct Solutions got the contract?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Were they the selection that you would have made based on the scoring you provided?
 - A. Scoring was only one component of the whole process. There was also an oral presentation, a demonstration that was conducted that I wasn't part of. That, that happened with part of the team, but I don't know who all was there.

I was -- actually, Billy McKelvey and I were at a conference in Fort Worth at the time of the selection.

But the day they met we got a -- I say "we" -- I, umm, and Billy McKelvey had received a phone call later that afternoon of who the selection was because we knew the process was taking place that day.

- Q. And it was Correct Solutions?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. You said you've been in the jail at different times during the course of your duties with the

- Sheriff's Office. Were you ever familiar during that time period with issues concerning sanitary conditions and infections, things of that nature, that occurred within the jail?
 - A. You know, I was the Administrative Sergeant under Chief Deputy, at the time, Tim Albin and Chief Deputy Michelle Robinette at a different time period. So, that was part of my job duties or responsibilities was if we had an issue I was supposed to research it, look into it, or try to find corrective measures.
- 11 Q. Was staph infection a problem at the jail?
- 12 A. Not to my knowledge, it really wasn't.
- Q. Are you familiar with a product called Staph
- 14 Attack?

6

7

8

9

10

- 15 A. Very much so.
- 16 Q. How are you familiar with that product?
- A. It's a chemical that's used at the jail. It's
- been used there for many years.
- 19 Q. Is that a product that's provided by a vendor --
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. -- to the jail?
- 22 A. It is.
- 23 Q. How long do you think the jail has been using
- 24 Staph Attack?
- A. My memory serves me correctly, since -- since

'05. We took over July 1st of 2005.

As far as I know Staph Attack was either the product of choice at the time or it was brought in just shortly thereafter.

- Q. Tell us what Staph Attack generally is; how do you use it; how do you apply it?
- A. Basically, it's a glorified solution like bleach and water. It's a chemical that's used to kill certain bacteria.

And at times Staph Attack was considered one of the leading industry products for killing all kinds of different bacterias.

There's a lot of different chemicals on the market. Bleach solution and water does the same thing. It's just you got to make sure it's applied correctly and in certain amounts and those kind of things.

It's just easier -- you know, one, bleach is not a chemical that's used in a jail. And this is -- also has an effect that it could be used in a dilution rate where inmates can consume it and it won't kill them and those kind of things.

But, basically, you spray it on the bedding.

You spray it on anything that inmates have access to.

It would be like you use Lysol or a bleach solution

at home.

- Q. Okay. Was that something that was done on a pretty regular basis for those 10 years that you're aware of since 2001?
- A. Yes. We used to order it -- well, I say "we". They ordered it in 50-gallon drums. I mean, it would come in, in big shipments.

And then it would be pumped out into smaller bottles that would be stationed in different parts of the jail. I guess you guys got to see the jail. So you might have some recollection of where those little storage cabinets were where they would store those chemicals.

- Q. In regard to that, sir, did you ever become aware of information concerning any financial interests that any member of the Sheriff's Office may have had in regard to Staph Attack, or the company that distributed it and provided Staph Attack to Tulsa County Jail?
- A. Not while I was an employee. No.
- 21 Q. Have you since become aware of that?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. Tell us what you found out.
- A. Well, I -- there's a lot of -- it is suspect to many that my termination was -- was inappropriate

and, umm, for personal reasons and so people have shared certain things with me since my termination.

I did get a call from the Undersheriff, Tim Albin, that I've talked to a couple times since my termination. And he had shared with me that he thought because OSBI, FBI, and people are involved in this investigation now, he thought that it was maybe attributed to the Sheriff and his financial interests in some of the personal vendors that we had used throughout the Sheriff's Office. And Staph Attack was one of the ones.

But he -- he referred to it Pure. Pure is, I guess, the manufacturer of Staph Attack. He said that he had stocks in Pure that he knew about.

- Q. That who had stocks in Pure?
- 16 A. Sheriff Glanz. I have no personal knowledge of that. I just have ...
- 18 Q. And he reported that to you?
- 19 A. He did.

- 20 Q. Did anyone else report that information to you?
 - A. No. I have not heard that.
 - Q. Okay. So, Mr. Albin would be the person that we need to talk to in regard to that, is that correct?
 - A. Yeah. He's the one that shared that with me.
 - Q. Okay. Are you familiar at all, during the course

of time you worked for the Sheriff's Office, with his use of Sheriff's vehicles for his duties and things of that nature?

A. Yes, sir.

- Q. Were you familiar with or aware of whether or not he had a vehicle that was accessible or usable by him at any time he chose?
- A. Yes.
- Q. What type of vehicle was that?
- A. It's changed through the years. At one time he had a mini-van. He had a Ford, or he had a -- he's had a -- a Chevy Tahoe. I think he's had two Chevy Tahoes that I'm familiar with just in the recent years.

The last one that he recently got, I was -- I had made a mistake publicly, and not many people know that -- that there's only one way a Sheriff can really drive a county car, but I had that knowledge from research from years ago.

And I had made a comment in the media, unbenounced (sp) to me at the time, and I was called in the Sheriff's Office and criticized for my statement because I referred to his Tahoe at the time. And I was -- I was criticized for using the term "his Tahoe".

Q. By whom?

- A. By Sheriff Glanz himself.
- Q. And what was the nature of his criticism?
- A. The nature is, in Oklahoma Sheriffs are allowed to receive a stipend for the use, for the nonuse of a Sheriff's vehicle. And they get, and I think the stipend now is, like, \$950 a month. They get a stipend in lieu of driving a county car.

If they don't accept a stipend, then they can drive a county car, but if they take the money there's -- there's only certain exceptions where they can even drive a county car or be in a county car.

A lot of Sheriffs elect not to do it because of the -- the -- I guess the rules are so strict that them happening to use a county car is probably more greater than not and they don't want to get caught up in that.

And from what I understand -- he did not share with me, the Sheriff did not, but Undersheriff Albin said at the same meeting, and Undersheriff Albin and the Sheriff were together when I was criticized for using the statement, and I was talking about Terry Simonson's Tahoe and then said he got the Sheriff's old Tahoe was my statement.

The reason I was criticized, the Undersheriff

- said he takes the stipend. No one is supposed to know that belongs to him. That's why it's unregistered in fleet. And that won't be registered in fleet. It will show as a pool car or it will show as assigned to the Court Operations Division, but you'll not find it in fleet record where it's assigned to him.
- Q. And that statement was made by Undersheriff Albin?
- A. That he took the stipend and the Sheriff was present and told me not to ever refer to that Tahoe as his Tahoe again.
- Q. And that all occurred in the Sheriff's presence?
- 14 A. Oh, absolutely.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

- 15 Q. And he didn't deny or correct any of that?
- 16 A. He told me never to use the term "his Tahoe".
- Q. Other than the issue about the stipend that we just discussed, Mr. Clark, were you aware at any time while you were employed at the Sheriff's Office of any other concern about use of a county vehicle or equipment or things of that nature in regards to a
- 22 Pike Pass?
- 23 A. I am.

25

- Q. Tell us about that.
 - A. When I was his personal assistant I would

2 3 4

frequently go and get the tag for his vehicles, or Pike Pass, or whatever equipment was being rotated out. And it was kept over at Fleet Management, which is over at the Faulkner Building. And, obviously, at the time Sheriff Glanz and I both officed here in the courthouse.

And I went over to pick up his Pike Pass one day. He had asked me -- Jerry Quinton at the time was the fleet manager. Asked me to come over and pick up the Pike Pass.

So I went over to get the Pike Pass. And when I went in he handed me two of the old plastic Pike Pass. He handed me two of those. And I said, I've already got mine. I just need to get Stanley's. And he said, he's called and asked for two. Don't ask any questions. I knew what that --

- Q. Who said this?
- A. Jerry Quinton.
- Q. Jerry Quinton said this?
- A. Yeah. He handed me two and said, the Sheriff asked for two. Don't ask any questions. Okay. So I didn't.

I took the Pike Pass back. I walked in and laid the Pike Pass on his desk, two of them. He was sitting at his desk.

- Q. He being the Sheriff?
- A. The Sheriff Glanz.
- Q. Yes, sir.

A. Then, we called for -- or he called -- asked his secretary to get the deputy working in the security office and -- I'm sorry, I can't remember his name.

But the deputy come over to the office, Sheriff Glanz gave him the key and the Pike Pass and asked him to go put the Pike Pass in his Tahoe.

And then he took the second Pike Pass, and he carries a brief case satchel looking thing. He took the second Pike Pass and he dropped it in his briefcase and that's the briefcase that he takes back and forth every night home.

At some point -- I was with the Sheriff several months after that, but Pike Passes have changed for personal vehicles. You get the sticky ones that go in your window. The Sheriff's personal vehicle still has one of the old, umm, box looking Pike Passes in his personal truck that he keeps at home.

I have no personal knowledge that's the same Pike Pass, but I know it's not the same type of Pike Pass that they -- the state issues me for my personal vehicle.

- Q. You said in your testimony that he told the security guy to put it in his Tahoe.
- A. Yes.

- Q. What vehicle was he referring to?
- A. At the time -- the last two vehicles he's had are both Chevy Tahoe's. The last one -- and I think it would have been the one before this one that Terry Simonson is driving. It would have been that Tahoe. The one he has now I'm not sure -- because he had just got that Tahoe not long before my separation.

And that Tahoe was specifically ordered for him. It had all the GPS system. It was -- Rick Weigel even made a comment that I made sure that he got all the whistles and bells this time, because -- referring that the other Tahoe didn't meet his expectations.

- Q. So the Tahoe you're referring to is not a personally owned vehicle of the Sheriff's. It was one he used as a county vehicle?
- A. He used it -- yes, every day. I participated in trips with him. He would take it to conferences and trips. He drove it every day.

His wife works for the County Assessor and so they carpool together to work. And the Sheriff gets here at 8:00 o'clock. He gets in his Tahoe and then

1 /

he drives it all day long. And then he parks it at night and then rides back home with her. And then a lot of times he'll take it out-of-state, county trips, conferences, things of that nature.

- Q. And where -- when you say he comes in to work and goes back home. Where is home?
- A. The home that I would have to take him to frequently, because that was part of his assistant's job, was some days he would want to go home around 3:00 o'clock and his wife don't get off till 5:00. So we would give -- I say "we", me and my colleagues, whoever was available at the time, would give him a ride home.

And that home is behind the Harley Davidson dealership between 31st and 41st and Memorial. It's back in that addition behind the Harley Davidson dealership.

- Q. Okay. Just one moment, sir.
- A. Can I make one more comment about the Tahoe?
- Q. Sure.
- A. If you guys have the opportunity, the Tahoe that Terry Simonson is driving now, if you'll look at it it's a white Tahoe, but it has pin-stripping down the side.

And that was personally -- the Sheriff had

that done, specifically, so it wouldn't look like a cop car. That's his goal is he didn't want people to see -- he didn't want anything he drove to make -- have an appearance of a police package or police vehicle.

That's why those Tahoes that are assigned to him are completely different than the other issued Tahoes that are driven within the office.

- Q. So you're saying that the normal Tahoe vehicle that would be purchased by the county has what they call a police package on it?
- A. Yes, sir.

- Q. What's a police package?
- A. Typically comes from the manufacturer with the spotlights on it. It usually comes with an enhanced suspension, maybe an enhanced exhaust to make it run a little better, a little more fuel efficient. Those kind of things.

And usually they're listed -- it will say, like, police interceptor, police package. Somewhere on the vehicle it will have that notation, but it's on a bid. It's typically on a state bid.

It's the same ones that the Highway Patrol buys or Broken Arrow buys, or we all kind of buy -- law enforcement in general all kind of buys the same

vehicles. They're on a bid.

)

- Q. But the vehicles you're discussing that Sheriff Glanz would have purchased through the county were not vehicles that were the police package type vehicles?
- A. That's correct. If you all see, like, the undercover cars running around, they may be a Tahoe.

Like, I drove the new -- I had two of the new Ford Explorers before I left. They're the smaller more compact SUV. They'll have spotlights. They have -- again, they have some different things.

But, yeah, the ones he drove they had the GPS. They had all carpet, surround-sound. I mean, they had, you know, all the things that -- cop cars aren't the most comfortable things to drive. A lot of times they have vinyl floors, you know, for people that urinate or throw-up or whatever they do in the car. So, you don't get the best of the best. But he would drive the more civilian-style packages.

- Q. Sir, I believe that's all the questions that I have of you right now. The Grand Jurors may well have some questions to ask you.
- A. Okay.
- Q. I just ask you to be as open with them as you were with me.

)

A. Absolutely. Thank you, sir.

GRAND JUROR 1: Juror 1.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

GRAND JUROR 1: Was the Tahoe he drove, was it originally outfitted for police use or it was straight-up commercial or civilian, I should say.

THE WITNESS: Straight-up civilian. The Sheriff gets -- he tells them what he wants and it's ordered and then brought specifically to him.

GRAND JUROR 1: Okay. So, basically, if I went to a dealership I can get the exact same car if I wanted to?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

GRAND JUROR 1: Okay.

GRAND JUROR 16: Juror 16.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

GRAND JUROR 16: Fleet process for signing out vehicles, is there such a sign-out sheet that we could reflect on?

THE WITNESS: Yes. It goes through the Quartermaster's Office. Like, when I would go and change out my vehicles there's a duplicate form and you put your name, your employee number, your badge number. And then it lists, like, your Pike Pass, your radios. Anything that is -- that is temporary

for the vehicle.

And then it also lists fire extinguishers, the unit number. And then you turn in and you sign that you're turning something in to the Quartermaster. And once you get your new vehicle then they do the same thing. They reassign everything back to you because things are assigned to the vehicles.

GRAND JUROR 16: If I go to the motor pool where I work and sign out a vehicle I have to take, umm, mileage. Is that something they do as well?

THE WITNESS: They haven't kept -- oh, yes, on your check out -- on your inventory sheet? Yes.

GRAND JUROR 16: Check in and out your mileage.

THE WITNESS: Yes. They do. It's also -it's supposed to be done by policy on a monthly
inspection sheet. You're supposed to turn in your
mileage to fleet management, so they know when the
cars reach a certain level to be exchanged, because
the office has over 200 cars, so that's the only way
they know how to replace them.

GRAND JUROR 16: Would the Sheriff check this vehicle out himself or would he send a deputy to

check out his vehicle?

THE WITNESS: You won't see the Sheriff's name on any paperwork. It's assigned -- it's either assigned under fleet to the courthouse as a pool car, or it's assigned somewhere else. You'll never see it listed to Sheriff Glanz. It's not assigned to him by name. It's a practice.

GRAND JUROR 16: Would there be video cameras in that area of fleet to record who comes in and out?

THE WITNESS: You mean, like, daily?

GRAND JUROR 16: Yes.

THE WITNESS: Or -- I think the back dock -- it's at the Faulkner Building on the back dock and I think there's cameras there on who goes in and out.

But, again, the Sheriff never goes to fleet. He would send me to get his Pike Passes. Umm, the security office, you know, the deputies that work in the security office downstairs, they fuel it and wash it for him. That's part of their job duties is to fuel it and wash it and bring it back and park it.

GRAND JUROR 16: What I was trying to find out if there is a way for us to track the Sheriffs picking up his vehicle and leaving with the vehicle. Is there anything you would know of?

THE WITNESS: Well, two things, you can watch

him get in it every day at 8:15 to go to the staff meeting. He parks it right down -- I mean, it's parked right down here.

GRAND JUROR 16: Does he turn in the keys?

THE WITNESS: They're in his desk drawer.

GRAND JUROR: So, they stay with him?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

GRAND JUROR 16: Okay. So, he doesn't physically have to check it in and out daily?

THE WITNESS: No. No. No. No, all cars are -- like mine, mine was permanently assigned to me during my duration of time. And then if I swap cars or got a new one I checked it back in. But, yeah, I didn't check in every day. You know, it was on a radio log. It was kept at dispatch.

See, his cars didn't even have radios in them. He didn't have antennas, radios. He had nothing, no spotlights, no anything cop related in his car. And, so, no, he wouldn't check it out.

But, like, if I needed to go pick someone up at the airport, like, if we had a dignitary coming in on maybe auditors coming in, and I'd go pick them up at the airport, I'd use his Tahoe, because mine was outfitted with shotgun racks and lights and, you know, mine was outfitted with all the normal stuff

I would go pick them up. It's easier to load baggage. And then, you know, I'd park it back and put his key back in his desk drawer.

So, if he -- I mean, video surveillance of the parking lot is 24 hours, seven days a week. And, I mean, you can stand across the street about 8:20, 8:15 he'll go get in it and drive off.

Q. (BY MR. BARRIS) As a follow-up to what he's asking about.

You say you would go to get his car on a daily basis from fleet or who would?

- A. No. It stays right here at the courthouse.
- Q. Okay.

A. And the key stays in his desk.

So when his wife gets to work they have a parking spot down in the basement and then he just walks up to his office and then he gets his key and gets in his Tahoe and then he goes and does whatever for the day.

- Q. So, the fleet records, as I understand, are going to show that vehicle by VIN number as being a courthouse vehicle or a pool vehicle?
- A. Correct.
- Q. And that's all it's going to show?

A. That's correct.

- Q. Okay. So, other than people's personal knowledge of seeing him drive that car or being aware of that, there's not really going to be a record we can find that would attach him, by him signing anything or anything of that nature, showing him driving that vehicle?
- A. The only thing that would show him that -- and I'm not sure -- each one of the vehicles have a fleet gas card assigned to it. We have a QuikTrip card and a fleet gas card that's through some national company.

When he's on trips driving that car to and from -- now, when he's in town he uses -- he has the deputy take it down to the county garage and get fuel, but when he's on the road, when you enter your fuel card you got to put your last four of your Social Security.

So fuel records would indicate him traveling out-of-state with that vehicle or out of town with that vehicle if he stopped to get fuel.

- Q. Okay. And he would have to place his last four numbers of his Social Security?
- A. Unless he was given a fictitious number to put in he would have to use his last four.

Q. I'm sorry. I apologize.

GRAND JUROR 16: You actually asked the question I was going to ask. That's our procedure, too --

THE WITNESS: Okay.

GRAND JUROR 16: -- when I check out a motor pool vehicle.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

GRAND JUROR 9: Juror No. 9. On the vehicle itself, I believe I heard you state that if the Sheriff would get off early you would take him home.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

GRAND JUROR 9. Okay. So you would be using your vehicle to take him home, or potentially his vehicle to take him home in, or his assigned vehicle -- the courthouse assigned vehicle to take him home in?

THE WITNESS: Either his assigned vehicle or my Sheriff's issued car.

GRAND JUROR 9: Okay. So that kind of tells me that he didn't necessarily use that as a vehicle to go to and from home?

THE WITNESS: Not generally. Very rarely would be ever take it home.

Either -- the only time that he took it home,

)

that I was familiar with, is if he was going to leave early in the morning for a trip, he liked to get on the road at 5:00, 6:00 in the morning. He may take it home that night so he can leave straight from his house. But other than that he rarely would take it home and park it in his driveway.

GRAND JUROR 9: Now, these trips that you talk about, are they personal trips or would they be Sheriff Department related trips?

THE WITNESS: Both.

GRAND JUROR 9: So he did use the car on personal trips?

THE WITNESS: I can only attest to one that I'm certain of that I know. I was inadvertently involved in it.

We were at a conference in Houston, Texas, for Immigration 287G and I flew to Houston. And then I got -- and he drove to Houston. And there were two major reasons he drove to Houston.

First reason is his brother lives in Galveston. And he -- and the Sheriff, Glanz, grew up in Galveston.

Well, one night he told me to meet him downstairs for dinner and I got in the Tahoe and he said, we're going to Galveston to eat dinner with my

brother. Well, it's almost an hour drive from Houston to Galveston.

. 2

Now, it's not uncommon that when deputies and stuff are on trips that they would use the rent-a-car and, you know, go to a restaurant or go see a beach or something while they are there, but it would be documented.

He drove to Galveston. I rode with him. I didn't know where his brother lived at the time until we got there.

And then on the way back he stopped at Wal-mart and purchased about 20 bottles of wine that he said is only in South Texas that you can get and that was one of the reasons he told me he drove the vehicle is so he could get that wine because he couldn't bring it on the airplane.

The rest of them are all company -- that I know of, Oklahoma Sheriff's Association, he would go to the National Sheriff's Association, the American Corrections Association, the Large Jail Network, sometimes he would drive, sometimes he would fly.

You know, I was with him in Houston. He drove. I was with him in Fort Worth. He drove. He drove to Nashville for a conference one time in the car.

You know, I never -- and that was the only time I had ever been with him on a distance trip was in the Houston deal. And, again, that was the only reason was he wanted to go see his brother at Galveston.

GRAND JUROR 8: Juror No. 8. Your internal investigation was not -- one of your allegations on that had nothing to do with the release of that e-mail, right?

THE WITNESS: Yes, correct.

GRAND JUROR 8: It seems to me that that investigation was very coincidental to the release of that. Is that your opinion? Do you feel like those are related or purely coincidental?

I'll just be blunt, do you think that he was using this IA because he thinks that you released that information.

THE WITNESS: Absolutely, I do.

GRAND JUROR 8: Do you think that happened to anybody else?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. And I actually have some personal knowledge to kind of elaborate on that.

GRAND JUROR 8: Sure.

THE WITNESS: My attorney and I were doing a sworn disposition on a federal lawsuit that my

testimony may be involved in.

1|

And they showed us a video of Sheriff Glanz giving sworn testimony in that federal deposition that my lawyers have access to, that he was specifically asked, did you fire -- who -- did you release one of your majors? He said me by name, and he asked, why did you fire him? And he said, because he was going to run for Sheriff and I felt like he was undermining my organization.

And then he made a reference to Billy McKelvey. And said that he -- the reason he demoted Billy McKelvey was because he thought Billy was helping me, which had nothing to do with anything that was involved in my investigation.

GRAND JUROR 15: Juror No. 15. When you talked to Undersheriff Albin about, like, he gave you some information after the fact, had he also already resigned at that point?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

GRAND JUROR 15: Why did he resign? Do you know why?

THE WITNESS: The Monday -- or I'm sorry, umm, I'm not sure what day it was. There was tremendous fallout after the press conference.

And sometime -- and it may have been the next

Monday or the following Monday. The Sheriff -- from the way I understand it, and the reason I got involved, the Sheriff called the Undersheriff and asked him to come to his office that morning and he -- the way I understand -- the Sheriff told the Undersheriff he was going to resign. The Sheriff said he was going to resign.

The Undersheriff, apparently from the Undersheriff's statement, said it wasn't a good idea or why are you doing that? And he said, well, either I'm stepping down or you're stepping down.

So he said -- and the Undersheriff always would -- Undersheriff Tim Albin would always tell us, the executive staff, all the time, if I'm not the man to lead you through this, just tell me and I'll go home. He would always say that. If there's something that I've done that has affected this office, tell me, I'll quit. And that day he told the Sheriff, you don't want me to lead you through, I'll go home.

So, he admitted that he was going to resign, which I got a call immediately from his secretary and I was driving into work and she called very emotional and said, the Undersheriff is going to quit.

Well, at the same time he was telling Major

Huckeby to resign.

GRAND JUROR 15: The Sheriff was?

THE WITNESS: Yes. He wanted Major Huckeby to resign and Major Huckeby told him he would not and he'd have to fire him.

GRAND JUROR 15: And he resigned, though.

THE WITNESS: But there was a whole lot of stuff, you know, the media said he resigned. He didn't resign. He was on administrate leave. He took vacation. He really was on vacation.

He went into -- the Sheriff asked him to resign, and I'm sure Major Huckeby will share all this with you from his perspective.

But the way I understand it -- and the Sheriff told me this, that he talked Tom -- Sheriff Glanz told me, personally, he talked Tom Huckeby out of quitting, to think about it.

Tom Huckeby says it's the opposite. But, nevertheless, Sheriff Glanz said that he had asked -- that Tom come in and asked to resign and that the Sheriff said, don't do that. Take a month off and think about it.

Then, that's when you saw all the paper saying he was on admin leave. He was on vacation. He really was on vacation.

4 5

Now, in the course of that 30 days, somewhere in there, he was asked to go ahead and leave the office.

GRAND JUROR 15: So he wasn't technically, like, fired, though?

THE WITNESS: No.

GRAND JUROR 15: He just was asked to resign and he chose to.

THE WITNESS: You know, and if I may take the liberty, you know, what really concerns me is Tim Albin and Tom Huckeby were very involved in the media about the 2009 report.

There was another 2008 report that's about 60 pages long that was done by Michelle Robinette, also. Michelle Robinette did my investigation. There's a -- Michelle is involved in a lot of these investigations.

But what bothers me is that everybody that we can remember that has resigned under duress, even Warren Crittenden that's on trial for murder now. He got to keep his commission and his retired -- his retired badge of commission. Tom Huckeby got to keep his. Tim Albin got to keep his. Billy McKelvey is going to keep his.

I'm not -- the Sheriff denied mine. My

attorneys -- they helped me prepare a letter. We requested that I get my retired commission, my badge, and my gun. It was denied from the Sheriff.

You know, and our policy says anyone that does 12 years or more service with the Sheriff's Office can have their retired commission and I did nearly 15 and was denied.

GRAND JUROR 15: Did you get along pretty well with Albin and Huckeby?

THE WITNESS: Albin, yes, but he was my immediate supervisor. And I will share, Tom and I have very -- it's almost like a sibling relationship, love/hate. As far as individuals we got along fine. As far as Division Commanders we were rivals.

GRAND JUROR 15: So you read this, obviously, this whole memo, right?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

GRAND JUROR 15: And there's some things in here that talk about how Bates truly was given favoritism and preferential treatment and all that.

And I think Albin is addressed in here as probably providing some of that preferential treatment and favoritism. Do you believe that that's true.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

)

GRAND JUROR 15: That this is true? And that he did at that?

THE WITNESS: I believe so, yes.

GRAND JUROR 8: Juror No. 8. And forgive me. I don't know how the system works. Would not having your commission, I assume, prevent you from being able to run for Sheriff?

THE WITNESS: No. I'm still a certified law enforcement officer, but based on what I've been through after 24 years of law enforcement service -- I had prior law enforcement service before I come here. My goal is not to reenter the law enforcement profession and I want to seek something in the private industry.

What it does is it strips me of 24 years of service, because if I had a retired commission, then, I keep my peace officer status, which doesn't give me anything. It doesn't give me any more money. It doesn't do anything.

Other than it just says that after this many years of service you get to keep that title as peace officer, which we all work for, and he stripped me of that ability.

Now, I'd have to go to work for another organization and I'd have to stay several years

before I could get a retired peace officer's commission. And that's simply what he's done to me is he has stripped me of 24 years of service.

So, if I enter the private sector then I -you know, there's a lot of things -- when the time
comes that, you know, I leave this world, retired law
enforcement officers are honored, you know, and I
spent 10 years on the Honor Guard going around the
country honoring law enforcement guys that have
fallen either present or past.

You know, and that's kind of the one of the things, like, a military thing. You want that badge of honor to carry with you for all those years of service and he stripped me of that, because a terminated law enforcement officer doesn't get the same respect, nor do you get the same privileges as a retired law enforcement officer.

GRAND JUROR 8: I guess, I was trying to look for a purpose of why you were the sole one that was stripped away in the series of events.

THE WITNESS: It's my belief that he's trying to strip me of any identity and more of a character assassination, because I do really believe they think I am a definite threat to run for this office.

I don't have any personal knowledge that

there's anybody in the shadows waiting to step forward. They may have a candidate that's waiting to come out, but it just -- it's very perplexing that they send me to all these certification schools, have me in the media, give my name recognition, and do everything in preparation and then they strip me of everything, umm, after a report is released, which I have been accused of releasing that report.

And under oath I'll tell you I didn't release that report. I don't know who did, either. There's speculation, but I had nothing to do with releasing that report.

GRAND JUROR 8: Thank you.

GRAND JUROR 16: No. 16.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

GRAND JUROR 16: So you're really familiar with this report, then, would you say?

THE WITNESS: Not really. I've just read it a couple times. I read it prior to my termination and then I read it once post-termination.

GRAND JUROR 16: And you've seen documentation with your name on it and Robinette's as well?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

GRAND JUROR 16: And reflecting back on your relationship, did you have a relationship with Bates

or was this all just solely based on conflict with Huckeby?

THE WITNESS: This is all conflict with

Huckeby. I actually -- for many years I thought Bob

Bates was a different Bob Bates.

There was a Bob Bates that worked for the Sheriff's Office that went and took one of those jobs over like in Kosovo, or somewhere, when all the cops were leaving to go over for that big money. He left. He later come back and went to work for Glenpool.

So when we were hearing the rumors of this preferential treatment, no testing. He was just being waved through. I was in a different division at the time, but I didn't really raise a lot of preferential treatment because I thought it was a former Sheriff's supervisor. He was a sergeant when he left.

So, it was -- it was -- umm, I was confused on who it was. I didn't know there was another Bob Bates. I thought it was the Bob Bates that had left here and I thought, well, why wouldn't --

GRAND JUROR 16: So this is in '09? I'm sorry to interrupt, but you're thinking at this time in '09?

THE WITNESS: It was a different Bob Bates

when all this was coming out.

But all this stuff that you read in here is my direct conflict with Tom Huckeby. I was his subordinate then. He was a captain. I was a sergeant.

So -- and I also want to point out, there's a 2008 report that was done. There was a lawsuit filed. There was a private settlement done. I guess it was in the media that the lawsuit was settled, but the amounts of money that were distributed were not disclosed. That was in 2008. That was part of the Michelle Robinette investigation.

And the statements that you see attached to this report, in my recollection these are the statements I made in 2008, not this report. Because this was the first time that I'd ever seen this, this report in its 13-page entirety. I believe those statements that I made was from a different investigation that Michelle Robinette concluded.

GRAND JUROR 16: So during the 2009 investigation you weren't interviewed by IA?

THE WITNESS: Not -- they tell me I was. I have no -- I have no recollection of that interview.

They can't afford me with the tapes or any transcripts of that. They tell me I was interviewed,

but I don't remember being interviewed. I remember being interviewed in '08.

GRAND JUROR 15: But this particular -- Juror No. 15. This particular document, Exhibit 16, is done by Lillard not by Robinette.

THE WITNESS: Right. But I believe the statements that -- if you notice when you read the report it kind of changes gears about halfway through there. It talks about Bates' preferential treatment. Then all of a sudden it talks about harassment and intimidation.

I believe what I'm referenced in saying in there was from a different investigation that was done by Robinette.

GRAND JUROR 15: Gotcha.

THE WITNESS: That -- I think that Captain Lillard, or at the time Sergeant Lillard, got that information from that other report and added it, concluded it, for the conclusion of his report, is my brief.

GRAND JUROR 8: Juror No. 8. Where is Robinette now? Is she still employed?

THE WITNESS: She is still employed. She is working -- she's carrying multiple hats, actually.

She's over the courthouse now. At least if I

)

remember when all the changes were made right before my termination. She's over the courthouse.

She also -- they had put Eric Kitch as a figurehead as a Jail Administrator to take my spot. He offices in my old office.

But Michelle Robinette is actually running the show. Telling him what to do and how to operate the jail.

So, I believe she's carrying multiple -- and I think she's still handling the construction of the jail expansion. So she's -- if what was then is still now, she's carrying multiple positions.

GRAND JUROR 8: Thank you.

GRAND JUROR 15: Juror No. 15. Where is Terry Simonson now?

THE WITNESS: Terry Simonson has -- he is still -- I think he is the only one that is corresponding directly with the Sheriff. As you know in the restructuring -- and, again, I don't know how much you guys know.

In the restructuring the -- there was a lot of authority stripped from the Undersheriff's position as the Sheriff made many references in the public. That he's not going to allow the Undersheriff to have as much latitude as they once

did.

Terry Simonson has taken over my PIO roles as the official spokesman. Now, they have another spokesperson that they use from time-to-time, but Terry Simonson is the official spokesperson. And he's also doing the contracts.

He's -- right now what he's doing is he's the personal legal advisor to the Sheriff for this entire situation.

Now, the Sheriff has other attorneys, but my understanding is Terry Simonson is the one that's directing him, statements to make. I believe Terry Simonson was very active in my termination on directing him.

I will share with you that right now my attorneys -- we had to -- I did apply for unemployment and was denied unemployment.

So, my attorneys appealed that to the Unemployment Tribunal and I was awarded, overwhelmingly, I was awarded unemployment.

And the Hearing Officer wrote a very detailed report not only saying should I not have been terminated, I shouldn't even have been disciplined for what they raised.

And they only raised one issue at hearing.

And the only issue at hearing was that I had asked a captain to reevaluate a sergeant and change the evaluation because he had gave her a superior rating and he had only been the captain for three months.

And I asked him to take the 12 months into totality and reevaluate her.

That's what they said. And that was part of my termination hearing, that he brought up, that I was intimidating by changing evaluations.

But what was under oath in the hearing of my unemployment was, not only did I not order it be done, I hadn't even seen it.

Because on my termination when I was cleaning out my office the completed evaluation by the captain with a note on it saying, no -- reevaluated, no issues, because I made him re-serve her. If you change the score you got to re-serve them and let them know.

And there's a sticky note saying, no issues, and it was laying on my desk. I had not even approved it, had not even seen a final copy of it, which I was held accountable for. That was the only issue that they raised in my unemployment hearing. The only issue they raised.

So, they said not only should I not have been

terminated, I should not have even been disciplined and now the county has appealed that to the Unemployment Commission.

GRAND JUROR 16: Juror 16. Since you brought up evaluations --

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

GRAND JUROR 16: -- some of the recent testimony was if there were issues that someone had with their superior that it would be on the evaluation, given the opportunity to complain at that time. Is that a true statement?

THE WITNESS: It is. In our policies you can do a grievance. You're allowed to bypass your chain of command if you have a problem with your immediate supervisor and go above it, or on your evaluation form it had employee comments where you could write whatever you wanted.

GRAND JUROR 23: Juror 23. The morning executive meetings, are they documented anywhere? Is there a tape recording or something, because I know where I work those meetings have to be filed to keep our accreditation.

THE WITNESS: The 8:30 morning meetings are not. The Wednesday executive staff meeting does have minutes taken and it is recorded and it does have an

agenda.

And if I may, I wanted to go back to one point early on, on one of his questions about how I knew I was going to be terminated before I ever come here.

Remember, I talked to you about the Sheriff sending me a text message from Wagoner County?

Again, you got to remember this was the Thursday before I was put on administrative leave.

One of his deputies, Deputy Elliott in Wagoner County, had told the major and the Sheriff, had shared information with them, specific to the allegations in my Internal Affairs complaint, that I yet had not even been put on admin leave, nor anybody had been interviewed, because the interviews started on Friday. He told them that I was going to be terminated when I got back from vacation.

How he knew that, and his relevant information to that, and I would hope that you guys may even think of subpoenaing him. He told them that he got the information from Tammy Marler, which is his wife, and she is the news director for KFAQ that hosts the Pat Campbell Show. And if you guys ever listen to Pat Campbell, Terry Simonson is on the Pat Campbell Show once or twice a week.

So they made a decision to fire me before any interviews had ever taken place. Something happened between that Friday and that Thursday and they had already told Pat Campbell that I was going to be terminated and she told -- Tammy Marler told her husband Deputy Elliott in Wagoner County and he told the Sheriff and he listed, specifically, the allegations that you guys have heard some of in this testimony.

GRAND JUROR 1: Juror No. 1.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

GRAND JUROR 1: Are you aware of any gifts, I guess you could say, that Sheriff Glanz as received?

THE WITNESS: Gifts? Besides -- no, besides the vendor dinners and things of that nature, I don't know of any tangible gifts he may have received.

GRAND JUROR 1: Okay.

- Q. (BY MR. BARRIS) I want to follow-up on something one of the Grand Jurors raised and you responded to them. You said there were minutes, agendas, and recordings of executive staff meetings?
- A. Not recordings, but -- I don't think they recorded them, minutes, though.

The Undersheriff's secretary, or in her absence the Sheriff's secretary, would take -- there

was an agenda for every Wednesday meeting, not every -- I apologize -- not every Wednesday meeting. If we had an agenda we would have a meeting. And it was on the Wednesday each week, typically, unless there was a scheduling conflict. And, yes, they did keep minutes of the meeting and then those minutes and those agendas were filed somewhere. I'm not sure about the recording.

- Q. And, so, who maintains those records?
- A. I believe the Sheriff's secretary does.
- Q. Okay. Thank you.

GRAND JUROR 9: Juror No. 9.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

GRAND JUROR 9: How familiar are you with the relationship between Sheriff Glanz and Undersheriff Albin?

THE WITNESS: My perception it's been strained a little bit over this whole entire incident, but they -- they were very close. They were very close personally and professionally.

GRAND JUROR 9: Okay. We'll go prior to April 2nd.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

GRAND JUROR 9: Try to get some of this strain out of there, obviously. It sounds like you worked

1	closely with Sheriff Albin.
2	THE WITNESS: I did.
3	GRAND JUROR 9: Officed next door type thing
4	and everything.
5	THE WITNESS: No. I officed next to the
6	Sheriff.
7	GRAND JUROR 9: Yeah. Next to the Sheriff.
8	THE WITNESS: Yeah.
9	GRAND JUROR 9: How is, ahh back up a
10	second here. How is the Undersheriff selected?
11	THE WITNESS: Strictly by the Sheriff.
12	GRAND JUROR 9: So, the Sheriff says, I want
13	this guy in this position?
14	THE WITNESS: Yes.
15	GRAND JUROR 9: Is it a rank or seniority
16	issue or
17	THE WITNESS: No. He could actually
18	GRAND JUROR 9: Can he pull a sergeant and put
19	him in as Undersheriff if he wanted to?
20	THE WITNESS: He could pull any one of you and
21	make his Undersheriff if he wanted to.
22	GRAND JUROR 9: Prior to Undersheriff Albin
23	being appointed that position how was the
24	relationship between Tim Albin and Sheriff Glanz?
25	Was it a long-lasting relationship, close

relationship, how did that come about?

THE WITNESS: Tim Albin is a very, very, dedicated, military raised subordinate. And he was very dedicated and loyal to the Sheriff no matter what it was, private, professional, it didn't matter. It was very close.

Now, they vacationed together. They worked together. Obviously, their relationship professionally was very good because the Sheriff, you know, he had many options to pick from when he picked Undersheriff Albin to be his new Undersheriff.

GRAND JUROR 9: Okay. Let's -- let's stray from that for a second.

Do you know of the relationship between Sheriff Glanz and then Major Tom Huckeby? Once again, prior to the April 2nd event how was their relationship.

THE WITNESS: That one was a little different. The Sheriff had made personal comments to me that he did not like Tom's management style. He told me that he had counseled Tom on occasions about him being so militaristic or so -- Tom can be demeaning at times, overbearing, demeaning, however you want to phrase it.

He told me that he would have those

conversations with Tom. And, again, a lot of it got into management philosophies and styles, but he would also go on fishing trips with Tom. He would ask Tom to come down to his ranch in Stiegler and help him do some stuff. So it was very odd.

He would use Tom when he needed Tom. And Tom was more associated to the Sheriff through Tim Albin.

Tom and Tim are very close and that was really Tom's nexus to the Sheriff.

And when, when majors were appointed -- and they got rid of the major rank years ago. When majors were appointed, or when the discussion of majors come into it, I was the Sheriff's Assistant and I was driving him home one day and the topic of majors come up and I asked him about the major rank. Told him I'd be very interested in the major rank.

At the same time the Undersheriff's position was available when he was considering the major rank and he had many Sheriffs in Northeast Oklahoma and even the Oklahoma Sheriff's Association suggest to the Sheriff that I should be the successor and take the Undersheriff's position. He didn't have enough -- well, there was a reason why he made me a major.

So I said, I would like to be a major. And

he said I think you'd be great in any position in my office.

So he -- when those major selections come there had been rumor in our office that John Bowman was going to succeed as Chief Deputy when George Haralson retired.

But they decided to make majors instead because it was going to save thousands of dollars on the budget because they could pay us -- they wouldn't have to pay a chief salary. They could pay three major salaries and save about 35 or \$40,000 a year. So they decided to make three majors.

So, the Sheriff picked a major, which was me. Tim Albin picked a major and that was Tom Huckeby. And, then, John Bowman was made a major because he's best friends with chief, or now Undersheriff Rick Weigel, and that was, basically, Rick's contribution to the management ranks.

That's how we were selected. Each person got to pick a major and I was the Sheriff's selection for major at the time.

GRAND JUROR 9: One more on relationships.

What would you say the relationship between Sheriff
Glanz and, umm, Chief Robinette is? What's their
relationship look like?

THE WITNESS: Again, let's talk before May 2nd because right now I have no idea what -- what Chief Deputy Michelle Robinette's role is with the office.

But prior to that I was in meetings where the Sheriff had asked Undersheriff Albin why he had not fired Michelle yet. And my understanding was Michelle was to be fired right at the conclusion of when Brian Edwards was going to leave.

And since Brian was going to leave he handed everything back to Tim and said, I don't want to do it as I'm leaving. You'll have to do it.

Tim had built a case, and he told me frequently, that he had a case built to fire Michelle Robinette for multiple reasons. But she is in a very estranged relationship with her kids and her ex-spouse, and she had just adopted, like, half a dozen of her grandkids or something like that.

Well, the Undersheriff made numerous references to the Sheriff he just didn't have the heart to fire her since she had just taken on all those kids because she makes a pretty high salary and you just can't find another salary like that in and around this area in law enforcement. And it would be too hard for her to move to meet that salary and that was why the Undersheriff wouldn't fire her.

)

But the Sheriff asked numerous times, why have you not fired her yet? And the Undersheriff, that was the response he would make, because I was worried about these grandkids.

But now she's officing next to him and seems to be running most of the investigations. So I don't -- I don't know how that changed.

GRAND JUROR 9: So were there -- would you say there were grounds at that time to fire her?

THE WITNESS: She was a rank above me. So, I was only really privy to a little bit of information about some of the things she had done.

But a lot of the reasons she was removed from the jail was -- and if I may go back to the Correct Solutions situation.

One of the reasons she was removed from the jail, that I was told specifically by the Sheriff and the Undersheriff, is because Michelle Robinette was told we are picking Correct Solutions to be our phone provider. She did not believe that was ethical and she scored them the lowest, intentionally, to try to change their score.

And if you'll look, our -- Correct Solutions was not the highest bidder or lower bidder, whichever way you want to look at it. There were other

companies that scored much higher in the presentations, but everybody -- the executive leadership already knew who we were taking. Michelle didn't like that. So she scored them the lowest and that really upset the Sheriff. So, if you look at the time frame not long after that she goes out and I go over.

GRAND JUROR 9: How did you score Correct Solutions even whether it counted or not. How did your --

THE WITNESS: If my memory serves me correctly I scored them -- I did score them number one and the only -- the component that I used to make them number one was the technology and that's -- that's what everybody was telling me.

I also had, you know, I had instructions on who was going to get it anyway and I didn't want to go against the grain, if you will.

But I knew I wasn't going to continue in RFP.

I knew I had no -- I wasn't going to participate in
the oral presentations. I wasn't going to
participate in the selection. I had nothing else to
do with it.

But based on the scoring mechanism, they offer a technology that's not in any other jail or

4 5

prison in the United States and I gave them a high enough score on the technology that made them number one.

GRAND JUROR 9: Okay. Regarding the Sheriff's Office itself. Granted, it's kind of tough to answer this potentially with your current situation, but as the overall Sheriff's Office and how it's being run can you give us your general impression?

THE WITNESS: There's a lot of turmoil within the Sheriff's Office. There's a lot of hatred between the troops.

Most of the guys work well at the rank of deputy. Most everybody gets along. Most of the detention officers get along.

But once you elevate to the rank of sergeant or higher there's a lot of territorialism. There's a lot of fighting. There's a lot of hatred. There's a lot of competitiveness, back-stabbing, people talking about each other.

And I hate to say that, because the Sheriff's Office is an elected office and in my law enforcement career people would ask me, why do you work for a Sheriff's Office? And I will tell you the reason that I chose, hopefully to finish my career in a Sheriff's Office is because you work for one man.

You work for the elected Sheriff's Office. That's it.

You don't work for a City Council. You don't work for a mayor. You don't work for a whole bunch of other bureaucrats. You work for one person. And he makes all the rules, good or bad, and that's why I chose the Sheriff's Office.

But I attribute that to the lack of leadership. There was no leadership. It was you had your cliques and depending on what clique you were in and depending on who was in power at the time is how well you would advance.

When Brian Edwards was the Undersheriff I wasn't in Brian's click. And Brian would take deputies up to his house on Grand Lake and they would lay bricks and sod and they work at his house in Grand Lake. I wouldn't go. And I wasn't in his click. So I didn't get go to the wine dinners and the things that Brian would do for the deputies.

But if you were in that click you got anything you wanted. You got new cars. You got the patrol shift you wanted, you know.

But then when Tim was in charge I got -- you know virtually I didn't ask to go to the jail, but for the most part I got what I wanted. I got to stay

PIO. I got to keep my immigration. You know, it just depended on who was in charge and what click you were in as to what you get within the organization.

GRAND JUROR 9: Okay. That kind of leads me to my final question for me, then. So you would say that the turmoil and the hatred and the -- I wouldn't say competitiveness. I think there's competitiveness in any industry, but the bad things.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

GRAND JUROR 9: Okay. You would say that those are directly related to Sheriff Glanz's leadership?

THE WITNESS: I believe so. Because he knew -- all these things that you're probably going to hear from all these different people that you talk to, he knew about every single thing that happened because we talked about it in the morning meetings, from who was having affairs, all the way to who was having money problems, to who was fighting each other and he thought it was comical.

There's an old management philosophy in law enforcement -- one of the first management schools I ever went to was, if you keep the troops fighting amongst theirselves they'll never turn on you. And I believed that was his theory. I believed that he

thought as long as I keep everybody fighting amongst themselves they ain't never going to come to me.

But the other thing, too, is -- and he's trying to use it as a segue to say that he didn't know, but he put everything on the Undersheriff. Absolutely everything relied and rested on the shoulders of the Undersheriff. He made very few decisions. And when he would make a decision -- Undersheriff Edwards at the time was a yes-man.

If the Sheriff even suggested an idea just in casual conversation, Brian immediately implemented it in the organization if it was good or bad. It's just because Sheriff mentioned it.

Tim would fight him a little bit and he would give credible debate on why it should or should not work and then we would voice our opinions a lot of times. And then he would just leave it to up the Undersheriff to make the decision in a lot of things.

But he knew, again, from the minor thing to the major thing, he knew everything that was going on in that organization.

He knew who was fighting. He knew the sergeants that were backstabbing each other in the field. And he related a lot of that back to his days at TPD. That's how TPD worked. That's -- everybody

2
 3
 4

was, you know, vying for the same jobs. You know, you have to compete. You have to cut-throat. You got to do these things. And I believe that his management philosophy had surpassed the current age of what goes on today.

GRAND JUROR 9: Okay. I'm going to renege on my statement. This isn't my last question because you just brought a lot more stuff to the table.

THE WITNESS: I'm here for you guys, so whatever.

GRAND JUROR 9: You know, based on that, and now I do have to come up to the April 2nd event.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

GRAND JUROR 9: Okay. A lot of the testimony that we've heard, in my opinion, aims us toward leadership and management styles of Major Huckeby and Undersheriff Albin.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

GRAND JUROR 9: But a lot of the testimony kind of tends to stray away from pointing directly at the Sheriff as even having known of the events.

Obviously, as a PIO you're right in there in the middle of it.

The question I have is: You just stated that the Sheriff knew stuff was going on. So, did the

Sheriff know of the training issues surrounding Bob Bates? Did he know of the -- well, let's answer that question right upfront.

Was the Sheriff aware of the training issues or lack of training documentation surrounding Bob Bates?

THE WITNESS: Yes. I believe so.

GRAND JUROR 9: Okay. Was the Sheriff aware of, umm, the lack of the initial information, the mental studies, the applications, I guess is what I'm looking for.

Was the Sheriff aware of lack of appropriate application procedures surrounding Bob Bates being placed on the reserve force?

THE WITNESS: Here's how the Sheriff is going to give you plausible deniability. He, basically, told us Bob Bates gets whatever Bob Bates wants.

When Bob Bates was hired they said, expedite the process. Internally we know what that means.

Now, when you start pinning him down did you know the MMPI was waived? No. Did you know that was waived? No.

You know why? Because he didn't want to be involved in that. He simply said, carte blanche, do it. That's why we did it. That's why Tim Albin and

knew what he meant when he said this.

Now, he will come in to you with

Now, he will come in to you with this plausible I didn't know. That's not true. He knew what was going on. He knew exactly what was going on.

Tom Huckeby carried the water for the Sheriff. We

And I had multiple conversations with him about how to introduce this to the media that would suggest that Bob didn't have to have all this training. He didn't have to go through the hiring process.

And when you look at it, if you take Tulsa County policy out of it, all our policies completely away, did Bob Bates meet every criteria of the state law? Absolutely he did.

Because once you're a reserve, you're always a reserve, forever. There was no continuing education. There was only a mental health deal that you had to participate in. You don't have to do what full-time law enforcement had to do.

Well, he wanted me to go out and say that and I told him there was no way. There was no way I was going to come out there and look like an idiot and say that, you know, because in today's society you got to have training no matter what it is. In every

industry.

But that's how he's going to suggest to you that he didn't know, because he would issue a blanket order and you just, in our industry, in the way that our office worked you just knew. You just didn't cross swords with Bob Bates. And I knew that. And I didn't have a relationship with Bob Bates. I knew not to cross swords with him. You didn't want to be on his bad side and you knew the Sheriff.

I can sit here and list out half a dozen millionaires to you right now that are on the same special treatment list that you just don't mess with. I mean, it's happening right now.

Even after I done my own little investigation and done some research that I've shared with my lawyers, that's still happening today. Sheriff ain't scared of you. He ain't scared of me. He ain't scared of the media. He thinks what he's doing is absolutely correct.

GRAND JUROR 16: Juror 16. You were the Sheriff's Assistant, you stated. Am I correct?

THF WITNESS: Yes.

GRAND JUROR 16: Did he sign everything or did he have a stamp?

THE WITNESS: Well, there were three ways

things were signed in the office. He had a stamp.

He did sign some stuff, but he also -- there was one or two within the office that could forge his signature pretty well that would help him at times. I think the secretary. There's like two people that can forge his signature and she would, if he was absent they would sometimes forge his signature.

GRAND JUROR 16: Now, specifically training

GRAND JUROR 16: Now, specifically training records?

THE WITNESS: He would never participate in training records.

GRAND JUROR 16: Even though some of the, ahh, certificates had the Sheriff's signature line on them?

THE WITNESS: No, that -- Bonnie Fiddler should have a stamp that she stamps all certificates on.

Now, the only other way that would happen is if -- if somebody in HR would bring in a stack of certificates in our morning meetings he would sit and sign those, all morning. He would just sit in there and he used a special pen to do that. They have special pens that he uses to sign stuff.

GRAND JUROR 1: Juror No. 1. Did you say Bonnie Fiddler has a stamp for the signature?

THE WITNESS: She either has a stamp or it's an auto signature on the computer that she just pulls it up. It's already on -- because I can show you half of my certificates that it's -- it's just a computer generated stamp.

Q. (BY MR. SIGLER) Mr. Clark, I've got a couple of

- Q. (BY MR. SIGLER) Mr. Clark, I've got a couple of questions.
- A. Oh, yes, sir.
- Q. You've just talked about the Sheriff's relationship with Mr. Bates and how that may have influenced people in the organization. Would that be fair?
- 13 A. Yes.

7

8

9

10

11

12

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Do you believe that the Sheriff's relationship with Mr. Bates influenced Undersheriff Albin's decisions?
- 17 A. Absolutely.
- Q. What about -- was it Major Huckeby? Would that be the same -- the same question as to Major Huckeby.
 - A. Major Huckeby was just as loyal to the Undersheriff as the Undersheriff was to the Sheriff. So, yes, I believe so.
 - Q. Do you have an example to give to the jurors about that, things of your personal knowledge, that that relationship between Sheriff Glanz and Bob Bates

influenced a decision that you may not have agreed with, or thought was maybe not the correct decision from Undersheriff Albin?

A. Okay. Some of these are going to be personal. I mean, I don't know how you take the personality out of it.

A lot of the things -- I personally -- you know, I had to adamantly defend Bob Bates and his participation with the Drug Task Force. I didn't think he should be on that Drug Task Force.

And the only reason he was on the Drug Task

Force was because he bought all the stuff for them.

And he bought lots of stuff for them. He was able to participate in whatever he wanted to participate

in --

- Q. Let me stop you right there.
- A. Sorry.
 - Q. Why do you believe that Mr. Bates should not have been on that task force?
 - A. Because he picked and choosed what he wanted to do; and where he wanted to go; and who he wanted to influence.

He also used that to promote his self-persona to other people, about he was a big undercover guy.

He also -- the stub-nose .38 that he used. Nobody

- else is allowed to carry a stub-nose .38.
- Q. Is that a dangerous detail?
- A. Oh, very dangerous.

- Q. Tell us about that.
- A. Well, I'll tell you I'll never do it. But I can tell you the undercover operation is significantly dangerous, especially Tulsa.

Tulsa is a major city, but it's a small community. And I wouldn't dare put -- go out in undercover because everybody knows you.

You know, you can't be in law enforcement for any length of time that somebody is not going to recognize you. Very, very, dangerous operation. They deal with some of the worst of the worst and, obviously, death occurs.

You know, I gave up the SWAT team after we killed the guy in Broken Arrow that had the hand grenade. It's real life. I mean, this is life and death. There's real things happen.

- Q. What type of officers are on that detail?
- 21 A. Crazy.
 - Q. Well, that may be, but I'm talking about their age, their --
 - A. Usually --
 - Q. -- physical description.

A. -- it's prior military. They're usually young bucks, muscled up, umm, usually have a propensity and like to be engaged in physical combat. They do lots of hand-to-hand stuff. They're in foot pursuits a lot. It's just -- it's not a normal behind the desk kind of policeman.

You know, you see guys kind of fall into who goes into being a desk jockey and who actually falls into being a task force guy.

But they're usually young, aggressive, motivated, healthy and, again, a lot of them have military backgrounds.

- Q. And Mr. Clark, would that be some of the reasons why you didn't approve or didn't believe it was a good idea for Mr. Bates to be on that detail?
- A. No. Mine was -- mine was, typically, personal. And mine specifically was I just didn't think that somebody like that should be able to come in and do whatever they wanted to do whenever they felt like doing it. I wasn't afforded that same opportunity and I had tenure here.
- Q. Now, in regards to -- do you have any personal knowledge of the Sheriff, specifically, instructing Mr. Albin to do something in regards to Mr. Bates?
- A. Nothing specific is popping out.

Q. Okay. What about -- was it Corporal Huckeby or Major Huckeby?

A. Major Huckeby. Major Huckeby and Bob Bates have a very close personal relationship as well.

And Tom will probably -- Major Huckeby will probably have to tell you. I think a lot of things were influenced by Major Huckeby because of his close relationship with Bob Bates, but I also think that he was trying to be the good deputy and do what the Sheriff wanted done.

- Q. What's your knowledge base of the relationship between Huckeby and Bob Bates? Their relationship.
- A. They're very close. I would say they're as close as me and my -- one of my closest friends. I mean, they communicate a lot.

If there was -- if you ever wanted to get Bob Bates you had to go through Huck. Like, for instance, if I wanted to talk to Bob Bates a lot of times I'd go through Huck to talk to Bob Bates.

When I say "Huck" we affectionally refer to him as Huck, instead of saying Major Huckeby.

But we refer to him -- I know he spends a lot of time at his properties in Florida and Colorado.

And he's with him a lot of times, not only professionally, but socially. And they spent a lot

of time in the same vehicle together during undercover operations.

Q. Now, do other deputies of that rank, Huckeby's rank, does that happen that they hang out with Reserve Deputies on that scale very often?

A. No. There's only two others at that rank and it

A. No. There's only two others at that rank and it was me and Major Bowman and neither one of us had a reserve friend that we had associated with.

Billy McKelvey may have been the closest to having a personal relationship, but it was more of a distant relationship with one of our reserves and it's only because they were in the construction industry together.

McKelvey owned a personal business on the side and this guy is a developer and he was kind of shadowing Billy and taking him under his wing. And they would -- they would share -- he would help him build his business. But that would probably be the closest that I could think of.

MR. SIGLER: Thank you.

THE WITNESS: You're welcome.

GRAND JUROR 8: Juror 8. You mentioned in passing that there was several other millionaires that you knew that you couldn't touch, like, are you talking about on the reserve program?

THE WITNESS: Yes. 2 GRAND JUROR 8: Currently? 3 THE WITNESS: Yes. GRAND JUROR 8: Do you want to expand on that 4 5 for us? THE WITNESS: I'd be more than happy to. 6 7 GRAND JUROR 1: I'm sorry. I've got to stop. 8 Can we take a quick bathroom break? MR. BARRIS: Yes. Let's show us in recess for 9 10 minutes. It's 3:26 p.m. on August 14, 2015. 10 (A recess was taken, after which the following 11 proceedings were had.) 12 MR. BARRIS: All right. It's 3:38 p.m. let's 13 open the record again on August the 14th, 2015. 14 The Grand Jury is back in session as are the 15 alternates and myself and Mr. Sigler, the legal 16 advisors for the Grand Jury. 17 We have had Mr. Shannon Clark on the stand as 18 a witness. At this point, Ladies and Gentlemen of 19 the Grand Jury, I am going to ask him to come back in 20 with his attorney and we'll resume questioning. 21 (Witness and his legal counsel return to the 22 Grand Jury Room.) 23 (BY MR. BARRIS) And, sir, for the record you're 24 Q. the same Shannon Clark who was here before the break 25

testifying before the Grand Jury, is that correct?

A. Yes, sir.

- Q. And your attorney, Mr. Stall, remains with you, is that correct also?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay.

MR. BARRIS: Ladies and Gentlemen of the Grand Jury, you may proceed.

GRAND JUROR 8: I think I'd asked before we took the break that you had mentioned there were several millionaires that were, you know, you were not supposed to touch. And I asked if they were in the reserve program and you were going to expand on that.

THE WITNESS: I do. Just as a couple of weeks ago, one in particular is Hastings Siegfried, he's the Vice President for Nordam Corporation and he lives in a mansion over by Gilcrease Museum.

He went to Singapore to run Nordam over there for quite some time and he was -- they parked a Sheriff's patrol car in his driveway and there still is one today parked in his driveway and he's -- he's one.

There was Greg Merrill is another one that flies the helicopter for us. Greg's given a patrol

car.

1|

There's, umm, the guy that owns Dong's Guns up on Admiral, Dave Stone, he's given a patrol car and he bought his. And they just recently took it away from what I understand.

But, you know, if you're in that category of people, or you're in the committee of 100, or you socialize with that group of people and you're on the reserve. And there's a lot of people on the reserves.

And like Hastings, for instance, that car sits in his driveway, you know, but they took Billy's car away. They took my Admin Assistant, Chris Cook's, car away. They took my secretary, Sarah Gadd's, car away. You know, but then they let cars sit in reserve's driveways if you're in the club. And that's just one thing.

The reserve program has been under suspension now for months and yet our cars are sitting in driveways. I mean, that brings a lot of distrust amongst the community.

They know who these places belong to and they know that a deputy can't afford a mansion by Gilcrease Museum. You know, if you could, you obviously, married well or something to that effect.

But that's what I'm saying, is depending on who you are -- Hastings Siegfried, he's on the SWAT Team. As most of the SWAT Team is comprised of Reserve Deputies.

He gets to do whatever he wants. He gets to carry whatever he wants. He wants to be on the sniper team, he can be on the sniper team. If he wants to be the entry team, he can be on the entry team.

You know, those are kind of the things -- and you know who to touch and who not to touch and who just kind of had full access to do --

GRAND JUROR 8: So, Bates just came to light because he made this mistake. He's not the only one, probably, getting this preferential treatment?

THE WITNESS: Oh, no, ma'am. He is not the only one.

Terry Simonsen, why do you think he got his job? Preferential treatment, because he helped out an elected official and they just made a job for that. That was not a spot that we had in the Sheriff's Office. That was a created spot to pay for him because nobody else wanted him.

You know, he had been fired from the city.

The County Commissioners didn't want him. They

just -- they asked us to make a spot for him and the Sheriff did.

GRAND JUROR 8: Do you know if any of these other individuals have the relationship or friendship similar to Bates and the Sheriff or is it simply their money relationship?

THE WITNESS: As we've heard the Sheriff say publicly, him and Bates have a very close relationship. They -- they fish frequently. They camp out together. They vacation together.

I'm not -- he has some close relationships with the Kelseys, Howard Kelsey and Ron Kelsey. They are very wealthy individuals. They own -- I think Howard Kelsey is one of our appraisers. He owns a big construction company or something to that effect.

Ron Kelsey is -- he's a former financial analyst or something like that. They have a lot of money and he spends a lot of time at the Joint with them.

His -- they're high-rollers at the Hard Rock and they get executive suites with all the furnishings. The only reason -- I've been there. They invited my wife and I to a concert one time and that's the reason I know that they get an executive suite and stuff.

Once the Sheriff started going I was not invited anymore and I haven't been in quite sometime, but he does go, him and his wife go to the Joint and hang out with the Kelseys. And they're brothers and they're both appraisers.

Rueben Davis, Rueben Davis used to be considered the Sheriff's very best friend and when Rueben Davis worked for McAfee and Taft -- if you look back in the records, McAfee and Taft handled a lot of the Sheriff's lawsuits, you know, upwards of well over a million dollars and it was because of Rueben.

And Rueben, you know -- and that's why I say -- he was a reserve on the SWAT Team. He got to pick and choose what he wanted to do on the SWAT Team.

A lot of the reserves aren't -- aren't required to meet the physical standards of the SWAT Team, either. You know, Rueben Davis had two hips replaced when I was on the SWAT Team with him. You know, I was a sniper. So, I had to spend a lot of time training and different elevations, a lot of time running with your packs and your rifle and different things of that nature.

And he had both hips replaced, so, he didn't

have to meet all the same criteria as a full-time deputy would have to meet or other SWAT members, but he was the Sheriff's best friend at the time, so we knew about that.

Sheriff's got a lot of relationships with these reserves that help pay for the tax initiative for the jail. They are helping pay for the training center, donating equipment, or things for the big Sheriff Glanz's Regional Law Enforcement Training Center. Things of that nature.

So, the friendships run wide. I'm not sure exactly that -- the two closest people that I could probably attest to would be Rueben Davis and Bob Bates.

GRAND JUROR 8: Thank you.

THE WITNESS: You're welcome.

GRAND JUROR 16: Juror 16. You heard the term, buy a badge program?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

GRAND JUROR 16: Is that what this pertains to?

THE WITNESS: That term has never been used internally until the media made that a term that was commonly used.

But depending on what your status in the

community is does elevate you to a different level within the Sheriff's Office as a reserve and a full-time deputy, actually.

GRAND JUROR 16: How about Ken Yazel?

THE WITNESS: Ken is -- Ken has quite a history with the reserve program. You know, we -- you know, the Sheriff employs his wife and he employs the Sheriff's wife.

And, umm, there were -- there was actually -- when Ken was coming out publicly against the jail tax initiative, the Sheriff said in an open meeting, I was present, that he was going to fire Yazel from the reserve program.

And then his command staff, the Undersheriff and the chiefs, convinced him to wait till the election was over and it may be a self-correcting problem, because he didn't want to fire Yazel and then worry about his wife getting fired.

He thought that if he let Yazel go from the reserve program, then Debra Glanz would get fired from the Assessor's Office.

And so they convinced him to wait for the election to be over and if Ken didn't get reelected then he could fire him because it would have no effect on Debra.

And, so, as far as I know, Ken's still active in the reserve program, but -- they were going to fire Ken for -- I'm not sure exactly all the reasons, but I know it was because -- one of the reasons because he come out publicly against the jail tax.

GRAND JUROR 16: Would you say there's a little quid pro quo there?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

GRAND JUROR 13: Juror 13.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

GRAND JUROR 13: It's like the more you describe these relationships and the fact that having a little bit of money kind of give you a little juice. It's like -- sounds like a law enforcement dude ranch.

THE WITNESS: Okay. I'm not going to -- I'm not going to argue with you.

GRAND JUROR 13: Okay. But it appears that it is -- we talking about job positions that are being occupied by people that don't even need money.

THE WITNESS: That's true.

GRAND JUROR 13: And I consider having to look at it from a layman's point of view, that I wouldn't stand a chance considering what I've heard in terms of even trying to be employed with the Sheriff's

Department.

THE WITNESS: Employment -- you probably would stand just a good as chance as anybody. Elevating in the office, which I always refer to myself as the most successful unsuccessful person that I know. I could call high ranking elected officials. I dealt with them every day, but I'm just a normal guy.

I live on a single-house income. I got a big family. We have a small house. I mean, you know, I'm just a normal guy like you. I don't have the money to play with these big dogs.

But through hard work and effort and through my ethics I believe that was one reason I was promoted. I also think that was one reason for my demise as well.

But you're right. We do have -- I don't know if you've heard the name Wayne Pauley. Has that name come up? Have you heard that name?

Wayne Pauley is a dear, dear, friend of the Sheriff. Wayne Pauley spends a couple -- I wouldn't say a couple days. I don't want to exaggerate.

He spends some time -- Wayne's on duty with the Sheriff's Office, but he goes with the Sheriff to his ranch in Stigler to work cows, but that's his duty assignment for the day.

Wayne owns Owl Night Security that has the security for Reasor's and some of the other big -- Wayne is very -- is one of these guys, very well off. He's a slick-sleep deputy. He has no rank. He has no supervision. He works out of the civil division, but Wayne does whatever Wayne wants to do. He works any hours he wants to work. He does any assignment he wants to do. And then when the Sheriff needs to work cows, they go work cows.

So -- but that -- that's one. And there are some other ones within the office, but most of those more stable in the community, they're more reserves.

You know, like one of the guys, you know, one of our reserves is Paul Coury. He owns the Ambassador Hotel downtown. He owns four or five historic hotels around the country. He's got the Ambassador collections. He's one of our reserves. You know, he's a very well off guy.

You know, there's -- there's several that have that -- and I was -- I was criticized because I used that term, you know, about the millionaires in the media when I said that. I was criticized by the Sheriff for using that term. He did not like me referring to these guys -- but it's true. They are. They're very wealthy. I mean, they're very wealthy

individuals.

And I think a lot of their ability to be associated with the Sheriff is based on their position in the community.

GRAND JUROR 13: Well, in terms of the shooting, it seems that the Sheriff wasted no time cutting ties. And it's, like, to use allegations, untrue allegations, we've heard it a few times. And the term you use, hostile work environment, when you, obviously, said you don't behave that way.

But it seems, like, is that the go-to mechanism? Is that the go-to instrument when you want to get rid of somebody?

THE WITNESS: It is because it raises the most eyebrows. What's our society focused around? When you say, hostile work environment, what does it attribute to? You're discriminating either on race, gender, sexual preference, some protected category.

It's one of the things I've shared with my lawyers and they've shared with me as we move forward with my personal issue with this whole thing. You know, they've accused me under oath and publicly of a hostile work environment. That's a protected class. They're going to have to figure out what I did to do that.

I requested an evaluation be changed on a female? That's not -- that's not abuse of power.

Umm, I was -- actually thought I was doing what I was supposed to be doing as a competent supervisor trying to keep -- trying to, you know, keep peace in the house, if you will.

But you're -- I mean, you're right to your point. It's their go-to because that's what people -- that's what resonates with people.

And just like if you read the -- the stories, which, you know, Terry Simonson comes out the day of my termination, two hours after he gets a letter from Eric Stall, saying, well, we haven't classified if Shannon has been terminated or resigned yet. My letter, the first sentence says, you're hereby terminated.

When I went the following week to fill out my retirement paperwork, and I did officially get to retire from Tulsa County, although, I don't get to draw my money for 18 years.

When I was doing my retirement paperwork they said, we don't have an action sheet. An action sheet is a form that the -- any of the county officials fill out that's filed with the County Clerk on why you were dismissed, or why you separated your

employment. They didn't have an action sheet on me.

And when she said what -- how are we classifying your leave as? I said, I don't know. You tell me because Terry Simonsen said it's up to HR. Well, HR don't make that classification, the Sheriff does. And they -- they didn't make a classification. I pulled my CLEET record, my CLEET training record, to put with my case file and it also -- it says, reason for termination, they've not put any reason there.

The other two law enforcement agencies I was with put resignation, but on my CLEET record it doesn't have a reason for why I left. It just says I'm no longer active -- a active law enforcement officer.

So it is a go-to, but to support that is -that's why I've got a team of lawyers to look to see
if that is a sustainable reason for me to be
terminated when I'm a statutorily protected deputy.
And what that means, if you guys don't know -- I keep
referring that I'm statutorily protected.

For many, many, years in Oklahoma, Sheriffs were like they ruled the office. You could be fired for any reason in a Sheriff's Office and it goes back into historical times of Oklahoma. It's in the

Constitution.

But a few years ago the legislature changed the law and said if you work for Oklahoma County or Tulsa County, it's basically populations of 500,000 or something like that, over, then, you're -- if you have five years or more in, it's considered a five year probationary period, which is to complete one full cycle of a Sheriff, if you have five years in then you're statutorily protected. Means I have to be fired with cause. That they have to have justifiable reason to fire me.

Therefore, I think alludes to your question that was the go-to thing, that's what resonates, and that's what they're going to try to hold, is the reason that I was actually separated, but that's not what the Sheriff said under oath in a deposition.

GRAND JUROR 13: Now, would you say, for instance, that particular choice of instrument come from a category of instruments that were otherwise say, for instance, as a new hire providing an employee packet it will list all the -- all the, ahh, particular, let's say, violations that will cause termination. Is anything in writing, in print, or did they make it up as they go?

THE WITNESS: If you guys get to look at any

of the -- employee evaluations that are done, that is the one policy that is administered in every annual evaluation to every employee. You have to acknowledge receipt. You have to acknowledge you read it. You have to acknowledge that you've been a victim of it or you have not or do you know about it. And you have to acknowledge that.

Therefore, the woman that filed the complaint on me, and, again, I've never seen any allegations. They say that people complained on me. I've never got to see any complaints or read any complaints.

They said a female sergeant complained because I asked her evaluation to be changed. In that evaluation it says, are you a victim of hostile work environment? No. Did you read the hostile work environment sexual harassment policy? Yes.

Do you know of any hostile work environment?

But that was two weeks prior to her filing a complaint on me. And that's what I tried to bring up, is you say she filed a complaint on me, but she's saying right there she's not knowledgeable of any hostility or any unfair labor practices from me or anybody else.

But then she turns around and they fire me

for that? So they say. That was the cause of my termination. You know, I mean, you guys have access to look at all that, that data I'm telling you about.

GRAND JUROR 13: Juror 13. Could it be because she was the only candidate and that was the only avenue that they had available to them at that time, at that particular time?

THE WITNESS: I believe it was solicited because the sergeant that I'm talking about's name is Judy Pounds. Judy Pounds and I have known each other for over 20 years. Her husband Brian Pounds works for Ken Yazel, works next to Debbie Glanz, and I went to high school with Brian Pounds.

And I believe that when the Sheriff wanted to get rid of me he had to figure a way and I think that he solicited a complaint that would in their minds meet hostile work environment.

GRAND JUROR 13: That's constitutionally protected.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

GRAND JUROR 13: Gotcha.

GRAND JUROR 16: Juror 16. So you mentioned before that when you returned to your desk that her evaluation, is that correct, was sitting on your desk with a sticky note?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

1|

GRAND JUROR 16: Did you have an opportunity to revisit that?

THE WITNESS: My attorneys have a copy of it.

But when I -- when you say revisit, you mean approve it or acknowledge it, or...

GRAND JUROR 16: Well, you said it was rewritten and placed back upon your desk, correct?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

GRAND JUROR 16: So, my curiosity is, did she at that time go back and change her verbiage from yes, no?

THE WITNESS: No. No. I -- I don't know what happened with the final document. I can tell you that when I was relieved of duty I turned over everything in my office that still had some process to go in the office to Eric Kitch, which is the captain that took my position.

And I gave him -- I gave him a copy of that and had him acknowledge that we were reading it together. That there was no signature. I had not approved it. And that was the original version and the original ink with Captain Scott Dean's signature saying I re-served her. No issues. And his initials. Scott Dean. And I gave it to Eric Kitch

because it had to be approved and go on to HR. I don't know what happened with it after that.

GRAND JUROR 16: And her signature was on there as well?

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry?

GRAND JUROR 16: And her signature was on there as well?

THE WITNESS: Yes it was. And the new date where she was re-served with a different scoring.

GRAND JUROR 16: I see.

GRAND JUROR 9: Juror No. 9. I'm going to jump back real quickly to the question of other people that are serving as Reserve Deputies that are also contributing to the Sheriff's Office, I'm assuming, or the Sheriff's Office, Sheriff's campaign?

THE WITNESS: Well, okay, I believe that they all have contributed to the Sheriff's campaign. I also believe that they're contributing to a different element in the Sheriff's Office that was developed by Rueben Davis. It's a 501c3 Sheriff's account.

And that's a way, basically, to push money through the Sheriff's Office without it being under the rules and regulations of the county.

Rueben oversees that program and I believe

they contribute to that, too, because the Sheriff makes very, very, sizable donations to United Way and to the Boy Scouts of America, frequently. And I believe he uses that account to do it.

He used to do it out of the Sheriff's fee accounts and I believe the county -- Pat Key, which is the County Clerk, I believe, she called him on that and said you can't use that money for that purpose. And so he had to stop using his Sheriff's fee account and he started using the 501c3, but I know people are contributing money to that account. I know that.

So there's a couple different accounts.

There's the Sheriff's campaign account and then the Sheriff's 501c3 account.

GRAND JUROR 8: Do you know the name of that because those are easily able to be looked up online.

THE WITNESS: I'm not sure of the name of it.

I'm not sure exactly how they have it listed in the

501c3, but I know people have found it pretty easy.

And I know Rueben Davis helped Sheriff Scott Walton over in Rogers County set up the same account when he was with McAfee and Taft. He did it as a service from Reserve Deputy to Sheriff's Office, but then he turned around and charged them through McAfee

and Taft for the consultation to do it.

And it took the Sheriff calling Reuben to tell him you're not charging the Sheriff to do that because he was trying to charge through McAfee and Taft.

GRAND JUROR 8: Trying to charge the Sheriff's Department?

THE WITNESS: He was charging Sheriff Scott Walton's office for telling him how to set up a 501c3, but he was doing it as a Reserve Deputy for Tulsa County helping another Sheriff and then he turned around and tried to charge him through his private law firm or through his law firm.

GRAND JUROR 9: Based on information that you've given, the list of names that you've given that are Reserve Deputies, do you know what level of qualification each of these Reserve Deputies hold? Is it basic, intermediate or advanced?

THE WITNESS: I don't know personally of their training records, but they do have the liberties of an Advanced Reserve Deputy. They can come and go as they please. They can check out a car privately. They can go anything that a full-time deputy can do and that is the advanced level.

GRAND JUROR 9: But you're not aware of

j

whether they're qualified to be an advanced level according to the department's policies?

THE WITNESS: True. I've never been in the training division, so, I do not know.

GRAND JUROR 13: 13. Refer back to the 501c3.

Normally, doesn't it require a Board of Directors?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

GRAND JUROR 13: And how would you know who was on the board? Is it sort of -- is it public? Is anyone on a payroll?

THE WITNESS: I know that they have -- I know one of our appraisers, which is also a Reserve Deputy, is on the board or on the advising team or something of that nature.

But I'm not sure how -- I'm not familiar with 501c3s, so I don't know if that's publically disclosed. I'm sure it's publically accessible. I just don't know if it's publically -- I don't know how that works. And I only know of one person on that and that is Reuben Davis.

GRAND JUROR 13: Okay. Now, considering the fact that it is the Sheriff's 501c3, doesn't he have access to those funds?

THE WITNESS: Those funds are influenced by his decisions on where the money goes and Rueben

carries those directives out.

GRAND JUROR 13: Okay.

GRAND JUROR 9: Juror No. 9. Do you know if Sheriff Glanz specifically directed Undersheriff Albin to bypass department procedures regarding Deputy Bates' entry into the reserve force?

THE WITNESS: I don't have any personal knowledge.

GRAND JUROR 9: Okay. One more question. Do you know if there is a retirement payment that would be directed to Sheriff Glanz at the end of his term?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

GRAND JUROR 9: So, he does have a retirement coming at the end of his term, potentially?

THE WITNESS: Yes, he has -- I mean, right now he has the City of Tulsa retirement, but he also gets an elected official -- state elected official retirement at the end of his term.

GRAND JUROR 9: If he were to be removed from any office for any reason would he still be authorized to that or entitled to that benefit?

THE WITNESS: I don't know about an elected official. My understanding at my level is you had to be convicted of a felony act utilizing your office to be not eligible for your retirement and I think that

applies to elected officials. 2 GRAND JUROR 9: Thank you. 3 THE WITNESS: You're welcome. GRAND JUROR 16: Juror 16. I'm going to ask 4 5 you a few questions, real quick. 6 THE WITNESS: Sure. 7 GRAND JUROR 16: Would you say with your knowledge and your experience with the department 8 9 that there is willful neglect of duty going on? THE WITNESS: Can you elaborate a little bit 10 11 more? GRAND JUROR 16: Well, let's say, you say 12 Sheriff used the Undersheriff quite a bit to maybe 13 shield himself from any wrongdoing? 14 THE WITNESS: Correct. 15 GRAND JUROR 16: But, eventually, it's his 16 duty to know what's going on in his department. Am I 17 18 correct in saying that? THE WITNESS: Yes. 19 GRAND JUROR 16: We've seen some exhibits with 20 the Sheriff's signature on it where there's no 21 sign-in sheets for the certificate. And we talked 22 about signature stamps and so forth. 23 With all this training stuff coming to light, 24 as the Sheriff I would be looking into it myself and 25

2 3 4

making sure that my name wasn't on anything, but at that point I feel like he has some neglect of duty and it may be just your personal opinion at this point.

THE WITNESS: If you presented the Sheriff -it has been -- and my personal observation as long as
I've been around Sheriff Glanz, if you presented him
with a document that had writing on it he would take
as long as he needed to read every word of the
document before he would place a signature on it.

As he would do in morning meetings when they would hand him a group of certificates to sign. He would go through and sign them, but he would typically ask, have they completed the training? What am I doing? You know, what are these certificates for? And then he would sign.

Certificates for -- in CLEET, CLEET has three levels of law enforcement basic, intermediate, and advanced on the full-time side.

In our organization -- in the Sheriff's Office organization they offer a pay raise if you get an intermediate certificate from a basic police officer.

GRAND JUROR 16: Now, we're speaking reserves still, so, that doesn't pertain.

1 2 3

Would it still hold as much weight, that certificate, would he want to make sure he read it and made sure that --

THE WITNESS: I believe so.

GRAND JUROR 16: Okay. Would you say that there is gross partiality in the office?

THE WITNESS: Similar to what I talked about the clicks, the certain clicks, yes.

GRAND JUROR 16: How about oppression? I remind you, we've had testimony people are terrified to go to him for things because of reassignments, not necessarily terminations, but offers to resign.

THE WITNESS: I -- okay. You, obviously, can see my mind is spinning and I have to share -- I have to share why my mind is going.

When I first was assigned to the Sheriff as his personal assistant, unprecedented position, never been before.

When I went in and said, what do you want me to do? He said, I want you to continue to handle the media and I want you to run your immigration, US Marshall and your task force and the things that you do and be available when I need you. Okay. And he said, I'll give you assignments, periodically, if I can't take phone calls and those kind of things.

2 3 4

He said, but I also want you to be my eyes and ears of the office, because a lot of times people tell me what I want to know, not what I should know, is what he once told me.

So, having those directives, being a loyal employee, I did exactly what he asked me to do and that lasted all about three days.

And one day I walked in and said, hey,
Sheriff, this is going on. And he said, something to
the effect of, my goodness you're a tattle-tail, but
it wasn't with those exact terms. And I said,
tattle-tail? And he goes, yeah. Some of that stuff
I don't want to know.

I went to -- at the time it was Chief Albin.

And I went to Chief Albin and asked him, how do I

deal with that? What am I supposed to do?

And I believe when you talk to Tim Albin he'll tell you he instructed me, once you learn the Sheriff you'll know what he wants to know and what he don't want to know. And you'll learn.

So, with oppression? People that tell you that they didn't feel comfortable going to the Sheriff, well, I can tell you there were several of the people that you probably will have time to visit with would go eat dinner with the Sheriff, or they

would go out socially with the Sheriff. And they had more than ample opportunity to tell the Sheriff what was going on.

But I will tell you more than going to the Sheriff, a lot of people in the organization will go to the Sheriff's wife because if you can get her ear, she usually will get her way with the Sheriff.

And that's how people would use her because she is -- she was once an elected official. She was the assessor -- elected assessor in Stigler, whatever county that is, and country girl, soft-hearted, and if you could -- if you could get her on your side you didn't have to go to the Sheriff. She'd do it for you.

So, a lot of these people that I have heard said that they were oppressed or scared, I would suggest not all of them, that's a hundred percent accurate, because a lot of people had an access to the Sheriff even if they didn't use the Sheriff.

GRAND JUROR 16: You mentioned they'd go to dinner or so forth. Was there a fraternization rule within the department?

THE WITNESS: No.

GRAND JUROR 16: So there's no policy on no fraternization. You could just go and hang out with

whoever above you?

THE WITNESS: There was no fraternization policy and there was no sexual conduct policy, either.

GRAND JUROR 13: 13. In most -- in most, I guess law enforcement agencies, I'm not from Oklahoma. I'm from the East Coast, West Coast, but most departments have some form, or form of accountability. It appears that the Sheriff's Office does not.

THE WITNESS: That's correct.

GRAND JUROR 1: Something that I asked you about, you said earlier, you said two people you knew for sure knew how to forge his -- the Sheriff's signature?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

GRAND JUROR 1: Do you have specific names, or ...

THE WITNESS: I was trying to remember who they were, but there's -- there's -- without speculating I think one of them is Brandy Hall, the Undersheriff's secretary. I know she could forge Tim's pretty well and I think she could forge Stanley's.

But there was one or two people within the

organization that could forge his signature pretty well in the -- in the immediate absence.

GRAND JUROR 8: Was the Sheriff aware of that and approved of that? Like, for them to sign that in his absence?

THE WITNESS: I think he was aware of it. I don't think he thought it was utilized.

And I'm not really familiar with it -- any form or document I could show you today that would -- it was utilized on, but I know there was -- I know there was a stamp because I've had to use the -- I've had to acquire the stamp. That's the reason I know that Bonnie Fiddler has the stamp, because I think the secretary -- his secretary, Carrie Knauf has the stamp and I think Bonnie Fiddler has either a stamp or it's computer generated from her computer.

GRAND JUROR 1: Wouldn't -- I guess, what I don't understand is if -- shouldn't the Sheriff have to be able to approve something? Well, let's say, yeah, I approve that. Then they can use the stamp. So to me that seems like they can use the stamp whenever they wanted to without his approval.

THE WITNESS: I guess that's a true statement.

Most of the time it would -- from my familiarization,

like his secretary, she would call him and say, I've

got these forms. And he would say, just stamp them or sign them. And she would approve them and send them on.

And I don't really have -- it could be a citizen complaint. It could be normal forms. I think of anything that was of relevance or significance he wanted to see. He may have questions on.

But, again, you know, I refer back to -- he had a Sheriff's assignment log, too, and he constantly would review the assignment log to make sure that certain documents, he got to see before they were approved in their entirety.

GRAND JUROR 1: Okay.

GRAND JUROR 16: Being his assistant would you be able to recognize the difference between his signature and that stamp?

THE WITNESS: Well, that stamp is his signature. It was just made into a stamp form.

I mean, the only way that I can tell the difference -- now that he's got a little older in the last few years his signature now is maybe a little more shaky than sharp like the stamp would be, but the stamp is his -- he signed and then they had a stamp made of his signature.

GRAND JUROR 16: I understand, but I don't 1| sign my name the same a hundred thousand times. It's 2 3 a little different. We have an exhibit --4 THE WITNESS: Do you? GRAND JUROR 15: I don't know which one it is. 5 I mean, I don't know the number off right now, but 6 it's a certificate. Exhibit 21. 7 GRAND JUROR 16: It's tough. It's a copy. I 8 9 know. THE WITNESS: That looks -- that looks pretty 10 close to his signature. I mean, it would be hard 11 to -- besides it not being in real ink. It would be 12 hard to tell the difference on which one is his and 13 not -- and this one actually looks -- I don't know. 14 GRAND JUROR 16: Do you see -- is there a date 15 on that? 16 THE WITNESS: Yes. May 28th of '09. 17 GRAND JUROR 9: What exhibit number is that? 18 THE WITNESS: 21. 19 GRAND JUROR 9: Thank you. 20 THE WITNESS: I don't know if that really 21 looks -- there's a couple letters in there that don't 22 look to me, but, again, I mean, that was five or 23 six years ago, so, he writes it a little bolder now. 24 GRAND JUROR 16: And I know you're not a 25

)

handwriting expert, but out of all of us in this room you would probably know better.

THE WITNESS: And at first glance it does look like his signature.

GRAND JUROR 9: Juror No. 9. I guess the major question here is, is that potentially his signature or is it one of his stamps, or a signature machine?

THE WITNESS: If it's on a certificate -well, it depends. On some certificates he personally
signed and some certificates were issued through
Bonnie's computer with his signature on it and I'm
not sure.

GRAND JUROR 9: Okay. I think that's the question being asked.

GRAND JUROR 1: Being that's Robert Bates' certificate for his driving, do you think he personally signed that, or did he try to keep away from that intentionally? Just opinion.

THE WITNESS: I think it come through the computer.

GRAND JUROR 16: I don't have any more questions.

GRAND JUROR 9: Juror No. 9. I just had this formulated in my head a moment ago. I lost it.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ì

You know, there's an, obvious, umm, issue here with you being terminated. Does your termination weigh into your answers today? Basically, what I'm looking for is, you know, do you potentially have an ax to grind?

I know you're under oath and everything, but I just wanted to make sure that we're getting a true picture of your impression of the Sheriff's Office.

THE WITNESS: I can tell you I have no allegiance to the Sheriff's Office or Sheriff Glanz at this point. I've accepted my termination.

And what I've been instructed to do, not only by the individuals heading the jury, but -- and my attorneys, is just to be truthful and honest with vou.

GRAND JUROR 9: Thank you.

THE WITNESS: And I think most of my statements could be validated by some other proof or evidence. And I'm trying to be as open and forthcoming as I can about the nature of the office.

You know, I've accepted what's happened to me and I'm just going to have to move on. I'm young enough at least I can do that, so...

As far as an ax to grind. I don't have an ax to grind, but I don't have any allegiance to him to

```
protect him, either.
              GRAND JUROR 9: Thank you.
 2
 3
              MR. BARRIS: Anybody have any other questions?
 4
      Okay.
              Mr. Clark, I appreciate your coming today.
 5
      You're free to go, sir. Thank you.
 6
              (Witness and his counsel, Eric Stall, left the
 7
 8
              Grand Jury Room.)
9
              (Proceedings were held that were not requested
10
              to be transcribed.)
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	
4	STATE OF OKLAHOMA)
5	COUNTY OF TULSA SS.
6	
7	I, Tami Morse, Official Court
8	Reporter, within and for the State of Oklahoma, do
9	hereby certify that on September 14, 2015, before the
10	impaneled Grand Jury in the District Court of Tulsa
11	County, State of Oklahoma, I reported in machine
12	shorthand the proceedings had and the evidence given,
13	and the above and foregoing is a full, true, correct
14	and complete transcript of the proceedings had and
15	testimony given, taken at said time and place.
16	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto
17	set my hand and official seal this 38 1 Amuary,
18	2016. Jo - Ma (MD) DD
19	TAMI MORSE, CSR-RPR
20	CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER
21	
22	Tami Morse State of Oklahoma
23	Certified Shorthand Reporter CSR # 1973
24	My Certificate Expires 12-31-11e
25	4747