1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS
2	TOPEKA, KANSAS 2003 FED 11 70 1: 24
3	
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)
5	vs.) Case No.
6) 00-40104-01/02 WILLIAM L. PICKARD and)
7	CLYDE APPERSON,) Defendants.)
8	
9	TRANSCRIPT OF VOLUME I OF THE TESTIMONY OF GORDON TODD SKINNER HAD DURING TRIAL BEFORE
10	HONORABLE RICHARD D. ROGERS
11	and a jury of 12 on
12	January 28, 2003
13	APPEARANCES:
14	For the Plaintiff: Mr. Gregory G. Hough Asst. U.S. Attorney
15	290 Federal Building 444 Quincy Street
16	Topeka, Kansas 66683
17	For the Defendant: Mr. William Rork (Pickard) Rork Law Office
18	1321 SW Topeka Blvd. Topeka, Kansas 66612
19	Topeka, Ranbab 00012
20	For the Defendant: Mr. Mark Bennett (Apperson) Bennett, Hendrix & Moylan
21	(Apperson) Bennett, Hendrix & Moylan 5605 SW Barrington Court S Topeka, Kansas 66614
22	Court Reporter: Kelli Stewart, CSR, RPR
23	Nora Lyon & Associates 1515 South Topeka Avenue
24	Topeka, Kansas 66612
25	

NORA LYON & ASSOCIATES, INC. 1515 S.W. Topeka Blvd., Topeka, KS 66612 Phone: (785) 232-2545 FAX: (785) 232-2720 Case 5:00-cr-40104-RDR Document 269 Filed 02/11/03 Page 2 of 131

COPY²

		- • !
1	I N D E X	
2	Certificate 131	
3	Certificate 131	
4	WITNES	
5	ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT:	PAGE
6	GORDON TODD SKINNER	
7	Direct Examination by Mr. Hough	3
8	•	
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1		THEREUPON, the preceding motion and
2		Rule 17B hearing were not ordered transcribed)
3		THE COURT: All right. Mr. Hough,
4		you may call your next witness.
5		MR. HOUGH: Thank you, Your Honor.
6		The prosecution calls Gordon Todd Skinner.
7		
8		GORDON TODD SKINNER,
9		called as a witness on behalf of the
10		Government, was sworn, and testified as
11		follows:
12		DIRECT-EXAMINATION
13		BY MR. HOUGH:
14	Q.	Sir, would you please state your name.
15	Α.	Gordon Todd Skinner.
16	Q.	What is the correct spelling of your last name,
17		sir?
18	A.	S-K-I-N-N-E-R.
19	Q.	Sir, you appear today to testify pursuant to an
20		agreement with the Government; is that correct?
21	A.	Yes.
22	Q.	Would you please tell us your understanding of
23		that agreement.
24	A.	I entered into an agreement with the Department
25		of Justice, main justice, D.C., negotiated by

1 my attorney, Thomas D. Haney, who negotiated it with John Roth, for immunity of producing 2 3 evidence of an LSD lab and such, and that I 4 would be immunized from those such items. 5 Q. Okay. And that immunity would mean no prosecution as a result --6 7 Excuse me, Your Honor. MR. RORK: 8 would object to his characterization what -- he can ask this witness what it was. 9 10 MR. BENNETT: Same objection, Your 11 Honor. THE COURT: Overruled. 12 13 Ο. (BY MR. HOUGH) That would mean that you would 14 not be prosecuted as a result of giving 15 truthful and complete information and testimony 16 regarding the entire matter. That's correct. 17 Α. And it would be an umbrella that would cover 18 Ο. 19 the conspiracy, the possession, distribution, 20 manufacture of the LSD. Correct? MR. RORK: Again, Your Honor, I would 21 22 ask that he not ask leading and suggestive 23 questions. He can ask what his understanding 24 was. 25 Same objection. MR. BENNETT:

1 THE COURT: I will overrule your 2 objection. It's perfectly proper. 3 Q. (BY MR. HOUGH) You can answer. 4 Α. Yes. 5 It would also include a failure to file income Q. tax returns and money laundering, those types 6 of things? 7 8 Α. Yes. 9 Sir, did the Government seek out your Ο. cooperation in this matter? 10 11 No. A. And you indicated that you and your attorney 12 Q. 13 approached the Department of Justice. 14 specifically? 15 Not to be difficult, which time? Α. 16 Q. The ultimate agreement. In Washington, D.C. 17 Α. Okay. You can move that microphone around so 18 0. 19 you don't have to keep leaning into it, if 20 you -- to get comfortable. And when was it that 21 the agreement with Washington was executed, if 22 you recall? 23 October 19th of the year 2000. Subsequently, then, the Court recognized that 24 Ο. 25 immunity agreement. Correct?

1	71	Voc
	Α.	Yes.
2	Q.	I will show you Government's Exhibit 800. Do
3		you recognize that?
4		MR. RORK: Excuse me, Your Honor. I
5		think the prior question was subsequently the
6		Court recognized that agreement, and I don't
7		know if that was what the Government meant to
8		ask him.
9		MR. HOUGH: That's correct.
10		MR. RORK: Well, the Government is
11		the one that gave the agreement. Judge, I
12		would object to the form of that question. I
13		don't think the Court can adopt any agreement,
14		that's for the jury to decide.
15		THE COURT: The Court has looked at
16		the agreement.
17		MR. HOUGH: Yes.
18		THE COURT: You may go ahead.
19	Q.	(BY MR. HOUGH) Do you recognize that?
20	Α.	Yes.
21	Q.	And is that the order recognizing the
22		agreement?
23	Α.	Yes.
24	Q.	Subsequently, then, you were interviewed by the
25		DEA. Correct?

A. Yes.

1

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. And in that regard, they made you sign a confidential source agreement, did they not?
- 4 A. Yes.
- Q. Let me show you Government's Exhibit No. 801.

 Do you recognize that?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And is that the confidential source agreement that you entered into with the DEA?
 - A. Yes.

MR. RORK: Judge, I would just note that he's handed me what's been marked as Exhibit No. 800 and I haven't seen it. It was just filed evidently today at 11:59, I would hand to Mr. Bennett.

MR. HOUGH: It was the purpose of handing it to them, Judge.

- Q. (BY MR. HOUGH) Now, sir, what was your motive, your incentive for offering your cooperation to the Department of Justice?
- A. I was under the impression, I'm still not clear, that a murder had been committed within the organization. For three years this murder had been discussed and I had been arguing against it. I was asked to provide a weapon

for \$50,000, I refused. I was asked to be involved in a kidnapping, I refused. I was asked to be involved in drugging the person to knock them out so they could be kidnapped and then transported to a country like Guatemala.

Numerous information was given to me and I kept saying, "We do not murder." And this specifically was being carried out with William Leonard Pickard, Junior. And I fought with him extensively on this issue. And sometime during May--

Q. Of what year?

- A. Of the year 2000. He either indicated, and I'll explain why I'm not for sure, that the person was killed or was going to be killed.
- Q. And who was this person?
- A. This person was a long-term associate of what we refer to as the ET man.
 - O. And--
 - A. The ET man is the ergotamine tartrate or any precursor that is unique that goes to the manufacturing of LSD.
 - Q. And what exactly was it about the ET man that caused Mr. Pickard to want him dead?
 - A. No, no, it was the associate of the ET man, not

the ET man, to be dead. His associate had cooperated either in Oregon or Washington or both states and was-- numerous people, quote, were going away to prison for life. But the main concern of Pickard's was that if the ET man's associate was able to get him indicted, that this would be a significant problem for the source of ET. And this would ultimately be a source problem for the organization. And there is tremendous amounts of evidence that this murder story had been going on and on and on. This isn't the only thing that brought in my cooperation.

- Q. What were the other issues that you had?
- A. I was fed up with the fact that the downstream people were getting life terms and extremely harsh terms, and no money was being cycled back into their defense. I was also concerned that we were selling this item, because the organization was not supposed to be profiting this heavy from this particular item.
- Q. The organization, did it have a name, does it have a name?
- A. According to Pickard, he claims that he was at the time heavily involved in the Brotherhood of

	ĺ	
1		Eternal Love. From the lineage of my
2		understanding of the system, it seems to be
3		correct.
4	Q.	And Pickard that you're referring to, is he in
5		the courtroom here today?
6	A.	Yes. William Leonard Pickard is the man
7	111111111111111111111111111111111111111	sitting there.
8		MR. HOUGH: For the record, Your
9		Honor, the witness has identified the
10		Defendant, who acknowledged such.
11		THE COURT: Yes, sir.
12	Q.	(BY MR. HOUGH) And what was it strike that.
13		The ET man, his problems had arisen and were
14		pending where did you say?
15		MR. RORK: Your Honor, I object that
16		this misquotes the evidence. He said it was
17		the ET man's associate that had the problem.
18		MR. HOUGH: The ET man's associate
19		was cooperating against the ET man. I'm asking
20		now, Judge, for the location that that was
21		occurring.
22		THE COURT: Yes, I understood that.
23		MR. HOUGH: Thank you, sir.
24	Α.	It was either Washington state, Oregon state or
25		both.

- Q. (BY MR. HOUGH) And prior to this, had there been any indication that anyone involved in the organization was acting as a confidential informant or a snitch, or was this the first time?
- A. This was the first time that I had heard of a situation like that. But we're going back the three years that we've been arguing about this.
- Q. Okay.

- A. Or two-and-a-half years.
- Q. So with that point of reference, the information you've just provided this jury, you decided to - with your attorney - approach the Justice Department?
- A. Yes, I-- yes.
- Q. You indicated that there were efforts prior to reaching Washington, D.C., what exactly did that consist of?
- A. Well, this is a strange story, but I called different districts and called them and said, "I have a problem." I went to pay phones and used calling cards because I didn't want it tracing back to me until I could get some sort of dialogue going. And I specifically called in Washington, D.C., and spoke to a U.S.

1 Attorney who was over the danger -- who was 2 involved in the dangerous drug section of his 3 particular thing. I made a mistake, it turned 4 out he was a U.S. Attorney of Washington, D.C., not from the Attorney General's Office, but I 5 6 didn't realize that. And he basically laughed 7 and said, "I don't have time for you." 8 MR. RORK: Judge, I object to what he 9 said, unless they're going to bring him here 10 and we can cross examine him. 11 MR. HOUGH: Judge, this is offered as 12 a preliminary matter to show how he wound up in 13 Washington, D.C., with an attorney. 14 MR. BENNETT: Judge, it's still 15 hearsay and I would join in Mr. Rork's 16 objection. 17 THE COURT: Well, just-- do not say 18 what he said, just --19 Okay. I'm sorry. I-- I said I have what I Α. 20 believe is the world's largest LSD conspiracy, 21 we have some significant problems, and I would 22 like to try to work out something with the 23 Government. And I, unfortunately, used the 24 word transactional immunity, which no longer 25 exists, and he laughed at me and -- I'm sorry.

1 That's it. I can't say what he said, so--2 Q. Okay. 3 Α. I then also, to finish your question, called the U.S. Attorney's Office in Northern 4 California because I thought they would have a 5 better understanding. It was in San Francisco. 6 7 And I got a duty agent who left me on hold forever. And effectively, no -- no one believed 8 9 the story. Q. Subsequently, then, as I understand your 10 testimony, you contacted Tom Haney. 11 ultimately the agreement was entered and the 12 order signed earlier today. Correct? 13 That's correct. 14 Α. 15 Now, prior to--Q. THE COURT: Mr. Hough, why don't you 16 17 tell who Tom Haney is. We know, but I'm sure 18 the jury doesn't. 19 Q. (BY MR. HOUGH) You indicated earlier in your 20 testimony that you had an attorney. That 21 attorney is who? 22 A. Thomas D. Haney. 23 0. And he --

Okay. And you had a relationship with Mr.

24

25

Α.

Q.

He's from Topeka.

1 Haney regarding a legal matter that was 2 resolved in this court. Correct? 3 Α. That's correct. 4 Q. And let's take a moment and discuss that and 5 some other types of matters, okay? You have 6 had legal problems in the past. Correct? 7 Α. This is true. The -- one of those would be a misdemeanor 8 0. 9 conviction in this court relative to possession of an Interpole identification badge; is that 10 11 correct? 12 Α. True. Are you aware that it has been alleged that you 13 Q. have written counterfeit checks to Mr. Pickard? 14 15 Yes. True, sorry. Α. 16 Now, did you file bankruptcy in '92 in Ο. Oklahoma? 17 Yes, the Northeastern District. 18 Α. 19 Q. Anything unusual about that bankruptcy filing, 20 to your knowledge? 21 Α. Other than the size of it, which there was 22 nothing unusual except for I ended up with two 23 debts that I could not discharge. To your knowledge, were there any allegations

24

25

Q.

of fraud?

A. No.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- Q. Presently, are there some charges pending in Potawatomie County District Court?
 - A. Yeah. I want to go back and answer that question.
 - Q. Okay. Go ahead.
 - A. Prior to this event, I had never heard-- and I mean the last few years, that there was some problem with this. In the last few years, there's been people tell me that there was some allegations of fraud. But prior to 19 let's say-- or the year 2000, I had never heard anything remotely involving fraud with that bankruptcy.
 - Q. Okay. Strike my prior question, please. Are there charges presently pending against you in Potawatomie County, Kansas?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. That's relative to allegations of theft of stereo speakers?
 - A. True.
- Q. You're represented by an attorney there?
- 23 A. True.
- Q. In addition to that, in June of 2002, did you represent yourself to-- to be a doctor in the

- 1 State of Washington?
- 2 A. Yes.
- Q. And in that regard, prescribe drugs without a license?
- A. Yes. They were unscheduled, not scheduled drugs.
 - Q. Okay. Is there presently pending a dispute between you and Mr. Haney such that he does not represent you anymore?
- 10 A. Yes.

8

9

16

17

18

19

20

23

24

25

- 11 Q. And is that dispute over attorney's fees?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. Anything else?

that.

- 14 A. No, not that I know about.
- 15 Q. Okay. Is there an incident regarding--
 - A. I'm sorry. I-- I may-- I may have been a named defendant in his lawsuit where he fell over the fence and broke his ankle. I'm not for sure.

 You (sic) could have been a named defendant on
- Q. And that was in your property-- or at your property in Wamego?
 - A. That was at the missile base in Wamego. So, yeah, I'm sorry. And besides legal fees, there could be I'm a named defendant in that, I just

1 don't know. 2 Okay. And was there an issue relative to a Q. 3 boat that wound up in the Cayman Islands? 4 Α. Yes. 5 Where was that -- was that legal matter filed? Ο. 6 Yes, in-- I don't know the district, but it Α. 7 would have been approximately New Orleans, Louisiana. 8 9 Someone sued you over a boat? Ο. 10 Yes. Α. 11 And did they receive judgment against you as a Q. result of that? 12 13 Α. Yes. 14 Had you used any aliases or any Q. 15 misrepresentations in acquiring that? 16 Α. Yes, yes. Was that in the Eastern District of Louisiana? 17 Ο. I can't tell you. 18 Α. 19 Okay. Have you in the past described yourself Q. 20 to the security staff at a casino as a 21 representative of the Billionaire? 22 Α. No. 23 Q. Did you ever represent to your neighbors in

Wamego that you were the largest land owner in

24

25

Arizona?

1 A. No.

- Q. Have you in the past used alias names?
- 3 A. Yes.
 - Q. And can you tell us what those are and when you used them and why?
 - A. The when can be difficult, but I will do my best. I will start with the lesser ones.

 James Young I used approximately sometime in '86, '87, '88. Let's see. Charles Fletcher, approximately those same years, had a driver's license with that name on it. Gerard Terrence Finnegan, P.C. Carroll. And then aliases that are my actual name would be Gordon Todd Roth Skinner. And there's still confusion if that's my legal name right now or not.
 - Q. Why?
 - A. Because the State of Oklahoma only represents me-- only considers my name as Gordon Todd Roth Skinner, because when I got divorced my wife did not-- my ex-wife did not correctly fill out the paperwork to change our names back to the previous unhyphenated position. So that's a confusing issue. And then another alias that would be close to my name would be Todd Roth, that came-- a credit card came through her, and

1 they just dropped the Skinner, which was a 2 surprise, and I just carried the credit card 3 around. There are more aliases, I have to think about them, so --4 5 Q. We can come back. 6 MR. RORK: Judge, I would ask that he 7 be allowed to finish his answer. He asked for time to think about it. 8 9 MR. HOUGH: Well, Judge, it's an 10 issue that we can come back to. 11 THE COURT: Well, you-- you go ahead 12 and handle it the way you want to. 13 MR. HOUGH: Thank you, Judge. 14 Q. (BY MR. HOUGH) What was the purpose at the 15 time of using these aliases? 16 In the -- okay, first of all, my Gordon Todd--Α. 17 all the Roth, Skinner-Roth stuff was nothing but just normal life procedures. It was just --18 19 you know, because I wanted my children to have 20 hyphenated names so that there would not be a 21 patriarchial lineage there. Beyond that, the 22 rest of the names were used so that no one 23 would know who I was when I was doing anything 24 illegal or anything that I didn't want to be

traced, and to move through areas without the

1 Government or anyone being able to follow me. 2 Did all or part of that occur during the course Q. 3 of the conspiracy that you're required to 4 testify about pursuant to this agreement? 5 Α. No. Most of those names were all used in the 6 period of the '80s. 7 Q. Okay. 8 Α. With the exception of this Roth, Skinner-Roth, 9 I used that prior to my marriage in '92. 10 Q. Okay. Sir, what is your understanding of what 11 will happen to you in the event that you tell 12 lies to this jury in this trial? 13 I would probably be prosecuted to the fullest 14 and get the maximum time that would be under 15 the guidelines. 16 Q. Pursuant to your agreement, do you intend to 17 tell the truth now? 18 Α. Absolutely. Will you tell us, please, were you, in fact, 19 Q. part of a conspiracy to manufacture and 20 21 distribute LSD? 22 Α. Absolutely. 23 And did at least part of that occur in the Q. 24 State of Kansas?

25

Α.

Yes.

- Q. And can you tell us, sir, who else was involved with you in this conspiracy in the State of Kansas?
 - A. Okay. Apperson, Clyde Apperson, otherwise referred to as "C", William Leonard Pickard.

 And then there would be people that knew about it late in the game who would have been technically involved in the conspiracy as-- for example, if someone is driving the get-away car, under the new laws or the new interpretation, they, too, are part of the conspiracy. These would be people like Michael Hobbs, Gunnar Guinan, Lupe, my father.
 - Q. To the extent that they knowingly participated in a conspiracy, if at all?
 - A. They were-- knowingly, but very late in the game knowingly.
 - | Q. Okay.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. Only under emergency situations.
 - Q. Now, you indicated, sir, Mr. Apperson also known as "C". Is he in the courtroom today?
- A. Yes, he is.
 - Q. Would you point to him and identify him by describing what he's wearing for the record?
- A. Well, he's wearing a dark suit, but he's

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

hunkered down, he has glasses on and he's-there he goes and he's got a tie on.

MR. HOUGH: For the record, Your

Honor, the witness has correctly identified the

Defendant, who sat up from his hunkered

position once the-- the witness mentioned that.

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

- Q. (BY MR. HOUGH) What role did you specifically play within the conspiracy?
- Α. It's complicated. I was involved in money laundering, I was involved in trying to locate places that the labs would be at, I was involved in making decisions of where money was to go for what we, quote, called charitable operations. I was also involved with communications decisions, I was involved with making decisions of security issues. Quote, Pickard referred to me as a -- I have the worldwide security for the Brotherhood of Eternal Love, end quote. I was the document keeper, to the best of my knowledge. I looked and would make decisions that had to do with was this a good decision, was this going to cause a problem, constantly sifting through errors of seizure-- I mean, errors of where we

- would have risk problems. Trying to keep us abreast of legal problems that would occur.

 Also interfacing with just general public people that we were dealing with.

 What was the duration of your involvement in
 - Q. What was the duration of your involvement in this conspiracy to manufacture LSD?
 - A. Well, you-- you know, if you mean from the first time I knew that it was going on.
 - Q. Active participation by you in the conspiracy.
 - A. Well, I'm not trying to weasel on this, what
 I'm trying to do is-- active participation, in
 one way I feel that a call came in to me on an
 800 number for a precursor, and that would be
 very early on, but I did not produce the
 precursor, nor did I-- nor was I very happy
 about the call.
 - Q. Would that have been essentially your first knowledge of the conspiracy generally?
 - A. No, no. My knowledge--
 - Q. When did that occur?
 - A. Sometime in '95, '96, through-- I think '96 through Alfred Savinelli.
 - Q. Okay.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A. And it was code named at that time the Swimming Pool Project.

1	Q.	And then when do you believe that you were
2		actively involved? For about how long prior
3		to
4	A.	Well, I would like to without butting in
5		front of you, I'm sorry. Finish.
6	Q.	When would be your belief that you were
7		actively involved doing the things that you
8		just testified were your role in the
9		conspiracy?
10	Α.	Well, it's like, you know you know, if you
11		want to what is it, cook a frog and not let
12		it know that you're slowly turning up the
13		temperature, so boil frog, sorry. So
14		gradually the involvement became greater and
15		greater, so
16	Q.	And started when?.
17		MR. RORK: Well, Judge, if he would
18		actually let him finish his answer instead of
19		cutting him off when he doesn't say something
20		he wants.
21		MR. HOUGH: Judge, I
22		THE COURT: Watch it. Go ahead.
23	Α.	The first thing that would have been is that
24		I at the there was an ethnobotany

conference at the Palace of Fine Arts. It was

the first time I physically ever saw William
Leonard Pickard. And he walked up to me and
asked me to launder \$50,000, and I said I would
consider it or something like that. So that
would be part of the conspiracy.

- Q. That occurred when and where?
- A. I believe-- I believe it was-- and this has been an issue that I've seen before, November of 1996. I mean, I'm doing my best on this.
- Q. Okay.

A. But I had had a phone call prior to that with him identifying himself as Carlos, and I was told that the phone call would be coming in.

MR. BENNETT: Well, now, Judge, I'm going to object to what he was told, that's hearsay. Deprives us of the right to cross examine whoever told him whatever was told to him.

MR. HOUGH: Based upon the Court's ruling at the <u>James</u> hearing, this would be admissible, Judge.

MR. RORK: Well, Judge, he's talking about a ruling. If it's something that he said Mr. Pickard said or Mr. Apperson said, I have no problem. If it's not, I would like to have

NORA LYON & ASSOCIATES, INC. 1515 S.W. Topeka Blvd., Topeka, KS 66612 Phone: (785) 232-2545 FAX: (785) 232-2720

1 it identified. Well--2 THE COURT: MR. HOUGH: These are co-conspirator 3 statements, Judge. 4 THE COURT: 5 Overruled. 6 Q. (BY MR. HOUGH) You may continue. 7 I was informed that a man by the -- with -- would be using the code name Carlos would be calling 8 9 me looking for a chemical precursor that I could obtain either through Sigma Aldrich, 10 let's just call it Sigma Aldrich, they're 11 12 merged effectively. And I had the ability to get chemicals from Sigma Aldrich. 13 What I was 14 surprised was that he said it on my 800 line and I was in shock, so I cut the phone call off 15 and never returned anything about that. 16 And that occurred approximately when? 17 Q. 18 I-- I can't tell you, I'm sorry. Α. You indicated that you were involved with Mr. 19 Q. 20 Apperson and Mr. Pickard in this LSD 21 conspiracy, sir. Can you describe for the 22 jury, please, what each of their respective 23 roles within the conspiracy were? I've got a question. Can I also -- this is 24 Α.

probably improper. Can I give the time of

when-- since it's in my mind, of when I met "C", and then give that?

- Q. That's fine. When did you meet Mr. Apperson?
- A. It would be-- it would be of record the date

 Leonard asked me to give "C" \$50,000 and all

 the name he gave me was "C". And he had to

 leave town, he was at the Pan Pacific Hotel in

 San Francisco. 50,000 was handed over to me.

 It was not my room, but it had been paid for.

 I decided that I didn't want to transport the

 cash, which it turns out to be interesting, and

 I shoved it up into a furniture piece that was

 a piece of decor in the room. And then I left.

And the next morning I had to come back,
I went to my girlfriend's house, I came back,
but it was good that I didn't carry the money
because I discovered that I had broke some sort
of regulation of traveling on the highway in
the San Francisco area. And I was in the
carpool lane and it said two-seater only or
something, and I was in a two-seater car. And
I ended up getting a \$450 ticket, which is a
matter of record, that day.

I did get to the hotel and then I was late and I was saying to my girlfriend this is

going to be a disaster because "C", according to Leonard, is very prompt. And this is not good. And I said here I got pulled over, you know, a ridiculous situation. It turns out that "C" was on that elevator with me. And the only way that we knew each other was that we both got off on the same floor. And I entered the room and gave him the \$50,000 in cash and he left.

- Q. What was your understanding of the purpose of giving Mr. Apperson \$50,000 cash?
- A. Leonard just asked me to do it. It was probably a-- he specifically didn't say what it was. I mean, it was just owed to "C". I mean, if he did say, I can't remember.
- Q. Okay. This Pan Pacific Hotel is located where?
- A. San Francisco.
 - Q. And the approximate date, if you recall?
 - A. I-- I can't recall. We would have to go back to the record and look at tickets and hotel receipts.
- Q. Do you recall the approximate year?
- 23 A. '98.

Q. Okay. Other than "C", do you know Mr. Apperson to go by any other alias names?

- A. I've never heard any last names. There was something about a Bill, but nothing more than that.
 - Q. Do you know Mr. Pickard to use other alias names?
- 6 A. Yes.

5

9

15

16

17

18

19

20

- Q. Would you describe for the jury what those are, please?
 - A. Bruce Niemi was one of them.
- 10 Q. Bruce Nieme?
- 11 A. Yes. Maxwell.
- Q. Let's stop with Bruce Niemi. Do you know
 whether or not there is an actual person named
 Bruce Niemi?
 - A. There is a couple of people named Bruce Niemi, but there's an actual person that I know named Bruce Niemi.
 - Q. And did you ever have any conversations with Mr. Pickard about why he used the name Bruce Niemi?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Describe those for us, please.
- A. Approximately the same height, gray hair,
 approximately the same age. But there was a
 problem that Pickard didn't like, and that's

- 1 that they had two different eye colors, and he 2 was worried about that with ID. 3 Q. And this Bruce Niemi that is actually a person is-- does what? 4 . Well, he's now a professor -- I don't know what. 5 Α. He is a teacher at a college, but he was a 6 7 state representative of the State of Oklahoma. 8 Q. Okay. Now, you indicated Mr. Apperson to use the alias of Bill and you never knew the last 9 10 name? Never. When I say never, I never knew it 11 Α. 12 during -- up until the year 2000 or -- you know, November of 2000 or whatever. 13 Let me show you what's been caused to be marked 14 Q. 15 and admitted as Government's Exhibit 121 and identified as an identification card of Mr. 16 17 Apperson bearing the name Bill Martin on Cherry Avenue, San Jose, California, phone number and 18 19 a badge number. Do you recognize the 20 photograph as that of someone you know? 21 Α. Yes, that's Clyde.
- 22 Q. Clyde?
- 23 A. Apperson.
- Q. Okay. The man you know as "C"?
- 25 A. "C".

- Q. Did you ever know him to carry this false identification?
- A. No. I've never seen this until this moment.
 - Q. Okay. I'm sorry to have interrupted you.

 Other than Bruce Niemi, you mentioned James

 Maxwell as a name that Mr. Pickard used. Were
 there others?
 - A. I believe John Connor, but Connor was definitely the last name. There were other names, and I'm going to have to think about them. I'm sorry, we'll have to go back and visit that.
 - Q. Okay.

- A. There were plenty of names.
- Q. Now, you briefly touched on your first time that you met Mr. Pickard. Can you tell us, beginning upon the first meeting with Mr. Pickard, how your relationship with him evolved into your involvement in this conspiracy?
- A. It was a very slow evolution. And during that time that I first met him, it was just a social gathering. We were staying -- there was a group of us who did not want to stay in the town for the ethnobotany conference, it was quite large.
- Q. And that town is what?

- A. San Francisco. And we stayed in a small town on the coast called Stinson Beach at a place called San Sushi, Jerry Garcia's old home. And we used to have meetings there.
 - Q. What kind of meetings?
 - A. Oh, they would be meetings-- this specific meeting had a kind of a positive and a negative to it. We-- extensive discussion was going on about the fact that Nicky Sand had been busted up in Vancouver in an MDMA, LSD, DMT lab. And there were a lot of pale white faces at this house.
 - Q. Who all was at the house and party to the discussion that you recall?
 - A. I mean, there was Joel Kramer, his wife, Diana.

 There was Ganga.
- Q. Ganga who?
- A. Ganga White. There was-- Leonard was there.
- 19 Q. Leonard?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

- 20 | A. Pickard.
 - A. Alfred Savinelli. There were some chemists out of Dave Nichols' lab. There was a D.M.

 Turner, I can't remember his real name, he has
- since died, he was there. Bill Wynn. Of
- course myself. There were other people staying

1 there, they just were not involved in those conversations. And there may be -- as I go on, 2 3 I can remember some other people that were involved in that conversation. 4 5 Q. And the individual that they were talking about 6 was who? 7 He is considered one of the prominent and Α. highest members of the Brotherhood of Eternal 8 9 Love, and he goes way back with the Brotherhood. And he had been a fugitive for 15 10 11 years or more, I believe, I'm roughly guessing 12 this. And he was a famed LSD chemist on top of 13 just a famed chemist. 14 When did you get into the Brotherhood of Q. Eternal Love? 15 16 Α. Well, I'm never for sure if I was in there, 17 because I'm not for sure which branch, if -- if Pickard had the authority. But it would be 18 19 through Pickard that I would have been in that. 20 Q. And who is the Brotherhood of Eternal Love? 21 Well, originally it was a large organization Α. that came out of the late '60s, early '70s. 22

back then, marijuana operations and psychedelic

And it's a -- the function was to produce --

well, they had-- they had hashish operations

23

24

1 operations. The psychedelic operations would 2 have been LSD, mescaline, MDA, unfortunately 3 DOB or something -- I'm sorry, DOM, which was nicknamed STP, which was a disaster. 4 5 Why was it a disaster? Q. Well, a famed chemist made it and another 6 Α. chemist copied it and they got the dose wrong. 7 8 And about -- and I can be totally wrong, but at 9 least 1,200 people showed up in the San 10 Francisco area in about a 12-hour period in 11 emergency rooms. It was a -- it was very harsh. And this was in the early '70s, as I remember. 12 And the drugs basically that were the subject 13 Q. of the Brotherhood of Eternal Love would be 14 psychedelics, hallucinogens? 15 16 With also hashish --Α. 17 MR. RORK: Judge, excuse me. 18 Honor, that misstates the evidence. He said 19 marijuana, hashish, and then we went into 20 psychedelics. So I would ask that the question not misstate the evidence. 21 22 MR. HOUGH: The witness, of course, 23 can answer appropriately to that question, 24 Judge.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

- A. I was getting ready to say a lot of funding at that time came from hashish and marijuana.
- Q. (BY MR. HOUGH) Okay. And then what was your next step into the involvement in the conspiracy?
- A. Where I would say that I-- I accidentally ran into Leonard at the hotel named the Mandarin.
- Q. Approximately when?
 - A. February of '97. It was-- he was there for a talk being given by Alexander T. Shulgin.
 - Q. Who is that?

- A. He is a famed chemist who had a Schedule I license, who I also know, who's written many books and is given of the position of creating the most different analogs and psychedelics, quote, entheogens, quote-- or slash tactigens (spelled phonetically) in the world.
- Q. A Schedule I license for the jury's benefit is what?
- A. It allows you to do research under very tight parameters with items that the Government has put into a category that says there is no medical use or legitimate use. And they cannot be written as prescription items. I.e., a Schedule I item could be THC, but I don't want

1 to use that one, it would be better to use 2 something like PCP-- no, let's get off of that 3 Let's go to-- well, we'll just say LSD, 4 psilocyn, psilocybin, mescaline would be a Schedule I. While Schedule IIs could be items 5 like cocaine, you know, methamphetamine. 6 7 Another Schedule I would be heroin. And then 8 you have Schedule IIIs and Schedule IVs. I.e., Schedule III would be something like 9 10 Alprazolam. 11 0. Mr. Sulgin also has an affectionate nickname? Sasha. 12 Α. 13 Q. Okay. But you have to remember that there has been 14 Α. 15 some confusion because when Sasha's name is used, there has been some confusion because 16 there's another Sasha that is in the worldwide 17 family as we would call it. 18 19 Okay. Tell us, then, about the -- the situation Q. 20 at the Mandarin that you had started to tell us 21 about. What occurred there? 22 Α. I accidentally ran into Leonard on the elevator 23 coming up. I think I was -- I was coming up 24 from being down at the front desk and he was 25 carrying a little roller suitcase behind him,

1		and we just were amazed to see each other. I
2		was I was not going to go to the meeting
3		because I didn't want that many DEA people to
4		see me. He had the guts to go to it, which was
5		pretty gutsy. And he went to the meeting and
6		we then talked. But in this bag he claimed to
7		have \$700,000 in cash. And he actually did
8		have what looked like a large amount of cash
9		that he was wheeling along like you would take
10		your dirty clothes. I mean, it was pretty
11		humorous, sir.
12	Q.	You indicated
13	A.	That's the way he dealt with cash.
14	Q.	We'll get to more of that in a little bit. You
15		indicated that it was gutsy for him to go to a
16		meeting with DEA people there. Why?
17	Α.	Because Leonard has had is a known chemist to
18		the Government, and
19		MR. RORK: Your Honor, may we have
20		a instruct the Government. I would like to
21		approach the bench.
22		THE COURT: All right. You may do
23		so.
24		(THEREUPON, the following
25		proceedings were held at the bench and

outside of the hearing of the jury).

MR. RORK: My objection, if the Court please, I believe that Mr. Hough had told me this morning he was going to follow your order in limine and approach the bench before he got into any areas you ruled were excluded. And what specifically is excluded is Mr. Pickard's prior criminal conviction or any information about that. And I don't think this witness-- I want to make sure, one, that Mr. Hough has instructed him not to talk about the facts of that case or anything relating to it in violation of your motion in limine. That's my concern.

MR. HOUGH: Judge, I hadn't asked him about the conviction. My understanding of his testimony was that he was not going to mention the conviction. We're aware of the Court's order regarding that. And the one thing that I can do, while we are all here to save time in approaching later, would be to ask him follow-up questions to get to his knowledge of the prior convictions now to establish the relationship of the parties and his understanding of his co-conspirator's

experience and background in manufacturing LSD. So to save time in coming up here later, I would ask the Court's permission to ask him questions about that now.

MR. RORK: Judge, I'm not prepared to argue that right now. I came up here about this witness and to make sure he was admonished initially so we didn't get to slipping things in, like we did with Mr. Sorrell. That way there won't be any question. For him to say I'm going to ask about his knowledge and background is just another way of attempting to get by your order in limine. That's my concern.

MR. HOUGH: Judge, the relationship of the parties within a conspiracy is a completely different matter than the collective knowledge of officers in a criminal investigation. The Government is entitled in the Pinkerton conspiracy case to establish the relationship of the parties and their knowledge one of the other and their understanding of the experience one of the other in fulfilling the role within the context of the conspiracy. That's very well established law.

1 THE COURT: Okay. Well, all of you 2 remember my orders, and I'm sure you're 3 remembering this. And this man is admonished 4 what to put in and what not to put in. 5 will -- if that was an objection, I've done what you want to do. Now, let's continue. 6 7 MR. HOUGH: Judge, we would ask the 8 Court -- the Court's order was that we approach 9 before getting into that. 10 THE COURT: Yes. 11 MR. HOUGH: I can get into that now as opposed to approaching the bench later this 12 13 afternoon, just to streamline this thing, and 14 have him testify about it now while we're on 15 notice that it's coming, which is my request 16 now, unless you want repeated bench conferences this afternoon. 17 THE COURT: Well, this is agreeable 18 19 to the Court. Put it in the way you think you 20 need to put it in. And you can object to what 21 you want to object to. But I'm not worried 22 about the bench conference. MR. RORK: Well, Judge, I object to 23 any reference in any manner, in any fashion of 24 25 Mr. Pickard's prior conviction or the facts and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

events around that, period. For the state --Government to try to get into it now and say it's part of a known conspiracy -- this conspiracy is charged from a date in 1998 to November of 2002, the information deals with the laboratory equipment at Wamego, it doesn't deal with something that happened 15 years earlier. It deals with what he did here. And the Government's efforts to try and get in his knowledge of Mr. Pickard as a chemist or making LSD is just a backdoor way of trying to get inflammatory and prejudicial evidence whose probative value -- prejudicial value outweighs the probative value to allow any of that to get in here.

If that's a conspiracy, he can talk about all the deeds, all the acts, all the things they did with this equipment. But to try and bring in prior equipment I think is a violation of Mr. Pickard's right—his right to confrontation, his right to have that evidence brought in. That's impeachment evidence, that's not dealing with the facts of his credibility. Just like Mr. Skinner's evidence of the Huleback death isn't admissible, as has

1	been ruled by you. It's similar-type behavior.
2	It's not a conviction, it's not relevant here
3	in this proceeding, other than to inflame the
4	jury. And I believe its prejudicial value
5	outweighs its probative value.
6	MR. HOUGH: Judge, I'm sorry
7	MR. BENNETT: I would just join in
8	in that. You're talking about a conspiracy
9	during a particular period of time, that's
10	what's been pled in the Indictment and it's
11	been amended twice to expand it. But it would
12	be our position that this man's testimony
13	should be restricted to that that the
14	conspiracy that's on trial here in this matter.
15	MR. HOUGH: Judge, those arguments
16	ignore 404(b) and they ignore the concept of a
17	Pinkerton historical conspiracy, which is what
18	this is.
19	THE COURT: Yes.
20	MR. BENNETT: Judge, we've never
21	received any notice of any intent to on
22	404(b).
23	MR. HOUGH: Mr. Rork did.
24	MR. BENNETT: Well, I didn't.
25	MR. RORK: And I don't have it in

front of me. 1 2 MR. HOUGH: It's not 404(b) as to Mr. 3 Apperson, it is as to Mr. Pickard. 4 MR. BENNETT: Well, then that's 5 another --THE COURT: Well, gentlemen, I want 6 7 each side to try their own case and I-- I'm not 8 going to allow you gentlemen to tell him how to 9 try his case and he tell you how to try your 10 case. MR. BENNETT: 11 Judge - -12 THE COURT: And backgrounds and 13 history is -- is not bad in this, we --14 eventually we're going to get into the 15 conspiracy for the time. But how they got 16 together and how they knew each other, there's 17 nothing wrong with that. MR. RORK: Well, Judge, to say they 18 19 knew each other because they manufactured LSD 20 in the past is getting into evidence that we 21 object to. That's not telling him how to try 22 his case. We're trying to ask that his case be 23 tried within the bounds of evidence. We came 24 up here for one objection and the Government

goes to somewhere else. I would ask that you

1
order him to go on to other matters. At the
afternoon break I can look at the 404(b) notice
and have your order and the motion and argue
and you can constructively rule on it then. He
can go to other matters now. But to just open
the door to let him in and then have me stand
up and object, which you continually deny them
which is your right, is it looks like to the
jury I am trying to hide something. And what
I'm trying to do is make sure this case is
tried within the rules of evidence. That's the
problem I have.
MR. HOUGH: Your ruling was correct
and we would ask to be able to proceed and get
this case tried.
THE COURT: Yeah, I cannot see that
we're opening the door at this time. So I'm
going to overrule your objection. You may go
ahead.
MR. HOUGH: Thank you.
MR. RORK: I will just note my
continuing objection then.
THE COURT: Yes, yes.
(THEREUPON, the bench conference
was concluded and the following

proceedings were held within the hearing of the jury).

- Q. (BY MR. HOUGH) Were there other reasons that in your estimation it was gutsy, other than that one that you just gave us?
- A. There was little reason for him to have gone, he should have sent a person to gather the information, to pay respect to Sasha, Alexander T. Shulgin. He was in the middle of large operations. It did turn out to be a problem that he went, even he-- I don't know if I'm allowed because it would be hearsay, so I can't say what he said, or I can?
- O. "He" is who?
- 15 A. Pickard.
- 16 Q. What he told you--
- 17 | A. Okay.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 18 | Q. What?
 - A. He told me a contact report was filled out and that he was followed by some sort of undercover agent, and he described where they were even parked at. And he said, "Be careful, I've brought heat to us accidentally."
 - Q. Okay. So what else happened as a result of this situation at the Mandarin?

- A. Well, he did not want to put the bill on his credit card, and it was-- he asked me to pay his bill and I did.
- Q. What was the total of that bill?
- A. 6,700 or 6,800, sorry, I can't remember.
- Q. And again, this was sometime in February of
- 8 A. I hope.

- Q. And did you ever get reimbursed by Mr. Pickard for that?
- A. Yes. He sent me an envelope that was intercepted, via Federal Express, by the Tulsa narcotics squad. And I got this call and I really didn't know, I was-- I was-- did not take it as a joke. I was thinking some friend of mine or enemy of mine had sent me something through the mail, and I was-- instructed Bill Wynn to call every possible person and say, "Did anything come in the mail?" Because I was very upset. When Bill came back and said I've contacted the known-- the usual suspects and nothing happened, I then said, "I'm going to go claim the package."
- Q. And did you?
- A. I did.

- Q. And did you get the money out of the package?
- A. Well, yeah. It became quite a tug-of-war between Federal Express, the narcotics squad and myself, because it-- the entire story was misrepresented to me by the Tulsa narcotics squad. They said it was a box and the drug dogs had picked it up. When it was eventually turned over to me, it was a very thin envelope. And Federal Express said, "We don't want any part of this," because it turns out I said, "I'm going to shut down my account corporately with you, Fed-Ex, for participating in this lie." They then told the narcotics squad, "Take this package outside of here, we do not want any part of it."

I then told the narcotics squad I would not put my hands on it, because I didn't trust him, because I didn't want fingerprints. I had him open the package, dump out the money, and I then claimed the money. He was shocked that I claimed the money.

- Q. This was \$5,000 approximately?
- A. It was exactly \$5,000.
- Q. And later did you recoup the additional 1,700?
- A. In person.

- Q. And describe that.
- 2 A. In Taos, New Mexico.
- 3 Q. Describe that incident with Mr. Pickard.
 - A. Leonard came by Alfred's house and I said, "By the way, that bill was like \$6,700 and with this was 5,000--"
- 7 Q. Alfred who?

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. Savinelli. Who has a house and a business in Taos, New Mexico. And Leonard got the 1,700 or 1,800 out and gave it to me and said sorry.

 And I said, "Here's the bigger problem," and I showed him the narcotics squad card, I showed him the envelope, I told him about the problem and I said, you know, "Don't do this anymore."
- Q. As a result--
 - A. And, in fact, I also said I'm not-- because it took this, you're going to have to front me money out if I pay your bills.
 - Q. And did Mr. Pickard, in fact, front you money from that point forward?
- A. Yes.
- Q. How much and in what form?
 - A. Always in cash. It could be different

 denominations. It could have been different

 currencies and I don't remember amounts of less

1 than 50,000. Usually 100,000. But I could be 2 wrong. I mean, it was usually 50 to 100,000 or 3 more. 4 Q. And when you say "fronted," describe for the jury what that means to be fronted money and 5 6 why that's done and what it means. 7 Α. He gives me--8 MR. RORK: Judge, I object to saying 9 he fronted me money and why that's done. 10 want him to testify he fronted me money and why 11 he did it here. 12 MR. HOUGH: Well, Judge, if he wants 13 that done, he can certainly ask it on cross. 14 THE COURT: It's overruled. 15 ahead. 16 Cash would be given to me. And there were 17 multiple accounts, and one account was to pay 18 incidental bills for me electronically and, 19 therefore, the cash --20 Q. (BY MR. HOUGH) Why were there bills 21 electronically? 22 Electronic money doesn't show a trail up to Α. 23 FINCEN and to the Treasury Department and to 24 all the bank regulation organizations, which we

were very-- trying to fly under the radar.

- 1 | Q. "We" is who?
- 2 A. It would be Pickard, myself, Apperson and such.
- 3 Savinelli. And we were-- I could be at this--
- 4 we were experts at flying underneath that
- 5 radar. And I handled electronic money.
- 6 Q. Okay. In addition to that, the money-- the
- 7 being fronted money in the context of the
- 8 conspiracy meant what?
- 9 A. Well-- again, okay. There-- there was an
- 10 account to pay things that were just ongoing
- 11 bills, and then there was different types of
- money that was given to me that may have been
- fronted or may have been in arrears for actual
- 14 other types of items.
- 15 | 0. Such as?
- 16 A. For example, if we were going to buy a large
- 17 ticket item, he would accumulate money in an
- account with me, but this would be a different
- account and it would be handled differently.
- 20 Q. What types of large ticket items?
- 21 A. Well, we were going to buy a house in Santa Fe.
- Q. For what purpose?
- 23 A. To put an LSD lab in it.
- Q. What period of time are we talking about there?
- 25 A. '99.

Q. Okay. Now--

- A. I believe it was called the Sandosky (spelled phonetically) house.
 - Q. Why was it called that?
 - A. It was the name of the physicist that had it built. I could be wrong about the name.
 - Q. Now, can you describe for the jury, please-you described your role. Describe for the
 jury, please, Mr. Pickard's role and then Mr.
 Apperson's role within the context of this
 conspiracy.
 - A. Mr. Apperson's role was to-- he was basically the setup and tear-down man.
 - Q. Meaning what?
 - A. Set up a lab. If there was a problem and we were going to have an inspection, which was always a problem, from the-- there were notorious stories about the Aspen lab always having been-- to be torn down and reset back up. The Santa Fe lab I think had to have it done a few times. It-- say like you rented a house and the landlord said, "We want to come through and look at it," well, you obviously have to tear down the LSD lab because it causes problems, and then you set it back up, so-- and

so mainly "C"'s role at that point early on was set up and tear down within this conspiracy. A little bit later it graduated on to some money laundering operations, maybe. I'm not fully aware of that. And also, it involved hiring smurfs.

- Q. And a smurf is what?
- A. A person that goes out and launders money for you by buying small amounts of money orders, wires small amounts of money and keeps you underneath this FINCEN elaborate treasury mechanism to catch illegal narcotics money and all illegal money, whether it's narcotics or not.
- Q. Okay. And did Mr. Apperson, first of all--
- 16 | A. Also--

- Q. -- graduate beyond that?
 - A. He did help with the chemistry, but-- but within this conspiracy, that was limited. He also was-- was responsible for building any sort of mechanical item or repairing anything within the lab or to disguise the lab's area or to do work within the lab for ventilation, for water coming in, electrical and so on.
 - Q. Okay. And Mr. Pickard's role within the

conspiracy was what?

- A. To obtain the precursors and to mainly synthesize the LSD.
- Q. And what do you mean, for the jury's benefit, synthesizing LSD?
- A. Well, you start with some sort of erigot derivative, let's say, i.e., Ergotamine and tartrate, and then you use different chemicals and you then come to lysergamide and then you take the lysergamide and you use some different operations and you end up with LSD. And this is a very critical process for yields and this is one of the things that Leonard claimed to be really good at was high yields and it seems that he was one of the best in the world, if not the best for high yield, large batch.
- 17 Q. Large batch?
 - A. Which is quite -- quite a feat technically.
 - Q. And a large batch would consist of about what?
 - A. Anything -- well, you know, in the regular world I mean anything above ten grams was a large batch, but by our standards 500 grams and up, I mean, you know-- you know, a couple of kilograms accumulated. And one of the things that Leonard had done was he had made a jump

from the best yield of around 24 percent to a claimed yield of 44 percent, which is quite a scientific feat.

- Q. Did he indicate to you or anyone in your presence how that was done?
- A. Well, a few stories to explain this. He said because of my refusal to get the precursor from Sigma Aldrich, it sent him in a different direction for a recipe formula, chemical thing. And because of that delay, he was able to come up with a standard that would give him high yields of -- I can go into explaining what the yield problem is, if you want me to.
- Q. To the extent that you understand it, please do?
- A. Okay. The first thing is the conversion from whatever your ergot source is, and let's say that's -- that ergot is going to have a certain amount of lysergamide that will be in its density that can be available. That will then give you lysergamides that you can work into LSD. And you start with-- that conversion gives you X amount of a yield.

The next step is a very touchy-- and this is where-- very specific properties, this must

1 be done virtually in the dark because of a 2 problem called -- and I'm not -- I'm not going to say the word correctly, impromazation 3 spelled phonetically), and because of a problem 4 5 with light, full spectrum light. And I'll 6 explain both problems. So you have to have 7 shielded tubes and some processes have to effectively be done completely in the dark. 8 9 Have you seen this done? 10 MR. RORK: Judge, excuse me, I would 11 ask that he be allowed to finish his answer and 12 that the Government quit cutting him off. 13 THE COURT: I thought he had finished 14 his answer. 15 MR. HOUGH: Yes, Judge. 16 (BY MR. HOUGH) Have you seen this done? Q. 17 Α. No, not the entire process. 18 Q. Are you capable yourself of making LSD? 19 Α. No. Who do you know -- actually know that has that 20 Q. knowledge and ability? 21 Dave Nichols, Sash Shulgin, Carl Nichols. 22 Α. 23 just going from the reports, maybe you don't. I just read reports, sorry. Leonard Pickard. 24 25 Sorry.

- Q. Okay. But you yourself are not capable of that.
 - A. No. I'm sorry, Tim-- Tim, the DEA chemist.
- 4 Q. McKibben.
- 5 A. Yeah.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 6 Q. Now --
- A. Actually, I've got to go back. Carl can make

 -- did a one specific thing is all I've ever

 read, I'm sorry.
 - Q. Relevant to this conspiracy, the members of which you are aware, who could make LSD, who can cook it?
 - A. The only one would be Leonard Pickard.
 - Q. Okay. Now, did you ever have any conversations with Mr. Pickard specifically regarding his prior experience in manufacturing LSD?
- 17 A. Yes.
 - Q. And did those conversations include information about prior experiences cooking the drug?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And did what he told you about that add to your belief that he was actually capable and could do this prior to you witnessing it?
 - A. I would like to answer it. Originally, the first money that was given to me really made me

suspicious that this may have been a hashish and marijuana operation because of the money all reeked of pot or marijuana, but that's -- was later rapidly -- that was dissuaded and I didn't believe that anymore.

O. How --

- A. Yes, from a technical standpoint, the procedures of where he would talk about I saw LSD and valuma-- L-U-N-- L-U-M-I LSD and the procedures that he used and the ways that he talked about how he did this. There were some things that not very many people on the planet would have known.
- Q. Did he specifically indicate to you an experience in Mountain View?
- A. Yes.
- Q. That added to your belief that he was real about this?
- A. He used to refer to himself as the poster child for the California -- I don't-- the bureau of narcotics of California, I don't know what their real name is, sorry. It's whatever would be like the DEA only state version of California, and he referred to himself as the poster boy for a very large bust by those terms

1 that occurred in Mountain View, California. 2 And what did he tell you about that? 3 He said --Α. 4 MR. RORK: Your Honor, excuse me. Ιf 5 the Court, please, may we approach, Judge? 6 THE COURT: Yes, you may. 7 MR. RORK: Prior ruling. (THEREUPON, the following proceedings 8 were held at the bench and outside of the 9 10 hearing of the jury). 11 MR. RORK: Judge, in light of your prior ruling, I will let the matter go on, 12 13 because you said let the Government try the case the way they want to. When Mr. Skinner 14 15 doesn't give the answer the Government wants to 16 violate the order and Motion in Limine, they 17 ask it a different way. They also got in that he knew how to do certain things, and that may 18 have been within the -- (reporter interruption) 19 20 that may have been within his knowledge. And now he's talking about Mountain View, giving 21 22 evidence again of a specific instance of 23 That's the exhibit that you ruled was conduct. 24 inadmissible. That's the exhibit that you 25 ruled the evidence and the maintenance of, the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

LSD laboratory was not to be talked about. That's the exhibit and the information that you ruled in the case would not be admissible into evidence. I need to be sure I find the right order. And again, he's bringing in Mr. Pickard's prior conviction and the nature of the conviction, the fact that he had been convicted in California, the fact that he had made the LSD in California. The Mountain View search is the same evidence in your previous order you said would not be admissible. And I believe the Government has now substantially violated your rule and which it said should be excluded in this case. I don't know if I grabbed the right order, Judge, I've got the November 27th.

MR. HOUGH: Judge, there is -- we went over this the last time we were up here. We thoroughly discussed it at the last time we were at the bench and the Court ruled that this witness could testify regarding his knowledge and his conversation with his co-conspirators regarding this issue. So I don't understand -- unless Mr. Rork has some new thing to add, this is a rehash regarding the matter the Court has

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

already ruled on at the bench the last time we were here ten minutes ago.

MR. RORK: And, Judge, when we were There's been no It's not in furtherance of

at the bench ten minutes ago, he went back out there and he didn't talk about his conviction, he said read back the question. And the question he read back was, quote, "Mr. Pickard was known to be a chemist to the DEA." not inflammatory in and of itself in light of the ruling. But then go back now and list specific facts about the conviction is in violation of your order. evidence at this point in time that Mr. Pickard has been convicted of manufacturing LSD, there's been no indication in this regard that he was known -- that would in any way have facilitated this conspiracy. It's outside the conspiracy, Judge. the conspiracy. And again, you've already ruled its probative value outweighs its prejudicial value. And we would touch upon when Mr. Skinner testified, depending upon what you let in-- excuse me, Mr. Pickard testified. Mr. Pickard hasn't testified, Judge, and to let it in in the case in chief I would argue is a

violation of the previous order. I don't have it with me. If you wouldn't mind taking the afternoon break at this time, I can get it so I can again argue it more constructively than try to write and look for the motion while the Government is asking questions.

MR. HOUGH: Judge, I understand-- I think we can all agree that Mr. Rork doesn't like it, but the fact remains that the Court has ruled it's admissible and we will ask that we be allowed to proceed with Mr. Skinner's testimony of his conversation with Mr. Pickard to and including Mr. Pickard's statements to Mr. Skinner and other co-conspirators about the Mountain View lab and his past experience there.

THE COURT: Well, we're not saying anything about convictions at all now, are you? You're not going--

MR. HOUGH: I ultimately will indicate that Pickard bragged about the conviction and that that formed at least part of the basis for the conversations early on and Pickard telling him about his prior experience manufacturing LSD.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. RORK: Judge, that's in light of the motion they filed with you. That allegation isn't in anything that you ruled on before. In fact, it's just now been said for the first time. That's why I wanted to get the order.

MR. HOUGH: Judge, we went over this the last time we were up here. It's the -it's admissible to show Mr. Skinner's knowledge of his co-conspirators, conversations among the co-conspirators relative to the conspiracy and statements made during the course thereof are admissible, whether it's regarding prior crimes In this case, this conviction is not limited. is for LSD manufacturing in Mountain View, California. This conspiracy was regarding an LSD manufacturing, Mr. Pickard was the cook He bragged about it to Mr. Skinner and other co-conspirators during the course of this conspiracy. And it's admissible.

THE COURT: Well, I will take a break now and I'll go back and go through these orders and see. Each side has a great ability to enlarge upon what I -- what I have ruled on, and it brings things in that kind of surprise

me, but I will go look at this again.

MR. BENNETT: Before you do that,

Judge, I just would like to -- in view of this
and is -- what is being attempted and what is
occurring, I want to renew my motion to sever
for the reason that this is -- has nothing to
do with Mr. Apperson and its -- its spillover
is -- is very damaging in my opinion to -- or
will be damaging in the eyes of the jury. So I
-- I understand the Court's ruled on the motion
to sever, but I just wanted--

THE COURT: Up until this time,

Apperson has been in it. But maybe we're

getting into something where he's not into it

at all.

MR. HOUGH: Judge, we will proffer
the witness would testify Mr. Apperson's
awareness of and conversation about this
conspiracy with Mr. Skinner and in his
presence. In fact, Skinner will testify that
Mr. Apperson was, in fact, present from time to
time in the Mountain View lab, that Mr.
Apperson told his wife -- strike that. Mr.
Apperson's wife read about Pickard's arrest in
the paper and Apperson told Skinner that when

1	that occurred, his wife rolled over and slapped
2	him and knocked him out of bed and that
3	Apperson, Pickard and Skinner were all laughing
4	about that incident. So it's relative to all
5	three men; Apperson, Pickard and Skinner,
6	relative to the manufacture and agreement,
7	conspiracy to manufacture and distribute LSD.
8	THE COURT: All right. Well, I will
9	we'll take a recess and we'll come back.
10	(THEREUPON, the following.
11	proceedings were held before the jury).
12	THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen,
13	let's take a 15 minute recess at this time, and
14	then we'll come back and hear further
15	testimony.
16	(THEREUPON, a short recess was had after
17	which the following proceedings were had before
18	the jury).
19	THE COURT: Would the attorneys
20	please approach the bench and I'll
21	(THEREUPON, the following proceedings
22	were held at the bench and outside the hearing
23	of the jury).
24	MR. HOUGH: Judge, if I might, so
25	the record is clear, and I articulated this

1 .

poorly earlier, but the information that Mr. Skinner would be offering is intrinsic evidence in the form of 404(b). And it's our position that offered in this form it is admissible as intrinsic independent of 404(b). But in addition to that, for the reasons we previously articulated, it is also admissible pursuant to 404(b).

THE COURT: All right. We've gone through our orders and we've ruled on certain things, other things we did not rule on. And the things we did not rule on were things that we said we would take up at trial and -- and rule on as we went along during trial. So far I do not find that you are violating any of my orders, so you can go ahead and -- and put it in. And I understand that, this is testimony, it started out to show why he got into the conspiracy and how he got -- how he met Pickard and all of this, and this is pretty much information on that. We're going to allow you to go into it.

MR. HOUGH: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. RORK: Judge, I need to show for the record that in your Order No. 217 filed

November 26th, 2002, you went through the arrest record of Mr. Pickard, you specifically talked about this 1988 conviction and you said, quote, "The 1998 arrest is much too old under Tenth Circuit law, even though it involves possession of an LSD lab." You then went over other factors and you said given the defenses of Mr. Pickard and what may come out for a public authority defense, you may at trial reconsider it. You then went down and said under Rule 609 these convictions, again, they were over ten years old and you needed to make a finding that the probative value outweighs its prejudicial effect. And you said you would address that at trial.

Judge, we filed for the record back in 2001 a motion for discovery of Rule 404(b) evidence. We filed on August 2nd, 2001, an objection to admission of evidence and indicated what the Government's letter said. They never filed anything. You issued your order on November 26th, 2002. Which only today, January 28th, 2003, now the Government tries to offer you different reasons why they want it in. And again, your order was that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the -- because of Pickard's public authority defenses, it would be revisited. Government's notice wasn't that it was why they got together or how they got together, they're asking this witness about things -- he's asking to brag about these convictions and whether he's bragging about them or not, and that's never been told to us. It's never been disclosed to us, it's never been brought up. It's-- the first time we know about it is in the questioning of this witness. So we would ask that if you're going to deny the motion for a mistrial and again the motion not to let-not to go into it, we would ask for a continuance for time to develop evidence of this witness and the statements he's now making for the very first time on a case that's been pending since November 5, 2000. And we think its prejudicial value is outweighed by the probative value to get into this.

It's the same thing, Judge, you wouldn't let in the information about the death of Mr. Hulebak and those charges, and it's not good enough for the prosecution. We just object. We need time to develop-- we need time to

investigate and develop this.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HOUGH: Well, Judge, there are several issues. Number one, defense counsel has been provided with all the reports of Mr. Skinner's statements, number one. Number two, 404(b) notice was given at -- well, if they had made the request, we disclosed the 404(b). Additionally, the Court analyzed the 404(b) and the Court also analyzed the issue as it relates to cross-examination of Mr. Pickard. And then the fourth issue was the issue of intrinsic evidence. The Government does not have to give notice such like 404(b) to use intrinsic evidence. However, the evidence came in the form -- the highway ^^ and the disclosure came in the form of disclosure of the reports and they got all the reports. Everything that's been written of the interviews of Mr. Skinner they've been provided with. So these motions that they're raising now we would ask the Court to reaffirm its ruling it gave when we walked in the door and deny these motions and let's proceed.

MR. RORK: And, Judge, I just -- I have no reports that say Mr. Skinner ever

1 bragged -- Mr. Pickard ever bragged to Mr. 2 Skinner about these convictions. I have no 3 reports that say Mr. Pickard said these 4 convictions are what got him into the conspiracy. All I have is reports that says 5 Mr. Skinner was aware of Mr. Pickard's criminal 6 7 history, period. THE COURT: Well, I've reviewed all 8 9 of those things you just went through there and 10 to see if there's anything that's binding. 11 I cannot tell what witnesses are going to 12 testify to when I make rulings or how it comes 13 in, the different circumstances that come 14 So I'm going to -- to allow you to go around. 15 ahead and let's go ahead and put this evidence 16 in. 17 MR. RORK: And just so it won't be disruptive, I want it noted for the record that 18 19 that's a definitive ruling, so I don't have to 20 make continuous objections like I'm trying to 21 hide something. 22 THE COURT: Either way. 23 MR. RORK: That's fine. 24 (THEREUPON, the bench conference was. 25 concluded and the following proceedings

1 were held within the hearing of the 2 jury). 3 THE COURT: You may continue, Mr. 4 Hough. 5 MR. HOUGH: thank you. 6 (BY MR. HOUGH) Mr. Skinner, before the break, Ο. 7 we were talking about an incident that you had had a conversation with Mr. Pickard and/or Mr. 8 9 Apperson about -- regarding Mountain View. 10 Would you describe that for the jury? 11 One of the things that Leonard said was he said Α. 12 that there was even microphones in the trees and he said it was a really bad situation. 13 said it was lucky that Clyde didn't get busted 14 15 because Clyde had been there not many hours or 16 days before. Clyde's story to me about it was that his wife -- they're in the bed and his 17 wife picks up the newspaper, reads it and she 18 elbows him and effectively knocks the wind or 19 20 knocks him out of the bed. And they used to 21 laugh about that quite a bit. And he said that 22 if she ever found out that he was involved in 23 this operation again, she would --24 Well, now, Judge, I'm MR. BENNETT: 25 going to object to what Mrs. Apperson said.

1 That's clearly hearsay. 2 THE COURT: Yeah, I will sustain the 3 objection. Go ahead. Q. (BY MR. HOUGH) Did Mr. Clyde Apperson, this 4 5 Defendant, communicate to you what his wife had told him? 6 7 Yes. Α. 8 What did Mr. Apperson communicate to you was 0. 9 told to him? 10 MR. BENNETT: Same objection, Your 11 Honor, it's just --12 MR. HOUGH: It's his co-conspirator's 13 statement. 14 MR. BENNETT: -- hearsay. THE COURT: They're doing it now on 15 co-conspirator statements, go ahead. 16 17 Α. That she said that if he was ever involved in 18 this or ever hung out with Leonard, it would be 19 a very bad situation, I don't remember exactly, 20 an elaborate mechanisms for payment and why he 21 was gone had to be created. He was working --"He" being who? 22 Ο. Clyde Apperson. When he would leave the area, 23 Α. 24 he would have to say I'm working on a project for, i.e., Native Scents, with some of their 25

.4

heavy equipment or machinery or whatever or I'm going to do a project with robotics or something like that.

- Q. And what exactly was the incident in Mountain

 View specifically that the three of you, Mr.

 Apperson, Mr. Pickard and yourself, discussed,

 what was that incident?
- A. There was a -- equivalent to a container that was large like a shipping container that was on a piece of property that Leonard had an LSD lab in. And it was busted by the Bureau of Narcotics Control, BNC I believe is what it's for, California, and this turned into a fiasco, because it wasn't properly identified what it was. A man went in there, he got heavily exposed, quote, had severe damage, had to go to the hospital and maybe have a long-term damage from it.

Leonard was convicted, I believe is what he said, but there was some sort of a civil action that he filed, I don't remember what it was, but he was convicted and went to jail.

- Q. Okay. Did this group always just manufacture LSD?
- A. Do you mean Clyde Apperson and Leonard Pickard?

- Q. Correct, to your knowledge.
- A. No -- well, do you mean direct knowledge or from things they told me?
 - Q. From either what Mr. Apperson and Mr. Pickard told you during the life --
 - A. Okay.

- Q. -- of your involvement in their conspiracy or that you had independent knowledge of.
- A. All right. Things that they told me was that they -- Leonard used to say that at one time he was the largest producer of MDA and he had produced tremendous amounts of it, in excess of 500 kilograms, maybe 1,000 kilograms. He said it wasn't very profitable for the long term, but it -- he lived in Hollywood and lived in the nicest areas of LA, but he wasn't making the kind of return he wanted from that.

They also made mescaline. Clyde was, quote, a better mescaline chemist than Leonard was. Leonard did not refute that. It -- even Clyde would describe how they-- in the early days they would take bed sheets and squeeze down at certain chemical processes. They also told a humorous story about how these -- they're sitting-- in the early whatever period

they're sitting with a lab in a warehouse, the door's open because it's hot. I believe they both said they were smoking pot. The police show up, they figure it's all over. The police get out of their car and say have you seen this robber or burglar or a strange person, and they said no, and the police left with all of this laboratory equipment going. And they never had a problem from it. They said that's just one of the many funny stories that happened to them.

- Q. And did they tell you how it evolved out of the MBA (sic) and mescaline into LSD?
- A. No, it was MDA.
- Q. MDA?
- 16 A. Yeah.

- 17 Q. I'm sorry.
 - A. Well, first of all, Leonard was supposed to -Leonard said that he was a protege of Nicky,
 and he actually got busted with -- before -- at
 this time it was not illegal to -- he had the
 lab but there was no residue, it was a clean
 lab, it was a cellular operation that the
 brother had created. And in case Nicky went
 down or someone went down, they had a backup

1 lab to go to. Leonard had one of these--2 somehow he got busted with one of the backup 3 labs, but they couldn't get a conviction, if the story is true at all, because there was no 4 5 residue, it was all fresh glassware. 6 would be a problem under the current laws. 7 And describe for us, if you will, how they told Ο. 8 you, Mr. Apperson and Mr. Pickard, how it 9 evolved out of that into LSD. 10 Well, they -- first of all, they said mescaline Α. just yielded almost no money, they couldn't 11 12 make money off of mescaline, and --13 Ο. And did they describe what that meant? 14 Α. Enough money to justify the risk, the time, 15 similar type of a situation like that. 16 other words, there's a lot of work for a low 17 amount of profit. 18 Q. Low amount of profit being what? I don't know, I mean--19 Α. 20 Q. Okay. I don't know the percentages, I didn't talk to 21 Α. them about it. But -- but the LSD operations 22 23 would come and go as far as profitability, but Leonard said that this was the biggest ride for 24

this last take-off because he finally got much

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

higher yields due to very specific control in the manufacturing process. And they said this -- that this was the big giant cash flow cow they had been waiting for.

- Were you involved in that manufacturing process Q. yourself?
- Well, technically as a -- they would have me Α. move equipment up and down flights of stairs and such, but as far as was I in the lab making it, no.
- And can you describe for the jury, please --Ο. Excuse me, Your Honor. MR. RORK:

He's asked this witness if he was involved and he's asked him about all of these conspiracy things, and this witness says, well, as far as moving it, no, and then he's allowed to testify about all of these things that other people he says. He should be allowed to continue about the other things he did other than just moving it so I object to him not letting him finish his answer, 1, and, 2, letting him define his answer to just be physically and not what he conspiratorially supposedly did.

MR. HOUGH: Objection. If there's a

23 24 question Mr. Rork would like to ask the 25

1 witness, cross examination is the mechanism. 2 MR. RORK: Judge, this is an 3 objection. I ask that Mr. Hough properly follow the decorum. 4 5 THE COURT: Well, let him go ahead 6 and finish his answer, if he thought that he 7 didn't. (BY MR. HOUGH) Were you finished with the 8 Q. 9 answer, sir? I think so. 10 Α. Now, would you describe, please, for the jury 11 Q. 12 your understanding from Mr. Apperson and Mr. 13 Pickard when the LSD lab started and its 14 movements, when and why, prior to arriving in Kansas? 15 Okay. This is the -- this is after he gets out 16 Α. 17 of jail and he is -- does a little stint as a 18 Buddhist monk and they --MR. BENNETT: Judge, I'm going to 19 object to this unless he describes who he is. 20 21 MR. SKINNER: Leonard Pickard. 22 THE COURT: All right. Go ahead. 23 Ο. (BY MR. HOUGH) Go ahead, sir. 24 Α. Leonard Pickard after he gets out of jail. 25 MR. RORK: That's not responsive to

1 the question. He asked him what did he do as a 2 result of this charge here, and he's talking 3 now about a time period fifteen, 20 years ago. 4 MR. HOUGH: Judge, nonresponsive is, 5 as a rule, an objection reserved to the 6 questioner. 7 THE COURT: Correct. Go ahead. 8 Α. So what happens is is that I could be very 9 wrong about this early stage because I wasn't 10 there, so I'm going through --11 Q. (BY MR. HOUGH) I'm asking you what they 12 communicated to you. 13 Well, Pickard said that he got into Α. Right. 14 Dave Nichols' lab. 15 And Dave Nichols is who? Ο. 16 Α. He has a Schedule I license at Perdue and he is 17 a famous LSD researcher. 18 Q. Okay. At the molecular design. He's also made 19 Α. 20 psilocybin or psilocyn for Rick Strassman for 21 FDA and DEA approved human studies, which ties 22 into this story later on down. 23 Leonard says he got into the lab and he 24 was able to make 66 grams, the number was 25 strange that he remembered that, I could be

wrong, and that started booting up the cash flow once again. And this -- I don't know the year that it happened. And then the next movement from there I believe was the Aspen lab.

- Q. And describe that as it was communicated to you.
- A. Yeah, he had a Russian lady who had a Russian passport, of which I presented the evidence, and she rented a house in Aspen, Colorado. And they, being Clyde and Leonard, put a lab in there and they got a lot of the -- oh, the standard chemicals and glassware from Native Scents and/or Alfred Savinelli and other places being-- the precursor being like from the ET man, and they started this lab there.

One of the problem was that the rent was I think 15,000 a month, and the house was falling apart and Clyde was constantly having to tear down the lab and-- while the workers would come in and put it back up and such and such. Then the lab moved from there -- by the way, there's a -- some evidence-- I know when the lab was moved up there and it was in a white van, I believe, that belonged to Hugo De

- Lahave, however you say his name, sorry. I
 know Hugo for some time.
 - Q. Do you know the spelling of his name?
 - A. I'm sorry, I can't spell it. I could probably do it if you gave me a little time.
 - Q. Okay.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. And Hugo is a friend of Alfred and was a friend of mine. And Hugo moved the lab. I didn't know he moved part of the lab or part of the precursor without knowing this.
- Q. As communicated to you by Mr. Pickard and Apperson and Savinelli?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay.
 - A. And when I told this to Hugo later, he was very upset. They then had this lab in-- things were kind of getting going cash-wise and there was money going around. Savinelli was absorbing quite a bit of cash at this point because he needed to get paid back. Then for whatever reason, the time duration, the mess with the house, they moved the lab down to Santa Fe.
 - Q. Was there some discussion between you, Mr.

 Apperson and Mr. Pickard about an appropriate
 time for the lab to be set up at one location?

- A. They did not like to go past two years.
- 2 Q. Okay.

- 3 A. They thought that was too long in one spot.
- Q. And can you describe, then, the next stop into Santa Fe?
 - A. Yep, they moved a -- a lab into Santa Fe, and one of the things they liked about that was that the precursor source was closer to the lab, the precursor source being Native Scents, not only the precursor -- all of them, but some of them. And also, they had a great place to dispose of the trash in Taos, which was a very risky proposition for them. Just trash disposal is risky.
 - Q. Describe that.
 - A. Well, first of all, you have very toxic items. Second of all, it's evidence and you've got to have somewhere disposing it and having someone watch it being disposed to make sure that it doesn't get carted off and somehow ends up in the authority's hands or ends up hurting someone accidentally.
 - Q. And is that the type of a thing that can, in fact, occur with the waste products of LSD, to your knowledge?

A. Absolutely.

- Q. And what kind of harm can result?
 - A. Well, severe seizures-- in high doses severe seizures. Plus then all the normal exposure to just being exposed to hexsane, methylene chloride, just the normal exposure to these-- to waste chemicals, you know. Those are not what we call things you want to hang out with, you know.
 - Q. And describe for us to your knowledge based on your personal knowledge, observation and as communicated to you by Mr. Apperson and Mr. Pickard, the events relative to the lab in Santa Fe?
 - A. Okay. Well, first of all, the Santa Fe lab was a successful lab from the standpoint of the overhead was much lower. They felt they had a safer firewall, meaning that they had a family or a couple that owned the house that didn't live in the United States, they had a good cutout. A cutout is a person, who rents something who doesn't know what they're doing theoretically, that rented the house. And their overhead for that house wasn't 15,000 plus all the bills, but it was a couple of

1 thousand dollars, plus whatever you kicked to 2 the man that's the cutout. 3 Q. Okay. 4 Α. And so they had a successful lab. But in that lab they had -- not they -- Leonard had at 5 6 least one or maybe two accidents of where he 7 crashed enormous amounts, broke enormous amounts, of LSD or some form close to the end 8 product on himself. 9 10 Q. Did Mr. Apperson and/or Mr. Pickard communicate 11 with any specificity what had occurred to you? 12 MR. BENNETT: Judge, I -- I'm going 13 to object to the form of the question. putting it to the witness "Did Mr. Apperson or 14 15 Mr. Pickard." I think we're entitled to know 16 which individual provided what information. So 17 I object to the form of the question. 18 MR. HOUGH: Your Honor, with all due 19 respect, the objection is premature because the 20 answer to this question is yes or no. If the 21 answer is yes, the next question is who was it. 22 And then the third question is, what did they 23 tell you. Well, there hasn't been 24 MR. BENNETT: 25 any "who was" in any of these questions up to

1 now, Judge. 2 THE COURT: Well, you're correct. 3 Try to proceed in that -- with that line of 4 questioning. 5 MR. HOUGH: Thank you. Did one or the other or both 6 Ο. (BY MR. HOUGH) 7 describe the specific incidents of the spills in the lab? 8 Yes, both Leonard and Clyde. 9 Α. 10 And what did --Ο. 11 Α. Leonard's description --12 Tell us what each of them told you. Q. Leonard said that his -- his worry was -- on at 13 Α. least one of the spills that he was really 14 15 specific about. He had a hot tub and he said he was really medically worried with that kind 16 17 of exposure. He went and jumped in the hot 18 He said the odd thing was he got no 19 effect, which is really remarkable, and -- or 20 close to no effect. And he said he thought 21 there was a chance he had died when it hit him 22 because it was such a massive dose. The other thing is, he said, once he 23 24 realized he wasn't going to die, he said, "All of this work and, " he said, "my knees got 25

wobbly, when I realized I was physically all 1 2 right, that I had just lost all that money 3 because it was a huge amount that was broken." Apperson was upset because he said this was an 4 5 unnecessary mistake and he said no matter how 6 hard you cleaned, it just kept coming out of 7 the bricks, with the Satillo tile or whatever, and just kept coming out and coming out and the 8 9 house was severely contaminated in this spot, so much so that when -- when I was brought in 10 11 to bring the team to help shut this lab down 12 and eventually take possession of it and move 13 it to Kansas, that the employee that we used, 14 he was named Lupe, because he was an excellent 15 worker with tile, marble. He had worked for me 16 extensively. He went in there and I would give 17 specific -- I gave him specific instructions, I did not want this man exposed to a chemical, I 18 19 did not want any problems. I wanted to -- and 20 Apperson said he had thoroughly cleaned it and 21 all he needed was these brick chipped out and 22 replaced. Lupe got severely dosed and, as I 23 understand, as of a year-and-a-half ago still 24 has complaints about the damage that he had 25 received. He also went off wondering when he

1 got returned to the house so that -- that's --2 that's the basic story there. And as I 3 understand, they never fully got it cleaned up. And "being dosed" means what? 4 Q. Α. Exposed to LSD. 6 And it would have the hallucinogenic Ο. 7 consequences you previously testified about? Yes, but -- but in those dose levels it could 8 Α. be something beyond that. You could have 9 10 physical tremors and you could have extreme 11 vasoconstriction going on throughout the body. 12 It's a strong, strong vasoconstrictor in large 13 amounts. Can you tell us what time period, to your 14 Q. 15 knowledge and based on your involvement, that 16 this lab was up and running in Santa Fe? 17 Let's just basically say '98, '99. Α. Okay. And then tell us who did what, when 18 19 relative to Santa Fe from the time it was moved 20 from Aspen to Santa Fe to the time that it was broken down? 21 22 Mainly Leonard was involved because I would see 23 him in the area on a regular basis. 24 over to Taos and Leonard would pop up and say

I -- we did -- I saw quite a bit of C

25

hello.

in the final tear-down.

O. C is who?

- A. Meaning Clyde Apperson. We all stayed in -- I have hotel bills to prove it, and we stayed in an area which I did not know was so close to the lab, because I was not even privy to where the lab was actually at because I really didn't care until the very end. I was brought in because we had a disaster in how they loaded a trailer up.
- O. And describe that for us.
- A. Well, the trailer was loaded with the forward part being way too heavy and we needed to move it and it required myself and Mike Hobbs coming there and, you know, dealing with this. While we had walkie-talkies to make sure we used a car caravan in case a police pulled it over, that-a-way one car could take off and get the police off of the trailer. That's how we moved things and we moved it to -- I may be just running on, I'll stop there.
- Q. Now, as far as take down the lab, you previously testified Mr. Apperson was always involved in the set-up and take-down of the lab.

A. Not always, mostly, usually.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. And were you aware of what his fee was to do that?
 - A. Well, there was a different kind of fee. I think the fee had to be negotiated down in Aspen because it was such a disaster how many times they had to take it up and put it down.

 But on a major set-up, initial brand new house, 100,000 just starting off. But if it was internally like the landlords are coming through, it was a \$50,000 fee.
 - Q. Okay. And the lab was moved from Aspen to Santa Fe in approximately when?
 - A. I can't tell you.
 - Q. And to your knowledge, the best of your recollection as you sit here now, it was operational in Santa Fe when?
 - A. Up to let's say September of '99.
 - Q. Okay. Who made the decision to move out of the location in Santa Fe?
 - A. Well, it was a complicated decision, but basically Clyde and myself, through a series of accidents, actually, was able to convince Leonard to move that lab out of New Mexico.

 Some things had happened. The Government had

- effected a bust against a religious group, a spiritual group, called the UDV, and that meant there was more eyes on that. Alfred Savinelli was tangentially involved.
- O. And this was in Santa Fe?
- A. The bust was in Santa Fe.
- Q. Okay.

2

3

. 4.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. And -- but that wasn't the bigger problem. The bigger problem was that in one day we ran into three people that knew Leonard, and I said and C said, and we said that's enough. I mean, to run into three people in one day that you know, Santa Fe is too small. Those three people I'm going to do the best I can to remember. One was the carpenter who was the cutout who rented the house. The other one was -- (pause)
- Q. Do you recall his name?
- A. No, I'm sorry. Ungeleider's wife gave

 Ungeleider and the third person I'll have to remember, I'm sorry.
- Q. And then about what time was this that that event occurred and the decision was made to dismantel and move?
- A. Well, no. Dismanteling was going down no matter what because Alfred had said this lab is

moving from that house. He said the game is over. Alfred Savinelli and Leonard were having a significant battle, some threats were made and such and such. Some sort of story like "If this lab isn't moved, I'm going to go down there and burn it to the ground," something about an ice pick through the heart. These kind of statements were made from Alfred to Leonard.

- Q. And why was, to your knowledge, Mr. Savinelli upset?
- A. He felt that Leonard was getting too sloppy.

 Leonard had left a gas burner on at Alfred's
 house without the flame going, and he said, "If
 he's doing this here, what's he doing in the
 lab. The whole lab could blow up and I'm going
 to go to prison for life."
- Q. What was the purpose of the gas burner going at Savinelli's place?
- A. I mean, it was just -- they were making food, boiling water or something. I mean, it wasn't -- I have no idea, it was just-- it was in the kitchen.
- Q. Something innocuous?
- 25 A. Yes, but it -- Alfred said it was a disaster in

- his opinion. He said, "If this is the trend,

 I'm worried."
- 3 Q. Okay.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

23

24

- A. Alfred said he was sick of the pressure and he couldn't handle the pressure anymore of having that much exposure.
 - Q. Then what was the next step in the process?
 - A. Well, the lab was going to be torn down and moved out of that house and theoretically we were supposed to buy another house, and we had located a house.
 - O. Where was it?
 - A. It was in Santa Fe. But due to these extra little problems that occurred, I recommended and C said let's get out of here. And we all took an airplane sometime around Thanksgiving of '99 and looked at a site in Kansas.
 - O. Who all went?
- A. I believe it was Trace Kliphuis, myself,
 Leonard and Clyde.
 - Q. Who's Trace Kliphuis?
 - A. A girlfriend-slash-wife of Leonard's, I don't know the legal status.
 - Q. And that was -- is she still to your knowledge or was that a --

A. I don't know.

2

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Okay. And why come to Kansas?
- 3 A. It was an unused state.
- 4 Q. What do you mean?
- 5 A. They had not been through here.
- 6 Q. "They" who?
 - A. Clyde and Leonard. They were really nervous of going west, west was not good. They said that there were a lot of problems. They wanted more areas where things were desolate where they could drive one --
 - MR. BENNETT: Well, Judge, I'm going to object again because he's again referring to the two defendants together. Again I ask the Court instruct Mr. Hough or the jury to specify who's -- or to the witness to specify who he's talking about.

THE COURT: Try to do that, please.

- Q. (BY MR. HOUGH) In referring to "they," can you tell us did they both or one or the other make those comments?
- A. In this case both of them, because they liked desolated areas, they liked areas that they could drive long distances and see if someone was following them.

- Q. So when you say "they" in the context of your testimony --
- A. Clyde Apperson and William Leonard Pickard,

 Junior
 - Q. And they both -- these two defendants communicated these things to you, correct?
- A. Correct.

- Q. Okay. Continue then.
 - A. So then we -- we were supposed to go to Tulsa and --
 - Q. Why?
 - A. Because it was Thanksgiving and I needed to pick my children up in the airplane, it was a private airplane, and I was going to have Thanksgiving with my children in Topeka or I was going to see them in Tulsa or something.

 But the weather was incredibly bad, and we made the decision on the runway on a cellular phone, due to tornados which was unusual, at that time it was unusual to have them that late in the season in Tulsa, so we changed our destination. After the flight plan had been made by the pilot, we said take us to Topeka and we landed in Topeka.
 - Q. Then what happened?

- A. It was a rough landing, also there was bad weather there, too. Then we went to Manhattan, Kansas, and --
- Q. "We" being who?

- A. Trace Kliphuis, myself, William Leonard Pickard and Clyde Apperson, and they stayed at --
- Q. "They" being who?
- A. Clyde Apperson, Trace Kliphuis, Leonard and maybe myself, I can't remember because I had a place to stay. But I believe we went to the Marriott or the Fairfield Inn, I think it was the Fairfield Inn, and I've shown the receipts to prove we were there.

And Leonard never went out to the base. He left the decision to Clyde, the -- what I refer to the Ellsworth, Salina, or Ellsworth base, which is an Atlas F, which is vertical, not horizontal. And he said it's up to Clyde and you, and if Clyde gives the approval, then this is where the lab will be. We made a bet because he didn't believe that there would be a place that he could have a lab where he could not see a neighbor. And -- and indeed that effectively was all -- it turns out at night you could see some sort of a shining light

- 1 somewhere, so -- the bet was a draw.
- 2 Did you have -- now, you testified that during Q. 3 this time you had a place to stay. Describe

4 that.

8

12

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

- 5 It was either Kansas Missile Base, Atlas E. Α.
- 6 And during the time alleged in the Indictment, Q. 7 did you own property in Kansas?
 - Α. Well, I mean, a trust-owned property in Kansas.
- 9 Q. Okay. And that was your trust for your 10 benefit.
- 11 No, I wasn't the beneficiary of the trust. Α.
 - Q. Did you control the property then in Kansas?
- Effectively I was in control. 13 Α.
- 14 Okay. When was it you obtained the property? Q.
 - I believe legally '96. I took possession of it Α. before we actually -- five to six months before it was paid for I took possession of it.
 - 0. And that was when?
- 19 '95 -- late '95, '96, sometime in that area. Α. It was a phase-in where, you know, we were moving in, the other person was moving out.
 - And what was the purpose of obtaining it? Q.
- We were going to put a robotic spring factory 23 Α. in there. 24
 - And describe why you would want a robotic Q.

spring factory?

- A. Well, first of all, I'd like to -- okay. I'd like to describe why that facility would be good for that, and then I'll back up to that question just because it's fresh in my mind. Is that all right?
- Q. That's fine.
- A. There were three-foot solid incredibly level floors built in the horizontal bases. And the temperature stability was amazing in them. It took tremendous amounts of BTUs to just move the temperature a few degrees, and this gave for-- extremely stable conditions for manufacturing springs of which my family, going up to my mother's side, is heavily involved with, there's many spring companies in the family.
- Q. Gardener springs?
- A. It was my mother's spring company and there's a bunch more spring companies that are owned by other uncles, aunts and cousins. But we were in the process of setting the new world standard for high precision quality springs.

 We were buying these experimental robots from Japan, and we were moving to a new grade of

wire that was experimental that was made by Suzuki, made by-- there was a German corporation, Bird, Berg.

And any variation in temperature or humidity would change the behavior of that spring as it was being manufactured, so I needed somewhere I could control. Plus in the spring manufacturing process, a dust is thrown off sometimes and I wanted to have air filtration so I could meet the new OSHA standards.

- Q. What kind of springs are we talking about?
- A. Mainly we were specializing at this facility in high precision extension springs.
- Q. And those have what type of a use or purpose?
- A. They are for pulling. You'll see them on windshield wipers, you'll see them on a kick stand of a motorcycle. But this particular plant was making them for robotic use and high precision engine use, high precision mechanical use where you had to have very high predictability. You had to be very, very accurate. The concept worked, by the way?
- Q. So did the business actually operate in the Wamego, Kansas, area?

A. Significantly.

- Q. During what period of time?
 - A. Well, we had a phase-in to where we had it-kind of where it was working in '96. Then in
 '97 and then by '98-- '97,'98 it was heavy in
 operation and it proved to be a success.
 - Q. And you indicated that you could stay there.
 - A. I had living quarters on one side of the facility.
 - Q. Would you describe for the jury what this property was and what it was like.
 - A. It was an Atlas E missile base, which is a horizontal missile base, which is a very shallow underneath-the-ground missile base, unlike a Titan One missile base or an Atlas F missile base. And because it's horizontal it had a lot of square foot—a lot of square foot usable space. You could get a semi-truck in it, you could move forklifts in and out easily and also you had tremendous volume because you had very high ceilings. These were very unusual structures.
 - Q. Let me show you what's been caused to be marked Government's Exhibits 1 through 6 and admitted into evidence in this case, identified as the

location in or near Wamego, Kansas, at six-
16795 Say Road. I will show you Government's

Exhibit No. 1, the intersection of Columbian

and Say Road. Do you recognize that general

area?

A. Yes.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

- Q. And Exhibit 2, which has been admitted into evidence here and described as the entryway driveway up into the property.
- A. Yes, I recognize it.
 - Q. And Exhibit 6, finally, which has been identified as an overall view of the property.

 Do you recognize that?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And can you describe for us, please, what went on in a business sense from the point in time of the acquisition of the property, where the business occurred?
 - A. Oh, yeah. Well--
- Q. And -- and just for your benefit, you can --
- A. Yes, I know I can touch.
- 22 | Q. -- touch, okay.
 - A. Okay. This building didn't exist. This is

 what we refer to as the Lester Building. This

 building is an original Quonset hut built by

the military. This is the road that goes
down-- that semi-trucks and forklifts could go
up or out of. And this right here, which is
not a very clear picture, is a 40-ton door that
opens up 20 by 20 approximately. And then
underneath this shield here is a long what we
call the missile bay, and from both sides you
could have forklifts load and unload. But over
to this side here, is a huge room that was the
room that we temperature controlled stable, air
filtered and manufactured springs.

- Q. Okay. Now--
 - A. And now I'll show you --
- Q. Please.

- A. I may be bothering you. This area here is where the underground loading quarters were at.

 And this area here has a tunnel connecting the two things. And there's a door here. I made a mess of this.
- Q. Okay. Now, you indicated that this building here, the Lester Building, wasn't there at the time. When did that get built?
- A. I don't know when it got built, but basically
 Gardener had said we need above-ground storage
 for different items. This was originally

another Quonset hut, so it's identical to the

-- the cement slab underneath it is identical

to the cement slab here. And I had it built, I

don't know when. I really was remote -- this

was -- the other employees were making the

decisions, I just appropriated and said yes, we

will pay for it. And Gardener had requested

it.

- Q. At some point in time in the statement to Agent Nichols, did you indicate that that Lester Building was purchased with drug proceeds?
- A. Yes, but that was a -- not the intent. The intent was Gardener asked for it. Gardener was supposed to pay for it, but Gardener moved out and I was left with a judgment and bargaining my way out of a problem with a building I didn't need.
- Q. Okay.

- A. And I did pay for it with drug proceeds.
- Q. Proceeds from what drug?
 - A. Well, actually -- well, only proceeds from large amounts of cash that Leonard gave me.
 - Q. Okay. That were generated from this LSD operation?
- A. I assume, I can't make that connection on that

because I didn't watch that, so I can't answer

yes. I assumed.

Q. And what is the basis of that assumption?

- A. Well, that's where all the money came from and
 -- you know, there was beaucoups of it, so --
- Q. At what point in time did the location at 16795

 Say Road in Wamego stop being the spring

 business?
- A. It was -- it phased out in a three-month period approximately, but really a two-month period, let's say, in April '99. From then they started being phased out until June, I think everything was gone, with the exception of there was some equipment still there up until a year ago that was like forklifts and stuff that belonged to Gardener. It was eventually just given away as payment for people who didn't receive payment for work they did at maintaining the base.
- Q. You indicated around Thanksgiving Trace

 Kliphuis and you and the two defendants going

 to visit the Atlas F location. And we got on

 to this discussion of the Wamego property

 because you indicated that you had a place to

 stay and you weren't certain if you had stayed

NORA LYON & ASSOCIATES, INC. 1515 S.W. Topeka Blvd., Topeka, KS 66612 Phone: (785) 232-2545 FAX: (785) 232-2720

in the motel with them. Do you recall that? 1 2 MR. RORK: Your Honor, again, I 3 object to this witness leading and suggestive answers or testifying, he can ask him what he 4 5 did. 6 MR. HOUGH: Well, Judge, I'm trying 7 to set the foundation for the next question in the series. 8 9 THE COURT: Overruled, go ahead. (BY MR. HOUGH) Can you --10 Q. 11 More importantly I can give you a better 12 answer. One of the nights I'm sure I stayed 13 there and one of the nights I don't know. 14 just can't remember. 15 Okay. Q. 16 So one night I did go to the hotel and stay and Α. one night I don't know where I stayed and it 17 would have probably been -- I mean, I would 18 19 have preferred to have stayed in Wamego than at 20 a hotel. It was a nicer area. 21 Q. Now, that trip was, you indicated, Thanksgiving 22 of what year, '99? 23 Α. 199. 24 And tell us what all happened after Mr. Pickard Q. 25 told you and Mr. Apperson to make the decision.

What happened?

A. Clyde and I drove over to the Ellsworth site,
Clyde was happy. He was concerned with the
vertical problem which ended up being quite a
problem because he -- he thought that it was
going to be like an Atlas E because that's
what, you know, he had seen.

And when he saw that we were talking about a vertical missile base, he realized we had some technical problems to overcome. It did become a point of contention and some failures that I did not implement when requested, I didn't get everything done correctly.

- Q. Such as?
- A. I was supposed to put in a hoist and really should have done it and ended up the three of of us had to physically move an entire lab down in there, which doesn't sound that difficult until you realize that methylene chloride, 5-gallon drums, are incredibly dense, and it was quite a chore moving the lab down inside of this vertical missile base.
- Q. So then ultimately, was it decided to move the lab out of Santa Fe into this location?

1 A. As soon as Clyde got back and told Leonard, 2 Leonard -- I don't even think he went to verify 3 the story of Clyde's. I think he said if Clyde 4 likes it, you say it's right, go for it. 5 Ο. Then describe for us, if you would, please, the 6 movement of the lab from Santa Fe to this area. 7 Okay. What happened was -- was that after the Α. 8 pack-down was done, Mike Hobbs was instructed -- I'm sorry, I was instructed -- we 9 10 had decided to rent a house and there's many numerous rental houses in the Santa Fe 11 situation of which has been a great deal of 12 confusion between my communication, the DEA and 13 14 everyone else so --15 Q. Now, you were instructed by who to find the house? 16 Leonard. 17 Α. 18 Q. Okay. Okay. And -- but I had employee houses and we 19 Α.

- A. Okay. And -- but I had employee houses and we tried to keep the employees from knowing what in the world was going on.
- Q. Who are these employees?

20

21

22

23

24

25

A. Gunner Guinan, Amber or Indra I can't remember,
I believe I believe it was Amber who was a
girlfriend of Mike's, Mike Hobbs, Lupe, and

there may have been another nanny that came and went. And they stayed in one house, and --

Q. In Santa Fe?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- In Santa Fe. And there was two different Α. houses they stayed in and both of them had a One was the Delgado house which has become a confusing item because Carl misunderstood me and thought the Delgado house was a house where the lab was stored. house I cannot remember the name of and everyone complained about it and they wanted out of it. And then I, myself, Emily and Leonard and Clyde all stayed at Las Companas in Consectas (spelled phonetically). And one of the reasons we always wanted to keep Clyde and Leonard away from the employees was the hours were so odd and we didn't want the chance of -of them -- the employees noticing something was odd about their behavior.
- Q. And what was -- how were the hours odd?
- A. Well, there were long stretches of time where synthesis where you can't walk away from the process.
- Q. And who would be involved in the synthesis?
 - A. In this particular one, Clyde and Leonard were

working very hard. They were pumping production to a new level. In fact, I think it was the greatest production they had ever attained, and other than some chemical company or some pharmaceutical company, it probably is the record production in the history of mankind that -- that occurred at that.

Q. What was the next move then?

- A. Okay. So I was instructed to get a house, and this was a -- a very expensive home and we were going to back the trailer down and put it into the garage.
- O. What was in the trailer?
 - A. The key essential items of the lab and whatever chemicals. The unfortunate thing is I'm doing this from hearsay, I did not look in to it.
- Q. And who told you?
- A. Leonard, Clyde. Clyde was explaining how they made the mistake of misbalancing. The trailer was bought, I believe by Gunnar Guinan in Home Depot down in Santa Fe and brought up, and then that was rejected and we had to go buy another one. And we then packed that down, a larger one, and we packed the essential items in there.

- 1 Q. Who packed?
- A. I don't know who packed, it would -- it's an unknown to me.
 - Q. Okay.

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

- A. So there were some repacking that was done and
 I was present because some -- some like

 ventilation tubes-- the last thing coming out

 of the Santa Fe lab came at the end, and that

 was thrown in the back of this trailer.
- 10 Q. By whom?
 - A. Leonard. And Leonard wanted Mike not to see it so when it was opened up, I was the only one that saw. That was the first time that I saw the inside of that trailer.
 - Q. And who obtained that trailer?
 - A. I believe Gunnar Guinan and I believe there's titles that show that he did it, receipts.
 - Q. And who did the driving of the trailer?
- 19 A. Okay. Mainly Mike Hobbs.
- Q. And after it was -- well, strike that. Do you know who moved it out of the residence in Santa

 Fe?
- A. Oh, yes. Oh, yeah, yeah.
- 24 | O. Tell us about that.
- 25 A. I was there because it was a car caravan

because we were worried that maybe we were hot and we wanted to make sure that if that -- and the bigger problem was that it was -- the -- it was loaded wrong, the axles had too much of the weight forward, and it was actually dragging, and we did the best we could to get a vehicle that could handle it. But we did still -- if you hit a bump, and these were some pretty weird roads we were on, it would just bounce and it'd cause a lot of problems. We thought a policeman could pull us over just generally on this incredibly poorly executed loading of this trailer.

- Q. Who all was involved in that, who all was there?
- A. Mike Hobbs, myself, I can't remember if Clyde was involved but Leonard was definitely involved. And we moved it to the -- the expensive house is what I refer to it as, \$800 a day. At the expensive house, it was then going to be put down into the garage and then Grahm Logan Kendall was going to babysit it, not ever knowing what it was, and he was just going to do Internet work there.
- Q. And how was that --

1 Α. I'm sorry, I forgot. Graham has also been staying at the Delgado house or one of the 2 3 homes in Santa Fe, I forgot he was there. 4 0. Doing what? 5 Α. Just enjoying life. He wanted to go on a --6 you know, a trip, he likes traveling, so--7 (pause) 8 Q. And what was your relationship to him? 9 Α. Graham was a tutor of mine in physics and math, 10 sciences across the board starting around age 11 13. 12 And what was your relationship to Mr. Q. 13 Hobbs, Mr. Guinan and Mr. Lupe? Mr. Hobbs had to work at Gardener and then when 14 Α. 15 -- and -- well, actually Gunnar and Hobbs 16 worked at Gardener and stayed with me when I 17 left Gardener. Lupe never worked for Gardener, 18 he always worked for the land trust or myself. 19 Q. And then how did you all get to Santa Fe? 20 Oh, we went there on our vacation is what the Α. 21 employees were told, and they would be given little instruction sheets of "go by this and 22

> NORA LYON & ASSOCIATES, INC. 1515 S.W. Topeka Blvd., Topeka, KS 66612 Phone: (785) 232-2545 FAX: (785) 232-2720

Lupe was the only one who

that." They had no clue what they were doing,

they had no -- there wasn't any suspicion in

their mind.

23

24

accidentally had a suspicion. And I don't know what he -- I didn't know until long after how bad that situation was for him, but -- and then the -- and then we were -- we were on a vacation ostensibly, you know, to get away from this long, hard project of finishing Wamego up, and so it was a bonus and -- but really what was going on behind the scenes was a tear-down of a lab.

Q. Okay.

- A. And we also liked to use this -- this turned out, we felt so hot that --
- Q. What do you mean by feeling hot?
- A. It means that the Government may have been on to us from any number of angles, that we were sending off decoy -- we were doing decoy work.
- Q. Describe that.
- A. Decoy work means you send a truck and it's suspicious and it leaves and you try to get a number of red flags to go off, and if you don't get pulled over, you're not being watched, and we did a lot of decoy. I was doing an incredible amount of decoy work for that operation to be moved. I was the most nervous of anyone with that operation.

- Q. And who was ordering the decoy work occur?
- 2 A. Myself.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19

20

21

22

- Q. And did you do that unilaterally or in consultation with anyone else?
 - A. I mean, I told Leonard, "I'm doing everything I can to make sure we're not having a serious problem here." But I was -- I was basically unilaterally doing it, and this went on for months, this decoy work went on for months. I was very nervous about this.
 - Q. And once the LSD was made, where did it go, what happened to it?
 - A. Well, this is an odd story. Normally I didn't

 -- I mean I knew it went up to Denver, I knew
 that it went to Petaluma.
 - Q. Petaluma?
- 17 A. California.
- 18 | Q. Okay.
 - A. And the buyer was Petaluma Al and went up there. But there was a lot of sophisticated routes that it took, there was a specific car that it took, and the traditional thing was it went to Denver so they wouldn't know --
- 24 | Q. "They" being who?
- 25 A. The -- the -- the transporters and the -- the

buyer, Petaluma Al, wouldn't know where the lab was, because if a burning came up -- burning meaning a bust came up backwards from the distribution system, we didn't want a situation of where they say the lab is in this state or in this city, because that would be too much. We wanted to keep some confusion there. traditionally the crystalline form of LSD or powder form or this particular end product form, which we're not talking blotter paper or any of that stuff, we're talking about -- or liquid, we're talking concentrated LSD was made, nearly pure -- not nearly pure, above 70 percent, would go in these vials and they would go in this specific thing, and Denver was normally the transporter. And if you look, the labs are all not far from Denver, and Denver was a -- and I'm -- I'm doing some guesswork, I'm interpolating --

Q. Don't guess.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A. Well, what I mean by guessing is I'm saying that I believe Denver could -- and Boulder could have been -- but it was somewhere in that area, was the normal distribution spot. But during this Santa Fe breakdown, since the lab

1 was moving, Petaluma Al actually knew that 2 there was a kilo or more of LSD in Santa Fe. 3 The reason I know that is direct information because he somehow -- I went to 4 5 pick up \$300,000 or something from him and he 6 said I've got a --7 MR. BENNETT: Judge, I'm going to 8 object to what Petaluma Al said. MR. HOUGH: the witness has 9 10 identified Petaluma Al as a distributor of 11 their end product, thus a co-conspirator, thus 12 a co-conspirator statement. MR. RORK: Well, Judge, if they would 13 produce Petaluma Al, whatever it is, and 14 15 again -- it's the first time we've ever heard of it, we would like to have him here to cross 16 17 examine. 18 MR. HOUGH: Co-conspirator statement, 19 Judge, it's admissible. THE COURT: I agree. Go ahead. 20 21 (BY MR. HOUGH) Continue. Q. 22 Petaluma Al was -- was out of normal behavior, Α. because he said, I've "got to have a phone 23 24 number for you." When I picked up and I'm going to guess it was \$300,000 in cash, he 25

said, "We cannot find the LSD in the area that
Leonard told us it was and Leonard is in
Europe." So I had a problem because I didn't
have a cell phone that I thought was clean, and
I really broke with tight protocol and I gave
him my girlfriend's actual land line, which was
a major breach of security. And it was only
because I told him, I said, "You're hard of
hearing," I said, "you just tell me to come up
and visit you, I don't want any conversation on
this phone."

- Q. Did you -- during the course of your involvement with Mr. Apperson and Pickard learn the name of Petaluma Al?
- A. Just Petaluma Al.
- Q. Okay. And you talked about security measures.
 - A. I'm sorry. I referred to him as Petaluma Al.

 Leonard referred to him as Al. I have to be

 very succinct here or very exact. I've never

 heard Clyde refer to Al.
- Q. Okay.

- A. I have to be fair.
 - Q. Now, you talked about security measures and a breach of security. Describe for the jury, if you will, the security measures that were in

place within this conspiracy with the defendants?

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Α. Yes, we had phone systems that continually rolled. We bought cell phones and we were so paranoid, for good reason, we were so nervous that we used calling cards on top of very expensive prepaid phones. We had very elaborate methods for -- now all of this is kind of a joke because you can go get them easy, but at the time this was a little more difficult. We had ways of accumulating lots of cell phones under fictitious names without ever showing ID. And we spent a great deal of money, it was not unusual for us to spend two bucks a minute on a phone call and then we would use a credit card that was a disposable calling card and that expense and then as soon as that five -- we always bought the -- we -- early on when we were making mistakes, we said it was cheaper to buy a hundred dollar card. Then we realized we were leaving a trail, so we went down to buying five dollar cards, made one phone call and it was destroyed. We completely implemented very tight phone communications, and then there was a level of securities within the phone systems themselves and --

Q. Such as?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Α. The -- the highest level of security would be this person has a phone that can only call this person and no other contamination could go on. And then you drop on down to where you just have a burn phone where you'd call anywhere and you'd just throw that phone away. And we had some elaborate techniques where we would give phones away to homeless people so if the DEA got on to this, they'd find a bunch of trivial phone calls, and we loved giving the phones down to -- not to -- I'm not being mean, but to Mexicans, because that really would throw off because it would look like some sort of weird marijuana drug conspiracy nonsensical phone and we'd have like \$100 left.
- O. "We" is who?
 - A. "We" being -- well, I mainly gave the phones away.
 - Q. To whom?
 - A. To -- I would tell Mike go get rid of phones, I would tell Gunnar go get rid of phones. They never questioned why we got rid of phones.
 - Q. And who was it that had these secure phones?

- A. Well, there was a very elaborate coding system and each -- each of us had symbols so we would know because we had so many of these phones, we didn't know whose phone was what so we had symbols.
- Q. "We" is who?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

- A. Clyde Apperson, myself, Leonard and then -- and then the employees would have a lower level of security phones. And then amongst ourselves there would be very high level phones and then there would be phones that were emergency phones that were one time use only.
- Q. And what types of things would be discussed on these emergency phones one time?
- A. That would be the -- I'll be polite here, we have a serious problem and it is time to leave the country or to dismantel and flee.
- Q. Does that ever occur?
- A. I've had some pretty serious phone calls that --
- 21 Q. From who?
- 22 A. Leonard.
- Q. Describe them for us.
- A. There was a money bust and -- at the Kansas

 City Airport and --

- Q. And tell us when that occurred and who was involved and what happened.
 - A. Okay. It was -- okay. Natasha Kruglova
 - Q. And who is Natasha Kruglova?

- A. She -- we originally met her as a front desk person that worked at the Pan Pacific Hotel, which was one of our alternative favorite hotels where we stayed in the penthouses and took the top floor. And she became a girlfriend of Leonard's, and she, I believe, is his legal wife, but I don't know, but they have a child. Natasha needed school money and --
- Q. School money for where?
- A. UCA -- UC and Berkeley. And there was \$27,000 that somehow at the airport got busted, I have no idea. The story to this day makes no sense to me.
- Q. Do you know how she got the \$27,000?
- A. Well, I can tell you a little bit about it. I have not seen 20,000 of the 27,000, but I can give you a pretty good idea. It happens to be that I had to run through Vegas and I had gone to the Horseshoe, Bailey's Horseshoe. It was an odd situation because I put some money up--I won very rapidly some money and when I got

paid, it was the first time I've ever been paid by a casino where the money looked like it had just been printed, and every bill was serializing, you had to literally yank the bills apart. And I gave \$20,000 of that money to Leonard when I got to Kansas.

Q. Why?

- A. He -- I owed him the money or something. And he needed it for her. And I definitely owed him the money, there was no doubt about that. There was some rental money that had been fronted to me in the rental deal imploding (sic) because the rental person that was going to be the cutout wouldn't sign the document, she had an argument with me. And so I owed the money to Leonard.
- Q. What time, what period of time?
- A. When the money was given, when I gave the 20,000 fresh dollar bills?
- Q. Uh-huh.
- A. \$100 bills. Sometime February of 2000, January of 2000.
- Q. Okay.
 - A. Sorry, you know, it's the best I can do.
- Q. Okay. And then when was the bust of Ms.

1 Kruglova?

- A. No, that's what I mean. The bust occurred, I thought, in February of --
- 4 Q. Okay.

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A. -- of 2000. That's my best guess.
- Q. And it was in -- when in relation to you giving the money to Leonard?
 - A. Oh, I mean, I gave the money to Leonard and a day or two later she was busted.
 - Q. Okay. What was she doing --
 - A. The other \$7,000 I was told was from the conversion of thousand Guilder notes.
 - Q. Who told you that?
 - A. Leonard. And then I had to question both of them very carefully because --
 - Q. "Both of them" being whom?

that nervous over that event.

A. Natasha and Leonard. I was in damage control mode at that point. He turned the whole problem over to me and I was -- there was a DEA agent name given to me. I started investigating the situation. I had to know, was he seen. I had to start doing damage control. It's one of the most shook-up times I've ever seen Leonard. I was surprised he was

NORA LYON & ASSOCIATES, INC. 1515 S.W. Topeka Blvd., Topeka, KS 66612 Phone: (785) 232-2545 FAX: (785) 232-2720

1 Ο. Who? 2 Α. Leonard. 3 MR. RORK: Excuse me, Your Honor, I object to this phrase he keeps saying, busted. 4 And it's Ms. -- improperly misstates a fact not 5 in evidence and ask the witness not be allowed 6 7 to continue making statements with reference 8 to, quote, a bust which somebody got arrested 9 which didn't happen. So I ask that he not 10 misstate the evidence or facts not in evidence. 11 THE WITNESS: I will be more exact. 12 MR. HOUGH: Judge, my understanding of the testimony was that his communication and 1.3 14 understanding of the situation from Mr. Rork's 15 client was that Ms. Kruglova got busted. 16 was my understanding of the testimony. 17 MR. RORK: Judge, it may be his understanding but it's not something this 18 19 witness has stated. 20 THE WITNESS: I will be more exact, because I have made a mistake. 21 22 Q. (BY MR. HOUGH) Can you clarify that for us. The money was confiscated, she was not 23 Α. arrested. 24 25 Okay. And in your conversations with Mr. Q.

Pickard, did either of the two of you refer to it as a money bust?

- A. Yes, of course.
- Q. Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And -- and we went to -- we went to high-burn Α. security status. He buried himself into the Wamego site, vehicle transfers occurred, Gunnar Guinan went and rented a vehicle for him to get back out of there. We had to see how much blow-back was going to occur from this. started digging in. I was willing to take the up-front position of claiming the money. I was -- I was positioning ourselves for this, even though it was going to be a high-risk probability, there was an unusual circumstance. This turned out not to be drug money, the 20,000, and I could prove right where it came from, and I was willing to go claim the money. And we talked it over and some legal confrontation or some legal advice was given and we thought it through and we said forget The reason was not to recover, the 27,000 was nothing, I'm sorry to say that, but that was nothing. It was to get her name cleaned up.

- Q. And why was that important?
- A. Because she was from the Ukraine, she was a student, she was over on -- got a lottery Visa. We did not want her to be deported. He was very fond of her and he wanted a great deal of damage control.
- Q. "He" is who?

- A. Leonard Pickard wanted a great deal of damage control done, and I was willing to do whatever, although I said -- I said, "Given all the rest of the problems that we have, this is foolish because the worst that could happen to her is some minor thing." I said, "The worst that could happen to us is a total explosion on this thing."
- Q. What problems were you having at that time that you were talking about?
- A. Well, I -- if you could -- I need some help on the date so I can -- if you can give me the actual date the money was confiscated, then I can tell you just how many problems I was having.

MR. BENNETT: Well, now, Judge, I'm going to object to the prosecutor providing information to this witness so this witness can

1	then answer the prosecutor's questions.
2	THE COURT: Well
3	MR. HOUGH: Judge
4	THE COURT: see if we can show
5	see if we can find the date some legitimate
6	way.
7	MR. RORK: Your Honor, he's entitled
8	to refresh his recollection and look at some
9	documents or identify some document, but just
10	for him to say what it is or provide it, that's
11	absolutely contrary to the rules.
12	MR. HOUGH: Judge, the witness had
13	asked me that question. I had not responded to
14	it so the objections are premature. May I
15	proceed to question him, please?
16	THE COURT: Yes, you may.
17	MR. RORK: Well, Judge, I object that
18	it's asking questions is an improper way to
19	refresh recollection, he said he doesn't know.
20	He can be shown something to help him refresh
21	his recollection, but he can't be told
22	something, so I object, it's a violation of
23	Rule 612.
24	THE COURT: Overruled, go ahead.
25	Q. (BY MR. HOUGH) Within the context of what your

memory will allow as you sit here, can you 1 2 describe for us, please, the events that were 3 going on approximately simultaneously with the bust that you recall? 4 5 Α. Well, I know that I had a problem with the 6 Secret Service, okay? That I'm for sure about. 7 And we discussed that earlier. Q. A little bit, yeah. We didn't -- I knew I had 8 Α. that problem. What I'm not remembering is had 9 10 a suicide been committed. That's my problem 11 here. 12 Q. Okay. I do not think a suicide had been committed, 13 Α. and -- but I just --14 15 You've referring to Tim Schwartz? 16 Α. Yes. 17 Now, we'll get more fully to that --Q. 18 Α. Great.

Q. -- a little later on. So during the period of time that the money bust occurred, did you ever recoup that money or -- or what happened -- what was your, Mr. Pickard and Mr. Apperson's next move?

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A. Well, we watched -- I got clear that Leonard had not been seen with her, that she had

correctly -- although the DEA in later questioning, a different DEA group that was involved with this, asked me some strange questions. I'm still to this day concerned what she said, but I wasn't at the time because I had no reason to be suspicious of what she said. I -- from everything that I could gather after a week, I had determined we didn't have a serious problem.

- Q. Okay. So what happened, then, next in the chronology?
- A. Well, basically Leonard then got a new four-wheel drive vehicle, he would only take four-wheel drive vehicles because he got stuck in the mud once in a two-wheel and that was a disaster and happened to Mike and Gunnar and Lupe and so it's a reality situation. It used to happen to everyone that went out to that Ellsworth base except for me, I'm the only one that never got stuck in the mud.

So he, after he had ducked in and was fighting in the Wamego site, decided it was safe to leave, left one night and went to Ellsworth, I assume.

Q. Did he tell you that's where he was headed?

- A. I think so.
- Q. Okay.

- A. It makes sense. And he went to the lab and we watched and we saw no problems.
 - Q. Okay.

MR. HOUGH: Your Honor, it's 4:30, this may be an appropriate time to break for the day.

THE COURT: Yes, I think this would be a good time to break for the day. Ladies and gentlemen, let's take our break at this time. And we'll adjourn until 9:30 in the morning and we'll see you here at that time.

Mr. Bailiff, let's recess the Court. Remember my admonitions.

(THEREUPON, a recess was had after which the following proceedings were held at the bench and outside of the hearing of the jury).

MR. RORK: Judge, I would just note for the record, when we took the last break, Mr. Skinner visited with Mr. Hough and Mr. Nichols for the most part talking about things, and I would just ask again that the case agents not be allowed to discuss their testimony with

this witness tonight during the break and not . 1 2 be allowed to go over what the questions are 3 going to be asked tomorrow and that like the witnesses aren't allowed to be vouched for, 4 5 they're not allowed to be gone over what the 6 testimony would be. And I would just ask that 7 they not meet and go over the questions. MR. HOUGH: Judge, this circumstance 8 9 is no different than any other circumstance we've ever had in any trial relative to the 10 relationship between the case agent and this 11 12 witness or any other witness. There's nothing 13 The Court's addressed it, the Court's unusual. 14 ruled. And at this point the objection should be overruled and denied and reaffirm your prior 15 orders. 16 Yeah, I issued a written 17 THE COURT: order on this and that will take care of it and 18 19 I will stay with that. 20 MR. BENNETT: Judge, while we're here, can we get an idea of how long Mr. Hough 21 thinks he's going to be tomorrow so we can kind 22 23 of prepare? MR. HOUGH: Do you want the --24 25 (reporter interruption).

1	MR. BENNETT: I'm serious.
2	MR. HOUGH: Prepare what?
3	MR. BENNETT: I'm asking a serious
4	question.
5	MR. HOUGH: To prepare what?
6	MR. BENNETT: To prepare the cross
7	examination.
8	MR. HOUGH: I plan to be all day
9	tomorrow with this witness.
10	MR. BENNETT: Very simple.
11	(THEREUPON, the proceedings were
12	adjourned until January 29, 2003,
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Case 5:00-cr-40104-RDR Document 269 Filed 02/11/03 Page 131 of 131

COPY

1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.)
2) ss: DISTRICT OF KANSAS)
3	CERTIFICATE
4	I, KELLI STEWART, Certified Shorthand
5	Reporter in and for the State of Kansas, do
6	hereby certify that I was present at and
7	reported in machine shorthand the proceedings
8	had the 28th day of January, 2003, in the
9	above-mentioned court; that the foregoing
10	transcript is a true, correct, and complete
11	transcript of the requested proceedings.
12	I further certify that I am not attorney
13	for, nor employed by, nor related to any of the
14	parties or attorneys in this action, nor
15	financially interested in the action.
16	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set
17	my hand and official seal at Topeka, Kansas,
18	this day of
19	Merci Stowart
20	4 felle Hewart
21	KELLI STEWART
22	Certified Shorthand Reporter
23	
24	
25	