

**COPY**

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS

2003 MAR 13 P 1:06

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, )  
----- Plaintiff,) )  
vs. )  
WILLIAM L. PICKARD and )  
CLYDE APPERSON )  
----- Defendants.)

RALPH L. DELOACH  
CLERK  
BY *[Signature]* DEPUTY  
AT TOPEKA, KS.  
Case No.  
00-40104-01/02

TRANSCRIPT OF VOLUME VI OF THE  
TESTIMONY OF GORDON TODD SKINNER HAD DURING THE  
JURY TRIAL  
BEFORE  
HONORABLE RICHARD D. ROGERS  
and a jury of 12  
on  
February 5, 2003

APPEARANCES:

For the Government: Mr. Gregory G. Hough  
Assistant U.S. Attorney  
290 Federal Building  
444 Quincy Street  
Topeka, Kansas 66683

For the Defendant: Mr. William Rork  
(Pickard) Rork Law Office  
1321 SW Topeka Blvd.  
Topeka, Kansas 66603

For the Defendant: Mr. Mark Bennett  
(Apperson) Bennett, Hendrix & Moylan  
5605 SW Barrington Ct. S.  
Topeka, Kansas 66614

Court Reporter: Roxana S. Montgomery, CSR  
Nora Lyon & Associates  
1515 South Topeka Avenue  
Topeka, Kansas 66612

COPY

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

I N D E X

Certificate ----- 898

W I T N E S S

ON BEHALF OF GOVERNMENT: PAGE

GORDON TODD SKINNER (Contd.)

Direct Examination by Mr. Hough	719
Cross Examination by Mr. Rork	781
Voir Dire Examination by Mr. Hough	797
Cross Examination by Mr. Rork	798

E X H I B I T S

PICKARD EX. NO:	OFRD	RECD
p-20 Gordon Todd Skinner's		
Chemical Usage	797	798

1 (THEREUPON, the following proceedings  
2 were held outside the presence of the jury.)

3 THE COURT: Let the record disclose  
4 we're meeting in chambers-- meeting in the  
5 courtroom. The defendants are present. The  
6 matter today is to discuss certain things that  
7 might arise on cross-examination. Let me read  
8 you something first: The Court has carefully  
9 considered its prior rulings on the  
10 introduction of extrinsic evidence concerning  
11 the testimony of Gordon Todd Skinner. The  
12 Court has also considered the additional  
13 research that has been provided by the  
14 government in its recent motions in limine and  
15 by the defendants in their responses. The  
16 Court is confident that it's properly laid out  
17 the rules previously. However, the Court shall  
18 briefly recap the orders so that the parties  
19 will have a road map for how the Court shall  
20 proceed. The Court will allow the defendants  
21 to introduce extrinsic evidence in the areas of  
22 impeachment by contradiction, bias, and  
23 capacity. This would mean that the defendants  
24 can introduce extrinsic evidence that impeaches  
25 Mr. Skinner's testimony on the matters relating

1 to the charges in this case. The Court will  
2 also allow extrinsic evidence on the immunity  
3 agreement as it tends to show bias and on  
4 Skinner's drug use, as it tends to show  
5 capacity. The Court, however, will not allow  
6 extrinsic evidence to prove lack of  
7 truthfulness under Federal Rules of Evidence  
8 608(b). See United States versus Olivo,  
9 O-L-I-V-O, 80 F.3d 1466, 10th Circuit, 1966.  
10 This means that the Court does not intend to  
11 allow extrinsic evidence, that is, evidence  
12 offered through documents or other witnesses on  
13 the myriads of matters that relate to Skinner's  
14 truthfulness, that is, the incidents of fraud  
15 and misrepresentation concerning collateral  
16 matters. The Court may have to address  
17 individual issues as they arise, but we believe  
18 that this will provide some guidance to  
19 counsel. Two other matters that the Court  
20 finds it necessary to address. First, in a  
21 prior ruling the Court held that the charge of  
22 manslaughter against Skinner and the events  
23 surrounding that charge arising from the  
24 Hulebak death are not admissible under Rule  
25 608(b). The Court shall now direct both sides

1 not to make any reference to the Hulebak death  
2 including any evidence concerning a drug  
3 overdose. The Court believes that the  
4 probative value of this matter is substantially  
5 outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice  
6 and its tendency to mislead and confuse the  
7 jury. Second, in a response to objections  
8 raised by defendants yesterday concerning the  
9 Secret Service file related to Skinner's  
10 misdemeanor conviction, the Court shall  
11 overrule these objections. The Court believes  
12 that the government has complied with its  
13 obligations under Brady and Giglio in allowing  
14 defendant's counsel to view this file. The  
15 Court does not find that the law requires that  
16 a copy of the file be provided to the  
17 defendants. The Court has discretion, of  
18 course, to order that, but we do not find it  
19 necessary since the matter is collateral and  
20 related only to Skinner's truthfulness. So  
21 that's going to be the Court's rulings in this  
22 situation. We have done a lot more, a great  
23 deal more research on this, and I have this in  
24 a file, but I'm not going to give that to you  
25 at this time. The time would be unnecessary.

1 MR. BENNETT: Judge.

2 THE COURT: Yes, sir.

3 MR. BENNETT: Could we get a copy of  
4 what you have just read to us so we know  
5 exactly. I've tried to make notes, but I  
6 don't--

7 THE COURT: Yes, sir, we'll do that.  
8 We'll give you a copy of that.

9 MR. HOUGH: Judge, given your ruling  
10 that extrinsic evidence would be admissible  
11 regarding the immunity agreement, we would  
12 reoffer Exhibit 800, which the Court disallowed  
13 the other day, which is the order of immunity.  
14 We believe that would be only proper if counsel  
15 is allowed to now, based on this ruling, prove  
16 with extrinsic evidence, the immunity  
17 agreement, that that order is appropriate, and  
18 we would reoffer it at this time consistent  
19 with this ruling.

20 MR. BENNETT: I'm not sure if he's  
21 talking about 800 or 801.

22 MR. HOUGH: 800.

23 MR. BENNETT: 800 is in.

24 MR. HOUGH: It's 801.

25 THE COURT: All right.

1 MR. HOUGH: It's the order.

2 MR. BENNETT: Our position would be  
3 the same, Your Honor, with regards to that,  
4 that its potential prejudicial effect far  
5 outweighs any probative value. It doesn't tend  
6 to prove or disprove any of the issues in this  
7 case but, in our opinion, it gives undue  
8 emphasis, it kind of puts the Court's stamp of  
9 approval, if you will, on the testimony, and we  
10 would object to 801 being admitted.

11 MR. RORK: And, Judge, with respect  
12 to Mr. Pickard and 801, first, I would just  
13 note for the record as before with all the  
14 other Court's rulings in issues made most of  
15 the time Mr. Skinner is present and in the  
16 courtroom listening to the Court's rulings.  
17 But, Judge, my first objection with respect to  
18 801 goes to the fact that it is an issue  
19 collateral to the matter here, the fact that he  
20 came in with an attorney and then had some  
21 issues in camera, which we weren't a party to,  
22 which is proper, but we were initially told it  
23 had to do with the theft charge in Pottawatomie  
24 County and the false affidavit for appointment  
25 of counsel issues. One, with Mr. Bennett, we

1           adopt the fact that its probative value  
2           substantially outweighs its unfair prejudice in  
3           giving some type of Court approval and, second,  
4           Judge, it's not a complete picture, and at some  
5           point in time I need to revisit your rulings  
6           when I find my exhibits, but there's two  
7           letters that Mr. Haney and Mr. Skinner signed  
8           in earlier October prior to the Exhibit No.  
9           800, and then there's a letter from the  
10          Department of Justice November 3rd interpreting  
11          what the immunity agreement does and does not  
12          cover, and so those are some issues. So if you  
13          just want to limit the conversation now to  
14          Exhibit 801, we would ask again that you  
15          reserve ruling on that pending-- it may be  
16          admissible under some other means, but at this  
17          time, it's not.

18                   MR. HOUGH: Your Honor, we would  
19                   respectfully submit that each and all of the  
20                   reasons that Mr. Bennett and Mr. Rork have now  
21                   given are reason enough for this Court to  
22                   reconsider allowing the proof through extrinsic  
23                   evidence of the immunity agreement, because  
24                   each of those arguments is an argument against  
25                   this Court allowing any extrinsic evidence of



1 the immunity agreements at all. However,  
2 consistent with the Court's ruling that these  
3 items, consistent with what the defense counsel  
4 have just proffered, will be admitted, I think  
5 the letters of the Department of Justice  
6 beingff proved up with extrinsic evidence, the  
7 other side of that coin, so that the jury has  
8 the whole picture, is the Exhibit 801, which  
9 has been barred. So as a matter of fundamental  
10 fairness and to allow the jury to see the  
11 complete picture, if you're going to allow this  
12 to be proved up extrinsically, we would  
13 respectfully submit they should be entitled to  
14 see that whole picture, and that order  
15 completes that picture.

16 MR. RORK: Judge, if I may address  
17 that, what Mr. Hough failed to advise you is if  
18 you do that, then your ruling you just made on  
19 Mr. Hulebak will have to be revisited for  
20 another reason, because the November 3rd  
21 communication from the government specifically  
22 says the death, apparent death, anything to do  
23 with death, has not been, will not be, and will  
24 never be part of this immunity, and that  
25 concerned information that came to their

1 attention about this death, and that wasn't  
2 provided to the Pottawatomie County Attorney, a  
3 matter I'm still trying to collaterally get to.  
4 But, again, I would object to that.

5 MR. HOUGH: Judge, the point Mr. Rork  
6 has just raised is well taken. The Court  
7 allowing the proof with extrinsic evidence of  
8 the immunity agreement would open the door for  
9 Mr. Rork to attempt to do what he has tried to  
10 do all along and this Court has barred and has  
11 now reaffirmed today, and that is get into the  
12 Hulebak death. So it's a Pandora's box that is  
13 being opened. The bottom line is here the fact  
14 of the immunity is not in doubt. It's not  
15 disputed by any of the parties. Collateral  
16 proof of it opens a Pandora's box, so that we  
17 would submit under 403 the Court should  
18 reconsider and bar.

19 THE COURT: Well, as of now, the  
20 Court sees no reason to reopen the 801 and  
21 allow it into evidence. So at the present  
22 time, I will not allow that unless some better  
23 reason comes up, and that's going to be the  
24 ruling of the Court as far as that's concerned.

25 MR. RORK: And, Judge, I know you

1 want to get the jury in, but in light of your  
2 ruling on the Secret Service file, I only  
3 viewed it for 11 minutes. It's, like I said,  
4 five or six inches thick. I'm going to need to  
5 review it more, I guess, over the noon hour  
6 when Mr. Hough ends, and Mr. Bennett needs to  
7 review it, and there are some other matters,  
8 but we can take them up later and start getting  
9 testimony.

10 MR. HOUGH: Judge, I would imagine  
11 that we will be done with Mr. Skinner, it is  
12 our hope, at the latest, by the afternoon  
13 recess. Assuming that is true, Mr. Bennett has  
14 not looked at the Secret Service file in our  
15 office. Mr. Rork looked at it briefly. If the  
16 Court deems it appropriate, an early recess  
17 today so the two of them can sit down and go  
18 through that at length in our offices, we would  
19 not oppose that. The other thing is that we're  
20 willing to stay in the offices until eight  
21 o'clock tonight if they would like to come  
22 after court today and view it. So we will make  
23 every attempt to accommodate the Court and  
24 counsel, again, as we have attempted to do in  
25 the past.

1 THE COURT: Well, I'm sure there are  
2 other things that they can start on if we're  
3 right in the middle of the day, and so I'm not  
4 necessarily going to change our schedule on  
5 this thing. I don't know how long the  
6 cross-examination is going to go along, but  
7 it's probably going to go a considerable period  
8 of time, and so I'm not going to change our  
9 schedule. There are many things they can start  
10 on. That's my suggestion. All right, is the  
11 jury all here?

12 THE CLERK: I believe so.

13 THE COURT: All right, why don't we  
14 just bring the jury in and get started on this  
15 matter?

16 (THEREUPON, the following proceedings  
17 were had in the presence of the jury.)

18 THE COURT: All right, I believe  
19 we're all here. You may be seated, and we'll  
20 get started. Mr. Hough.

21 MR. HOUGH: Thank you, Judge.

22  
23 GORDON TODD SKINNER,  
24 called as a witness on behalf of the  
25 Government, was previously sworn, and testified

1 as follows:

2 DIRECT EXAMINATION (Contd.)

3 BY MR. HOUGH:

4 Q. Mr. Skinner, yesterday you had testified  
5 regarding accumulating large denominations of  
6 American currency. Do you recall that?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. And so that the record is clear, what  
9 denominations, specifically, can you tell us?

10 A. \$500 U.S. bills and \$1,000 U.S. bills. They  
11 were issued up until the '50s, I believe.

12 Q. Now, to your knowledge, during the life of the  
13 conspiracy, did you ever use any of the aliases  
14 of Mr. Pickard and Mr. Apperson?

15 A. No.

16 Q. To your knowledge, did either of them ever use  
17 any of your aliases?

18 A. Leonard used Todd Rothe, Todd Reagan, Gordon  
19 Todd Skinner, Todd Skinner.

20 Q. And you indicated during the course of your  
21 testimony Petaluma Al, an individual that you  
22 did not know the full name of.

23 A. That's correct.

24 Q. Do you recall providing a photo of him to Agent  
25 Nichols in October of 2000?

1 A. I recall providing multiple photos.

2 Q. Okay. How did you obtain those paragraphs?

3 A. From Leonard Pickard asking me to generate fake  
4 ID for Petaluma Al.

5 Q. And do you recall then, in January of 2001,  
6 Agent Nichols showing you photographs of an  
7 individual during the course of your discussion  
8 about the ET Man?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. And do you recall identifying a photo in a set  
11 of photos that he showed you?

12 A. Yes. There was a lineup of photos, and they  
13 were all different pictures of people, and I  
14 had to pick which one was the ET Man.

15 Q. Let me show you, sir, what has been caused to  
16 be marked Government's Exhibit 196. It's been  
17 admitted into evidence in this case, and it's  
18 been identified as an address book that came  
19 from the laptop computer taken from a Buick  
20 LeSabre driven by Mr. Pickard on November 6,  
21 2000. Can you look at that address book,  
22 please, and tell us if any of the entries in it  
23 are ones familiar to you through your  
24 conspiratorial agreement with the defendants?

25 A. Yes, I'll identify some names. Is that what

1           you want me to do?

2           Q.    Please.

3           A.    Mike Bauer, Michael Bauer.  He lived in the  
4           Boston area.

5                           MR. RORK:  Excuse me, Your Honor.  
6           Again, direct examination is to deal with new  
7           matters, and for the government now to  
8           cumulatively again go through matters that have  
9           been brought up the last five days, I object.  
10          The purpose is to provide evidence that hasn't  
11          been brought out before, and the names and  
12          whatever Mr. Skinner has alleged have been  
13          involved have been gone over for four days, so  
14          I object.  This is cumulative and wastes time.

15                          THE COURT:  Anything else?  Hearing  
16          nothing else, I'm going to overrule the  
17          objection, and it could possibly be helpful to  
18          the jury and to other parties, so you may  
19          proceed.

20                          MR. HOUGH:  Thank you.

21          Q.    (By Mr. Hough)  Continue, please.

22          A.    Yes, Mike Bauer lives in the Boston area.  He  
23          was friends with both John Halpern, Dr. John  
24          Halpern, and he was friends with William  
25          Leonard Pickard, and he did research after he

1 lost his job with a publishing company. He did  
2 research with-- for William Leonard Pickard,  
3 and he is a person that early on I warned that  
4 there was a major LSD conspiracy.

5 MR. RORK: Judge, again, I object to  
6 the nature of the question and the answers. He  
7 can respond.

8 MR. HOUGH: Judge, he's describing  
9 the nature of his relationship with Mr. Bauer  
10 based on the relationship with the defendants.  
11 That is appropriate.

12 MR. RORK: And again, going into  
13 matters that he just adds for a response to  
14 government questions. He was asked to identify  
15 who the people were and then is using a  
16 narrative set of events that fits his story.

17 THE COURT: I assume if Mr. Hough's  
18 objecting, he will do so, to what he's doing.  
19 Overruled. Go ahead.

20 A. Make Bauer was a person that came to visit me  
21 in Tulsa and Kansas, and after I developed a  
22 relationship of knowing him, I warned him that  
23 he was involved with something that he fully  
24 didn't understand and that it was to his best  
25 interest to remove himself from this because



1 this was going to blow up in the end, and I  
2 told him that there was a-- he could  
3 potentially end up in some legal trouble. He  
4 went back and then told Dr. John Halpern this,  
5 and they convinced both William Leonard Pickard  
6 and Dr. John Halpern that I was totally  
7 psychotic and suffered from all sorts of  
8 delusions, and there was no truth to this at  
9 all.

10 MR. RORK: Does he mean there's no  
11 truth that he suffered from delusions, or does  
12 that mean there was no truth to it at all?

13 MR. HOUGH: Judge, that would be  
14 appropriate cross-examination.

15 THE COURT: Overruled.

16 Q. (By Mr. Hough) Based upon your presence in  
17 this courtroom before this jury today, do you  
18 believe that those allegations have come true,  
19 your advice to Mr. Bauer?

20 A. Yes, to the tee.

21 Q. Also on that first page, Richard Alpert, is  
22 that--

23 A. Yes, but you prefaced that I was introduced  
24 through this conspiracy, therefore, he would  
25 not be.

1 Q. Okay, let's keep it that way.

2 A. And that's going to change things because of  
3 the way you phrased it. Selene, Diana, those  
4 are actually two names. These are girlfriends  
5 of William Leonard Pickard. They received  
6 large amounts of cash. They also actually met  
7 with Petaluma Al-- I'm sorry, not they-- Selene  
8 met with Petaluma Al. Her real name is  
9 Martina. Her first name that we were given was  
10 Natasha to add to the confusion with all the  
11 names in this trial. The next name that I was  
12 given was Selene when she named herself, and  
13 then when I had to make travel arrangements, it  
14 ended up being Martina. Those are two  
15 girlfriends of William Leonard Pickard that did  
16 receive illegal funds and also received Guildler  
17 and, through another one of their friends, they  
18 tried to sell Guildler back to me because he was  
19 giving them Guildler at times, and they didn't  
20 know what to do with it. The General Dostum, I  
21 was made aware of information through William  
22 Leonard Pickard about General Dostum.

23 Q. What did he tell you?

24 A. He said that he met a man, I believe it was at  
25 Terminal Island while he was in jail, who was a

1 colonel underneath General Dostum, and that  
2 this colonel had an elaborate way of smuggling  
3 in heroin to the United States by having it  
4 inside of the fibers of a carpet, and that he  
5 had been given quite a sentence for this, and  
6 that the U.S. government had made quite a large  
7 deal to get a hold of this man, and that one of  
8 the things that William Leonard Pickard was  
9 trying to do was to get his friend, the  
10 colonel-- or whatever his position under  
11 General Dostum-- out, was to try and bargain a  
12 deal with the U.S. government, and he was doing  
13 this in the form-- different forms, but one  
14 form was to get a man coming through, entering  
15 the U.S., busted with heroin, and--

16 Q. Now, earlier in your testimony you talked about  
17 being in an airport with Mr. Pickard when he  
18 made a phone call. Is that related to this?

19 A. Same man, not General Dostum, but the same man  
20 that was being set up to be busted.

21 Q. How do you mean being set up to be busted?

22 A. Well, that he was going to be carrying heroin  
23 only for the purpose of either he knew he was  
24 doing this to be arrested and his family had  
25 been paid a large amount of money, or he did

1 not know he was doing it and someone else had  
2 been paid a large amount of money but,  
3 effectively, this was a fictitious bust for the  
4 U.S. government, in their mind, and this was a  
5 standard Pickard move.

6 Q. What do you mean it was a standard Pickard  
7 move?

8 A. You can't ever tell what's going on with his  
9 strategies, and he's usually double dealing on  
10 both sides.

11 Q. Was there, based on your conversations with Mr.  
12 Pickard, any legitimacy to any claim that he  
13 was cooperating with the government in any way  
14 at that time?

15 A. I have no way of knowing, other than seeing a  
16 phone call and it being dialed and hearing the  
17 conversation. This could have been off into  
18 space. I don't know. Could have been-- this  
19 could have been all done for my benefit. I  
20 have no knowledge to know what the truth was on  
21 this.

22 Q. From time to time, given your relationship with  
23 Mr. Pickard, was it difficult to determine the  
24 truth of these types of stories when he told  
25 them to you?

1 MR. RORK: Again, Judge, I object to  
2 the form and the nature of the question and the  
3 foundation and the relevance.

4 MR. HOUGH: Judge, the form is  
5 appropriate, and the nature is a follow-up  
6 question to the witness's statement, and it's  
7 relevant based upon his relationship with the  
8 defendant.

9 THE COURT: Overruled. Go ahead.

10 A. I'm quite a skeptic, and I believe in thorough  
11 examination of all the underlying data to  
12 derive and to both get conclusions made in a  
13 very thorough manner. Therefore, yes, I would  
14 find it difficult, and some of the stories were  
15 pretty far out, and some of them were true.  
16 Indeed, there was a major LSD lab. As I said  
17 earlier, I originally thought because of the  
18 smell of the money it was a marijuana  
19 operation. And, you know, as time went on, I  
20 could see how the maneuvering would go and  
21 such.

22 Q. (By Mr. Hough) How was the maneuvering going  
23 on as it related to this fake bust?

24 A. Well, the bust wouldn't have been fake. This  
25 guy was going to go to jail. Initially,

1 Leonard told me that the man's family was being  
2 paid off and it was a million dollars, U.S.  
3 dollars, and that he would-- the man would  
4 voluntarily do this-- he wavered on his story  
5 over time-- and that this was being done for  
6 the benefit of trying to get the colonel out,  
7 and I said, "Leonard, do you realize this man  
8 has no concept of what it is to do life in  
9 prison in the United States?" He said, "It  
10 doesn't make any difference because it's better  
11 than what life they have currently."

12 Q. And the million dollars that person was being  
13 paid was coming from who?

14 A. I have no idea.

15 Q. The next name?

16 A. George Greer. This is Dr. George Greer. He's  
17 part of the Hefter (spelled phonetically) Board  
18 at the time. We had arguments with George  
19 Greer about the Sasha Grant, Alexander T.  
20 Shulgin Grant, about the acceptance of stock  
21 certificates that William Leonard Pickard  
22 forged the back of-- the signatures without  
23 Graham Kendall's permission. He forged the  
24 signature on them. I was coconspirator in  
25 that. I knew he was going to forge them, so I

1 had permission from Graham to deal with his  
2 financial matters, but I did not have  
3 permission for that to be forged, so I'm  
4 equally as guilty as Leonard is on this. These  
5 were approximately, it turns out-- and it will  
6 be a lot more money than we realized due to the  
7 stock splitting, so it's really good that the  
8 Hefter Group sent us the certificates back.  
9 The certificates were sent back because it was  
10 earmarked for a project for Alexander T.  
11 Shulgin in St. Petersburg. The Hefter Group  
12 felt it was too hot of an item for them to give  
13 a grant.

14 MR. RORK: Judge, Mr. Skinner again  
15 goes off into a narration of events and  
16 purported crimes and forgeries. I would ask,  
17 in light of this obviously programmed  
18 testimony, that the Court provide the jury at  
19 this time a cautionary instruction about all  
20 these allegations of offenses and crimes that  
21 Skinner allegedly says occurred during the  
22 course of this, that the Court provide the jury  
23 a cautionary instruction about what the purpose  
24 or what admissibility or the weight any of this  
25 could have with respect to the charges we're

1 here for.

2 MR. BENNETT: Judge, if I might join  
3 in, I would object to all this testimony. It  
4 doesn't tend to prove or disprove any of the  
5 issues in this case, doesn't have a thing to do  
6 with any of the allegations in the second  
7 superseding indictment. We're way beyond that.

8 MR. HOUGH: Judge, the evidence-- the  
9 government is entitled, as is the defense, to  
10 have witnesses explain and describe evidence  
11 that has been admitted. Without this  
12 testimony, all the jury has is a document and--

13 MR. RORK: If you will recall--

14 MR. HOUGH: -- the witness can aid  
15 the jury in understanding why that document is  
16 relevant.

17 MR. RORK: Judge, if you recall, I  
18 think when we were here last Tuesday and last  
19 Wednesday, we even broke overnight and at lunch  
20 so Mr. Skinner could take this phone book down  
21 and look at it over the lunch hour. Then we  
22 came back, and the jury was told he had it over  
23 the lunch hour, and we went through this phone  
24 book for half a day. I would renew my  
25 objection, one, that you provide the jury a



1           cautionary instruction about any alleged other  
2           crimes Mr. Skinner has tried to fit in here  
3           and, two, that it's cumulative. We have been  
4           through this phone book.

5                   MR. HOUGH: Judge, we're talking  
6           about apples and oranges here. It's a  
7           completely different phone book that was found  
8           in the vehicle with Mr. Pickard, a hard copy  
9           that we went through the last week. This is a  
10          completely different document, and so that  
11          objection is not well founded.

12                   MR. BENNETT: Well, Judge, I would  
13          just repeat what I said before. If this is  
14          allowed, arguably, we can go through every  
15          other name in that book and ask him about that.  
16          We'll be here until the Fourth of July.

17                   MR. HOUGH: Judge, questioning, as  
18          the Court is aware, is limited to the names of  
19          individuals that he learned relative to the  
20          conspiracy during the life of his relationship  
21          with the defendants.

22                   MR. RORK: And what the relevance is  
23          to this conspiracy, Judge, I see none.

24                   MR. HOUGH: Well, that's for the jury  
25          to determine, Judge. Thank you. The other

1 phone book, Exhibit 211, which was seized from  
2 the vehicle that was driven by Mr. Pickard,  
3 it's a completely different exhibit. This, as  
4 the record reflects, came off of Mr. Pickard's  
5 computer.

6 MR. RORK: Judge, I understand that.  
7 He had both the phone books and exhibits when  
8 he was looking at them.

9 THE COURT: Well, I'm going to allow  
10 you to go ahead, but let's not go into flights  
11 of fancy here on this matter.

12 MR. HOUGH: I understand, Judge.

13 THE COURT: We're only interested in  
14 those that are tied into the conspiracy in some  
15 way. So go ahead, but let's not run amuck.

16 Q. (By Mr. Hough) For the record, Mr. Skinner, do  
17 you recall last week when we took a recess so  
18 you could look at a phone book?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. Was this part of that?

21 A. No, not even remotely. This is a computer  
22 generated phone book. The other one was  
23 handwritten, and they're two completely  
24 generations apart. One is analog, one is  
25 digital, and they're not remotely alike.

1 Q. Thank you.

2 MR. RORK: Judge, I object to the  
3 form of the question and the context without  
4 Mr. Hough advising him that he has had those  
5 exhibits in their possession every break.  
6 Every time they're done, he runs over here and  
7 grabs the exhibits, and they've looked at them,  
8 and he's talked to the agents, and I object to  
9 the form.

10 MR. HOUGH: Judge, that's not true.

11 THE COURT: Let's stop our  
12 complaining about all the problems and try to  
13 get this case tried. Go ahead, please.

14 MR. HOUGH: Thank you.

15 Q. (By Mr. Hough) You were telling us about  
16 George Greer, sir, and his relationship to  
17 Hefter.

18 A. I'm not trying to go lead off into other areas.  
19 This is a complicated thing that needs to be  
20 well described. He sat on the board. The  
21 board rejected a promise that was given upon  
22 the \$100,000 that was given in cash to Hefter.

23 Q. By whom?

24 A. By Leonard William Pickard or William Leonard  
25 Pickard, through Federal Express, to the lawyer

1 for the Hefter Group, and it was considered AD,  
2 anonymous donor. That was how Hefter listed  
3 it. They then put it into a mutual fund, and  
4 it ended up being \$300,000 or something. When  
5 the note was called due, the marker was called  
6 due, then we want a promise that was made, that  
7 if we asked for funding and we give you the  
8 funding, you, if it's earmarked by William  
9 Leonard Pickard and myself, at that moment,  
10 whatever we ask for be done, and we had a  
11 project earmarked by ourselves for Alexander T.  
12 Shulgin involving using scientists in St.  
13 Petersburg, Russia, that were low cost  
14 scientists, that were on the surface going to  
15 be doing research on actavine-- acatavine  
16 (spelled phonetically)-- I'm doing the best--

17 Q. Acadamine?

18 A. No, acatavine. I'm saying it incorrectly. It  
19 is nicotine-- a way of handling nicotine  
20 withdrawal. Really, what was going on was this  
21 was going to be a new drug, it was going to be  
22 a new way for us to develop future drugs, and  
23 Hefter bogged down, refused, and they sent back  
24 the stock certificates that we had given them  
25 and said, "No, thanks. We don't want any part

1 of it," and at that point Leonard said, "That's  
2 it, all the rest of the members of the board  
3 and Hefter is cut off, and the only one that  
4 will receive money will be Dave Nichols at the  
5 amount of \$50,000 U.S. per year for his help  
6 and work in developing better synthesis and new  
7 forms of LSD analogs."

8 Q. And Dave Nichols is where?

9 A. At Purdue, and he carries a Schedule 1 license  
10 through the DEA.

11 Q. Okay. Now, the next name?

12 A. Let's see. Abe Halpern. Abe Halpern received  
13 some money through William Leonard Pickard for  
14 something. I don't know what it was. He is  
15 the father of Dr. John Halpern, and he is a  
16 well-known-- he has been on the television--  
17 famous psychiatrist. The next name is Deborah  
18 Harlow. This is, I was originally under the  
19 impression, the ex-wife of Leonard. She has a  
20 child of Leonard. I have eaten meals with her.  
21 I've spoken to her on different occasions on  
22 the phone.

23 MR. RORK: Well, Judge, and again, I  
24 object to the relevance of that with relation  
25 to this conspiracy. I don't think we're here

1 charged with eating meals with somebody. And  
2 again, it's cumulative and irrelevant.

3 THE COURT: Go ahead.

4 A. Not only that, she received cash--

5 MR. RORK: I object to this witness  
6 starting the narration again without a question  
7 being in front of him. I mean, Mr. Hough  
8 should ask a question.

9 MR. HOUGH: Judge, the witness was  
10 cut off.

11 THE COURT: Still talking about the  
12 same lady.

13 MR. HOUGH: Yes, sir.

14 THE COURT: Go ahead.

15 A. Yes. She also received cash, and we actually  
16 broke into her storage units on occasion when  
17 we were short cash to retrieve cash to make up  
18 for shortfalls of which Leonard said, "She's  
19 going to be pretty mad about this," that he has  
20 to get the money back to her.

21 Q. (By Mr. Hough) And where were the storage  
22 units?

23 A. San Anselmo.

24 Q. Was it-- did you in fact inform agents about  
25 that, the cash in storage lockers in San

1 Anselmo?

2 A. Yes.

3 MR. RORK: Judge, if the records  
4 would be clear, Mr. Hough said, "Did you inform  
5 the agents?" and I think he's established there  
6 have been at least 18 times that Mr. Skinner  
7 talked to the agents with respect to this  
8 matter. Let's identify when this was as  
9 opposed to leaving it hang out there.

10 MR. HOUGH: Judge, that, one, will be  
11 a matter that can be addressed on cross-  
12 examination and, two, will become abundantly  
13 clear when the seizing agent of the evidence  
14 from that search warrant testifies later in  
15 this trial.

16 THE COURT: All right, overruled. Go  
17 ahead.

18 A. Continue on the list?

19 Q. (By Mr. Hough) The next one, please.

20 A. Bob Jesse. He specifically, to make it fast, I  
21 hand-- I reached into a bag, as I have  
22 previously talked about, at the Ritz-Carlton  
23 and pulled out approximately \$30,000, either  
24 handed it to Leonard or directly to Bob Jesse.  
25 I don't know. I can't recall.

1 Q. The purpose of that was what?

2 A. To fund his work on trying to legalize certain  
3 Schedule 1 items.

4 Q. Okay.

5 A. Connie Jones, only remotely. She was at the  
6 Stinson house in the ethnobotany conference  
7 where I first met Leonard in person, and she  
8 lives in the Boston area. Mark Kleiman, this  
9 is the person that was the senior boss over  
10 Leonard at UCLA, and this is the man that  
11 received the grant that Leonard had laundered  
12 through using Guilders. Stefan Wathne, a  
13 Russian that went back to UCLA, and the same  
14 man that was ill with Hodgkins, I believe, and  
15 Leonard paid his medical bills with money  
16 orders. Trais Kliphuis, this is another  
17 girlfriend/mother of one of Leonard's children.  
18 Met her on numerous occasions, and--

19 Q. Do you recall whether or not she was ever in  
20 Kansas with either Mr. Apperson or Mr. Pickard?

21 A. Yes. I've testified two or three times to  
22 that. She was on the plane with us that came  
23 into Topeka.

24 Q. Okay.

25 A. George Marquardt-- I can't say the name--



1 Marquardt. This is the famous fentanyl chemist  
2 who-- there were numerous deaths, at least in  
3 excess of 250, in a very short time. The  
4 production was done in Wichita, as I  
5 understand. This is a historic case of  
6 information, and William Leonard Pickard told  
7 me he actually did research and helped and  
8 tried to interview or interviewed concerning  
9 this case.

10 Q. And did you ever see any actual evidence of  
11 that, or was it just his word saying it?

12 A. Saw nothing.

13 MR. RORK: Judge, I object again to  
14 the form of the question, "Was it just his  
15 word?" I object to the form and the  
16 connotation. Argumentative.

17 THE COURT: Well, you're simply  
18 asking how the information came to him?

19 MR. HOUGH: Yes, and if there was any  
20 corroboration.

21 THE COURT: Go ahead. Overruled.

22 A. No.

23 Q. (By Mr. Hough) Okay.

24 A. Deborah Mash, this is tangential. I'm just  
25 going to move through it fast. Because of

1 Alfred Savinelli and other people, Dr. John  
2 Halpern, she was involved many different  
3 neuroreceptor sites research, and she was  
4 involved with ibogaine and iboga, ibogaine  
5 research for heroin withdrawal.

6 Q. Okay.

7 A. Well-known researcher. Jerry D. Patchen. This  
8 is a lawyer that the money was sent to, the  
9 \$100,000 that was short \$2,500, and I was  
10 present when a phone call was made to him once.

11 Q. The money was sent to him for what purpose?

12 A. A donation to Hefter so that Hefter could get  
13 seed money to start going. Wendy Perry, this  
14 is the step-daughter of Alexander T. Shulgin,  
15 who used to host at her father's house, the  
16 famous-- not famous among general populace, but  
17 amongst the community-- the Friday night-- the  
18 Friday evening dinners. John C. Reppert. This  
19 is a retired military general who was-- Leonard  
20 was trying to entice into doing the FEDS  
21 project, who was putting pressure on Leonard to  
22 get this huge legitimate grant so that it could  
23 be funded, and another general friend of mine  
24 had conversations with General Reppert over  
25 that issue. David Rosensweet, MD, a doctor of

1 mine.

2 Q. Your doctor?

3 A. Well, I mean, I went to him. I guess Leonard  
4 also went to him. He was in Santa Fe.

5 Q. Okay.

6 A. At the time. Alexander Shulgin, numerous, I  
7 mean, I've talked extensively about him.  
8 Again, Alexander T. Shulgin, the same person.  
9 I've talked extensively. Sasha and Ann  
10 Shulgin, again, talked about the situation with  
11 them. Ann Shulgin, Alexander Shulgin, same  
12 thing. Ann Shulgin, again, this is all  
13 referring to the same husband and wife, I  
14 assume. Todd Skinner, this is myself. There  
15 are numerous entries made underneath my name.  
16 Do you want me to talk about the entries or--

17 Q. No.

18 A. Also under Todd Skinner is all the information  
19 about me, date of birth, Social Security  
20 number, mother's maiden name--

21 MR. RORK: Judge, if he's going to  
22 give some of the information that's in there  
23 about him, I would ask he give all the  
24 information like he did the other names, not  
25 select parts.

1 MR. HOUGH: He can certainly come  
2 back to that on cross-examination, Judge.

3 MR. RORK: Judge, I could come back  
4 to it on cross-examination, but Rule 106  
5 requires, if the government is introducing  
6 something out of context, the rest of it needs  
7 to be presented so the jury can have a clear  
8 picture.

9 MR. HOUGH: Judge, we are well within  
10 106 in this matter.

11 THE COURT: Overruled. Go ahead.

12 A. Rick Strassman. He was given a Schedule 1  
13 license by the DEA, got FDA approval to do  
14 human research with the injection of  
15 dimethyltryptamine, otherwise known as DMT, and  
16 also psilocybin studies with live human  
17 experiments, which was done, and because of  
18 him, numerous of us all met, because we would  
19 go to the hospital and see some of the research  
20 being done, and this is actually how Alfred met  
21 John Halpern, Dr. John Halpern, I believe. I  
22 have been told this is how ultimately--

23 Q. (By Mr. Hough) By who?

24 A. I have been told by William Leonard Pickard,  
25 also, in other words, this is a complicated

1           compounded question, so I will try and explain  
2           it. William Leonard Pickard, Alfred Savinelli,  
3           and Dr. John Halpern have all told me different  
4           stories how they met, plus I was there too, so  
5           to save time, I don't want to go through all  
6           the ways, but this was a neuronetwork of how a  
7           lot of these people ended up meeting. This was  
8           in Albuquerque. Natasha Vorobee, girlfriend  
9           and mother of one of Leonard's children. J.  
10          Thomas Ungerleider, I believe, is the  
11          grandfather of another Ungerleider, who was  
12          friends with both Pickard, myself, and the  
13          community in general, who lived in Santa Fe,  
14          whose wife's name was Gay Ungerleider, who was  
15          one of the people that we ran into in a bakery  
16          in Santa Fe, which is one of the decisions for  
17          moving the lab out. We ran into too many  
18          people that we knew. Bill Wynn, he is a long-  
19          term, junior high school associate of mine who  
20          has worked with me for many, many, many years.  
21          He also knew William Leonard Pickard and drove  
22          him around, helped him pick up money, helped  
23          him with computer stuff, helped him generate  
24          things. Bill Wynn is also the one that  
25          generated the fictitious ID, and on occasions

1 he would assist in generating the fictitious  
2 counterfeit cashier's checks. Jeffrey  
3 Bronfman. This is from the Seagram's alcohol  
4 family, a distant branch. After Ganga White  
5 stepped down as the head of the UDV, Jeffrey  
6 became the next head. This started a series of  
7 events, because customs busted a load of  
8 sacrament or Ayahuasca coming into the United  
9 States, traced it right to his house, seized  
10 it. This was in Santa Fe. This started a  
11 series of events of where Ganga White was then  
12 interviewed by Customs and then had to go  
13 before a grand jury. Because this was in Santa  
14 Fe, this was another pressure of get the lab  
15 out of there. It was a good decision. We knew  
16 this heat was sitting back there. We didn't  
17 know that Ganga White would end up getting  
18 subpoenaed, because he was so far back. So  
19 this was a stress maker for us. Dennis J.  
20 McKenna.

21 Q. Just a second. During your conversations with  
22 Mr. Pickard relative to that grand jury  
23 investigation, did he make any comments to you  
24 regarding any attempts to influence that  
25 investigation?

1 A. Yes. We were very nervous about the situation.

2 Q. We being?

3 A. William Leonard Pickard.

4 MR. RORK: Excuse me, Mr. Skinner.

5 Again, I would ask that the Court advise the  
6 jury, if Mr. Skinner is going to be allowed to  
7 interject all these supposed crimes-- now he's  
8 referenced Mr. Pickard as corrupting a grand  
9 jury-- I ask you to advise this jury of the  
10 cautionary instruction for why they should  
11 consider it and what for, because we're getting  
12 into now about 17 different things Mr. Pickard  
13 has done just since 9:30, and I don't think the  
14 jury should be entitled to consider this with  
15 respect to this charge unless they're  
16 instructed for what purpose.

17 THE COURT: I appreciate you helping  
18 me, but I'll overrule your objection. You may  
19 go ahead.

20 A. I'll claim equal responsibility for the  
21 thoughts of this, so I'm going to say that we  
22 were equally devious in this plan. We were  
23 very nervous about what Ganga White would say  
24 before the grand jury, considering that he was  
25 familiar with the swimming pool project, which

1 was code name for the LSD operation,  
2 manufacturing, that Alfred Savinelli had told  
3 us he had told Ganga, plus other people told us  
4 Ganga knew, i.e., Joel Kramer. He knew this  
5 information. He was granted some form of  
6 immunity. This made us very nervous because we  
7 didn't know how far the grand jury would let  
8 him talk, and both of us came up with a plan to  
9 have-- we said we'd pay his legal bills, we  
10 would go-- we would hold his hand and support  
11 him and give him moral support, but the real  
12 reason we were there, although I never arrived,  
13 was to plant a bug on him so we could hear what  
14 he said before the grand jury. Grand juries  
15 have an interesting problem that not even a  
16 lawyer for the client can be present when the  
17 grand jury convenes, therefore, what he says,  
18 we would virtually have no knowledge of what he  
19 said, and it's sealed, and we felt that this  
20 was the only way we could ever know, and the  
21 bug was actually going to be in the form of a  
22 pen. We were going to give him a pen that he  
23 would carry in. It would be a transmitting  
24 pen, and both of us came up with this idea. I,  
25 in the end, said this is just too much, and I



1 never showed up.

2 Q. (By Mr. Hough) To your knowledge, did Mr.  
3 Pickard show up?

4 A. Yes, he showed up, and he stayed, I believe, at  
5 Las Campanas (spelled phonetically), and he did  
6 talk or meet with Ganga White.

7 Q. And the purpose of that was, overall, to  
8 protect your operation?

9 A. Correct.

10 Q. Okay. Now, the next name.

11 A. Dennis J. McKenna. This is a Ph.D. He's a  
12 famous ethnobotanist researcher. He is a  
13 personal friend of mine, and he was also a  
14 member of the board of Hefter, and when there  
15 would be problems about the inner politics, he  
16 would be my-- he was the liaison that I had to  
17 Hefter's board to put pressure on which way and  
18 what projects were approved and not approved.

19 Q. The next name?

20 A. Again, I recognize many of these names, but I'm  
21 trying to adhere to your instructions that you  
22 have given me. William Pickard, obvious,  
23 referring to William Leonard Pickard. I notice  
24 a name Wadena. This would refer to the Wadena  
25 that was the step-daughter of Brent that is

1 referred to so many times in the tape.

2 Q. Brent Nicholson?

3 A. Right. Charles S. Grob. He was given, I  
4 believe, a Schedule 1 license and FDA approval  
5 for Phase 1 studies of MDMA, personal friend of  
6 mine, tangential friend of William Leonard  
7 Pickard, also a tangential friend of Alfred  
8 Savinelli. Dr. John Halpern, or actually says  
9 John Halpern, MD. He was involved in the money  
10 laundering, involved in conversations about how  
11 to deal with taking care of eliminating the  
12 informant, was fully aware in all aspects of  
13 the LSD conspiracy as far as that it was a  
14 large, ongoing thing, the same man who told  
15 Mike Bauer I was psychotic and suffered from  
16 paranoid delusional thoughts. Again, William  
17 Leonard Pickard, obvious. Jack Conway is the  
18 person that Leonard said the story was not  
19 true. This is indeed the cochairman of the  
20 Maybee Foundation, a place that both I and  
21 Leonard were looking at getting funding for  
22 different projects. Rick Doblin, who was the  
23 head of MAPS.

24 Q. MAPS is what?

25 A. This is a group that publishes both on the

1 website and a newsletter, I believe, so that it  
2 talks about different research that's going on  
3 with psychedelics and entheogens, and different  
4 drug trends.

5 Q. MAPS is a moniker--

6 A. It's an acronym. I don't remember what it is,  
7 sorry.

8 Q. Okay.

9 A. I don't read MAPS. That's the reason I'm--  
10 Jonathan Ott.

11 Q. What page of the document are you on?

12 A. Page 63.

13 Q. Thank you.

14 A. A very well-known entheogen researcher who has  
15 written many books, who was also at the Palace  
16 of Fine Arts. I've known Jonathan Ott since  
17 1984. He was a protege of Albert Hofmann, the  
18 man that first synthesized LSD in 1943.

19 Jonathan Ott also translated from Swiss German  
20 to English "LSD, My Problem Child," which is a  
21 book of Albert Hofmann's. Jonathan Ott is very  
22 much involved in the entheogenic community.

23 Q. Palace of Fine Arts where?

24 A. San Francisco at the ethnobotony conference  
25 where we stayed at the house in Stinson Beach.

1 Q. Thank you.

2 A. Richard Yensen, Ph.D., he was given somewhat of  
3 an approval for LSD research on human subjects.  
4 Either the FDA or the DEA required that a safe  
5 be put into his house. I believe it was at the  
6 Palace of Fine Arts, he was one of the many  
7 people that came up and asked me for a  
8 donation. I'm not for sure that Leonard was  
9 present when that donation was asked, but I  
10 know that Leonard was also hit up for money  
11 from Yensen. Through some strange mechanism  
12 we were forewarned that they would be asking  
13 for money, and that the lab in Purdue of David  
14 Nichols is the one that produced LSD that went  
15 to a safe. Because of lack of funding and some  
16 other problems Yensen was never-- maybe now,  
17 but to the best of my knowledge he never  
18 continued his studies. It's been the note of  
19 many main stream magazine articles. Bob  
20 Wallace, who helped fund Hefter, made a promise  
21 of matching dollar-for-dollar a grant for every  
22 bit of money that went in there, who also knew  
23 William Leonard Pickard, and has recently died,  
24 cofounder of Microsoft. David E. Nichols is  
25 from Purdue University, Schedule 1 licensed man

1           that we keep talking about, a well-known,  
2           famous person on the structure of all the  
3           analogs, isomers, and derivatives of LSD and  
4           other like compounds, also his skills are far  
5           beyond that, by the same lab that Leonard said  
6           that he synthesized 66 grams of LSD out of to  
7           get everything going.

8           Q. Describe that for us.

9           A. He was out of money. Everyone was out of money  
10          as far as that group. They had not approached  
11          me. They needed initial funding. Savinelli  
12          did not have enough money, or it was before  
13          Leonard knew Savinelli. Money was scarce, and  
14          Leonard somehow got into the lab through saying  
15          he was going to do research work or something,  
16          and he synthesized approximately 66 grams of  
17          LSD.

18          Q. And do you know, did he tell you what became of  
19          it, what he did with it when he got it?

20          A. No. I assume it was sold, but he didn't tell  
21          me that.

22          Q. What would it be worth on the street?

23          A. At that time it would have been worth quite a  
24          bit, more than later, because it was scarce  
25          because Nicky, Nick Sands, had been busted in

1 Vancouver, and there was a tremendous scarcity  
2 worldwide of LSD, but the minimum value of it  
3 would have been, oh, around \$200,000, could  
4 have had a much higher value depending on how  
5 the distribution was done, much higher. That  
6 brings up something-- well, I'm meandering.  
7 I'm not-- there's been a misunderstanding. The  
8 LSD was sold for 29 cents and a fraction per  
9 dose or \$2,970,000 per kilo, and I have seen  
10 where there's been misunderstanding of that.  
11 That is what this organization sold the LSD  
12 for. That's not what it cost us to make.

13 Q. Okay, what did it cost to make?

14 A. It's a complicated question. It depends on if  
15 you're looking at operational or complete  
16 overhead or entertainment value thrown in  
17 there, and so I don't know that. Just strict  
18 in and out accounting by traditional  
19 operations, accounting of a business, it would  
20 be less than a cent per dose, 29-fold profit  
21 minimum.

22 Q. That's at wholesale level?

23 A. At the very large wholesale level. Albert  
24 Hofmann, this is a man that is in his 90s, who  
25 is a famous chemist for Sandoz Chemical out of

1 Switzerland and the man that in 1943 first  
2 synthesized LSD(25). Gary Bravo, tangentially  
3 involved only because he knew the group, and he  
4 actually knew of the swimming pool project,  
5 because that's Grob and him were telling me  
6 about it, like I didn't know about it, which  
7 concerned me. He was not involved, he just  
8 knew about it.

9 Q. And why would that concern you?

10 A. That someone that's in Northern California  
11 would know that there was an LSD operation of  
12 large scale concerned me, how many leaks of  
13 information there were. This was supposed to  
14 be a need-to-know basis only. Jim De Korne, he  
15 wrote books, lives in New Mexico, about  
16 entheogens. Ethan Nadelman (spelled  
17 phonetically), he's involved with Soros  
18 (spelled phonetically), and he worked for  
19 Soros.

20 Q. What is Soros?

21 A. Soros, George Soros is a billionaire who trades  
22 currency and all sorts of complicated financial  
23 instruments all over the world through  
24 something called Quantums Fund One, Two, and  
25 Three, which are off shore. He's also referred

1 to in the video that has been shown twice to  
2 the jury, and his name is referred to as  
3 tryingto get everybody to go, or he was being  
4 invited.

5 Q. The video tape of your meeting with Mr. Pickard  
6 in California--

7 A. Correct.

8 Q. -- prior to them coming to Kansas?

9 A. Correct. Andrew T. Weil, MD, famous author of  
10 many books. He's become on line, and he's  
11 written a lot of popular books now. He was out  
12 of the Harvard team that was pro the use of  
13 psychedelics. I've known him since 1984. He  
14 also was best friends with Ungerleider and  
15 would routinely come into Santa Fe.

16 Q. And he was pro the use of psychedelics for what  
17 purpose?

18 A. For many things. To better help someone deal  
19 with problems, to better help medical-- he  
20 wanted to use them in medical applications.  
21 He's had numerous, numerous books written by  
22 him. You can go to any book store, and they're  
23 on the best seller list. A repeat of the name  
24 Deborah Mash. I've already gone over the name.  
25 Peter Louie. This is the Customs agent that



1 was contacted, theoretically, in front of me  
2 concerning the artificial or the setup bust  
3 involving General Dostum and the colonel and so  
4 on and so on. That concludes the list to the  
5 best of my ability to handle it with the  
6 instructions you gave me.

7 Q. Page 97, if you would, please.

8 MR. RORK: Do you have a copy of that  
9 with you, Mr. Hough?

10 A. I'm sorry, Ganga White. Didn't see this.  
11 There's many, many, many names on this list,  
12 and this is-- Ganga White was involved with all  
13 of us. He was at the Stinson house, at the  
14 ethnobotany conference that was held in the  
15 Palace of Fine Arts in San Francisco, a  
16 personal friend of Joel Kramer's, the one that  
17 was the original previous head of the UDV, who  
18 was given the Customs subpoena or was  
19 interviewed by Customs, was then later  
20 subpoenaed by the grand jury, the same person  
21 that we were going to put a bug on, the same  
22 person that became so panicked that wanted to  
23 reverse out of the \$80,000 U.S. contract  
24 situation.

25 Q. (By Mr. Hough) Okay. Now, previously you

1           talked-- you started to talk about the personal  
2           information on you that's contained in this  
3           document. Do you recall that?

4           A. Yes.

5           Q. And I cut you off. Now I would like to go back  
6           and do just that. Let me--

7           A. Can you tell me the page number?

8           Q. -- see the document.

9                         MR. RORK: Well, Judge, if he's going  
10           to use the document now and then has a copy of  
11           it, I would like to have a copy of the document  
12           to go through. I don't know if now-- if you  
13           want the time now for your morning break or  
14           when, but--

15                        MR. HOUGH: Judge, it's been in here  
16           in evidence since Ralph Sorrell testified. We  
17           have no objection to counsel getting another  
18           copy of it. Not a problem. We can either do  
19           it now or later.

20                        MR. RORK: Judge, it isn't another  
21           copy, it would be a copy.

22                        THE COURT: Why don't we go ahead for  
23           about 15 more minutes, then we'll see what we  
24           can cover.

25                        MR. HOUGH: Okay. I'll put this on

1           there.

2                           THE CLERK:   Okay.

3       Q.   (By Mr. Hough)   All right.   Under your name  
4           there, if you can just describe for us, now  
5           it's on the overhead, what the entries mean  
6           regarding you.

7       A.   First entry is \$1,343.   It looks like I  
8           scratched through it.   It's a total that's  
9           given.   This is an entry so that we can be  
10          accounting for money transfers between the two  
11          of us.   This represents two airline tickets for  
12          him to go to Honolulu, to San Francisco.   Since  
13          it's times two, it would have been for Natasha  
14          and William Leonard Pickard for their wedding.  
15          The next one would be St. Martin, Miami, San  
16          Francisco, Honolulu.   This was because they  
17          were not granted by the governor of St. Martin  
18          the right to marry, and they had to do this.  
19          This is a \$4,800 total.   It shows, again,  
20          another entry that he would been going-- I have  
21          no idea what this next line means.   I can try  
22          and figure it out.

23                           MR. RORK:   Can we have, like, a date  
24           that he's talking about per line, or some  
25           idea--

1 THE WITNESS: Okay, 8-11, 2000.

2 MR. HOUGH: For the record, Judge, on  
3 the overhead it shows date and time entry.  
4 Date and time are on the left-hand side of the  
5 scroll.

6 MR. RORK: I meant when he was saying  
7 this one--

8 THE WITNESS: I'll do it. 8-9, 2000.  
9 I'm a little confused, but now I'm looking at  
10 this, maybe this was Bank of America to  
11 validate the validity of cashier's checks.  
12 That's what I now think this means. 8-7, 2000,  
13 this is the long term address of Ivo Kaanen  
14 from the Netherlands, who was going to be  
15 involved with the quadplex project, with the  
16 knock-off Viagra story being told to him, using  
17 his family's different companies to be fronts  
18 to buy the glassware for a giant LSD lab in the  
19 Netherlands. 7-6, 2000, those are my current  
20 private numbers. That would have had a prefix,  
21 and then the second number, that's 9002, that  
22 would have been a private number that would  
23 have gone directly to me. The next number  
24 would have been the general number. The next  
25 number would have been #2079 to get into the

1 gate. 7-22, 2000, these are different phone  
2 lines of mine, and then it goes to Iv, meaning  
3 Ivo. This would have been a Dutch phone  
4 number. This number 1919 has been-- Anna Marie  
5 is the wife of Ivo Kaanen. This 1919 would  
6 have been a phone number of Ivo's since we went  
7 to school in Europe together as teenagers.  
8 7-22, 2000, another phone number that was a  
9 private line for the base, and then a private  
10 phone number for the corporation in Tulsa to  
11 reach me directly. 7-12, 2000, Gardner Spring  
12 fax number. 7-10, 2000, just referring to the  
13 amount of money that was owed, \$190,000 plus  
14 \$19,100, then the deduct later from air, and if  
15 we probably went to 7-5, we'll find that there  
16 is an amount of airfare. If you will go down  
17 to 7-5-- I can't point or anything-- if you  
18 will go down to line 7-5, you'll see a whole  
19 series of airfares. So from that \$190,000  
20 plus, there would be a deduction. This is just  
21 his way of keeping an account. Back to 7-8,  
22 2000, this is a car phone, cell phone of mine.  
23 Then there would be a base private line besides  
24 the 9002. The 5-7 revisited again, \$3,000 due  
25 for Chicago, San Francisco, and the next, N.

1 must mean Natasha, the amount of the money for  
2 round trip, Denver, San Francisco. Then in  
3 parentheses, plus +C, that means the amount of  
4 money that C was supposed to receive for one  
5 week's work officially in the form of a  
6 cashier's check that was legitimate that I gave  
7 him. Then the next one would be for round trip  
8 tickets, \$15,602.80, LA, London, San Francisco.  
9 6-3, 2000, Platinum Card Travel Services  
10 number, this is a way for Leonard to use my  
11 Platinum Travel American Express system for  
12 buying tickets rapidly. 5-21, 2000, this is a  
13 phone number for Bill Wynn. B. W. stands for  
14 Bill Wynn. K. I. is-- my mother's name is  
15 Kathryn Inez Magrini. This is a long-term  
16 house phone number. Emily, previous wife of  
17 mine. Rents refers to her parents. This is a  
18 long-term phone number of hers. Krystal refers  
19 to a phone number that she had in Kansas.  
20 5-21, 2000. This is all the American Express  
21 data so that Leonard could prove that he was  
22 me. All the information was there so that he  
23 could prove anywhere in the world that he was  
24 me on the phone and get electronic tickets.

25 Q. (By Mr. Hough) Specifically, that information

1 is what?

2 A. The card number to a Platinum American Express,  
3 it's expiration date, the address where the  
4 bill is sent, Tulsa, Oklahoma, the 800 number,  
5 and the two numbers that would be asked,  
6 although there's a typo here-- it should have  
7 been 918, not 800-587-- the two numbers that  
8 would be asked to verify, Social Security  
9 number, date of birth, my date of birth,  
10 mother's maiden name, being Kathryn Jackson,  
11 current name Magrini, and security code of 6983  
12 that's found and printed on the back of  
13 American Express card-- or the American  
14 Express, they may print that on the front on  
15 the Platinum cards. The next line, 5-21, 2000,  
16 this would be people that he was in contact  
17 with for getting this. Next line is--

18 MR. RORK: Well, Judge, I think he  
19 should not just give a short explanation for  
20 those that touch on other matters. He's gone  
21 on into great narrations on other ones, and I  
22 would ask him to give the full narration on the  
23 5-21, 2000.

24 THE WITNESS: Can you make it clear  
25 to where I can see it all?

1 MR. HOUGH: Can you see it all now?

2 THE WITNESS: Yes.

3 MR. HOUGH: I have no problem with  
4 that, Judge.

5 THE COURT: Go ahead.

6 A. This is a mixture of both fictitious  
7 information I have given him and real  
8 information I have given him involving his  
9 ability to get a grant for the FEDS project  
10 from Warren Buffett. It would be hard for me  
11 to dissect what is real, but on this, what I  
12 know is real is that these phone numbers do  
13 look like they're the real phone numbers to the  
14 different Warren Buffett foundations in Omaha,  
15 Nebraska. The addresses look approximately  
16 correct. The next line on there would be  
17 retired Major General Moise 'Mo' B., Benjamin,  
18 Seligman, his phone number, his address, and  
19 you need to-- in Little Rock, Arkansas. The  
20 next line is the Reverend Henry Valentine  
21 Spilman, misspelled Spilman, who is the  
22 patriarch and the head of the Augustinian  
23 order, the person that, again, he puts the-- he  
24 being William Leonard Pickard-- in a note says  
25 a fictitious situation. This is truly the man



1 that meets every Saturday for 40 years with the  
2 head of the Maybee Foundation, who is then  
3 mentioned as Jack in here, the Maybe  
4 Foundation's phone number. Move over to make  
5 sure I'm not missing anything. I'm sorry. I  
6 just don't know how far over it goes. And H.  
7 V. Spilman is a long-term friend of mine also  
8 in this, so is General Moise Benjamin Seligman,  
9 retired Major General. The next line-- is that  
10 enough of an explanation?

11 Q. (By Mr. Hough) Yes, yes.

12 A. Okay. 5-12, 2000, this would have been the  
13 attorneys that were used for Natasha, when the  
14 money was seized, to get recommendations on  
15 what to do at the Kansas City airport. We were  
16 in a-- trying to-- we were on a hunt to find  
17 what to do with that legally. The next line  
18 5-12, 2000, this is the phone number of Warren  
19 Buffett's wife. Interesting. This is the  
20 phone number of my lawyer, Thomas D. Haney. I  
21 do not-- I am really confused of this next one  
22 being Delaney. Delaney is a billionaire that  
23 owns McMaster Car. I do not know that this is  
24 a correct entry. I do not know how William  
25 Leonard Pickard would have gotten this name.

1 The next one is Arnold Schick (spelled  
2 phonetically), a long-term friend of mine and  
3 business associate involved in the-- by the  
4 way, Delaney is the largest industrial  
5 distribution company in the world for parts.  
6 Arnold Schick was an employee of Delaney.  
7 There's many Delaneys, so I don't know which  
8 Delaney this is. I'm just blown away that he  
9 has a phone number for him. Arnold Schick is a  
10 long-term business associate of mine involved  
11 in the spring business. Dan Bleckman (spelled  
12 phonetically). The Bleckman is left out. It's  
13 a phone number for MSC, Manhattan Supply  
14 Company, the third largest industrial  
15 distributor in the world. I'm trying to give  
16 more, fuller examples of the lines given to me.

17 Q. Mr. Skinner, are you familiar with  
18 ergocristine, what it is?

19 A. No-- I mean, yes, I am now, yes.

20 Q. During the course of this conspiracy, to your  
21 knowledge, was ergocristine used in the  
22 manufacture of LSD?

23 A. No.

24 Q. To your knowledge, what ergot alkaloid was  
25 used?

1 A. Ergotamine tartrate, although I know that  
2 Leonard was constantly looking for a new source  
3 of a lysergamide worldwide.

4 Q. During this conspiracy, did you, Mr. Apperson,  
5 Mr. Pickard, or any combination of you ever  
6 discuss what would happen if one or more of you  
7 ever got caught?

8 A. There were different forms of that. This is a  
9 complicated--

10 Q. Did you have those discussions?

11 A. Yes, informally, formally, I mean, it's  
12 difficult, I mean, yes.

13 Q. And did you have them with both Mr. Apperson,  
14 both him and Mr. Pickard, or one or the other?

15 A. All of the above.

16 Q. And can you describe for us these scenarios?

17 A. Well, it depended on if, like, one of us got  
18 busted with cash at an airport, that would be  
19 considered one problem. If one of us got  
20 caught with a lab, that's another problem. If  
21 one of us got a burn-back somehow where there  
22 was a dry conspiracy indictment, that's another  
23 problem, and all these had different levels,  
24 but generally--

25 MR. BENNETT: Judge, I'm going to

1 object to him talking generally. If there were  
2 discussions, I would like to know with regards  
3 to each discussion when it was and who it was  
4 with. I think we're entitled to know that  
5 much.

6 MR. HOUGH: Judge, the witness is  
7 describing generally conversations that he's  
8 had with both defendants. Counsel can come  
9 back on cross-examination and cross-examine at  
10 length on the witness's recollection of the  
11 dates and times and other specifics of these  
12 conversations.

13 MR. BENNETT: Judge, in order for the  
14 jury to understand when, where, who, I think  
15 we're entitled to know, if he's going to talk  
16 about a series of discussions, when they were,  
17 where they were, and who was participating  
18 rather than just some general hodge-podge of  
19 information.

20 THE COURT: Yes, I think that might  
21 be a good idea to tie it down more, but in the  
22 meantime, ladies and gentlemen, let's take  
23 about a 15-minute break at this time, then  
24 we'll come back and have further testimony.  
25 Mr. Bailiff.

1 THE BAILIFF: All rise. Court will  
2 stand in recess for 15 minutes.

3 (THEREUPON, a recess was had.  
4 WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were had  
5 outside the presence of the jury.)

6 THE COURT: All right, did you  
7 gentlemen have something you wanted to discuss?

8 MR. RORK: Judge, yes. On behalf of  
9 Mr. Pickard, Exhibit 196 that's been in  
10 evidence, evidently Mr. Skinner has gone  
11 through and circled certain names in the report  
12 and left other names uncircled, and I just  
13 object to the names being circled in blue ink  
14 on the exhibit and then having that exhibit go  
15 to the jury with respect to highlights put on  
16 it by Mr. Skinner. That was the first matter I  
17 had.

18 MR. BENNETT: We would join in that  
19 objection, Your Honor.

20 MR. HOUGH: Judge, Mr. Skinner  
21 circled those, as the Court could see, during  
22 the course of his testifying. We would submit  
23 that there's no harm in it going back. It just  
24 identified the ones the witness knew as he had  
25 testified regarding.

1 THE COURT: Well, let me think about  
2 it. We may-- of course, if we would now give a  
3 clean copy, it would lose the impact of the  
4 ones he signed, so we'll think that over, take  
5 that over and decide what to do about it.

6 MR. RORK: That was just it, Judge.  
7 There's 1500 names on there. The second thing,  
8 Judge, the government, before the recess, was  
9 beginning to ask Mr. Skinner questions about  
10 supposedly "plans" if they ever got busted or  
11 along those lines, and we would object to the  
12 introduction of any such statements as, one,  
13 they're hearsay, two, they're not in  
14 furtherance of any conspiracy or resulting from  
15 a conspiracy, absent a foundation of when those  
16 were discussed and to what purpose they were  
17 discussed, and I'd ask that he establish a  
18 foundation outside the presence of the jury  
19 before you make a ruling on whether or not he  
20 can have them introduced into evidence before  
21 the jury so we don't have to continually make  
22 objections while the jury is in here and  
23 approach the bench.

24 THE COURT: Mr. Hough, do you want to  
25 say something about that?

1 MR. HOUGH: Yes, Judge. The witness  
2 was asked specifically during the life of the  
3 conspiracy if there were plans. He said yes.  
4 He said there were conversations with both Mr.  
5 Apperson and Mr. Pickard. These are obvious  
6 coconspirator statements. They're obviously  
7 admissible. They're obviously not hearsay.  
8 Now, counsel objected and the Court sustained  
9 the objection as to requiring the witness to  
10 give whatever specificity as to date and time  
11 and who was present that he is capable of.  
12 When the jury returns, we would expect that he  
13 would commence answering the question before  
14 him in that manner.

15 THE COURT: All right. Except for  
16 that last restriction, trying to give as much  
17 information as he can about what we're talking  
18 about there, I'll overrule the objections, and  
19 we will proceed.

20 MR. BENNETT: Judge, before you-- as  
21 I understand it, at least my request, I believe  
22 your ruling was that when, where, and who  
23 participated in the conversation were the  
24 things that I asked for, and I understood you  
25 to have sustained that request.

1 THE COURT: Yes, I suggested that  
2 that would be a good idea to do that, and we'll  
3 try to get it done.

4 MR. BENNETT: Thank you.

5 MR. RORK: Judge, the only other  
6 thing I have is I believe Mr. Hough is getting  
7 to a point where he may cease his direct  
8 examination, and whenever that is after this  
9 point in time, I would ask the Court, one, to  
10 recess at that point in time and, two,  
11 depending upon when Mr. Hough does cease, if it  
12 is before noon, that I be able to present  
13 further facts and circumstances to you as to  
14 some additional time that I would like to have  
15 before I can just jump up and start doing  
16 cross-examination, items I need to look at.  
17 I'm going to attempt to do whatever I can over  
18 the noon hour also, but I was going to ask  
19 maybe the Court allow-- my ideal request would  
20 be to allow me this afternoon to prepare, but  
21 if not that, if he gets done before noon,  
22 possibly not reconvene until two o'clock or  
23 2:30, and then go straight through until 4:30  
24 or something. I don't have a transcript, and  
25 I've got 200, 300 pages of handwritten notes to



1 try to get ready.

2 THE COURT: Well, I assume cross-  
3 examination is going to go on for a long, long  
4 time, I assume, but let's wait until Mr. Hough  
5 stops, and then we'll talk about that and see  
6 where we are.

7 MR. HOUGH: I only have a couple  
8 questions for the witness, Judge. I'm very,  
9 very nearly done.

10 THE COURT: All right. Well, let's  
11 bring the jury in and do that.

12 (THEREUPON, the following proceedings  
13 were held in the presence of the jury.)

14 THE COURT: All right, I believe  
15 we're all here. You may be seated, and you may  
16 continue.

17 Q. (By Mr. Hough) Mr. Skinner, prior to the  
18 recess, you had indicated that there were  
19 conversations between you and Mr. Apperson and  
20 Mr. Pickard as to what would happen or what  
21 should happen in the event that someone were  
22 caught. Do you recall that?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Can you describe for us, with as much  
25 specificity as you can as to date, time, and

1           who was present, those discussions?

2           A. I can't tell you the dates. It was a regular  
3           kind of an ongoing conversation that would  
4           happen at least once every couple of months as  
5           technology changed, as our ability to get fake  
6           ID, and as new, real passports would come in,  
7           and such and such, and technologies would be to  
8           our advantage changed, the nature of the  
9           conversation would change. So I can't tell you  
10          specific dates. I can say that I had more  
11          conversations with William Leonard Pickard than  
12          I did with Clyde Apperson about this.

13          Q. And can you tell us, then, the content of the  
14          conversations and who was present during them?

15          A. When William Leonard Pickard and myself would  
16          talk about it post him receiving his British  
17          passport or United Kingdom passport that he  
18          paid \$50,000 for and received it in London, his  
19          idea was anything that was above a certain  
20          amount of a problem-- i.e., the Natasha seizure  
21          of money would not have triggered this kind of  
22          escape unless it had blown back-- but if it was  
23          a fairly serious hit, in other words, a down  
24          stream person, one of our employees gets  
25          arrested carrying a lab, something like that,

1 he would flee, basically, to Spain and remote  
2 control damage control to Spain-- from Spain on  
3 his British passport or whatever other means he  
4 had. I was to do whatever I needed to do,  
5 which my options were less because I didn't  
6 have those technologies to move around on. I  
7 could have. I just never ponied up and did it.  
8 I was very suspect of a source of all these  
9 documents from my just reading. I'm more  
10 skeptical than he is, and obtaining fictitious  
11 passports that are real is a pretty skeptical  
12 project for me. I worried about it. So my  
13 means of doing it would be different than his  
14 means of doing it.

15 Q. And the discussions you had in the presence of  
16 or with Mr. Apperson?

17 A. Yes. Clyde once was very serious with me and  
18 said, "How did Leonard get out of the Mountain  
19 View arrest and charges?" And I said, "Well, I  
20 can only tell you that he did some cooperation  
21 or something like that. I'm not fully aware of  
22 how he did it." He said Alexander T. Shulgin  
23 played a part in helping him out. I told him  
24 that he had heads-up warning that there was a  
25 meth lab in the neighborhood and it was going

1 to be busted, and that was the warning, and it  
2 was actually his lab that was going to be  
3 busted, and Leonard said he really knocked  
4 himself in the head for not realizing the  
5 chances of a meth lab being in his neighborhood  
6 along with his LSD lab. Clyde asked me  
7 specifically what would happen, do I think that  
8 Leonard would roll on us if there was a  
9 problem, what would be done, what mechanically  
10 should be done, and I gave him some advice. I  
11 said, you know, "If you're really that worried  
12 about it," you know, "get some alternative ID  
13 and don't tell anyone the names on the  
14 alternative ID and plan a route and have money  
15 sitting somewhere for such an event."

16 Q. During the course of your testimony, sir, you  
17 have identified a community within which you  
18 and Mr. Apperson and Mr. Pickard are also  
19 members. Do you recall that testimony?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. And you have identified for us with some  
22 specificity consequences of a member of that  
23 community cooperating with the government and  
24 testifying against other members. Do you  
25 recall that testimony?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. In light of that, do you have any concerns  
3 about testifying here in this matter?

4 MR. RORK: Well, Judge, I object to  
5 the nature of this question. May we approach?

6 THE COURT: Yes, you may.

7 (THEREUPON, the following proceedings  
8 were held at the bench and outside of the  
9 hearing of the jury.)

10 MR. RORK: Judge, I object to the  
11 prosecution trying to bolster or somehow vouch  
12 for the honesty and veracity of this witness by  
13 alleging concerns about him testifying. That  
14 has nothing to do with the issues in this  
15 trial. The grant of immunity was the question  
16 for him to, "Oh, yeah, I have concerns about my  
17 safety" or concerns about this. They parade  
18 him up and down in front of the jury every  
19 break with an escort to and from the bathroom  
20 every time the jury's walking down the  
21 hallways. They've done everything else to try  
22 and show that they're protecting this witness,  
23 so to speak, versus hoping he sticks around and  
24 doesn't run. But I would object to any type of  
25 responses to the questions that would bolster

1 any of his veracity or propensity to tell the  
2 truth that he's concerned about his safety.  
3 That's just improper. I believe the probative  
4 value substantially outweighs any unfair  
5 prejudice.

6 MR. BENNETT: Judge, I would join in  
7 the objection, and the question that was asked  
8 and whatever the answer might be at this time  
9 will not tend to prove or disprove any of the  
10 issues in this lawsuit. Whether he's got some  
11 concern about testifying or not doesn't prove  
12 anything in this case. It's not evidence.  
13 It's improper, and we strongly object to it.

14 MR. HOUGH: Well, Judge, a witness's  
15 concerns regarding testimony, particularly a  
16 witness who is a confidential informant who's  
17 come from the same community as the defendants  
18 he's testifying against, that is legitimate  
19 evidence. It's admissible. I don't know  
20 whether Mr. Rork misspoke or not, but his  
21 comment was the probative value substantially  
22 outweighed the prejudice, which is accurate.  
23 However, I believe he misspoke. But under 403,  
24 the analysis would weigh in favor of admission.  
25 In every case I've tried in this Court and in

1 the District, we've been allowed to ask  
2 questions of confidential informants, and we  
3 believe this would be no different rule in this  
4 case.

5 MR. BENNETT: I don't know about any  
6 other case. I don't know if there was  
7 objection in any other case, but we're trying  
8 this case, and we've objected on the basis--

9 MR. RORK: If I did misstate it, the  
10 prejudice substantially outweighs the probative  
11 value. There have been no identifiable  
12 threats, no information involved in indication  
13 of along with what their "plans" if they did  
14 get popped that then, in the event one of them  
15 testified, the other was going to kill the  
16 other or something like that. I would object  
17 to the relevance of it.

18 MR. HOUGH: If you will recall, Mr.  
19 Skinner had a conversation with Mr. Pickard on  
20 the recording where Mr. Pickard specifically  
21 indicated the informant in Oregon had been  
22 killed. Mr. Pickard's voice was unequivocally  
23 clear in that comment in the tape that was  
24 played yesterday-- or what is today, Thursday?  
25 Whatever, the day before or yesterday. So it's

1 out there. This witness does in fact have  
2 concerns, and those concerns are being  
3 addressed. The fact that he has concerns and  
4 in spite of those concerns is testifying here  
5 is relevant and is admissible.

6 THE COURT: What was your last  
7 question?

8 MR. HOUGH: My question was-- well,  
9 there were three of them: "You have testified  
10 about the community that you were a part of."  
11 "Yes." "You've testified about what happens  
12 when a member of the community testifies  
13 against another member of the community." Then  
14 the question present before the witness:  
15 "Based upon that, do you have concerns about  
16 testifying here?" That is foundation in the  
17 way the question came before the witness.

18 THE COURT: Well, I'm going to allow  
19 him to answer the question that he has  
20 concerns.

21 MR. BENNETT: Judge, before we do  
22 that, if he answers that question  
23 affirmatively, yes, then are you going to allow  
24 him to go to the next question, "What are your  
25 concerns?"



1 MR. HOUGH: I'm not going to ask that  
2 question.

3 THE COURT: No. I'm not.

4 MR. BENNETT: I don't agree with the  
5 Court's ruling. I understand it. I don't want  
6 to go to the next-- I wanted an opportunity  
7 to--

8 MR. RORK: And again, Judge, I would  
9 just note a continuing objection and defer to  
10 your ruling.

11 THE COURT: All right.

12 (THEREUPON, the bench conference was  
13 concluded and the following proceedings were  
14 held within hearing of the jury.)

15 THE COURT: You my proceed.

16 Q. (By Mr. Hough) Simple yes or no will do. Do  
17 you have concerns about testifying here?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. And in spite of those concerns, have you told  
20 us the truth?

21 A. Yes.

22 MR. RORK: I object to the question  
23 he told the truth. That's for the jury to  
24 decide and invades the province of the jury.

25 THE COURT: Overruled.

1 MR. HOUGH: Judge, I have no further  
2 questions. Thank you, Mr. Skinner. Your  
3 witness.

4 (THEREUPON, the direct examination  
5 of Gordon Todd Skinner has been previously  
6 transcribed and is contained in a separate  
7 volume.)

8 THE COURT: Pat, come here.

9 (THEREUPON, there was a conversation  
10 in low tones between the Court and the  
11 Bailiff.)

12 THE COURT: I think you may step down  
13 now, and ladies and gentlemen, we're now ready  
14 to start with cross-examination of this  
15 witness, and I believe that what we'll do is to  
16 just recess now and come back and start again  
17 at 1:30, and I would like to start the  
18 cross-examination at that time. So let's now  
19 recess until 1:30. We'll see you back here at  
20 that time, and we'll hear further cross-  
21 examination. Mr. Bailiff, let's recess.

22 THE BAILIFF: All rise. Court will  
23 stand in recess until 1:30.

24 (THEREUPON, a recess was had.)

25 THE COURT: All right, we're all

1 present. Yes, you need to take the stand.

2 Yes, sir.

3 MR. RORK: Thank you, Your Honor.

4 CROSS-EXAMINATION

5 BY MR. RORK:

6 Q. Mr. Skinner, this isn't the first case that you  
7 have been a confidential informant in. Is that  
8 correct?

9 MR. HOUGH: Judge, we'll object. Ask  
10 to approach.

11 THE COURT: All right, you may.

12 (THEREUPON, the following proceedings  
13 were held at the bench and outside of the  
14 hearing of the jury.)

15 MR. HOUGH: Judge, as to impeachment  
16 matters, we would submit that this is an  
17 inappropriate impeachment. The Court has  
18 previously ruled that the Worthy matter, which  
19 Mr. Skinner was previously an informant on, is  
20 off limits in toto.

21 MR. RORK: Judge, number one, I just  
22 reviewed the Secret Service file over the noon  
23 hour, in the time that I had. In that, it  
24 indicates Mr. Skinner says he was an informant  
25 for the DEA. My question was, trying not to--

1 I'm sure Mr. Hough has instructed him what he  
2 can or can't talk about. On the question, this  
3 isn't the first time you have been an  
4 informant, for that purpose, number one, and  
5 number two, Mr. Hough's last question,  
6 cooperative individual, concerns about his  
7 safety, and it goes to both those issues with  
8 the DEA and the fact that he's been-- I'm not  
9 going to ask him about the Worthy case. I  
10 think he can answer the question yes or no.

11 MR. HOUGH: Judge, his prior  
12 cooperation is in the Worthy case. This Court  
13 has ruled it's totally off limits. To start  
14 the questioning in direct contravention of  
15 pending orders of this Court is absolutely  
16 outrageous, knowing that this is going to be  
17 objected to, knowing it's off limits. There's  
18 no excuse for it, and we would ask that counsel  
19 be admonished to move on and the jury  
20 instructed to--

21 MR. RORK: I would ask the Court to--  
22 hasn't said-- it doesn't say he said he was an  
23 informant for the DEA before. If I can't go on  
24 information in that file, I don't know what I  
25 can go on. I tried to base the question as

1 close as I could so he would not-- agents were  
2 sitting there with me the whole time.

3 MR. BENNETT: Judge, if I might just  
4 join in. I know I'm not the one asking the  
5 question at this point, but I think that I've  
6 read the same thing in the Secret Service file  
7 over the noon hour, that he claims-- claimed to  
8 the Secret Service to be, to have been a DEA  
9 informant in the state of Florida and,  
10 certainly, I would think that that-- that does  
11 not, with that regard, doesn't in any way  
12 violate the Court's order, and additionally, I  
13 think it is relevant if he claims he has some  
14 concerns as an informant. I think that opens  
15 up the door to allow us to make inquiry of him  
16 and to establish with this jury if it's not his  
17 first time, that whether or not he had concerns  
18 before and whether or not any of those concerns  
19 proved to be valid.

20 MR. RORK: And that's why I started  
21 where I did, Judge, because that's where he  
22 ended off.

23 MR. HOUGH: Absolutely nothing about  
24 the cross-examination (sic) justifies this  
25 inquiry. It is cooperation, and the witness

1 has been instructed that the Worthy matter is  
2 off limits. So now we're in a Catch-22 where  
3 for him to answer this question truthfully, he  
4 has to say yes, what he is going to be thinking  
5 about is the Worthy matter. That's what we  
6 discussed over lunch, what was off limits.  
7 Prior cooperation in the state of Florida,  
8 foundationally, unless there can be a proffer,  
9 one, that there is a good-faith basis that  
10 occurred, two, when it occurred so that the  
11 Court can make a determination of when it was,  
12 or whether it was remote in time at all or--  
13 and whether or not it's even relevant to what  
14 occurred in this case. Contextually, the  
15 witness's concerns were regarding providing  
16 information on people that were within his  
17 community. He made that very clear, both me in  
18 the questioning and he in his answer. The  
19 question and the answer were limited to that.  
20 He's not cooperated on people within this  
21 community in the past, and counsel are aware of  
22 that, for one. For two, the prior cooperation  
23 that's first and foremost in this witness's  
24 mind and that we have hashed and rehashed here  
25 is the State v. Worthy, and our position is

1           it's totally unjustifiable, based upon the  
2           rulings of this Court, to open this up  
3           immediately, knowing it's going to draw an  
4           objection in front of the jury.

5                       MR. RORK: Judge, if I may state for  
6           the purpose of the record the government ended  
7           with big hoo-haa about his cooperation. I went  
8           down and reviewed the file there. Mr. Bennett  
9           took one side, I took the other side, in the  
10          time allotted, 20 minutes to review it. It  
11          talks about January 24, 2000, and February 1,  
12          2000. In conversation with the Secret Service,  
13          Mr. Skinner said he had cooperated before. I  
14          don't remember in Florida. I had just seen the  
15          DEA before this is before July and November of  
16          2000. The government had ended with his  
17          concerns, and before I got to anything about  
18          Worthy-- I wanted to approach the Court about  
19          that. I'm not here to rehash that. I was here  
20          to object to the question, and I object to the  
21          government trying to get the witness answers  
22          when they know he has been instructed about  
23          that, and he can answer yes or no. And now I  
24          know it's Florida, I can go on into another  
25          area. But I'm going by what I had in the

1 limited time to review trying to get to cross,  
2 and it was the last thing he started with--  
3 ended with.

4 MR. HOUGH: Judge, if counsel was  
5 unclear as to the when or the where of this, it  
6 would not be appropriate to start off  
7 immediately with it. Counsel has been taking  
8 notes for the last five days that Mr. Skinner  
9 has been testifying. There are a number of  
10 things that they can cross-examine on that are  
11 clear and not barred by orders of the Court.  
12 Counsel must have a good-faith basis and not be  
13 in violation of a Court order to propound a  
14 question. What happened here did not do either  
15 of those.

16 THE COURT: As of now, I'm going to  
17 sustain the objection because I can't tell what  
18 you're trying to do here, whether we're getting  
19 into the Worthy matter or other matters I have  
20 been trying to stop, so I'm going to sustain  
21 the objection. You can start on something  
22 else. We'll look into it.

23 MR. HOUGH: Judge, we ask that you  
24 inform the jury to disregard the question.

25 MR. RORK: Judge, I object to that



1           because, again, that's where the government  
2           ended, the cooperation and concerns he had.  
3           But I don't think the government can choose the  
4           questions I can ask. I'm not in violation of  
5           any order, and I can start where he ends his  
6           case, which is the first thing on the jury's  
7           mind when they come back.

8                         THE COURT: Nothing he said when he  
9           ended his case allows you to disregard a Court  
10          order, which I'm afraid you're trying to do.  
11          We'll continue to look at this.

12                        MR. RORK: And for the record, I was  
13          not violating a Court order, and the basis was  
14          the DEA cooperation, secret Service. The prior  
15          cooperation in the last two questions dealt  
16          with his concern. So if he has concerns about  
17          the fact he previously cooperated with the DEA,  
18          I don't think that was the DEA, Judge, it was a  
19          state court, and that was my question to him.

20                        MR. BENNETT: Judge, before I start  
21          my cross-examination, I'd like to know whether  
22          or not I can go into this Florida situation or  
23          not. I mean, if there's some confusion, I'm  
24          talking about Florida, and he indicated DEA  
25          informant in Miami or he served--

1 THE COURT: We'll tell you, and we'll  
2 continue to study this.

3 MR. RORK: If you're going to  
4 continue to study it and you will not admonish  
5 the jury, I'll go on to other questions then.

6 THE COURT: I'm not going to admonish  
7 the jury.

8 (THEREUPON, the bench conference was  
9 concluded and the following proceedings were  
10 held within hearing of the jury.)

11 Q. (By Mr. Rork) What's the status of your  
12 education?

13 A. High school education and some college and  
14 university in Europe.

15 Q. What high school did you go to?

16 A. Cascia Hall Preparatory School, Tulsa,  
17 Oklahoma, ran by the order of the-- the  
18 Augustinian Order.

19 Q. What year?

20 A. From 1976 to 1982.

21 Q. And is that where you met William Wynn?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. And that was in Tulsa, Oklahoma?

24 A. Correct.

25 Q. And what year did you graduate?

1 A. 1982.

2 Q. And what was your education after that point in  
3 time?

4 A. Went to Europe in Heidelberg-- West Germany at  
5 the time was where Heidelberg was located  
6 before the fall of the Berlin wall-- and went  
7 to school in Shiller (spelled phonetically)  
8 International University.

9 Q. How many hours did you take?

10 A. I don't remember.

11 Q. What classes did you take?

12 A. Money and banking, finance, financial, currency  
13 fluctuations, insurance and risk analysis,  
14 multinational accounting, that kind of classes.

15 Q. And what time period?

16 A. 1983.

17 Q. So just one year?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. At the time you were in high school, were you  
20 employed anywhere?

21 A. I worked at Gardner Industries.

22 Q. In Tulsa?

23 A. In Tulsa, Oklahoma.

24 Q. In what capacity?

25 A. I would do design and engineering, price

1 quotes, quality control. I was over  
2 manufacturing.

3 Q. In high school?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. And that was because of your mathematical and  
6 other managerial skills?

7 A. Well, I didn't have what I would call  
8 managerial skills, but I did have a strong math  
9 background.

10 Q. Did you go directly from high school to  
11 Heidelberg?

12 A. Well, no, I had a summer break.

13 Q. Were you employed during that summer break?

14 A. Yes. I believe I worked at Gardner during that  
15 period, yes.

16 Q. And then when you went to Heidelberg in 1983,  
17 did you just do studies, or were you also  
18 employed at that time?

19 A. No. I mean, I did-- I had to make-- my income  
20 wouldn't-- the amount of money that my mother  
21 was sending me, due to the major cost of  
22 Europe, didn't cover all my costs, so I had to  
23 supplement my income.

24 Q. And how did you do that?

25 A. At that time the banks only had a very short,

1 narrow time that they opened up currency  
2 exchange, and so I would carry three, four  
3 different currencies around at a time and trade  
4 them with the other international students 24  
5 hours a day, whenever they would need them, and  
6 there were people that were coming from the  
7 Middle East to the same school, and they would  
8 get a check in on a given day, and I would loan  
9 them money until the check came in.

10 Q. Charge them an interest rate or a fee?

11 A. Small fee. Mainly, it was to get the exchange  
12 rate. I would give the same exchange rate as  
13 the bank, or close to it.

14 Q. And in doing that exchange rate and the loaning  
15 of money, again, you used your mathematical and  
16 your employment skills?

17 A. Well, I mean, yeah. This could have been done  
18 with, you know, seventh grade math.

19 Q. Had you done any gambling over in Europe at  
20 that point in time or elsewhere?

21 A. No, I hadn't gambled in Europe.

22 Q. You had talked earlier about that you had a  
23 number of high school students, with respect to  
24 study that you undertook, for them using drugs  
25 and finding out which ones you liked and didn't

1           like. What year in school were you when that  
2           occurred?

3           A. I think that would have started '79 on.

4           Q. And do you recall the first drug use you had?

5           A. My first drug use I had?

6           Q. Yes.

7           A. Yes, mescaline, on the cusp of the age of 19,  
8           of what would be called entheogens. Obviously,  
9           I had some much lesser-type things, like I had  
10          some alcohol, not much. I never drank in high  
11          school. I drank in Germany twice and didn't  
12          like it.

13          Q. So then let's--

14          A. I think I had laughing gas in high school. I  
15          had something called adrenaline carbarsone or  
16          something like that, that was used to-- you  
17          know, minor, minor things.

18          Q. With respect to the-- do you know which came  
19          first, the laughing gas or the second thing you  
20          said?

21          A. Probably the laughing gas.

22          Q. And what was the effect and purpose in that?

23          A. Oh, somebody was driving me home from high  
24          school and said, "Here, suck the stuff out of  
25          this whipping cream can," and I said, "Why,"

1 and they said, "Just do it and hold it," and I  
2 did it, and I had a laughing gas experience and  
3 was surprised. I said, "Is there anything  
4 dangerous in that?" And they said, no, they do  
5 it all the time.

6 Q. What was the effect that you noticed from it?

7 A. Actually, I didn't laugh. I noticed some sort  
8 of elevation, euphoria.

9 Q. And what do you mean by that?

10 A. Uplifted spirits slightly. I mean--

11 Q. And did you do it again after that one time?

12 A. Yeah, I did some more laughing gas.

13 Q. On how many occasions do you think at that  
14 point?

15 A. Don't know.

16 Q. Numerous times?

17 A. Yeah.

18 Q. And would you have to use more gas each time to  
19 increase the effect?

20 A. No, that's not the nature of the laughing gas.

21 Q. How much would you need to use to obtain any  
22 effect?

23 MR. HOUGH: Judge, we'll object.

24 This is remote in time. We're talking about  
25 events in 1979. It's irrelevant.

1 MR. RORK: Judge, again, I think when  
2 he asked these questions, I interposed an  
3 objection. Mr. Hough said wait until cross,  
4 going into his drug use. He said it would be  
5 easier to go on the drugs he didn't use. I'm  
6 trying to establish his history of drug use.

7 THE COURT: I'll overrule the  
8 objection. You may go ahead.

9 THE WITNESS: I have a question now  
10 if we're going to get into this. Mr. Hough,  
11 may I please have that list I prepared for the  
12 Court, since this is going to be so intensive?

13 MR. HOUGH: Judge, the witness, as  
14 the Court may be aware, provided a list of the  
15 items he had previously listed in direct  
16 examination for the purposes of the court  
17 reporter getting them down correctly. We ask  
18 that he be allowed to refer to that during this  
19 line of questioning.

20 MR. RORK: Judge, I believe Mr.  
21 Skinner asked the government for something. I  
22 just object to the government giving an  
23 explanation. He can give him the list if he  
24 needs it to refresh his recollection. I have  
25 no objection.



1 MR. HOUGH: May I approach the  
2 witness?

3 THE COURT: Yes, you may.

4 THE WITNESS: Thank you, Mr. Hough.

5 Q. (By Mr. Rork) Can I just use it, see it on the  
6 overhead, since you've got it there?

7 A. If you'll wait until I get to the page with  
8 nitrous oxide on it. Okay?

9 Q. Well, if you have the list up there, I'd prefer  
10 to go over the list.

11 A. We're going to be here for a couple of years.  
12 Here we go. It's all yours. Is there another  
13 copy of this list so I can sit and read  
14 something, because it's hard reading this?

15 Q. Well, what I think I'll do is I'm going to look  
16 at it first. I may let you keep it and get one  
17 at the break.

18 A. Okay. I'll gladly give you a floppy, since I  
19 give the court reporter a floppy of it also.

20 Q. Just for brevity purposes, I would hand you  
21 what's been marked as P-20, a typewritten list,  
22 and if you could look at that-- you can hang on  
23 to it for a while-- can you identify what that  
24 list is and what it contains?

25 A. This is the best recollection of what I

1           consider what would be called, quote, chemical  
2           usage of my lifetime that I could get down, and  
3           with the difficulties of definitions and  
4           things, I'm doing the best I can with this  
5           list.

6           Q.   And who prepared that list?

7           A.   I did.

8           Q.   And when did you prepare that list?

9           A.   Over a weekend when the court reporter asked me  
10          to.

11          Q.   Recently?

12          A.   Yes.

13          Q.   And have you gone over that list?

14          A.   Well, I mean, I've tried to go over it.  Yes, I  
15          mean, I've made typo corrections on it.

16          Q.   But you prepared it on a computer that you had  
17          all the time you needed?

18          A.   Yeah.

19          Q.   And besides the spelling of the items that are  
20          contained on there, you also were preparing the  
21          list to include the nature of the items or  
22          substances you abused?

23          A.   Now, what do you mean the nature?

24          Q.   Well, identifying what they are.

25          A.   Correct.

1 MR. RORK: Your Honor, at this time I  
2 would move for introduction of P-20.

3 MR. HOUGH: May I voir dire briefly,  
4 Judge?

5 THE COURT: Yes, you may.

6 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION

7 BY MR. HOUGH:

8 Q. Mr. Skinner, is this list all inclusive from  
9 '79 to present or intended to be?

10 A. This is from the beginning of my life that I  
11 can remember being, you know, whatever was even  
12 told to me, like, if I had a surgery when I was  
13 four years old on, to the best I can do.

14 Q. And is there any indication in the document of  
15 the period of time--

16 A. No.

17 Q. -- or how much--

18 A. No.

19 Q. -- or anything like that?

20 A. No.

21 Q. Does it include such things as over-the-counter  
22 items?

23 A. Yes, yes, and also prescriptions.

24 Q. Thank you.

25 A. But there may be some prescriptions that I have

1 left out that I've forgotten when I was seven  
2 or eight or nine years old.

3 MR. RORK: Judge, I'm going to go  
4 through all that.

5 MR. HOUGH: Judge, I have no  
6 objection to the document, with that  
7 foundation.

8 THE COURT: All right, that will be  
9 admitted.

10 CROSS-EXAMINATION (Contd.)

11 BY MR. RORK:

12 Q. Go ahead and hold on to that a little bit then.  
13 While we're on that, prior to your coming here  
14 to testify last week-- and that would have been  
15 what, January 27, 2003?

16 A. Yeah.

17 Q. When did you first know what day you were going  
18 to be called upon to testify here, do you know?

19 A. I mean, I have been notified numerous times I  
20 was supposed to come here and testify.

21 Q. But for the January 13, 2003, trial, when were  
22 you aware when you were going to be testifying?

23 A. I was twice notified. Once I was notified over  
24 the phone by Carl Nichols on approximately July  
25 the 15th, I think, of the year 2000, then I was

1 handed a subpoena another time.

2 Q. With respect to the January 13, 2003,  
3 proceedings.

4 A. That's correct.

5 Q. When did you last review any documents with  
6 respect to this case before January 13, 2003?

7 A. Before January 13?

8 Q. Yes.

9 A. Sometime within the week before that.

10 Q. And did you come here to review them?

11 A. I came to this building.

12 Q. And do you recall what you reviewed then about  
13 a week before January 13th?

14 A. I reviewed transcripts.

15 Q. And let's go-- were those transcripts of the  
16 recordings that have been played here?

17 A. That's correct, and also the video.

18 Q. The video that I saw for the first time with  
19 the jury?

20 A. I don't know if you saw it for the first time,  
21 so--

22 Q. Well, I'm talking about the video machines that  
23 are here.

24 A. Well, whatever. I don't know when you first  
25 saw it, so you're going to have to be more

1 specific.

2 Q. We'll go back then. You saw a video recording  
3 of October 23, 2000?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. And then you also listened to transcripts that  
6 were recorded in 2000?

7 A. That's correct.

8 Q. And can you tell me, Mr. Skinner, did you  
9 listen to the original transcripts that were  
10 recorded in 2000, or did you listen to what's  
11 been noted as an enhanced copy of the original  
12 recording? Do you know?

13 A. The answer to your question would be no.

14 Q. You don't know?

15 A. That's correct.

16 Q. So when you wrote that-- did you look at a  
17 transcript, a written transcript at the time  
18 you were listening to--

19 A. Give me which time. Which time are we talking  
20 about?

21 Q. The week before January 13, 2003.

22 A. I believe those would be the enhanced  
23 transcripts. I don't know.

24 Q. Well, I was going to get to that. So the  
25 question would be if you looked at transcripts

1 at the time you were listening to recordings.

2 The answer would be yes?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. And then you believe those might have been  
5 what's called enhanced transcripts?

6 A. I believe that's the nomenclature.

7 Q. And did you listen to them here in this  
8 building?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. And when you listened to them, did you take a  
11 pen or pencil and make any notations on the  
12 copies of the transcript you had before you for  
13 any changes that needed to be addressed?

14 A. Yes, but it was not for changes. It was--  
15 there were-- I was trying to identify was it an  
16 A, B, C. I was putting those kind of notations  
17 afterwards.

18 Q. So you didn't, then, prepare the conversation  
19 between you and Mr. Pickard. Correct?

20 A. I don't know what you mean.

21 Q. Well, the times of the recording conversations  
22 that have been played here.

23 A. Again, ask a question that I understand better.

24 Q. And the question I asked you was: Those are  
25 recording between you and Mr. Pickard?

1 A. That is correct.

2 Q. All right. Now, if you understand that  
3 question, you weren't the one that prepared the  
4 transcript that you were then looking at to  
5 compare to the tape, were you?

6 A. That's correct.

7 Q. That was prepared by somebody else, wasn't it?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. And so the jury understands, then, when you've  
10 indicated you compared the transcripts and you  
11 looked (sic) at the recording, you looked at  
12 what somebody else prepared as a transcript and  
13 then listened to the recordings. Right?

14 A. Correct.

15 Q. And you don't know whether it was the enhanced  
16 transcripts or not?

17 A. That's correct.

18 Q. And you didn't then, at the time you listened  
19 to any of those recordings, the audio  
20 recordings, at no time did you then make  
21 changes in the written transcript to put in,  
22 change who said what between you, Pickard, or  
23 Apperson?

24 A. There was numerous pages. I may have made one  
25 change, I don't know, or a couple. I can't



1 recall. I don't remember.

2 Q. That's all I'm trying to get. So maybe one or  
3 two changes you may have made?

4 A. That's correct.

5 Q. On things that you listened to that you  
6 believed in listening didn't comport to the  
7 written word. Correct?

8 A. Correct.

9 Q. And do you know if any of those changes you  
10 made were then incorporated into either of the  
11 transcripts that the jury was allowed to see at  
12 the time the recording was played?

13 A. I believe Carl Nichols made the changes, or he  
14 had the person that needed to make the changes  
15 make them. I'm doing this from the best I can  
16 know.

17 Q. And again, you weren't the one that prepared  
18 these original transcripts?

19 A. That's correct.

20 Q. And we were all here, could hear the tapes  
21 ourselves to see what words went to what  
22 person. Correct?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Because when they were played again in the  
25 courtroom, you looked at this monitor and

1 viewed what was going on at that time.

2 Correct?

3 A. That's correct.

4 Q. And in the course of doing that, did you happen  
5 to make any changes in what you heard on the  
6 recordings as to what was showing up on the  
7 transcript here, where there were incorrections  
8 or there were--

9 A. You mean while I was sitting here?

10 Q. Yes.

11 A. No. I made no changes.

12 Q. So a week before January 13, 2003--

13 A. Approximately a week.

14 Q. -- approximately, how long a time do you think  
15 you spent on the audio recordings and video  
16 recordings and comparing them to the written  
17 transcripts?

18 A. That particular time?

19 Q. Yes.

20 A. Maybe a total of four and a half or five hours.

21 Q. That was during-- how long a period of time  
22 were you here that week before?

23 A. I mean, a minimum of ten days.

24 Q. And so over that ten-day period then, about  
25 four and a half, five hours were used listening

1 to tapes and looking at the words?

2 A. (Witness nods head up and down.)

3 Q. You need to answer out loud for her.

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. So other than looking at those tapes then--

6 excuse me-- looking at the transcripts and

7 listening to the tapes, what else did you

8 review to assist you for your testimony here?

9 A. Went over interviews that I had with different  
10 DEA agents.

11 Q. And when you were present, Agent Nichols was  
12 here?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Mr. Hough was there?

15 A. No.

16 Q. We wasn't there. Hanzlik was here?

17 A. Not necessarily.

18 Q. Tell me who was here then.

19 A. Hanzlik could have been there. Generally, Carl  
20 Nichols was there.

21 Q. And you went down to one of the conference  
22 rooms downstairs?

23 A. Correct.

24 Q. And when you say you looked at the reports that  
25 various agents had prepared in this particular

1 case, do you know how long a period of time in  
2 this ten days would have been looking at these  
3 reports?

4 A. No, I can't recall.

5 Q. An hour, or more than an hour?

6 A. Considerably more than an hour.

7 Q. And did you know if you went through those in  
8 chronological order or alphabetical order?

9 A. Neither.

10 Q. How was it decided which report you were going  
11 to look at to assist you for your testimony  
12 here?

13 A. It was handed to me. There was no decision  
14 process that I knew about.

15 Q. In any fashion, like by the names of the  
16 witnesses?

17 A. No.

18 Q. Or by page number?

19 A. No.

20 Q. And what were you told when this was handed to  
21 you?

22 A. "Here, Todd, read these."

23 Q. And did you then read something, and then would  
24 you have a discussion with Mr. Nichols?

25 A. Not usually. He usually was doing other work.