NO: CV11-0008

: SUPERIOR COURT

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

: G.A. # 20

v.

Sec

No.

10 C

海:

0420

Seq. No.

10 C

 $\mathrm{Ch}_{\mathbb{G}}:$

GA.20

380

Wo.

10 0

GARO -

ાલીવદ

Sec

Chg:

Chg:

: AT NORWALK, CONNECTICUT

1.85

55 \

WALTER REDDY

: FEBRUARY 25, 2011

BEFORE THE HONORABLE BRUCE HUDOCK, JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

Representing the State of Connecticut:

ATTORNEY SUZANNE VIEUX Office of the State's Attorney 17 Belden Avenue Norwalk, CT 06850

Representing the Defendant:

WALTER REDDY Self-represented Party

Recorded By:
Donna Bonenfant

Transcribed By:
Donna Bonenfant
Court Recording Monitor
17 Belden Avenue
Norwalk, CT 06850

ATTY. VIEUX: Your Honor, this is the firearms 1 2 safety hearing, Mr. Walter Reddy being the subject of that search warrant. He is present in court. 3 have an opportunity to speak with him across the 4 hall. He is indicating a desire to have counsel. 5 indicated we would need to address the Court. 6 7 THE COURT: Okay. Sir, come forward. 8 ATTY. VIEUX: I would note, Your Honor, that the 9 State did issue subpoenas. I have a civilian witness present prepared to proceed, as well as a number of 10 members of the Weston Police Department. 11 12 THE COURT: Sir, what is your request? 13 MR. REDDY: Well --THE COURT: You don't have to lean down. 14 just picking up your voice --15 16 MR. REDDY: All right. 17 THE COURT: -- for the Court Monitor's purposes 18 for the record. But your voice will pick up as long 19 as you speak clearly and loudly. 20 MR. REDDY: I had spoken to a couple of counsels 21 before. One was the chairman of our board of 22 advisors on a website that I -- an organization that 23 I belong to. 24 THE COURT: Okay. 25 MR. REDDY: And he's -- he's out of state. 26 in Virginia, but he's a constitutional attorney. 27

Cally and

G240

advised that I find out what this whole process is 3

We're

1 about here. I didn't know -- I didn't know what I needed, what this was going to be --2 THE COURT: All right. 3 MR. REDDY: -- the proceeding here. I did have 4 5 a chance to speak to public defenders just briefly about what it would entail and that -- so I think I 6 do need -- I had spoken to one attorney here -- two attorneys here in Connecticut prior to this. 8 9 waiting to hear back from one if he could take this 10 case. He specializes in firearms. THE COURT: All right. Well, as I read --11 12 before I turn to the State -- as I read the statute, in particular, 29-38c(d), it says no later than 13 fourteen days after the execution of the warrant, the 14 15 Court shall hold a hearing to determine whether the 16 seized firearms should be returned to the person, or held for the State for a period not longer than one 17 year. So I see a "shall", and shall means that there 18 is no -- shall means shall. That means we've got to 19 have a hearing in my opinion. 20 MR. REDDY: Your Honor, you asked me what I'd 21 22 like. THE COURT: Yes, no. I un --23 What I'd like, I'd like to clear my 24 MR. REDDY: 25 name of these slanderous accusations by --

MR. REDDY: -- Rand McNeil.

THE COURT: Sir --

26

THE COURT: Sir -- sir, we don't need to go there. I understand that. You've had two weeks in which to retain counsel, and it does seem that you should have been able to do that by now. What's the State's position?

ATTY. VIEUX: Well, the State would ask -- it reads the statute as Your Honor does, and would ask that the hearing go forward.

I can represent to the Court that Mr. Reddy did come to court and received a copy of the search warrant from the Clerk's Office. At no point did he come to the State's Attorney's Office or make inquiry as to what the procedure was going to be.

I would note that the statute section is listed right on the top left-hand corner of the search warrant as well, which would indicate, if one looked at the statute, what was going to be transpiring. So it is an eleventh hour request, Your Honor. I do have a civilian present who --

THE COURT: I'm also -- I'm also aware that not youly is the State ready to proceed, I'm aware that this is not a criminal proceeding, so that this is a civil proceeding. So I'm -- unless you have anything further to say, I'm ready to rule. I'll argue the last word.

MR. REDDY: I did speak to Jonathan McCord (phonetic), I believe. He's an attorney in New

Haven. I was trying to retain him. I had sent him a copy of the search warrant. He specializes in this, and I was trying to retain him. He's in court this morning. I would like to have -- I contacted him earlier in the week. I finally found an attorney that I think would be appropriate in representing me here. He couldn't make it today.

ATTY. VIEUX: And certainly Your Honor, if that was the case, that counsel could filed an appearance along with a motion for continuance that could have been addressed in the proper form.

MR. REDDY: I haven't retained him yet. He's still looking at the case, the paperwork and --

THE COURT: I'm going to proceed.

MR. REDDY: Okay.

THE COURT: Yes, get a chair for the gentleman.

All right. Now, the burden is upon the State, just to explain to you, sir. The burden is upon the State by clear and convincing evidence to establish the following; that you pose a risk of imminent personal injury to yourself or to other individuals. If I find that the State has established by clear and convincing evidence, which is a high burden, then we will proceed to the next portion, and that is, what I should do with the firearm for the period not to exceed one year. So I'm just filling you in. It's a fairly simple straightforward statute.

ATTY. VIEUX: If I may call my witness? THE COURT: Please. ATTY. VIEUX: Mr. McNeil can come forward please. THE COURT: All right. Sir, if you'd raise your right hand before you sit down?

```
Randall T. McNeil, residing at 517 Newtown Turnpike, Weston,
1
    Connecticut, having first been duly sworn, was examined and
2
    testified as follows:
 3
                THE COURT: Thank you.
 4
 5
    DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. VIEUX:
           Mr. McNeil, do you know Mr. Reddy?
 6
       Q
           Yes, I do.
 7
       Α
           Do you see him in court today?
 8
 9
       Α
           Yes.
           Okay. Can you just describe something that he's
10
11
    wearing?
           He's wearing a loose tie with a dark gray jacket.
12
                ATTY. VIEUX: If the record can reflect he's
13
           identified the subject of the seizure.
14
                             The record should so reflect.
15
                THE COURT:
16
    BY ATTY. VIEUX:
           Mr. McNeil, how long have you known Mr. Reddy?
17
           Probably 15 -- maybe more, 15 years or better.
18
       Α
19
           Turning your attention to the first week of February,
20.
    did you have the occasion to go to the Weston Police
21
    Department?
22
       Α
           Yes.
           Can you tell me why you went to the Weston Police
23
24
    Department?
                  I went to the Weston Police Department because:
25
       Α
26
    I was concerned for Mr. Reddy's welfare and the Weston
27
    Police Department's welfare.
```

Q And what gave rise to that concern, Mr. McNeil?

A I stopped to see Mr. Reddy because we had had conversations concerning his bank affiliation with his mortgage foreclosure on his house. I stopped to see how he was doing with that. And during the conversation that we had at his house, I can't remember exactly how it came up, but it came up about how protected we were or he was. And he said, well, I'm pretty well protected. I said, well, what do you mean by that. At which point he left the room and then came back into the room and he was carrying a twelve gauge shotgun with a pistol grip, no stock. It was a short weapon. And he said I've got a street sweeper.

- Q Did you know what a street sweeper was?
- A I never heard the term before but --
 - Q Did you subsequently learn what that was?

A Well, that's what he called it and I said Jesus, I said that doesn't look like a duck gun. He said, well, its not a duck gun. He said its -- I've got -- and he unloaded it. He popped the shells out of it. It was a pump action shotgun. He pumped the shells out. And I said what are you loaded with? And he says, oh, I got buck shot. I got odd shot. He said I got -- every other one is a scatter shot and the other one is buck shot. And I said Jesus, that's quite a personal weapon. I mean it's a weapon that's, in my mind anyway and he didn't say this, but in my mind, it's a weapon used on people.

THE COURT: Did you actually say that to him?

THE WITNESS: What? 1 THE COURT: Did you say that to him or was that 2 3 your thought? THE WITNESS: That was my thought. 4 THE COURT: All right. Okay. 5 THE WITNESS: And I can't remember, Your Honor, 6 whether I said it to him or not. 7 THE COURT: All right. 8 THE WITNESS: I mean, I don't remember verbatim. 9 THE COURT: You don't remember if you said that 10 to him? 11 THE WITNESS: I don't remember. 12 THE COURT: Okay, all right. 13 THE WITNESS: But I mean, I thought about it. 14 Then -- there wasn't much more conversation and I 15 left Mr. Reddy's residence, went home, had supper, 16 whatever. And the next day I thought about it some 17 more, and I thought Jesus, if something happens to 18 upset this guy, he might use that. So, and I thought 1.9 well, I know in the past I guess the police had 20 accosted him at his house with another incident. It 21 22 had nothing to do with this. 23 BY ATTY. VIEUX: Well Mr. McNeil, you indicated that there wasn't much 24 further conversation, but there was some conversation 25 26 between you and Mr. Reddy prior to his departure from his

27

home that day?

A I can't remember.

- Q Do you recall if he made any comments with regard to bank employees?
- A Just that they didn't think he had -- that they had any right to be on his property. I mean I can't remember whether he -- I don't think he made any threats toward them.
- Q Okay. Do you recall if he made any threats or alluded to the --
- 9 A Just that he knew how to handle things if they showed 10 up.
 - Q And when he made that comment, did he -- was he holding a firearm at the time or no, or you don't know?
- 13 A No. The firearm was on a table.
- Q Mr. McNeil, you indicated you don't remember as you sit here today some of the conversations that transpired.
- 16 A That's correct.
 - Q Do you recall what information you relayed to the Weston Police Department?
 - A I went to the Weston Police Department to give them a heads up. I mean, I didn't go to make a complaint. I didn't file a complaint. I thought they ought to know that if they went to 16 Briar Oak Drive that the resident there was armed; that Walter Reddy was armed. And that —basically that's what I told them. I said he's armed. I don't know how you know, what he might do. It wasn't something that I really had any firm grip to.
 - Q May -- you indicated that you waited about three days

to go to the police department?

A Three or four -- I mean, I didn't go for three or four days, and then I finally -- I was coming up Weston Road and I said you know, I think I'll just stop there and just make the Weston Police Department aware that this gentleman was -- had a street sweeper.

Q So within --

A And that -- what stuck in my mind more than anything else was the street sweeper aspect, and I never had thought about a gun as a street sweeper because I wasn't sweeping any streets with the gun. I'm a hunter, you know, I'm a veteran.

Q Mr. McNeil --

A I've used plenty of guns but I never thought of them as street sweepers.

Q So within three days, you went to the Weston Police Department and made representations as to what the conversation between you and Mr. Reddy had --

A Yeah.

Q -- three days prior; correct?

21 A Yes.

Q Okay. And from that date, which I believe would have been about the 4th of February to today, have you had any physical injury between then and now?

A I fell and had a concussion. I got a cut on my forehead on the left side at the temple and I was treated at the walk-in clinic in Wilton.

```
So is it that you sit here today that you don't
 1
    necessarily recall the verbatim conversation that you had
 2
 3
    with the Weston P.D.?
           I don't recall verbatim, no, and I made him aware of
 4
    what I thought. That's -- that's all really.
 5
                ATTY. VIEUX: I have nothing further at this
 6
 7
           time.
                THE COURT: What military service were you in,
 8
 9
           sir?
10
                THE WITNESS: Air Force.
11
                THE COURT: And what were the years of your
12
           military service?
                THE WITNESS: I was in 1950, '51, '52, '53.
13
14
                THE COURT: All right. And --
15
                THE WITNESS: I served in Korea.
16
                THE COURT: You were in Korea?
17
                THE WITNESS: Yes.
18
                THE COURT: And were you a pilot?
19
                THE WITNESS: I was a flight engineer and a
20
           bomber.
21.
                THE COURT: All right. So you actually saw
22
           military action; is that right?
23
                THE WITNESS: Shot down in North Korea.
24
                THE COURT: So you were shot down in North
25
           Korea?
26
                THE WITNESS: I walked out.
27
                THE COURT: All right. Now, you say you're a
```

hunter? 1 2 THE WITNESS: Yes. THE COURT: All right. So you are familiar with 3 4 quns? THE WITNESS: Yes. 5 THE COURT: You are an active hunter even to 6 today; is that right? 7 THE WITNESS: Yes, although not as frequent as 8 in the past. I -- I did shoot the largest buck in 9 10 Maine. I have a letter from the governor, you know, with that effect. It was a very large animal. 11 12 THE COURT: And your employment over the period of your life was involved in what? 13 THE WITNESS: I do title work, land titles, and 14 my major business was locating missing heirs. And I 15 16 have an aircraft restoration business in Vermont, and I was the -- what they call the F.B.O. for Rutland 17 Airport. I was the Fixed Base Operator of Rutland. 18 I owned the buildings and the operation and the 19 fueling and so forth at Rutland Airport. 20 THE COURT: All right. And what are you doing 21 22 now? 23 THE WITNESS: I still do title work. 24 THE COURT: Okay. 25 THE WITNESS: But much less than in the past. And I'm in the process of restoring an antique boat. 26 THE COURT: What kind of boat, sir? 27

1 THE WITNESS: It's a Sparkman & Stephens Nevins 40. It's a sailboat. Its a --2 THE COURT: I think Stephens is a name that I 3 recall. At any rate, any questions based on mine? 4 5 ATTY. VIEUX: No, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Reddy, you now have 6 7 the opportunity if you wish, to cross examine the witness. You can --8 9 MR. REDDY: Sit here? 10 THE COURT: -- you can remain seated --11 MR. REDDY: Okay. THE COURT: -- if that's easier for you, sir. 12 MR. REDDY: That's fine. Thank you. 13 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. REDDY: 14 15 Rand, do you remember you had stated that -- brought 16 up the reason you were coming over quite a bit in that prior year when my house was listed -- I believe you spoke to my 17 real estate agent at the time -- you were interested in the 18 19 property or at least Joanna Stone, my realtor thought you 20 were and spoke to --21 ATTY. VIEUX: Objection to what his realtor 22 thought. THE COURT: Yes. You -- look. 23 MR. REDDY: Well, she had spoken to him about my 24 25 property. 26 THE COURT: Hold on, hold on, hold on. 27 got to stick to some --

MR. REDDY: Okay. 1 THE COURT: Some rules of evidence, and there's 2 no way to cross-examine the statement that you just 3 have made about somebody else. 4 5 MR. REDDY: Okay. THE COURT: So stick to --6 7 MR. REDDY: All right. THE COURT: -- for now, and if you're going to 8 go beyond that, I want to be able to evaluate it 9 10 before the witness responds --11 MR. REDDY: Okay. THE COURT: -- issues directly involving you and 12 the witness as it relates to this alleged incident. 13 14 MR. REDDY: All right. Thank you. 15 BY MR. REDDY: 16 Rand, you do recall that I had a pending case that concerning -- well, concerning a foreclosure, that 17 18 Deutschebank brought against me? Is that --THE COURT: Is that correct; do you recall that? 19 MR. REDDY: Are you familiar with that? 20 THE WITNESS: I answered the complaint. 21 THE COURT: Okay. 22 23 BY MR. REDDY: You do recall that as of November or December of 24 2010, a few months ago, my -- the case was dismissed? My 25 attorney is covering this case, Hanson Guest, and he -- he's 26 representing me in this case. Its fraud -- we believe it's 27

a fraudulent case and it was dismissed by the court in 1 Stamford. Do you remember that conversation, you telling me 2 3 that? What I remember was that you told me it was reopened. Α 4 No. Its dismissed. My -- my --5 Q ATTY. VIEUX: Object. 6 THE WITNESS: Well, I don't know. 7 THE COURT: Excuse me, excuse me, excuse me. 8 Hold on, hold on. First of all, you have to ask 9 10 questions. MR. REDDY: Okay. I'm --11 THE COURT: You can't tell -- there's ways to 12 ask a question without coming out and saying no, its 13 -- in other words, you're argumentative and so I've 14 got to --15 MR. REDDY: I'm sorry, Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: No, its all right. It's all right. 17 I'm trying to --18 MR. REDDY: I'm not an attorney. 19 THE COURT: -- allow you, since you're not 20 21 represented by counsel, I'm trying to give some 22 leeway to you. 23 MR. REDDY: Okay. THE COURT: But just understand that this is a 24 question and answer, and the prosecutor did the same 25 thing. If you can keep in the line of question and 26 27 answer, question and answer.

1 MR. REDDY: All right. 2 THE COURT: I know that's not how usually we are used to engaging with other people. 3 MR. REDDY: All right. 4 5 THE COURT: However in this courtroom, there's 6 different rules that apply. So if you stick to question and then answer. And you can devise ways to 7 ask a question that will further get into the -- the 9 8 9 issues you may wish to get into. 10 MR. REDDY: Okay. 11 THE COURT: Sometimes -- sometimes witnesses 12 give answers that you don't like, or sometimes they 13 disagree with your version of things. You got to 14 stick to questions. Okay? 15 MR. REDDY: Okay. Thank you. 16 THE COURT: All right. 17 BY MR. REDDY: 18 Do you -- and do you recall me telling you the case 19 was dismissed? 20 Yes. Α 21 Thank you. Do you recall calling me on or about Q February 1st, a few days prior to you coming over? 22 23 Α No. 24 No. Do you recall ask -- telling me, warning me, 25 repeatedly warning me if I didn't stop with what I was doing 26 with my business, Sovereign State Depository, that I'd be 27 sorry?

1 Α No. You don't remember that conversation? 2 I never did. 3 4 Yes, you --THE COURT: Excuse me. 5 MR. REDDY: I'm sorry. I'm sorry, Your Honor. 6 7 THE COURT: All right. So what you're saying is, your recollection is that you never did make any 8 9 statements? THE WITNESS: Not about what he was doing with 10 his argument with the Federal Reserve Bank. 11 12 THE COURT: All right. Next question? 13 BY MR. REDDY: Do you remember calling me and warning me that if I 14 15 didn't stop with what I was doing, I'd be sorry? 16 Α No. ATTY. VIEUX: Objection. Asked and answered, 17 18 Judge. THE COURT: Cross examination. I'll allow it, 19 and the answer remains the same. 20 21 THE WITNESS: No. 22 THE COURT: I have a rule of three's by the way. 23 After three on cross examination -- you do have 24 greater leeway on cross examination. I'm letting you 25 know that after you get past three, then I'm going to ask you to move on. But at any rate, go ahead. 26 27 BY MR. REDDY:

```
The day you came over on or about, what, February
 1
       Q
    1<sup>st</sup>, do you remember what you asked me? Did you ask me to
 2
    -- if I had a firearm?
 3
 4
       Α
            No.
            You did not ask me that -- if I had a firearm?
 5
 6
       Α.
           No.
            If I owned a firearm?
 8
            I don't believe so, no.
          Do you not remember me saying yes, I do have one.
 9
    I'll show you this firearm?
10
            I think I said you were going to show me the firearm,
11
12
    but I can't remember asking you to show it to me.
13
           And do you remember me saying, well, I have it safely
14
    stored upstairs in my bedroom, following me up there?
                 I didn't go to your bedroom.
15
       Α
           A studio bedroom.
16
       Q
17
                 I didn't go up there.
       Α
           No.
18
                 THE COURT: Excuse me, sir. There's another
19
            issue that we have here and that's exclamations.
20
           necessary. If you're trying to influence the Court,
21
            it may have a backfire influence.
22
                 MR. REDDY: All right.
23
                 THE COURT: So please --
24
                 MR. REDDY: Okay.
25
                 THE COURT: -- please stick to question and
            answers, okay? I'm -- I'm going to insist on that.
26
27
            Thank you.
```

BY MR. REDDY:

Q You had made a statement that you don't remember things correctly. Do you -- do you believe that you correctly remember me saying I have a street sweeper?

ATTY. VIEUX: The State is going to object to the form of the question, Your Honor. Mr. McNeil did not testify that he did not remember things correctly, but rather there were things that he did not remember, and I would submit there's a marked difference.

THE COURT: I think he was also -- well, my recollection is-- and you can argue this, okay -- but my recollection is, is that his loss of memory referred to the statement that he made to the Weston Police Department. That's my recollection. I'll let you argue it because I'm human and I can be proven to be wrong.

So if you want to specifically -- if you leave out the, "you stated you can't remember", and you just continue with the rest of the question, I'll allow you to ask the question. So if you want to rephrase the question, just leave out the beginning of it. I'll allow you to ask the question. I think that was my reaction to it, so.

MR. REDDY: Well, I'll move on.

THE COURT: Do you rem -- do you remember the -- do you want me to replay it for you? I can replay

_ -

1	the question for you?
2	MR. REDDY: Yes. Thank you.
3	THE COURT: All right. Can we replay the
4	question and I'll evaluate it again?
5	(The requested question was played back).
6	THE COURT: All right. The first portion is
7	stricken. I'll allow the question to, do you
8	remember
9	MR. REDDY: Thank you.
10	THE COURT: about the street sweeper. Okay.
11	So I should go back on the record with that. Are we
12	back
13	COURT MONITOR: We're still on the record.
14	THE COURT: We're on the record. Do you
15	remember the question, sir?
16	THE WITNESS: I remember you calling the weapon
17	a street sweeper.
18	MR. REDDY: Your Honor, I never
19	THE COURT: He
20	MR. REDDY: Okay. I
21	THE COURT: Okay. Let me explain something.
22	Let me explain because this is something else I'm
23	going to explain to you. Again, you should continue
24	to ask questions if you wish
25	MR. REDDY: Okay.
26	THE COURT: and you get answers. You will
27	have an opportunity to testify yourself if you so

desire. That testimony will be presented to us on direct, which is what you would be. You would open up with your own testimony. That would be a statement that you can make, so you can make these statements under oath that you wish to.

The State however, will have the opportunity to cross examine you after you make the statement under oath, but you will have the chance to testify under oath. So do you understand that?

MR. REDDY: Yes.

THE COURT: Number one, and that will be like I-said, in the form of statements.

MR. REDDY: Yes.

THE COURT: Number two, you have -- you will have a second opportunity to make statements to me, and that will be final argument. Those statements are not evidence. Those statements will be in the nature of arguments, and it's the presentation that you may wish to make based upon your conclusions as to what the evidence is. The State will also have the opportunity.

So there's two opportunities that you have to make statements to me; one under oath, and one not under oath as argument. So just in case you have a question about will you have the opportunity to tell me your side of things, you will if you wish. But for now, because this is not your -- you are not on

·16

the witness stand, this is another witness on the 1 stand, you have to continue to ask questions, and I 2 continue to evaluate responses. So its question, 3 response, question, response. 4 MR. REDDY: Okay. 5 THE COURT: For now. 6 Thank you. MR. REDDY: Okay. 7 BY MR. REDDY: 8 Rand, do you remember me stating why I had that 9 10 firearm? 11 Α No. Do you remember me telling you why I had it, for home 12 13 protection? I think you said for protection. 14 Α Home protection, yeah. 15 Well, I don't know if it was home protection. 16 17 for protection. Well --18 Q For your own protection, whatever. 19 Against violent criminals if they broke into the 20 21 house? ATTY. VIEUX: Objection. He's testifying, 22 23 Judge. THE COURT: Yes. Sir --24 I mean, that's the question. MR. REDDY: 25 THE COURT: Excuse me. No. 26 27 MR. REDDY: No.

THE COURT: No, no. You've got to ask a 1 question, sir. I'm going to sustain the objection. 2 MR. REDDY: Okay. 3 THE COURT: You can't make statements. But you 4 were doing good. Just make sure that you put a 5 question mark at the end of it. 6 MR. REDDY: Okay. 7 THE COURT: Ask the question. 8 BY MR. REDDY: 9 The question is, do you remember me saying I had that 10 firearm in case a violent criminal broke in and --11 No, I don't. 12 MR. REDDY: Okay. Your Honor, I don't think 13 I have anymore questions. 14 THE COURT: Okay. The State have any questions? 15 ATTY. VIEUX: Yes, Your Honor. Just some 16 17 follow-up. THE COURT: All right. 18 REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTY. VIEUX: 19 Mr. McNeil, you testified on direct, you've known the 20 defendant -- excuse, Mr. Reddy -- for about 15 years? 21 Yes. 22 Α Okay. And you waited about three days to go to the 23 Weston Police Department; correct? 24 25 · A Yes. Did the Weston Police Department ask you to provide a 26 sworn, written statement with regard to what you had heard? 27

- 1 A Yes.
- 2 Q And what was your response to that?
- 3 A I didn't wish to do it.
- 4 Q And you're under subpoena today; correct?
- 5 A Yes.
- Q So the State issued a subpoena making you come to correct; correct?
- 8 A Right.
- 9 Q Do you have any axe to grind with Mr. Reddy?
- 10 A No, none.
- 11 Q And through the Court's questioning, you indicated
 12 you've been in the military. For a number years, you were
 13 in the military?
- 14 A Yes.

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

26

- Q And the statements made by Mr. Reddy were sufficient enough to cause you concern to go to the Weston Police

 Department; is that not true?
 - A The statement as to what that gun was, that it was a street sweeper, caused me to go the Weston Police

 Department. I don't think Mr. Reddy made any statements that would have caused me to go there. It was the gun itself with the nomenclature that it was a street sweeper, that I felt that the Weston Police Department ought to be aware that that was there.
 - Q But you did testify earlier that you believed that there was some danger to law enforcement; is that not your earlier testimony during direct examination?

That's the reason I went to the police department. thought there might be. And as you sit here today, is it your testimony that you don't recall the conversation verbatim that you had with the Weston Police Department? , A That's correct. ATTY. VIEUX: I have nothing further. THE COURT: All right. Before you have the opportunity -- now, you've indicated you've known Mr. Reddy for 15 years? THE WITNESS: Yes. THE COURT: In what capacity did you know him for 15 years? THE WITNESS: Mr. Reddy lived at my house for a short period of time when he first came back from California, I think, or Hawaii, whichever it was, about 15 years ago. I don't remember the exact dates. And I've known -- known him through an association that we both belong to. THE COURT: All right. And has there -- had there ever been a time in the past 15 years that -that your association with him led to this level of concern regarding a weapon? THE WITNESS: No. Because I didn't -- I never knew that he was -- that he had weapons. THE COURT: All right.

THE WITNESS: 'I don't believe that he had

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

26

weapons at my house. I didn't know he had weapons at 1 his house. 2 THE COURT: All right. So you knew him over the 3 15 years as a friend and as a member of -- a joint 4 member of an association; is that right? 5 THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor. 6 THE COURT: All right. And so there was no 7 other time that your relationship led you to believe 8 that you should report his activities to a police 9 department; is that correct? In other words, was 10 there ever a time in the past when you said this man 11 is a -- is a danger to something, somebody, and I 12 need to report this to the police department? 13 THE WITNESS: No. 14 THE COURT: Now sir, you may wish to ask 15 questions based upon the prosecutor and mine. I 16 mean, I'm entitled to ask questions because I'm just 17 meeting you two for the first time. So you may wish 18 to ask questions, just based upon questions that the 19 State and I have asked, if you wish. 20 RECROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. REDDY: 21 Rand, in the at least 15 years that I've known you, 22 have you never known me to be violent? 23 Α 24 No.

26 A No.

25

27

Or threatening?

MR. REDDY: Thank you. No -- no further

1,	questions, Your Honor.
2	ATTY. VIEUX: None from the State.
3	THE COURT: Thank you, sir. You may step
4	down.
5	ATTY. VIEUX: The State is going to call Officer
6	Miceli to the stand.
7	THE COURT: All right. Raise your right hand.
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23.	
24	
25	
26	
27	

- 1 Officer Joe Miceli, Badge #28 of the Weston Police
- 2 Department, located in Weston, Connecticut, having first
- 3 | been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:
- 4 DIRECT EXAMINATINO BY ATTY. VIEUX:
- Officer Miceli, have long have you been with the
- 6 | Weston Police Department?
- 7 A Since October 2006.
- 8 Q And what is your current status?
- 9 A I'm a patrolman.
- 10 Q Were you so employed in that capacity on February 4th
- 11 of 2011?
- 12 A Yes, I was.
- 13 | Q Do you know who Rand McNeil is?
- 14 A Yes, I do.
- 15 Q Okay. Did -- did you have occasion to speak with him
- 16 on February 4th of 2011?
- 17 A I did.
- 18 Q Okay. Can you tell the Court why Mr. McNeil or --
- 19 | strike that. Can you please tell the Court what you were
- 20 | investigating as a result of Mr. McNeil's -- your
- 21 | conversation with Mr. McNeil?
- 22 A Yes. Officer McGowan and I were directed to go to
- 23 Mr. McNeil's residence to speak with him about a statement
- 24 | he had made earlier in the day. Apparently he had occasion
- 25 to stop by Mr. Reddy's home and saw that Mr. Reddy showed
- 26 | him a shotgun which he stated was named a street sweeper,
- 27 and we were asked to go up and further discuss it with Mr.

- 1 McNeil and attempt to get a written statement from him.
- 2 Q Were -- were you able to obtain a written statement
- 3 from Mr. O'Neil?
- 4 A No, we were not.
- 5 Q But did you have an oral -- a conversation with him
- 6 as a result of trying to obtain that statement?
- $7 \mid A \quad Yes.$
- 8 Q You heard Mr. McNeil testify in court today that he
- 9 does not recall the conversation, or rather the verbatim
- 10 | conversation that he had with Weston Police with regard to
- 11 | this incident; correct?
- 12 A Correct.
- Q You've also heard him testify that he had a
- 14 | concussion between now and the date that he spoke with you
- 15 | and today; correct?
- 16 | A Yes.
- 17 Q Do you recall the conversation that you had with Mr.
- 18 McNeil?
- 19 A I do.
- 20 Q Okay. Specifically, do you recall any information
- 21 | that Mr. McNeil provided to you with regard to Mr. Reddy and
- 22 | police officers?
- 23 | A I do. That was one of the most alarming statements
- 24 obviously to us. Mr. McNeil told us that through his
- 25 | conversation while Mr. Reddy was demonstrating the shotgun
- 26 | to him, unloading it, he -- Mr. McNeil stated that he was
- 27 | concerned about the type of gun that it was and was asking

- questions regarding it, and one of the questions was, and what happens if the police come here. And he says well, next time the cops come here, I'll be ready for them.
- Q Do you recall if Mr. McNeil advised you as to any other statements that Mr. Reddy may have made with regard to the foreclosure action that may or may not have been pending with regard to his home?
- A Yes. Mr. McNeil stated that he was going through some foreclosure proceedings, and had further stated at some point during the conversation that the two had, that he wouldn't want to be a bank employee showing up at his house.
- Q Did Mr. McNeill give you any other information as to why that would be alarming to him?
- A He gave us a brief background for what he believed to be, you know, past with Mr. Reddy regarding some involvement with militias, and the government not having certain authorities over him in the nature of -- and felt that he was a sovereign type citizen.
- Q As a result of the information, did you prepare a search warrant, or risk assessment warrant?
- A I did not prepare the warrant. I assisted with attempting to get the statement from Mr. McNeil and throughout the process.
- Q Was information -- okay. And information that were able to obtain was used as a part of that search warrant; would that be correct?
 - A Correct.

1	ATTY. VIEUX: Okay. I have nothing further
2	of Officer Miceli.
3	THE COURT: Any questions of the Officer?
4	MR. REDDY: Your Honor, can I ask you a
5	question? If I can enter into the court record, some
6	of the information regarding my these alleged
7	conversation.
8	THE COURT: I'm sorry. I don't can you
9	rephrase the question because I do not I don't
10	understand what you're saying.
11	MR. REDDY: We have okay. Okay. For example
12	right here, this is on our public website.
13	Committees of Safety, clearly stating that we do not
14	the organization has no affiliation with any
15	militia, militia training, anything like of the
16	sort.
17	THE COURT: Well, I think you can ask the
18	question, Officer, are you aware that I'm not a
19	member
20	MR. REDDY: Oh.
21	THE COURT: of the militia?
22	MR. REDDY: Okay, all right.
23	THE COURT: I think that's the way to do it.
24	MR. REDDY: Okay. Thank you.
25	THE COURT: This is sort of like
26	MR. REDDY: Yeah.
27	THE COURT: what's that T.V. show, where you

```
-- the answer comes in the form of a question and if
 1
           you give the right answer --
 2
                 MR. REDDY:
                            Okay.
 3
                 THE COURT: -- its still wrong if its not in the
 4
           form of the question. Okay.
 5
                 MR. REDDY:
                             Okay.
 6
 7
                 THE COURT: Guess what?
 8
                 MR. REDDY: Thank you.
                 THE COURT: We're in that T.V. show.
 9
                 MR. REDDY:
                            Okay.
10
                 THE COURT: You got to ask the question.
                                                            Thank
11
12
           you.
                 MR. REDDY: All right. Thank you.
13
14
    BY MR. REDDY:
           Officer Mi --
15
       Q
16
           Miceli.
       Α
17
           -- Miceli, are you aware of Committee's Safety
       Q
    website, committeesofsafety.org's website?
18
19
           I do know that that website exists and saw that you
20
    are involved in that, yes.
21
           Are you aware that I'm the founder of that --
22
       Α
           Yes.
23
           -- organization? Are you aware that Dr. Edwin Vierra
24
    (phonetic) is the Chairman of our Board of Advisors?
25
           I am not.
       Α
           Are you aware that he's a constitutional attorney?
26
27
           Actually, that was something you informed me of --
       Α
```

- 1 Q Okay.
- 2 A -- when we served the search warrant at your home.
- 3 Q Thank you.
- 4 A So, yes.
- 5 | Q Are you aware -- are you aware of our -- that Edwin
- 6 | Vierra, this constitutional attorney, wrote our public
- 7 | policy statement and disclaimer on the front -- the home
- 8 page?
- 9 A I am not.
- 10 Q Okay. Are you aware of the fact that it clearly
- 11 | states it's a First Amendment organization and not involved
- 12 | in any militia, militia training, any -- anything of the
- 13 | such?
- 14 A I did not go through that website and read the pages
- 15 | in depth, so I'm --
- 16 Q Okay.
- 17 | A -- not aware of --
- 18 Q All right.
- 19 A -- the specific purposes of that --
- 20 | Q Okay.
- 21 A -- organization.
- 22 | Q And that where -- that it -- are you aware that it
- 23 also states that -- that it's a peaceable -- a peaceful,
- 24 | nonviolent organization engaged in political -- political
- 25 advocacy?
- 26 A Again, I didn't peruse the site.
- 27 MR. REDDY: All right. Thank you. Thank

1 you, Officer. 2 THE COURT: Anything further? 3 ATTY. VIEUX: Just one. 4 REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTY. VIEUX: 5 Officer Miceli, are you aware of every organization that Mr. Reddy belongs to? 6 7 I -- you know, just doing background research, did see that there was other organizations. I wouldn't say that 8 9 I'm aware of every organization. 10 ATTY. VIEUX: Thank you. Nothing further. 11 THE COURT: Is there any further questions? 12 Its got to be based on the --13 MR. REDDY: Well --14 THE COURT: -- one question and answer. 15 MR. REDDY: Right. 16 RECROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. REDDY: 17 Are you aware of the Tea Party movement as --18 ATTY. VIEUX: Objection. That's not an Organization. Its (indiscernible) something. 19 20 MR. REDDY: Excuse -- I --21 THE COURT: Hold on. There's an objection, sir. 22 What is the purpose of the question? 23 MR. REDDY: The purpose is my organization 24 hosted the -- this was on the forefront of the Tea 25 Party movement. We had United States Senator Rand 26 Paul was our keynote speaker at that event. 27 ATTY. VIEUX: Then I'll object --

1 MR. REDDY: Committees of Safety. That is very relevant to our public --2 3 THE COURT: Well, he indicated that he knew you 4 . were a member of a number of organizations --MR. REDDY: Well --5 THE COURT: If you want to -- if you want to ask 6 the question, are you aware that I'm a member of one 7 of those organizations and that is the following, 8 9 that would be legitimate questions, and then I'll see where you want to go with it after that. 10 11 BY MR. REDDY: 12 Okay. Well, the question is -- I mean, what I'd like 13 to know about my character. I mean, what you -- what you think of my character and whether you think -- I'd like to 👾 14 15 know, Officer, if you think a sitting U.S. Senator, a United 16 States Senator would have any affiliation with someone that 17 was violent or threatening? 18 THE COURT: Well, I'm going to sustain the 19 objection. 20 ATTY. VIEUX: I'm not objecting to that 21 question. THE COURT: Well, I am. 22 23 ATTY. VIEUX: Not at all. 24 THE COURT: It has no -- it has no relevancy 25 whatsoever. 26 MR. REDDY: I don't --27 THE COURT: So in other words, this can go on.

1	I understand there's some political discussion here,
2	but my concern is a weapon that was the subject of
3	the search warrant, so try to keep to relevance. We
4	could be here for days.
5	MR. REDDY: Your Honor, I have
6	THE COURT: I'm just letting you know
7	MR. REDDY: no further questions.
8	THE COURT: I've got relevancy. Relevancy is
9	a major concern of mine.
10	MR. REDDY: Okay.
11	THE COURT: Okay.
12	MR. REDDY: Thank you.
13	THE COURT: Next question.
14	MR. REDDY: I think I'm through.
15	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
16	MR. REDDY: Thank you.
1.7	THE COURT: You can step down.
18	ATTY. VIEUX: The State is going to call Officer
19	Mogollon.
20	THE COURT: All right. Raise your right hand.
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

```
1 Officer Joe Mogollon, Badge #25, of the Weston Police
```

- 2 Department located in Weston, Connecticut, having first been
- 3 duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:
- 4 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTY. VIEUX:
- 5 Q Officer Mogollon, how long have you been with the
- 6 Weston P.D.?
- 7 A Approximately six years.
- 8 Q Okay. And were you so employed in your capacity as a
- 9 Weston Police Officer on February 4th, 2011?
- 10 | A I was.
- 11 Q Did you participate in the investigation surrounding
- 12 | this risk assessment warrant?
- 13 A I did.
- 14 | Q Did you have an occasion to speak with Mr. McNeil
- 15 | with regard to this?
- 16 | A I did.
- 17 Q You've heard Mr. McNeil testify that he didn't recall
- 18 | a specific conversation that he had with the Weston P.D.;
- 19 correct?
- 20 A Correct.
- 21 | Q Do you recall as to what Mr. McNeil advised you with
- 22 | regard to Mr. Reddy and this warrant?
- 23 A I do.
- 24 | Q Specifically, did he provide information with regard
- 25 | police officers?
- 26 A I do, yes.
- 27 | Q Can you tell us what was said?

1 When we spoke to Mr. McNeil, he stated that he felt Α 2 compelled to tell that he had had a conversation with Mr. Reddy, and that Mr. Reddy had shown him a shotgun, pistol 3 grip, one that he did not believe was for hunting. And as 4 he was unloading the shotgun which was -- he had scatter 5 6 shot as he called it, and buck shot loaded into the weapon. 7 As he was unloading it, he stated that he made -- that Mr. Reddy made the comment that I would not want to be the cops 8 9 when they come here next time. Do you recall if Mr. McNeil gave you any information 10 11 with regard to statements made by the defendant with regard to the banking industry, specifically foreclosure? 12 13 Α Yes. He made a statement -- Mr. Reddy made a statement that he would not want to be one of the bank --14 15 coming to take back his house. 16 And Officer Mollogon, were able to obtain a sworn 17 statement from Mr. McNeil? 18 Α We were not. 19 ATTY. VIEUX: Nothing further, Judge. 20 THE COURT: Any questions? 21 I have no questions. MR. REDDY: THE COURT: Okay. 22 Thank you, sir. You may 23 step down. 24 ATTY. VIEUX: The State calls Sergeant Brodacki. 25

26

```
Sergeant Matt Brodacki, Badge #19 of the Weston Police
1
    Department, located in Weston, Connecticut, having first
2
    been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:
3
                             Thank you. You may be seated.
                THE COURT:
4
    DIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTY. VIEUX:
5
           Sergeant Brodacki, how long have you been with the
6
       0
7
    Weston Police Department?
           Twelve years.
8
       Α
 9
           And you're currently a Sergeant?
       Q
           Yes.
10
       Α
           As such, you supervise other officers; is that right?
11
       0
12
           Yes, yes.
       Α
13
           Turning your attention to the risk assessment
       Q
    warrant, did you participate in the investigation which
14
    resulted in this search warrant being prepared and
15
    subsequently executed?
16
17
           I did.
       Α
           Were you a participant when the warrant was executed?
18
       Q
19
           Yes.
       Α
20
           Okay. And can you tell the Court what participation
    you had in the execution of that risk assessment warrant?
21
           As the investigative sergeant, my job was to oversee
22
       Α
    the tasks at the scene of the search warrant, provide
23
24
    intelligence, and also assist in executing the warrant and
25
    seizing the firearms.
           And do you recall what day you executed that warrant?
26
       Q
27
                 It was February 14.
       Α
```

- Q Okay. Was Mr. Reddy home at the time?
- A Yes, he was.
 - Q And can you tell the Court what was seized?
- A What was seized was a pistol grip shotgun that was loaded, a revolver type handgun, an ammo can, various types of rounds, rifle and shotgun type rounds, two inner hand grenades and some detonation cord that was in the ammo can
- 8 as well.

1

2

3

- 9 Q Did you have the occasion to speak with Mr. Reddy --
- 10 | A I did.
- 11 Q -- upon arrival at the home?
- 12 A I did.
- Q Did you make inquiry of him with regard to the firearms?
- 15 A I did.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q Okay. And what did you ask him?
 - A I -- just before the -- we had a tactical team on standby just to go into the house to execute the warrant to make sure that it was safe to enter the residence. And prior to that I walked up and I just asked Mr. Reddy, are there any weapons in the house? Is there anything that any of the officers entering the dwelling are going to get injured, hurt, and he did provide me answers with that.
 - Q And what was the answer with (indiscernible)?
 - A He said yeah, there's a shotgun next to the bed.
- Q Did you inquire if there were any other firearms?
- 27 A Yes.

Τ	Q And what was his response:
2	A His answer was no.
3	Q And did you find other firearms?
4	A Yes.
5	Q Did you question him with regard to finding a
6	firearm?
7	A Yes. Originally when he said no, that there wasn't,
8	when we found the revolver next to it, I came right back out
9	and I said Mr. Reddy, I want you to ask you again, sir. You
10	know, there's a second firearm was located. I just want to
11	make sure no one is going to get hurt. Do you have any
12	other firearms anywhere in the residence, and he said no.
13	Q And you did or did not find any other firearms?
14	A No. We didn't find any other firearms other than
15	that.
16	Q And Mr. Reddy, would you describe him as cooperative
17	during this search?
18	A Very much so, yes.
19	ATTY. VIEUX: Nothing further.
20	THE COURT: Let me just ask you a question. You
21	said two inert hand grenades?
22	THE WITNESS: Yes.
23	THE COURT: Please define "inert" for me so that
24	I don't have a heart attack.
25	THE WITNESS: They were nonfunctioning. So we
26	located them in the next to the bed in the ammo
27	can, and they had the detonation cord was in a

circular pattern below it. So we actually contacted 1 a bomb tech to come out to make sure. And inert just 2 means that they were nonfunctioning, but they did 3 have the pins inserted in the grenade, but the bottom 4 of them was hollowed out. 5 THE COURT: Ah, okay. I just -- I had that 6 question. 7 THE WITNESS: Yeah. 8 THE COURT: The revolver, was that loaded or 9 unloaded? 10 THE WITNESS: No, it was not loaded. 11 THE COURT: Not loaded. The pistol grip shotgun 12 was loaded? 13 THE WITNESS: Yes. There was one other item too 14 in there. It was a bandolier of rifle slugs as well. 15 THE COURT: All right. Live ammunition? 16 THE WITNESS: Live ammunition, yes. 17 THE COURT: And the other ammunition you've 18 talked about in your testimony was live ammunition? 19 THE WITNESS: Yes. 20 21 THE COURT: I'm sorry. ATTY. VIEUX: May I just inquire as to --22 THE COURT: 23 Sure. 24 BY ATTY. VIEUX: Were there any markings on those inert hand grenades? 25 Q Α Yes. It said "U.S. Military" on it. 26 Did it -- it just said U.S. Military, or did it have 27

1 property of or --Yeah. Well, I think it was stamp, but it said "U.S. 2 Military" below it, and then below, I think it was real 3 small, it said "property". 4 And with regard to the bandolier, can you just 5 describe what that is? 6 A bandolier is a nylon satchel type that you would 7 put over your head, and inside of the bandolier it has 8 individual holders for those rifle slugs or rounds. 9 And someone owning a bandolier, does that have any 10 Q significant meaning in terms of firearms? 11 A Well, it would usually indicate when you go to a fire 12 range, usually you put your ammunition next to your rifle 13 that you're shooting. A bandolier might be that if you're 14 actually moving with your weapon and you don't have the 15 facility to hold the ammo next to you on a table or in your 16 17 hand. And the bandolier, can -- was this an old -- similar 18 to the grenades, an old military owned -- can you describe 19 20 it? It was black and nylon. I don't know how old it was. 21 It looked relatively, you know, modern in terms of 22 construction. But I'm not an expert in that. 23 ATTY. VIEUX: Thank you. Nothing further. 24 THE COURT: Well, the ammunition that was on the 25 bandolier, did that fit any weapon that was found in 26 27 the house?

THE WITNESS: Yeah, it fit. All of it was all 1 shotgun shells specifically, different types. So one 2 was bird shot, one was slug, one was buck shot, and 3 it just went all the down the line and various types. 4 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Any further 5 questioning? 6 Yes. MR. REDDY: 7 CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. REDDY: 8 Hi, Officer. The two inert grenades that were in a 9 canister -- a canister, would you say they were nothing more 10 than could be like paperweights? I mean, they're just lead, 11 12 inert, no --Yeah. Well, my understanding --13 14 -- ammu --Q -- from the bomb tech that showed up was they could 15 either live functioning grenades, or they could be inert as 16 17 a novelty item --18 Q Yeah. -- as you indicated. 19 The fuse that you -- I mean the co -- just the 20 0 wire -- I mean, that wasn't associated, was it, with the 21 22 grenades or --The --23 Α Yeah. 24 -- inert ---- he called it, the bomb tech that showed called it 25 det cord. And when -- I wasn't even familiar with it. I 26 just knew that I didn't know what I was looking at. 27

```
explained to me that det cord is detonation cord, and its
used to light, you know, it could be used to light an
explosive or light something.
       Are you aware of our conversation of that day, me
explaining to you what I --
   Α
       Yes.
       Could you -- could you state what I had said about --
   Ó
            ATTY. VIEUX: I'm going to object as to Sergeant
       Brodacki testifying --
            MR. REDDY: All right.
            ATTY. VIEUX: -- for the defendant with regard
       to Mr. Reddy for the information that he wants put
       forth. Its certainly something that --
            THE COURT: It is self-serving.
            ATTY. VIEUX: -- he can indicate -- yes, Your
       Honor.
            THE COURT: It is self-serving.
            MR. REDDY: Do you remember -- can I --
            THE COURT: I will sustain the objection. Next
       question.
BY MR. REDDY:
       Can you -- do you remember me stating I bought that
years ago at a gun --
            ATTY. VIEUX: Objection, Your Honor. It's the
       same --
            MR. REDDY: -- a gun show?
            THE COURT: Sir, you can't ask --
```

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

26

MR. REDDY: No? 1 THE COURT: -- what you told the Officer. 2 self-serving. You may wish to testify as to all of 3 this. 4 MR. REDDY: All right. 5 THE COURT: All right. 6 7 MR. REDDY: Thank you. No further questions. THE COURT: Thank you. You may -- I'm sorry. 8 ATTY. VIEUX: Nothing further. 9 10 THE COURT: You may step down. THE WITNESS: Thank you. 11 THE COURT: All right. 12 ATTY. VIEUX: The State has nothing further, 13 14 Your Honor. THE COURT: I'm sorry? 15 16 ATTY. VIEUX: The State has nothing further. THE COURT: Okay. All right. Now sir, the 17 State has rested. You may wish to present evidence 18 19 of your own. You may wish to testify. You may also 20 wish not to do any of the sort, and then I will hear 21 final argument. 22 MR. REDDY: Your Honor, can I submit this as a statement? I mean, it's a --23 24 THE COURT: Well, here's -- here's what we do. 25 I would ask you to take the stand and you may -- you may make statements. You may read statements, as 26 27 long as they are relevant to the issue at hand, which

as I will state again, is as follows: as to relevant to the risk of imminent personal injury to yourself or to other individuals, okay. So its got to -- its got to be related to that, and if its related to that, sure. I'll let you read a statement. MR. REDDY: Okay. I'll take the stand. THE COURT: Sure. All right. Then I've got to do the same thing here. Would you raise your right hand?

Walter Reddy, residing at 16 Briar Oak Drive in Weston, Connecticut, having first been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: THE COURT: Thank you. You may make your statement. Just understand again, that whatever you state and I allow into evidence, you could and most likely will be cross examined on it --MR. REDDY: Okay. THE COURT: -- by the State. MR. REDDY: All right. Thank you. THE COURT: Go ahead. MR. REDDY: I'd like to read our public policy statement and disclaimer on the organization I founded, committeesofsafety.org. ATTY. VIEUX: Your Honor, the State is going to ask for some proffer as to relevance with regard to the founding of organization. THE COURT: All right. What's the name of the organization? MR. REDDY: Its committeesofsafety.org. THE COURT: Committee --MR. REDDY: Committeesofsafety --THE COURT: -- of safety. MR. REDDY: -- .org. Committees of Safety is an organization dedicated to individual and collective exercise of American's freedoms of speech, association and petition under the First Amendment to

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

26

2.7

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

the Constitution of the United States, for the ultimate purpose of revitalizing the militia of the several states under the Second Amendment and other provisions of the Constitution of the United States and constitutions and laws of the several States. Committees of Safety is not now, nor does intend to become any kind of private militia, paramilitary group, firearms training association, gun rights organization, or other entities of that like nature or purpose. No individual should seek to become or remain a volunteer for Committees of Safety who -who proposes the Committees of Safety, ought to identify itself as such -- some form of such a group, or that volunteers for Committees of Safety should engage in military, para-military or like activities as part of their association with Committees of Safety. Committees of Safety recognizes as constitution militia only such groups that have been formed an operated under lawful mandated statutes within particular states.

Any individual can be, and is welcome as, a volunteer for Committees of Safety, whether or not he or she possesses a firearm or desires to possess one. The only requirement for affiliation with Committees of Safety is that the individual acknowledges the need and agrees to work in some way, for community preparedness according to constitutional principles

and under State statutory authority as called for in Committees of Safety petition and other publications.

The only official statement for Committees of
Safety are to be found on this website or in
publications and other materials that Committees of
Safety have produced or expressively approved.

Volunteers are free to speak for themselves, but not
as spokespersons for Committees of Safety at the
level of press, radio, T.V., except with permission
from the Committees of Safety Advisory Board.

That's our public policy.

THE COURT: All right. Well, that's a statement. Very well.

THE WITNESS: That we're not involved in any private militia.

THE COURT: I -- I understand that.

THE WITNESS: I'd also like to address one thing off of our mission statement. Its on our home page.

Committees of Safety intends, by means of peaceful mass grass roots, political activism, to restore the Power of the Purse and the Power of the Sword to the American People through their state governments. Central to this plan is an Economic Security bill through which each state can adopt an alternative State currency of silver and gold, managed and protected through a revitalized State Militia, and it goes on.

So -- oh -- well, in order to protect the State's governmental finances and eventually the State's entire private economy against the collapsing of the Federal Reserve System.

I'd also like to read one thing from this book that just came out. I just picked it up last night at Barnes & Noble. Its by Senator Rand Paul.

Committees of Safety organized -- we're on the forefront of this Tea Party movement. I organized the Tea Party in December 14th, 2008 at Faneuil Hall, Boston. The theme of the Tea Party was on restoring sound money. Dr. Rand Paul was our keynote speaker at that event, along with Dr. Edwin Vierra, our Chairman of our Board of Advisors. Its on page two of this new book if anyone wants to get a copy.

I'd just like to say, there were a lot of allegations made that -- in painting myself or -- Your Honor, I really don't know what else to say.

I mean, I -- my whole life I've been nonviolent.

And we're -- I'm working through, along with a lot of networking with a lot of State Legislatures to get this Economic Security bill in place.

I've been politically active most of my whole life, nonviolently. I believe in nonviolence. And I had recently testified at our State Capitol on our Tenth Amendment on this issue, of reinstituting these two vital powers.

ſ	
1	Anyway, I'd like to have my name cleared and my
2	property returned to me. With that, I'd like to
3	that's it.
4	THE COURT: All right. As I told you
5	originally, any statements that you made were
6	could be cross examined upon, so I'll ask the State
7	whether they have any cross examination.
8	ATTY. VIEUX: No, Your Honor.
9	THE COURT: Thank you. All right. You may be
10	seated, sir.
11	All right. Mr. Reddy, do you have any other
12	witnesses to present, because you do have the
13	opportunity to present other witnesses, if you wish.
14	MR. REDDY: I have
15	THE COURT: I'm not telling you you have to.
16	I'm just telling you that if you do have any
17	MR. REDDY: I have a couple of friends here that
18	
	are part of my organization that know me.
19	are part of my organization that know me. THE COURT: So you're presenting them as
19 20	
	THE COURT: So you're presenting them as
20	THE COURT: So you're presenting them as character character witnesses?
20 21	THE COURT: So you're presenting them as character character witnesses? MR. REDDY: You know, Your Honor
202122	THE COURT: So you're presenting them as character character witnesses? MR. REDDY: You know, Your Honor THE COURT: No, I'm just asking you.
20 21 22 23	THE COURT: So you're presenting them as character character witnesses? MR. REDDY: You know, Your Honor THE COURT: No, I'm just asking you. MR. REDDY: Yeah. I don't know if I
20 21 22 23 24	THE COURT: So you're presenting them as character character witnesses? MR. REDDY: You know, Your Honor THE COURT: No, I'm just asking you. MR. REDDY: Yeah. I don't know if I THE COURT: The ball is in the proverbial your

1	decision.	
2	MR. REDDY: I'd like to call one witness.	
3 .	THE COURT: All right.	
4	MR. REDDY: Rosie Haas.	
5	THE COURT: All right. Would you raise your	
6	right hand?	
7		1
8		3
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		3
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		

1 Rose E. Haas, residing at 5 Scofield Place in Norwalk, 2 Connecticut, having first been duly sworn, was examined and 3 testified as follows: 4 THE COURT: Thank you. Question and answer, 5 question and answer. 6 MR. REDDY: Yes. 7 8 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. REDDY: Rosie, what is your connection with Committees of 9 10 Safety? I'm a volunteer. 11 Α And in what capacity are you a volunteer? 12 What -- can you be more specific? 13 Α As a state organizer? 14. Q As -- yes. I help to organize e-mail on the website. 15 Okay. And Rosie, how long have you known me? 16 I'm trying to -- ever since Naomi Wolf came to 17 Westport, Connecticut. I believe that was two or three 18 19 years ago maybe. I believe so. 20 21 Yeah. Α Have you ever known me to be violent or advocate 22 violence towards any government official, including the 23 24 police? No. You've done just quite the opposite actually. 25 You make it known -- you're very clear about, you know, not 26 27 to be violent and --

1 Q And that ---- to use legislative means for -- for effectuating 2 3 change. MR. REDDY: Thank you. No further questions. 4 ATTY. VIEUX: None from the State. 5 THE COURT: Thank you. You may step down. 6 Anything further? 7 MR. REDDY: Nothing. 8 THE COURT: All right. Does the State wish to 9 present any evidence on redirect, rere --10 ATTY. VIEUX: Rebuttal? No, Your Honor. The 11 12 State has no --THE COURT: Re-- rebuttal, whatever. Okay. 13 ATTY. VIEUX: -- rebuttal witnesses as a result 14 of the defendant's testimony. 15 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. All right. 16 Since the State has the burden, I'll allow the State 17 to proceed and I'll allow the State to answer 18 anything they feel is necessary. I may decide to 19 allow you to have the last word because this a civil 20 proceeding. So you'll each get two chances to talk 21 22 to me, not in evidence. It is argument. Okay. ATTY. VIEUX: Your Honor, the State is of the 23 position that based upon the testimony of Officers 24 Mollogon, Milici, Brodacki and Mr. McNeil, that the 25 State has met its burden. 26

I believe that Mr. McNeil's testimony with

regard to what he did remember, but more important since he didn't remember some of the conversations he had with the Weston P.D. I would draw the Court's attention -- he's known this -- this individual for 15 years, Your Honor. He described their relationship as friendly. He indicated to the Court he is here under subpoena. There is no evidence before the Court that there is any motivation by Mr. McNeil other than concern as he indicated for law enforcement, that Mr. Reddy himself and others.

I believe that he can be determined credible by the Court based upon the testimony of Officers

Mollogon and Milici who testified similarly with regard to the statements that were made to them, much more contemporaneous to when this occurred, rather than two weeks later as Mr. McNeil has testified to today and indicated to the Court he couldn't remember.

I also would submit to the Court, Your Honor, that Mr. McNeil's information provided to the Weston P.D. is further corroborated by the fact that through test -- well, through questioning, the defendant -- excuse me -- Mr. Reddy had pretty much indicated he was in fact in foreclosure at some point.

As Your Honor recalls, statements were specific with regard to the bank coming to his property and foreclosure. This would lead -- I think the

inference can be drawn these were not made up out of thin air, Your Honor, that there is -- there is factual basis that would corroborate the information that was provided by Mr. McNeil to the Weston Police Department.

I would also draw the Court's attention to specifics being that the shotgun was in fact loaded. I would draw your attention to Sergeant Brodacki's testimony with regard to the bandolier. This is not a situation where one would be taking it to the rifle range. This is an on the move type of ammunition holder, Your Honor.

I would submit that the finding of a bandolier, the characterization of a firearm by the -- through Mr. McNeil attributed to Mr. Reddy as a street sweeper, coupled with the comments of I'll be ready for the police when they come to my house, coupled with the comments knowing that he did have issues with the bank, that if the bank comes to his house, there's going to be problems, that this is an individual who is in fact a threat to others.

Its interesting. He's indicated several times over that he's not a violent person. He's not a violent person. Certainly we all in this business adhere to the Constitution, Your Honor, and the right to bear arms. But certainly the bandolier, the comments don't lead one to get to the conclusion that

he is -- as to what he represents himself to be.

This is the avenue that we use before we get to the next step, before we say, well, wow, what could have been stopped and what did we know.

Mr. McNeal, again Your Honor, comes to the Court with no motivation, had to be under subpoena. And as you heard several times from three different witnesses, would not provide a sworn statement. This was something that he felt he needed to do, was compelled to do, because akin to a sleeping dog knowing the difference between tripped and being kicked, Your Honor, Mr. McNeil had a gut reaction that this was just beyond the normal, you know, I don't want to saying rantings, but conversation or you know, embellished comments, that this went farther than that, Your Honor. And as a result of that he went -- and mulled it over with consideration. This is an individual who is a military veteran, a war veteran who has seen a lot apparently through Your Honor's questioning, and didn't appear in his demeanor to be one that shies away or takes things lightly.

He was compelled to go the Weston P.D. The Weston P.D. corroborated a lot of the information provided, Your Honor. So the State believes at this time, it would be inappropriate to return any firearms to Mr. Reddy.

26

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

1	THE COURT: All right. Sir, you may wish to
2	present me with a statement as I indicated you had
3	the right to do.
4	MR. REDDY: Your Honor, I clearly believe that
5	the State has not proved anything, made a compelling
6	case to deny me that that I am a threat to myself
7	or others, or that I was brandishing any firearm.
8	And this threat to the bank, that makes no sense
9	on the face of it since that the bank fore that
10	was dismissed a few months before the supposed
11	statement that took place.
12	ATTY. VIEUX: Your Honor, the State is going to
13	object that its not in evidence.
14	THE COURT: That is correct, sir.
15	MR. REDDY: Well
16	THE COURT: Its not in evidence. It was not
17	admitted into evidence and you did not
18	MR. REDDY: Okay. Well
19	THE COURT: there's nothing before me that
20	MR. REDDY: All right.
21	THE COURT: it was dismissed or otherwise.
22	You may wish to continue.
23	MR. REDDY: Yes. This is all based on something
24	that Rand doesn't even recall and he didn't he
25	wouldn't sign this statement, all of this
26	allegations.
27	I he's known me, for I believe its 25 years

now, 15 to 25 accurately, and he's never known me to be violent or threatening. So I don't know what else to say.

I have no -- no violent or criminal background or any statements ever in my life to warrant this, the case the State's bringing against me. So I'll end with that.

THE COURT: All right. The State wish to respond?

ATTY. VIEUX: No, thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. The State has presented a witness here who -- and I did -- I was interested. I asked the question about his military service. I did that for a reason. I'm -- I just don't ask questions up here for any old purpose.

My concern naturally would be whether this would be an individual who might have overreacted, might have seen a weapon and overreacted.

But what I got in response to my question was that he had been part of a bomber crew during the Korean War; that he had been shot down, and in his words, he walked out of North Korea.

So this is not a witness who, in the Court's mind, displayed any type of exaggeration, and that's what I was looking for. any type of just a reaction out of just total fright and total, total unreasoning irrationality.

The -- Rand as you put it, testified that you indicated you thought you were pretty well protected; that you came back into the room carrying a twelve gauge shotgun with a pistol grip. And what did surprise him, notwithstanding his military record, not withstanding the fact that he is a hunter and is clearly familiar with weapons, was a description of this pistol grip shotgun as a street sweeper. He had never heard that phrase before. It is a phrase that stuck in his mind and was the -- from what I hear of his testimony, the -- a dominant motivator in his concern for you and what you might do with this, guote, "street sweeper", unquote.

As I listened to his testimony, I took down some notes. I noted that the pistol grip shotgun was in fact loaded. You took the shells out in his presence.

You indicated that bank employees have no right to be on your property. You indicated that you knew how to handle things if they showed up on your property, that you were in the middle of a mortgage foreclose.

The Court notes that in the ordinary course of things, a foreclosure is normally a very emotional time. It's a very upsetting time. And it would be, I think, unreasonable to believe that the reasonable individual would not be upset under those

. į

circumstances.

The Court heard testimony that you were cooperative to a point at the time that the police officers arrived, that you conceded that you had the shotgun. The police uncovered the shotgun and it was loaded at that time and fit the description that was provided to the Court earlier.

The Court also notes the presence of a bandolier, which the testimony was that this was a -- not a for stationary use in the officer's opinion, but was for use, I think on the run was the phrase that was used, and it was filled with shotgun ammunition that would have fit the pistol grip shotgun.

The police also recovered a revolver which was not loaded, but that you had not informed them about when they first made inquiry.

The Court will also take note of the following; that in a container of some kind, was found two inert hand grenades whose bottoms had been hollowed out.

Now, that in and of itself is -- is of small note.

But the Court notes that there was a detonator attachment that was wound around in the same container.

Now, it is difficult to imagine that in a container with a detonator wire for lack of a better word and two inert hand grenades, that it is

difficult to imagine that item being something you would put on the desk.

The Court conceives that that was an instrument that could well have been used as a deceptive ruse, could well have been used as a threatening device in the event that bank employees or police officers came on your property. Its certainly within the realm of reasonableness under these circumstances.

The Court is going to find --

MR. REDDY: Your Honor -- Your Honor, can I just

THE COURT: No. This is not the time to interrupt me, sir. You've had your opportunity.

All right. I'm not allowing the State to interrupt, all right?

The Court is going to find as follows: that the burden of proof upon the State is by clear and convincing evidence. The Court finds that by your statements and by your actions, and by the circumstances of the foreclosure action on your house, by the circumstances of the bandolier and the container of the detonator with the two hand grenades, creating a big picture which includes finally, the pistol grip shotgun that was loaded that you described as a street sweeper, that the State has proved by clear and convincing evidence, that you are a risk of imminent personal injury to other

individuals.

I will order the items that were seized to be held by the police department for a period of one year.

Thank you, sir.

NO: CV11-0008

SUPERIOR COURT

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

: G.A. # 20

v.

: AT NORWALK, CONNECTICUT

WALTER REDDY

: FEBRUARY 25, 2011

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify the foregoing pages a true and correct transcription of the audio recording of the above-referenced case, heard in Superior Court, G.A. # 20, Norwalk, Connecticut, before the Honorable Bruce Hudock, Judge, on the 25th day of February 2011.

Dated this 11th day of April 2011 in Norwalk, Connecticut.

Donna Bonenfant

Court Recording Monitor