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> PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, JULY 30, 2013
AFTERNOON SESSION
THE COURT: Whenever you are ready, Mr.
Beemer.
The Commonwealth calls Agent Sassano.

## ANTHONY SASSANO,

called as a witness, being duly sworn, testified as follows:

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BEEMER:
Q Can you state your name, please.
A Anthony Sassano.
Q Spe11 your 1 ast name.
A $\quad S-a-s-s-a-n-o$.
Q How are you employed?
A With the Pennsylvania Office of Attorney
General, Bureau of Narcotics.
Q Briefly describe your career in law enforcement.

A From 1979 to 1999, City of Altoona Police Department. And from December of 1999 to present, the attorney general's office.

Q What is your current title?

A Regional director.
Q You were one of the lead agents assigned to this investigation?

A Yes, sir.
Q About when did that occur?
A May of 2009.
Q As a result of information you obtained during the course of the investigation, did you attempt to ascertain whether or not there had ever been a report either made to either 1 aw enforcement or a child welfare agency or any other agency within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania related to the incident reported by Mike McQueary?

A Yes, I did.
Q What did your investigation reveal?
A There was no report filed in reference to the report, which at the last preliminary we thought was '02. It was 2001.

There was no report filed in reference to that matter.

Q Did you check with both police entities and child welfare?

A Yes, and Centre County CYS also.
Q Now, I want to ask you, did you participate in the trial of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania versus

Gerald Sandusky?
A Yes, I did.
Q And that particular case involved 10 listed victims. Eight of them were identified; is that correct?

A Yes.
Q They were referred to, both in the information and in other court pleadings, by certain victim numbers; is that correct?

A Yes, you are correct.
Q Could you tel 1 the Court, were any of those victims the subject of abuse by Jerry Sandusky after February of 2001?

A Yes.

Q Could you identify who those victims were?
A Without saying their names, identifying by the same numbers we used in the Sandusky trial, they would be the following: Number one, number five, number nine.

Q And specifically as it relates to number five, was some of that abuse, was it alleged to have occurred on Penn State's campus?

A Yes, same shower, Lasch Building. Same showers, $I$ believe, Mr. McQueary witnessed in his incident.

Q And specifically as it relates to victim one and victim nine, how recent was that abuse in terms of how long ago did they indicate that they had been sexually abused by Jerry Sandusky?

A 2007-2008 time frame.
Q And with regard to victims one and nine, what was Jerry Sandusky convicted of?

A Number one and nine?
Q Yes.
A Umm --
Q Let me ask you what the most serious crime was?

A Number one and number nine was IDSI, involuntary deviate sexual intercourse, was the most serious offense. And there were other underlying or related sexual offenses such as indecent assault and having contact with a minor, unlawful contact with a minor, things of that nature, not as serious as the IDSI.

Q And were there criminal charges instituted related to the 1998 incident that we've heard much about over the last two days?

A There were, yes.
Q And that victim was referred to by what number?

A Number six.
Q Did a jury return a criminal conviction related to the 1998 incident?

A It did.
Q Could you identify what the jury convicted Mr .
Sandusky of?
A Unlawful contact with a minor, corruption of minors, endangering welfare of children.

Q And similarly, were there criminal charges filed against Mr. Sandusky for this conduct and contact with the boy that was seen in the shower by Mike McQueary that was testified to yesterday?

A Yes, sir.
Q Were there criminal convictions as a result -by a jury, as a result of that incident?

A Yes, sir. They were indecent assault, unlawful contact with a minor, corruption of minors and endangering welfare of children.

Q Okay. During the course of your
investigation, did you obtain a document from the 1 aw firm McQuaide B1asko?

A Yes, I did.
Q And back in the nineties and well into the 2000s, did McQuaide Blasko have any sort of relationship with Penn State University?

A They were the legal firm that represented Penn State in everything, yes.

Q And specifically, did you obtain a document or a time sheet or a biliing record that would be particularly relevant to this investigation?

A Yes.
Q I want to show you what I've marked for identification purposes Commonwealth's Exhibit 28 and ask if you can identify that?

A Yes, $I$ can identify it.
Q What is it?
A It's a billing record from McQuaide Blasko in reference to their Penn State account.

You look at the entire thing, it is all Penn State billing records on here. Specifically, the last three 1 ines are reference to something that occurred in this investigation.

Q Now, just to clarify, it has been identified through electronic documents and through testimony that the date of the Friday night incident that Mike McQueary witnessed was what date?

A February 9, 2001.
Q And through the testimony, the date that he would have reported what he had seen to Coach Paterno was what day?

A The following day, February 10th; Saturday. February 10th, 2001.

Q Is there any notation in Commonwealth's 28 that is relevant to that time frame?

A Yes. The very last notation on this page is dated February 11 th of 2001.

Q What is the -- what is the indication on that notation?

A There is some type of case number on there. I don't know how McQuaide Blasko does that, if they do it per incident or $I$ don't know their numbering system.

Anyway, in reference to that, it says,
"PSU-general-finance/business-centra1." On the next 1ine it says, "Conference with G. Schultz regarding" -- it has re -- "regarding reporting of suspected child abuse."

I will repeat that, "suspected child abuse.
Legal research re" -- r-e -- "same."
Then under that there is another 1 ine that says, "Conference with G. Schultz."

Then beside that there is notation for time spent which equals 2.90 hours.

So Wendel 1 Courtney would have been the attorney of record for McQuaide Blasko at the time.

He spent, on a Sunday -- on a Sunday -- for suspected child abuse, he spent 2.9 hours dealing with Gary Schultz.

MR. BEEMER: Move for admission of 28.
MR. FARRELL: No objection.
MS. AINSLIE: No objection.
THE COURT: So moved.
BY MR. BEEMER:
Q Now, during the course of the investigation, was there a file folder that was recovered from Mr. Schultz' office that was noted to be a file containing information about Jerry Sandusky?

A Well, there is one that we recovered which essentially was empty.

Q Right.
A There is another one that we recovered eventually.

Q Right. The one that was essentially empty, what was left in there?

A There were -- my recollection is the one that was provided to us, the one we recovered, had two pieces of paper in there in reference to Jerry Sandusky and there was reference to retirement documents.

I don't recall exactly what they were.

Q My question is, during the course of the investigation, did you determine that one of the people who was involved in dealing with Sandusky's retirement was Gary Schultz?

A Yes. And then through talking to other people, he fit into the misconduct employee category, I do believe.

MR. BEEMER: That's al1 I have, Your Honor.
Cal1 for cross.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. PERRY:
Q Mr. Sassano, good afternoon.
A How are you doing?
Q My name is Brian Perry. I represent Tim Curley with Caroline Roberto.

How many child abuse investigations have you been involved in?

A I don't know a number.
Q Give me a number?
A Oh, I would say less than 10.
Q Have you had any training in child abuse investigations?

A Yes.
Q Is it the policy of Centre County to ask children and youth services and law enforcement to
interview kids at the same time?
A That is my understanding.
Q That's typically a statewide thing, isn't it?
A It's what they call protocol.
Q Because you don't want to interview child victims too many times, do you?

A That's correct.
Q One of the reasons why you don't want to do that is because you want consistency, don't you; consistent statements?

A You want consistent statements and you want more, you don't want to keep traumatizing the kid more than necessary.

There --
Q Sure.
A So there's more than just the part that you emphasized.

Q The same is true in these investigations with witnesses; isn't that true? You want consistency?

MR. BEEMER: Your Honor, objection to the relevance. This is beyond the scope of direct.

MR. PERRY: I ask for a little bit of leeway.
I will end it quickly.
THE COURT: End it quickly.
BY MR. PERRY:

Q You want consistency?
A What witnesses are you referring to?
Q Well, let's talk about Mike McQueary in this investigation. You interviewed him, didn't you?

A Yes.
Q Back in November of 2010?
A Yes.
Q Right?
MR. BEEMER: Objection, Your Honor. Now we're just way afield.

MR. PERRY: I will ask one series of questions.

MR. BEEMER: They still need to be relevant.
MR. PERRY: These are relevant.
THE COURT: I don't know how far we're going. BY MR. PERRY:

Q Did you interview him in 2010, Mike McQueary?
A You already said I did and I said yes.
Q Did you interview him?
A I said yes.
Q Okay.
Were you here yesterday when he testified?
MR. BEEMER: Same objection, Your Honor. It is completely irrelevant.

MR. PERRY: It can rebut prima facie, Your

Honor. We are here for that, a prima facie finding.
THE COURT: We are going to abandon this 1 ine about Mr. McQueary.

MR. PERRY: Yes, sir.
BY MR. PERRY:
Q You talked about the alleged victim or the victims in the Sandusky trial by number, correct?

A I did.
Q For the 2001 case involving Mike McQueary in the shower, what he saw in the shower, what was that victim's number?

A Number two.
Q Is it true that the jury acquitted Mr.
Sandusky on penetration-related charges?
A Yes, it's true.
Q They convicted on indecent assault, right;
which is inappropriate touching?
A Yes.
Q Corruption and endangering, didn't they?
A Yes.
Q So no penetration?
A And unlawful contact.
Q Okay, but they acquitted on involuntary deviate sexual intercourse, which is penetration; am I correct?

A That's correct. And if I can give you a complete answer.

Q Sure.
A From day one, Mike McQueary never said that he saw penetration. He said he saw Mr. Sandusky behind a boy in a motion that he believed there was penetration. However, the only way we would actually know if there was penetration would be if the victim would come forward, number one, or if Mr. McQueary would have actually seen that with his eyes, which he always said he never saw there.

Q But he later described hands on hips?
A Yes.
Q And 1 ifting, didn't he?
A Yes, that's part of his testimony.
Q Did he describe --
MR. BEEMER: Your Honor, now $I$ got to object.
This is a most far afield area of cross-examination.
THE COURT: Can we move on?
MR. PERRY: Yes, we can.
BY MR. PERRY:
Q You are aware when children and youth and 1 aw enforcement get involved in investigations that these investigations can take some period of time; am I correct?

A Yes, they can.
Q And sometimes children and youth and 1 aw enforcement have differing opinions; differing conclusions, don't they?

A I imagine that happens.
Q Back in 1998, are you aware that Centre County Children and Youth did not have an indicated or founded finding in their investigation?

A Say that again.
Q In 1998, did Centre County Children and Youth have an indicated or founded conclusion?

MR. BEEMER: Objection, relevance.
MR. PERRY: Absolutely relevant, Your Honor.
MR. BEEMER: He can say it's relevant, but it's clearly not. It is completely beyond the scope for which he was called. We could ask Agent Sassano about everything he did during the investigation.

MR. PERRY: He is the affiant. He is in control of this investigation, Your Honor. He had -they've asked about the number of people who were -the number of alleged victims who led to convictions after 2001.

I'm asking one question about 1998 where no criminal charges were filed and children and youth did not have an indicated or founded status. And I'm
asking if this trooper is aware of that. That's the only question $I$ will ask him on that line.

MR. BEEMER: It's irrelevant whether he is aware of it. It does not have anything to do with why he was called or what you have to determine.

THE COURT: I'm not going to let him answer that.

MR. PERRY: Okay.
BY MR. PERRY:
Q When did you become aware of the 1998 incident?

MR. BEEMER: Objection, it is also irrelevant.
THE COURT: Go ahead. Can you answer that?
THE WITNESS: When did we become aware of
1998? It was subsequent to dealing with Mr. McQueary, so somewhere around November, 2010. Maybe December of 2010, in that time frame.

BY MR. PERRY:
Q Let's go fast forward. You're suggesting in 2001, when Mike McQueary saw what he saw, that Mr. Curley, Mr. Schultz and Mr. Spanier, did not act appropriately, which led to other victimization. Is that what you are suggesting?

MR. BEEMER: Objection. It is not up to the agent to suggest anything.

MR. PERRY: Is that what you have charged?
THE COURT: Well, that's a fair question.
Is that what you have charged?
THE WITNESS: That's what I have charged, yes, but $I$ haven't suggested anything. You are suggesting. You are making suggestions. I am giving testimony in response in your questions.

MR. PERRY: I understand.
BY MR. PERRY:
Q How many alleged victims were victimized post 2001?

A Post what?
Q Post 2001.
MR. BEEMER: Objection. There is no way to know. It could be hundreds, so it is an impossible question to answer. If he wants to ask how many were charged and were convicted, that's another thing.

MR. PERRY: Okay. Fair question.
BY MR. PERRY:
Q How many were charged post 2001?
A I just testified to three, but something is telling me I might have missed one, but at least three.

Q And your belief is that the victimization occurred between 2001 and 2010?

A On the ones charged in 2008 --
Q I'm sorry.
A 2008 - -
Q On one?
A No, I said on the ones charged.
Q On the ones charged?
A They would have been between 2001 and 2008.
Q Since the Sandusky verdict, have other alleged victims come forward to you?

MR. BEEMER: Objection.
THE COURT: All right, $I$ don't know what the relevance is. We're here for the specific charges set in the criminal complaints. If there is additional victims, I don't see that it has a bearing on the matters before us today.

MR. PERRY: Okay. No further questions.
Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you.
BY MR. FARRELL:
Q Good afternoon, Mr. Sassano.
A Hello, Mr. Farrell.
Q Don't take this one way or another as either a compliment or an insult, but you are not a lawyer, are you?

A No.

I have a thick skin, so $I$ won't take it either way.

Q Good. You never worked in a law office, have you?

A No, that's one thing I didn't do.
Q You wouldn't stoop that low, is that what you are --

A I have hauled garbage. I have done a lot of things, but $I$ have never been a lawyer.

Q All right. The McQuaide Blasko billing record --

A Yes, sir.
Q -- you're not -- you don't deal much, in the course of your work, with attorney's billing records, do you?

A No, not much. In this case somewhat because I had to, but typically no.

Q If you take - do you have the exhibit in front of you?

A $\quad$ I do.
Q 28 ?
A Yes, yes.
Q If you would look at the entry, the page, the 1ast entry, the one for February 11th, 2001, the way that's set up, is there a description of what appears
to be the work the attorney did, right?
A You mean the comments after the name Schultz? Oh yeah, you're talking like about the title, general, finance or business.

Q Yeah, well, that's the title.
A Tell me what you are talking about.
Q Yeah, all right. At the top of the page. Let's set this up.

A Okay.
Q You see there are headings?
There's matter I.D., then description, then task/activity, then hours; right?

A You're right, yes.
Q And matter I.D. on the entry we're talking about appears to correspond to number 4000-450061?

A It does, yes.
Q All right. Then description. That appears to correspond to PSU-general-finance/business-central; is that right?

A Yes.
Q Then the task activity, that appears to correspond to the entry "conference with G. Schultz, re reporting of suspected child abuse; legal research re same; conference with G. Schultz," right?

A That's correct.

Q So what $I$ just read starting with "conference" and ending with "conference with G. Schultz," that appears to be the task or activity that the biling attorney did on that date?

A To me it does, yes.
Q What it indicates is that - if we take it in the sequence in which it was written, first a conference with Mr. Schultz, then legal research about the subject of the conference and then another conference with G. Schultz, right?

A I agree.
Q Now, each of those task activity descriptions,
none of them has a time immediately after each activity, does it?

A No.
Q It just has, in the hours column, a summary for the amount of hours spent on that day on those total task activities, right?

A That's correct.
Q Of 2.9 hours?
A That's correct.
Q So from reading this, you can't tell how much time was spent in the first conference with Mr. Schultz versus how much time was spent for the legal research versus how much time was spent in the
second conference with Mr. Schultz?
A Yes, you're right.
Q So as far as we know, it could have been . 2 hours -- the way we guys do it, tenths of an hour -. 2 hours for the first conference, 2.5 hours for the research, or . 2 , and then .2 hours for the 1 ast conference, for example. That's possible?

A Perhaps, yes, that could have happened.
Q We can't tell from looking at this?
A Mr. Courtney could explain it to us. We can't -- yes, we cannot tell from this document.

Q Okay, but you can't tell -- explain it to us?
A That's correct.
Q Moving on to a different topic, the investigation you did to check whether there was a report about what we now know to be the 2001 incident. Now, as you yourself pointed out back at the time of the previous preliminary hearing involving Mr.

Schultz, Mr. Curley, we all thought the incident was 2002, right?

A That's correct, yes.
Q And you testified at that preliminary hearing about investigating to see whether a report had been made about this 2002 incident, right?

A Yes.

Q Since that preliminary hearing, did you go back and check with the same agencies about the 2001 date?

A The only one I checked with, which I didn't testify the last time, I didn't call DPW. I believe I just went with Centre CYS. I did call DPW and they have no report of anything on file in reference to Mr. Sandusky.

I believe my prior testimony, the information that we had gotten from Carol Smith, the director of Centre CYS at the time, was for them to provide any information listing Mr. Sandusky, you know, as a subject of an investigation, a perpetrator.

There were none at all. That would have covered '02 also.

The only thing that she could find or provide to us in reference to Mr. Sandusky is a 2008 report and that would be the victim number one report. That was through child --

Q All right.
A Hopefully I didn't make that too confusing for you.

Q Well, let me make sure $I$ understand.
You checked with CYS before the previous preliminary hearing, right?

A That's correct, yes.
Q According to what CYS told you, they keep their records by potential subject or perpetrator name; is that right? Is that accurate?

A Yes, that's correct. However, if it is unfounded, they don't have it. They would not have that record.

Q So if they had a report, investigated it and decided it was unfounded, they would not keep any record of it?

A By 1 aw they cannot. Yes, you are correct.
Q So the fact that they have no record about 2001, concerning -- 1 et me withdraw that.

Based upon what she told you, they would have no record and had no record about the 1998 investigation, did they?

A They did not have a record, you're right.
Q And DPW had no record of 1998 either, did they?

A Yes, that's correct. So then $I$ go to plan B or $C$ or $D$ and go to the police department who would have conducted the investigation --

Q Um-hum.
A -- who would have jurisdiction over the location where the incident occurred or would have
occurred. In this particular case, that's Penn State University Police Department, and I got the report there from them. It was a 1998 incident with Mr. Sandusky.

Q For the 1998 incident?
A Yes, sir. If there would have been an incident reported in 2001, the DPW or Centre CYS -and if it was unfounded, where $I$ think you are going with all of this, if it was unfounded, of course they would not have a report. However, they cannot conduct a criminal investigation.

One of the other attorneys referred to protocol that's in place in reference to these types of matters. They would have done a joint investigation with, in this particular case, Pennsylvania State University Police Department, who would have retained a copy of that report, and there was none for 2001.

Q Let me make sure $I$ understand it.
A Okay.
Q It seems what you are implying is, if CYS did an investigation on its own and found the allegation to be unfounded, it would not maintain a record, right?

A If CYS did? CYS would not do a child sexual
abuse investigation on their own. They may take the initial complaint. They would immediately marry up with the D.A.'s office and the police department and this group and this protocol would go out and do the investigation.

Q Is it your understanding that CYS would and did do suspected child abuse investigations on their own?

In other words, child abuse, not child sexual
abuse?
A They can do some, yes, that's correct. I thought you meant sexual abuse, because that's what we are talking about.

They can do regular child abuse stuff. If they see that there is something that the police need to be involved in, they would call them in.

Q They would call the police only if they determined that it was child abuse of a sexual nature; is that what you are saying?

A There could be other things; extreme violence, injuries, things like that. So it's not solely just sexual abuse. There are certain criteria.

Q It was up to CYS to make the initial call to bring the police in?

A Yes - under which case? Which are you
talking about? Just --
Q Generally?
A Generally, yes, under those conditions.
Q Yes.
A Perhaps they would get a call that someone doesn't have food in their house, a child is being abused, those generalities. They could go into the house, do a preliminary investigation, and if they see that there is something there they need the police -sexual abuse would definitely be something they need the police for -- they would call them in.

Q So CYS gets an allegation -- you're understanding is that CYS would get an allegation, do an investigation and then decide whether or not to call the police in, depending upon the nature of what it found?

MR. BEEMER: Objection, relevance. I mean at this point --

MR. FARRELL: The relevance is the absence of a record may not show that there was no report.

THE COURT: If we can wrap this up relatively quick.

MR. FARRELL: A11 right.
THE WITNESS: You have to repeat that.
BY MR. FARRELL:

Q Your understanding of CYS -- and we're talking about Dauphin County -- no, we're not. We are talking about Centre County CYS.
$A \quad$ We are.
Q Yes.
Their practice was, they get an allegation back in 2001, talking about generally, not this particular one. Do an investigation and CYS would make the determination whether or not to call in the police, right?

A In certain matters, yes. That's not sacrosanct. It is certain matters.

Q But it was their call?
A Yes.
Q If they did an investigation, did not call the police and determined it was unfounded, there would be no record with CYS, right?

A That's correct.
But sexual abuse is different than, I believe, what we are talking about here. We are talking about maybe a physical abuse or, like I said, child neglect or something or other, is my understanding of what you are relaying to me right now.

Q I am going to move on, because I think everyone is losing patience with the two of us.

A Me too.
Q Your search for the Jerry Sandusky file, you mentioned finding documents relating to Jerry Sandusky's retirement in the office of the senior vice-president of finance and business, right?

A Yes.
Q When did you find that document?
A Can't give you a date. I don't know for sure.
It was at some point in time after Duane Morris became involved. Duane Morris 1 aw firm became involved and they turned those over.

Q So it was Duane Morris lawyers who actually found the record; is that right?

A I don't know that they found it. I know they turned -- yeah, I guess you could say that. They turned over a bunch of files from Mr. Schultz' office and that was amongst those files.

Whether they just went through and gathered everything up and turned everything over to us or not, I'm not real clear on that.

Q So it was not you yourself who found the file or anyone from your office, right?

A My recollection, it was turned over amongst other documents from Gary's office by Duane Morris.

Q And that was -- so you don't know of your own
personal knowledge exactly where they found that document, do you?

A No. I believe it was in that - I believe it was in the same file drawer, the credenza.

Q Meaning? I'm sorry.
A It's like a credenza/bookcase. It was long and narrow, had three or four drawers on the bottom.

Q The one we heard talk about yesterday, right?
A Yes. Yes, same one. Joan and --
Q Kim?
A -- Miss Belcher would know better than me.
They saw it every day.
Q Without fixing the specific date, it was found after the initial charges were filed against Mr. Schultz and Mr. Curley?

A Yes.
MR. FARRELL: I have no other questions.
THE COURT: Thank you.
BY MS. AINSLIE:
Q Good afternoon, Agent Sassano.
A Hello.
Q I think you know who $I$ am by now?
A I know who you are and who you represent, yes.
Q Good.
You said in response to questions from

Mr. Beemer that you -- that eight out of the ten victims were identified at Sandusky's trial?

A Yes, and they testified, yes.
Q And - all right.
The person that Mr. McQueary says he saw in the shower room with Mr. Sandusky in February of 2001 was not one of those; isn't that right?

A That's correct.
Q Do you know who that child is?
MR. BEEMER: Objection.
MS. AINSLIE: Your Honor, this is at the heart of this case.

THE COURT: I am going to sustain the objection.

BY MS. AINSLIE:
Q I'm not going to ask you what this child's name is, but did you make a decision not to call that child to testify at Mr. Sandusky's trial?

MR. BEEMER: Objection to what went on in Mr. Sandusky's trial.

MS. AINSLIE: Your Honor, the prosecution has opened the door by bringing in all of these convictions, all of the Sandusky trial. It was the predominant subject matter.

MR. BEEMER: It's a fact. I mean, we're
talking about something the Court could have taken judicial notice of. She is asking about some particular strategy or decision by the attorney general's office. There is a big difference.

THE COURT: I don't know that this agent can answer that.

MS. AINSLIE: He can answer it. I don't know Your Honor. Understand, I am not quarreling with the Court.

THE COURT: I know you're not. I don't want to go further with this 1 ine of questioning with this witness.

MS. AINSLIE: A11 right.
BY MS. AINSLIE:
Q Now, you have been shown -- we have been shown in the course of the 1 ast two days, several times, the e-mail that came on June 9 of 1998, that announced that they met with Jerry and concluded that there was no criminal behavior in the 1998 episode. Do you recall those?

A Yeah, I recall a series of e-mails, so $I$ guess that was one of them.

Q Well, I can show you this one if you would 1ike. Would you like?

A If you want me to testify from it, that may be
better. Thank you.
Q It's the top one that $I$ am talking about.
A Okay.
Yeah, I do remember this one.
Q It's dated what?
A June 9, 1998.
Q And your investigation revealed, did it not, that Graham Spanier was out of the country for some period of time, including June 9th of 1998, did it not?

A Um, I'm not sure if he was out of the country or not, no. I know he was in country until --

Q I'm sorry?
A I believe he was in the country until May 22nd. When he returned, $I$ don't exactly recall off the top of my head.

MS. AINSLIE: I am not going to offer it in evidence, but $I$ will show the witness.

BY MS. AINSLIE:
Q May I refresh your recollection with Dr.
Spanier's diaries?
These were maintained by his secretary,
Carolyn Dolbin, were they not?
A It looks like something similar to what $I$ possess and back at that time Carolyn Dolbin did
maintain his day planner.
Q That date planner maintained by Carolyn Dolbin shows that Dr . Spanier was in London for at least several days, possibly a week, in that vicinity and certainly was in London on June 9 th of 1998 , correct?

A That's what's in the day planner, yes.
You said June 9th?
Q Yes.
A Yeah.
Q I believe that's the date?
A Yep, you have it underiined there.
Q Yes.
Dr. Spanier traveled a great deal, did he not?
A Oh my, yes. I don't know how he ran the university as much as he traveled, to be quite honest with you.

Q He had a great many of e-mails on a daily basis?

A I don't know about that. Braden and those people would be the e-mail experts.

Q That's fine.
I'm showing you what $I$ have marked GBS 1 , which is a letter from me to Mr. Beemer?

A Okay.
Q Could you take a moment to read it?

A Witness complies.
Q In this letter --
MR. BEEMER: I have a number of objections to this as absolutely nothing to do with Agent Sassano or any relevance to anything before this Court.

MS. AINSLIE: Your Honor, as Your Honor can tell, if Agent Sassano has never heard that $I$ made on behalf of Dr. Spanier an offer to bring him in, if he could look at his grand jury --

MR. BEEMER: I want to do this at sidebar, because this is completely --

THE WITNESS: Do $I$ have to step down, Your Honor?

THE COURT: If you don't mind.
(A discussion occurred off the record at sidebar.)

THE COURT: Tiva, I think for the record, Miss Ainsiie had requested for us to review this document that was labeled GBS No. 1. Over her objection, I am not going to allow this document to be entered or I'm not going to let this particular agent review this and be questioned on the matter.

MS. AINSLIE: Very well, Your Honor.
May I retrieve the copy from the witness?
THE COURT: Yes.

MS. AINSLIE: And may $I$ have a moment?
(Pause.)
MS. AINSLIE: I have nothing further, Your
Honor. Thank you very much.
MR. BEEMER: No redirect.
THE COURT: You are dismissed, Agent. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Beemer.
MR. BEEMER: Commonwealth rests, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Will there be any specific
testimony or witnesses called on behalf of any of the Defendants in the matter?

MR. FARRELL: Not on our behalf.
MS. AINSLIE: No, Your Honor.
MS. ROBERTO: Not on behalf of Mr. Curley.
THE COURT: Have we worked out an order for closing arguments among counsel?

MS. AINSLIE: I think I'm first, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right.
Liz, before you get started, if anybody would like to leave the courtroom you can go now, but obviously once we get started in this, nobody is coming back in. I don't want anybody moving. Thank you.

MS. AINSLIE: Thank you, Your Honor.

Your Honor, I actually have a little bench memorandum to offer the Court.

THE COURT: Thank you.
MS. AINSLIE: I beg the Court's indulgence.
THE COURT: That's all right.
MS. AINSLIE: Your Honor, what I propose to do is to review the evidence very briefly with respect to Dr. Spanier that you've heard in the last two days and then relate it to the legal requirements that I set forth in the bench memorandum. That will basically be it.

Your Honor, the evidence against Dr. Spanier, I submit, amounts only to innuendo and far-fetched inference, and I think that you can see that when you look at the evidence that has been given here.

Mr. McQueary testified. I will leave it to my co-counsel to comment on his credibility. He seems to be, in my judgment, making it up as he goes along. I don't think he has ever told anyone the story about Paterno having told him that Old Main screwed it up or messed up. I don't think that's -- he is making that up, but I will leave that to my co-counsel to address, because, in the end, Mr. McQueary says nothing about Dr. Spanier. Never spoke to Dr. Spanier. Never followed up with Dr. Spanier. No relationship
whatsoever with Dr. Spanier.
Tom Harmon came next, according to my notes, and also had no conversation with Dr. Spanier. All of this is not very surprising. Even though they were on the staff at Penn State, you've heard from numerous witnesses that Dr. Spanier was in charge of a university that was vast, that had thousands, tens of thousands of employees, almost 100,000, I believe, students. The fact that they would not have had contact with Dr. Spanier about these incidents is not that surprising. But the fact remains, they have nothing to say about Dr. Spanier's culpability in this case.

My notes show that Joan Coble was the next witness. She likewise had nothing to say about Dr. Spanier. She was Gary Schultz's lawyer \{sic\}. She said nothing about him whatsoever.

Kim Belcher, likewise Mr. Schultz' secretary, also said nothing about $\operatorname{Dr}$. Spanier.

John Corro, the IT person at Penn State, said practically nothing. Said again that it was -- his file was unusual because the inbox was almost empty, but there were, I think he said, 84,000 or 64,000 -- I think 84,000 e-mails in the outbox. That's not exactly critical evidence bearing on the charges
before the Court.
He also agreed that the 01d Main
administrative e-mai 1 system was changed over in 2004 and that the e-mails from prior to 2004 , or $I$ think maybe he was not sure of the precise date, that those e-mails that predated that, unless they were saved in a special system like Mr. Schultz', could not be retrieved.

Lisa Powers testified to back and forth with Dr. Spanier in the dark days at the end of October and beginning of November of 2011. Back and forth about a press release.

It still mystifies me what that -- what relevance that has to these charges. You know, the fact that Dr. Spanier wanted to express more or 1 ess support for Mr. Schultz, for Mr. Curley, or more or less effusive expressions of sympathy to Mr. Sandusky's victims, $I$ don't see how that bears at all on any of the charges.

Finally, Mr. Cook testified and again I'm mystified, and $I$ think it's not just because I am a neophyte to computers. It was conflicting. It conflicted with the other prosecution witness, Mr. Corro.

Again, Braden Cook said, one way or another,
some of Dr. Spanier's e-mail disappeared, but some popped up from before -- what was it? 2004, I think it was. Some of them popped up from before.

A11 of them were erased in 2011. He couldn't explain that and he never, apparently, took this conundrum to Steve Neeper, the head of Information Technology at Penn State, for an explanation of all of this.

That, I think, Your Honor, is the prosecution's evidence against Dr. Spanier.

He was not -- Agent Sassano testified about the victims. Again, Dr. Spanier never saw any of these victims. Never spoke to any of these victims. He basically had no relationship whatsoever to any of these victims.

He also testified about, you know, the McQuaide Blasko billing record. He himself did nothing with respect to the biling record. Again, it was Mr. Schultz who consulted counsel and obviously counsel -- I will 1et Mr. Farrell make his point at greater length, but obviously Mr. Courtney did not feel that the allegations warranted a full-fledged police investigation.

Finally, again, Mr. Sassano agreed that with respect to the e-mails that the prosecution has been
taking us through the last couple of days, one of them -- the first one in 1998 didn't even mention Jerry Sandusky or even Jerry. It just mentioned Joe Paterno and said the individual will be interviewed.

The subsequent one that did say Jerry in the re 1 ine, didn't say Jerry who. Simply said this investigation has been fully investigated and is closed with no criminal wrongdoing.

So these two 1998 e-mails are basically vanilla. They mean nothing. The fact is, Dr. Spanier was copied on them, did not respond to them.

The first one was totally nonspecific and the second one said, "This investigation has been wrapped up with no criminal charges."

So it's hardly surprising that when, in 2011, Dr. Spanier appeared before the grand jury, that he did not recall anything about the 1998 episode. There wasn't anything to remember. And in any event, he had not been told anything about the 1998 episode other than having been copied on two e-mails, one of which he probably didn't get because he was out of the country.

Finally, Your Honor, the one e-mail that Dr. Spanier did generate talks about, in February of 2001 -- talks about, for one thing, that it would be humane
to deal with it this way. I think that part of the e-mail is totally explainable in terms of Mr. Curley's desire to talk to Mr. Sandusky rather than talking around him. Um, that he should be confronted with the complaint that Mr. McQueary had made against him and that he should be offered the opportunity to go to Second Mile when Mr. Curley told Second Mile that Mr. Sandusky was not to be bringing any more Second Mile kids to the Penn State facilities.

So the humane part of it was not doing this behind Mr. Sandusky's back, but getting him involved.

There is the part that talks about, you know, would it be -- it might be vulnerable to criticism, some such thing, for failing to report it, but they could cross that bridge when they came to it. Something along those 1 ines.

If the rest of the evidence showed that Dr. Spanier had been told about deviant sexual behavior, that might be a really very critical e-mail. But in the absence of that, in the absence of any evidence as to what Dr. Spanier was told, I submit that this e-mail says nothing more than what has been said before, and certainly nothing inconsistent with what Dr. Spanier said at the grand jury.

He has said, and consistently said, that what
he was told was upsetting; was that a staff member was upset at seeing Jerry Sandusky and presumably a Second Mile kid horsing around in the showers and that it was inappropriate. So he understood, and there is nothing in this e-mail to contradict that, that what he was dealing with was a guy who everyone had revered, at that time certainly, for having been not only a star defensive coordinator at Penn State, but also, and more importantly, having founded Second Mile; having been in the vanguard of helping troubled youth.

Obviously, in retrospect, that has a sinister sound to it. But in fact, I believe -- I have been lead to believe that tens of thousands of young people who Second Mile, through its child psychologist and so on, helped to lead more productive 1 ives.

So he thought - again, this is - I'm just going by the text of the e-mail, that it would be -you know, they would go to Second Mile, tell Second Mile that Jerry Sandusky, the founder of Second Mile, had a problem with boundaries. He did not seem to understand what was appropriate, what was seemly and that he should not bring children, Second Mile children, onto the Second Mile \{sic\} campus again.

Your Honor, I now have sort of summed up my understanding of the facts that have been produced to
you the last two days. What $I$ would just like to point out, in the bench memorandum, some of the really important aspects of it.

First, Your Honor, the perjury. A lot of these elements -- there are six elements that $I$ put down there, but the one that $I$ want to focus on is number four.

Not only does the prosecution have to show that there was an inconsistency, that testimony was incorrect, but the prosecution has a burden of showing, even though it's a low burden here, Your Honor, I think they have a burden of showing that Dr. Spanier did not believe the statement to be true at the time it was made.

I see no evidence in this record that $\operatorname{Dr}$.
Spanier did not believe the statement, any of the statements that he made in that grand jury transcript to be false at the time. How did $I$ start that?

I see no evidence that Dr. Spanier didn't believe the statement to be true. He did.

Secondly, Your Honor, going on to obstruction of justice, it's the first two of those elements that I would like to focus on.

Dr. Spanier -- the Commonwealth needs to show that $\operatorname{Dr}$. Spanier had the intent to obstruct the
administration of the law or of other governmental function.

Where is the evidence of that? There is no evidence whatsoever.

They also have to show, in addition, that Dr .
Spanier used force or violence, breached an official duty or committed an unlawful act to do this.

Again, there is no evidence in this record that $I$ have seen that amounts to that kind of level of evidence.

Third, conspiracy to obstruct -- conspiracy to commit perjury. All of these conspiracy things, they have to show that $\operatorname{Dr}$. Spanier entered into an agreement to commit or aid in an unlawful act with another person or persons; there was a shared criminal intent.

Now, of course, you know it is fairly clear who the prosecution thinks the co-conspirators were. It was Dr. Spanier and Mr. Schultz and Mr. Curley. But that they had a shared criminal intent? There is absolutely no evidence of that.

Next, Your Honor, number four, endangering the welfare of a child. There are two subsections, as Your Honor will note, on page three. There's one which is 4304(a)(1) and another that is 4304(a)(2).

I believe the charges fall under both, or at least it is confusing to me as to which the Commonwealth wants to charge.

But in any event, taking the first one, (a) (1), the Commonwealth has to show, and I'm looking at the first two elements, that $\operatorname{Dr}$. Spanier was a parent, guardian or other person supervising the welfare of a child under 18 years of age. There is absolutely no evidence of that.

Endangering the welfare of a child, he had no supervision over these Second Mile children. As his testimony said, Dr. Spanier and the administration at Penn State was generous about allowing the community to use the facilities at Penn State. That is no crime. And it certainly does not mean that Dr. Spanier or any of the others in the administration at Penn State took on the supervision of young people simply because they came onto the campus.

The clear intent of this statute is to talk about foster parents, uncles and aunts taking care of children, doctors perhaps, parents, guardians, people who were supervising the welfare of a child.

They also have to show that Dr. Spanier endangered the welfare of a child by violating a duty of care, protection or support. Again, that does not
apply to this case.
Dr. Spanier had no such duty. He was simply in charge of a large university that made its facilities available to the Second Mile and many other organizations and people.

The second part of that, 4304(a)(2), if the Commonwealth is proceeding on that arm of endangering the welfare of a child, they have to show that he was in an official capacity with respect to the child. Not just that he had an official capacity, but that he had an official capacity with respect to the child.

So again, it has to be a guardian, a parent, something that's official with respect to the child, and there is no evidence of that.

Secondly, they have to show that he prevented or interfered with the making of a report of suspected child abuse. Not just that he failed to do so, but that he prevented or interfered with the making of a report. There is absolutely no evidence in the record of that.

Finally, Your Honor there is failure to report child abuse. And the first element there --

MR. BEEMER: Your Honor, I don't mean to interrupt. I submit that is charged as a summary offense, so the Court would not be entertaining
jurisdiction over that offense at this point.
MS. AINSLIE: That's fine. I mean, if the prosecution is not bringing that case to you, Your Honor, then $I$ needn't trouble you with it.

Your Honor, I would just like to --
MR. BEEMER: It is just that the Court had made the decision --

MS. AINSLIE: That's fine. I understand. I think we both understand.

Your Honor, one of the things that - I know -- I'm not going to argue the statute of limitations. You can see that that's one of the things that the prosecution has to show, that they filed these charges in a timely manner. I'm not going to argue that as a matter of 1 aw, but $I$ would 1 ike to argue it, Your Honor, as a matter of fact.

The events that brings us here today almost entirely occurred 15 years ago, 13 years ago, 12 years ago. What you are dealing with is recollections of events when these gentlemen testified in the grand jury. Recollections of events that were at least 10 years old.

So although I'm not going to argue, Your Honor, the statute of limitations as a legal matter, I am going to ask the Court to understand and to examine
the evidence in 1 ight of the fact that the witnesses, certainly these Defendants, and absolutely Dr. Spanier was, when he testified in the grand jury, as he said on several occasions, testifying on the basis of a recollection; a recollection that was at least 10 years old.

Your Honor, I think that's all I have unless the Court has questions.

THE COURT: No, ma'am. Thank you very much.
MS. ROBERTO: May it please the Court, members of the attorney general's office, and my colleagues, Mr. Curley, Mr. Schultz and Dr. Spanier. I am not going to belabor the points that were already covered by Attorney Ainsiie, but $I$ would like to just review very briefly what evidence came out over the last day or so concerning Mr. Curley.

The evidence is repetitive. We heard really nothing out of the ordinary that we don't always hear from Mr. McQueary when he takes the witness stand, except we did hear some embellishment, like we always do.

Nonetheless, Mr. McQueary testified in front of this Court a year and a half ago and he established what this Court held was a prima facie case on the perjury.

Mr. McQueary testified to pretty much the same thing yesterday. He did not address whether Mr. Curley supervised the child. He did not address the issue of obstruction of justice. He did not address the issue of criminal conspiracy.

I felt like $I$ was listening to testimony that may be more germane to a trial on the perjury. Perjury was held for court in 2011.

I heard some testimony related to Mr. Curley, because I brought it up from John Corro, who was the individual from Penn State who worked with the SOS.

Mr. Corro, after questioning him, stated that indeed there was a search of e-mails, Mr. Curley's, Mr. Schultz', Dr. Spanier's and others, as early as March and April of 2011.

I wanted to bring that out because, frankly, the testimony that $I$ was hearing did not fit at all this 35 or so page presentment that we were served with last year.

So even though I am trying to make an argument to the Court, I really don't know what the foundation is that the prosecution is proceeding on. I guess for the obstruction of justice -- well, I don't know. I just don't know.

But I thought maybe it would be what they have
alleged in their presentment. And so, if you go to page -- I think it's page 23 of the presentment.

The presentment says, as part of the obstruction, "None of the SOS professionals were ever shown a subpoena, subpoena 1179. Nor were they directed to seek any information requested by 1179," inferring that there was never any collection of any evidence, especially the electronic evidence. And that's wrong. It's just wrong.

Mr. Corro did what he was instructed to do by office of general counse1. He not only gathered together and collected all of the e-mails that he was requested to collect, but then he ran a key search on al1 of those -- on all of those e-mails and provided them to general counsel.

Mr. Corro said that had Braden Cook, the special agent, been called in to assist him in March or April of 2011, he would have gladly worked with him.

It was not until December or November, 1 ate November or early December, 2011, that the attorney general's office sent Mr . Braden to Penn State University.

So I don't know where we go from there. So I was also thinking that, well, maybe as per the
obstruction of justice facts or the averments that are alleged on page 32 concerning some boxes that were found that belonged to Jerry Sandusky in the athletic department, $I$ waited for all day yesterday and half a day today and heard nothing about boxes that were allegedly found in the athletic department.

So this document that we received last year has lots and lots of information in it, but none of it is really -- or very 1 ittle of it is really before the Court.

So I think when we look at the obstruction of justice charge, there really is no evidence presented by the prosecution that supports that.

The other thing -- the other group of documents that we heard evidence of were the e-mails. Again, I think the e-mail thread that Mr. Curley was on relating to the 1998 incident, is clearly not obstruction of justice. It supports the Commonwealth's position on the perjury, but the perjury already has been held for court.

There is nothing in that document that supports a conspiracy to commit perjury. There is nothing in that report that promotes any kind of conspiracy to obstruct justice.

You know, $I$ want to read to the Court, if I
have it here -- if the Court just grants me one indulgence. Let me get my file.

THE COURT: Sure.
MS. ROBERTO: I am befuddled by the obstruction charge, so $I$ went to the bench book which includes all of the suggested instructions for jury instruction for the judge to read to a jury.

It says on the obstruction, part of it, it says, "Generally speaking, a person cannot commit a crime unless he or she uses means to affirmatively interfere with governmental function. Thus, you cannot find the defendant guilty if you find that he merely tried to avoid complying with the law without affirmatively attempting to interfere with the governmental function.
"The Commonwealth must prove something more than just, for example, that Defendant fled the scene of a crime, refused to submit to an arrest, or did not perform a legal duty" -- or did not perform a legal duty. They have to prove more than the individual did not perform a legal duty.
"However, if the Defendant was a public official charged by law with the obligation to perform the duty, his failure to perform that duty must be sufficient."

Commonwealth offered no evidence before this court yesterday or today that Mr. Curley was an official, public official. Which, of course, he's not.

Failure to perform a legal duty, they really discussed nothing related to performing a legal duty, so I'm again confused about the obstruction of justice charge and confused about the conspiracy to commit obstruction of justice.

Regarding the endangering the welfare of children, I think Miss Ainsiie reviewed the elements of that charge. However, I did want to speak to the fact that both endangering the welfare of children charges are felony charges, and I don't see where the evidence is that Mr. Curley, over a course of a period of time, endangered welfare of children.

And Mr. Curley, at least we know from the e-mails that were presented, made a decision in 2001, over a period of 30 or 45 days, and the decision was made, it was implemented, and it was over. Mr. Curley did not repeatedly visit that issue. He did not -- he was not confronted again with the issue.

The Commonwealth showed us no evidence that there were other children that came forward.

And I will -- I will tell you, I will read
this case -- headnote from this one case, Commonwealth versus Popow, P-o-p-o-w.

And basically says, the statute defines --
"The offense of third degree felony endangerment of children is designed to punish a parent who, over days, weeks, or months abuses his children, such as repeatedly beating them or depriving them of food."

Now, that's not what happened in this case.
There were not repeated times where children came forward. This decision was not revisited.

I understand the Commonwealth's theory that because there were children who were abused by Mr . Sandusky after that, that Mr. Curley should be held responsible for that, but he did not revisit the decision related to those individual children.

Another thing about this statute, the case 1 aw is replete with the Superior Court urging lower courts and litigants to interpret this statute in a commonsensical way. And common sense is, if you are going to hold something 1 ike this for court based upon one decision, then it should not be the continuing offense that rises to the level of a felony.

Now, the Commonwealth may argue this is more of a sentencing issue, it shouldn't be argued at this stage. I would point out to the Court, I don't have a
copy with me, the new Supreme Court case, United States Supreme Court case, that any fact that raises the grading of a crime to a higher grader is an element and it is not just a sentencing issuing.

Even before we get to that, Your Honor, I don't think that any of the evidence that was presented related to Mr. Curley meets the prima facie case of endangering the welfare of children.

Then, finally, on the endangering, I think Miss Ainslie addressed this to you; that the offense of endangering, the way it is charged by the Commonwealth, is a post 2007 statute.

We all learned from today and yesterday, looking at the e-mails, this incident occurred in 2001. There was a different statute that was in effect in 2001 through 2006, and then the statute was changed.

I don't know how the Commonwealth expects to charge or have this charge with this new statute stick against our clients. I'm sure that they will bring that up with the Court and maybe we can respond once we know. But $I$ think under the circumstances, if we were back here a year and a half ago, this evidence may support a prima facie case of perjury, but under the circumstances, there's no case here for the
obstruction, the endangering, and the conspiracy.
Thank you.
THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am.
MR. FARRELL: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
THE COURT: How are you, sir?
MR. FARRELL: I'm fine. How are you?
It's been a long two days. I will try to be brief, although $I$ promised that before and perhaps disappointed you.

THE COURT: That's all right.
MR. FARRELL: I will try.
The three quick points -- I am not going to repeat what my co-counsel said.

On the conspiracy charges, there is just no evidence of anything that Mr. Schultz did in conjunction with the other two Defendants after 2001. There's no evidence of a conspiracy.

There -- I attempted to bring out, I think the Court understood, from the various witnesses that Mr. Schultz was in retirement for 2009 through September of 2011. He had no involvement in responding to any grand jury subpoenas for documents in that time period and there is no evidence that he was even aware of any grand jury subpoenas.

The evidence about Mr. Schultz with respect to
obstruction is actually to the contrary. He's the guy that preserved his e-mails. He's the fellow that kept his notes. He told his secretary to tell the truth. Finally, he's the one, through me, who produced the Sandusky file. All the time not being under subpoena to do any of that.

So contrary of their being a conspiracy case and obstruction case, there's no evidence of conspiracy, and actually, evidence of Mr. Schultz going above and beyond to obey his obligation as a citizen and cooperate with the investigation.

I guess there is -- again, I get pulled into this, the audacity $I$ had to write a press release in October proclaiming my client's innocence. That's the only thing you heard. That is not obstruction of justice, certainly not from Mr. Schultz's part nor on my part.

Finally, with respect to the endangering the welfare of a child, you -- the Commonwealth obviously has charged the post 2006 version of the statute where, again, the only evidence about Mr. Schultz' conduct is evidence about his conduct in 2001. But even under the post 2006 version of the statute, the Commonwealth doesn't make out its case.

Under subsection (a) (1), it has to be shown
that Mr. Schultz either supervised the welfare of a child or supervised one who did supervise the welfare of a child. No evidence that Mr. Schultz had any supervisory capacity with respect to any of the children at issue in this case, and he had no supervisory role with respect to Mr. Sandusky, because as of 2001-- as of 1999, Mr. Sandusky is no longer a Penn State employee.

The other subsection that's charged, (a)(2), requires that one in his official capacity interferes with the making of the report of child abuse. There is no evidence that Mr. Schultz did anything in an official capacity. Certainly not to interfere.

At most, there's evidence suggesting that he failed to make some sort of report in 2001. I know the Court doesn't have that issue before it, but it does have the endangerment issue. The endangerment requires more than what the summary offense requires.

Summary offense is violated, at least according to the Commonwealth. There is certain prerequisites that apply. One simply fails to make a report. What they've charged here is interfering with the making of a report. There is no evidence before this Court that Mr. Schultz did anything to interfere with the making of any report of child abuse.

Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you, sir.
MR. BEEMER: Your Honor, it's a rather astounding series of circumstances that go through -start in 1998, go all the way up, really, into 2011, 2012. The Defense clearly is just misconstruing the nature of the evidence.

It was really rather remarkable, the attempt to gloss over the historical evidence from 2001. That e-mail where there is a decision made on how to handle this case. I could have submitted that e-mail to you, Your Honor, and made out this case.

Now, we gave you quite a bit more. And what does that establish?

It establishes that in 1998 -- you have all of this evidence that there was tremendous interest in what was going on from Gary Schultz, from Tim Curley, and you've heard the evidence from the witnesses who testified about Mr. Schultz, Graham Spanier. They are detail-oriented, micromanaging kind of guys. It is an inconceivable position to take, based on the documentary evidence, that all three of them did not know what was going on in 1998, and that they weren't kept apprised. Because, if Dr. Spanier wasn't kept apprised, then he's negligent.

You have an assistant football coach in the most-high profile athletic team in a major university, and the second most well-known person in that department is being investigated for having contact with a young boy on your campus, and Miss Ainslie wants to stand up here and say, "Well he wouldn't know what that was about because all it said was Joe Paterno or Jerry."

I would submit that is completely inconsistent with all the other evidence you heard in the case and it's ridiculous.

I submit to you, Judge, that if it had been 1999 or 2000, and some member of the press came and got ahold of the fact that there was a 1998 investigation, and they went to these guys, you know what they would have said? They would have said, "Yeah, of course we knew about it. The police investigated it, DPW looked at it, the D.A.'s office declined to prosecute and nothing happened."

But it wasn't 1999 or 2000 when they finally were asked about it, it was 2011. And what happened in the interim?

In 2001, they get a report from Mike McQueary, and you don't have to make a credibility assessment at this stage, Your Honor, but I think his testimony
speaks for itself. You've now heard him twice.
I think the chain of events is remarkable. He makes a report to Joe Paterno on Saturday, February 10th about something he sees on February 9th. As the grand jury testimony indicates, he meets with Curley and Schultz on that Sunday. Immediately there is a plan of action. They meet with the university legal counsel about suspected child abuse on a Sunday.

On Monday, before anybody's ever talked to the witness, Schultz formulates, in his notes, a plan of action. Nobody -- they haven't even talked to Mike McQueary yet.

I think it suggests something. The evidence is suggestive of the fact that they wanted this to go a certain way. And if that certain way was to keep out the police, the department of public welfare, children and youth and every other agency that could do a legitimate investigation into what Jerry Sandusky was doing, that's what they were going to do.

It is all 1aid out in those e-mails on
February 26th and 27 th.
In fact, Curley says he is uncomfortable with going to everyone but the person involved. I think I would be more comfortable meeting with the person and telling him about the information we received.

They feel responsibility to inform his organization. Spanier replies that the approach is acceptable to him, "Requires you to go a step forward, but I admire your willingness to do that. The only down side for us is if the message isn't heard and acted upon and we then become vulnerable for not having reported it. The approach you outiined is humane and a reasonable way to proceed."

That is a question for the jury.
Now, the issue about obstruction of justice and endangering the welfare of children, you saw the testimony in the grand jury transcript. It's clear. These guys were in charge of a large university that by their own admission in their grand jury testimony had thousands of children on their campus every year for camps, for all sorts of activities. And they take this position in 2001, where they are going to allow Jerry Sandusky to continue to have access to the university. By their own admission in grand jury testimony, specifically Mr. Curley, the directive he gave was unenforceable.

So they continue to obstruct justice by not reporting this when they have a duty to do so to law enforcement.

But that doesn't end it, because there was a
conspiracy of silence and they agreed to do this. All the way up through 2011, the record is replete with the fact that they are continuing to 1 ie, including under oath.

Why? Because they don't want to be exposed for not reporting this, for not protecting children and for avoiding the responsibilities that we all tragically know came to fruition.

Agent Sassano testified about the victims that were abused by Sandusky, some on Penn State's campus, some after. That endangerment was continuing and ongoing because after that statute was changed in 2007, more kids continue to be abused. They are not relieved of criminal responsibility because their conspiracy worked for 10 years. That's essentially what they are asking for.

They should be relieved of the criminal responsibility of endangering children; of obstructing justice?

The statute applies. We're asking the Court to hold all of the charges. It's clear that Spanier lied about material facts during the course of his testimony. It's clear that the three of them obstructed justice through 2001, all the way up until the present. And their course of conduct led them to
endanger the welfare of children, a role in which they had an overall supervisory role over the kids on this campus. Otherwise, it would be an enormous problem at Penn State.

For all of those reasons, ask that you hold all of the charges that are currently before you for court.

THE COURT: Thank you.
I would like to first off commend the attorneys that were with us, with me, the past two days for their professionalism shown; the respect for courtroom decorum. That means a lot to me as a sitting magisterial district judge.

I would also 1 ike to thank the Commonwealth.
It is a tragic day for Penn State University to say the least. But with respect to the charges against Dr. Spanier, Mr. Schultz and Mr. Curley, I am going to hold all the cases based upon a prima facie finding.

I will advise everyone in the courtroom, if you want to leave, you can leave. Obviously, the Defendants and their attorneys and the prosecution wil1 be required to stay. I have a 1 ittle paperwork that I've got to do.

Jonesie, if you want to adjourn.

Everyone if you want to go, go.
(The proceedings were concluded.)
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| ```46:15 professionalism [1] -68:11 professionals [1] -``` |  |  | 8:23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { S-a-s-s-a-n-o [1] - } \\ & \text { 5:16 } \\ & \text { sacrosanct }[1] \text { - } \\ & 31: 12 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $37: 14,54: 13$ | related [9]-6: | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 40: } \\ \mathbf{R} \end{array}$ |  |
| 54:4 <br> profile [1] - 64:2 <br> promised [1] - 60:8 <br> promotes [1] - 55:23 <br> propose [1]-40:6 <br> prosecute [1]-64:19 <br> prosecution [11] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 63:3, 63:8 } \\ & \text { RDR }[1]-70: 13 \\ & \text { re }[5]-11: 16,11: 19, \\ & 23: 23,23: 24,44: 6 \end{aligned}$ | 53:9, 57:6, 58:15, <br> 59:7 <br> relates [2]-7:20, 8:1 <br> relating [2] - 32:3, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 62:18 } \\ & \text { research [5] - 11:19, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 12,7: 17,8: 4,8: 7, \\ & 9: 6,9: 10,12: 12, \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  | $23: 23,24: 8,24: 25$, $25: 6$ | 17:5, 21:8, 26:8, |
|  | RE [1] - 11:19 read [5]-24:1 | relating [2] - 32:3, 55:17 relationship [3] - | ```25:6 respect [12] - 40:7, 43:18, 43:25, 50:9,``` | $32: 2,34: 6,34: 23$ <br> 44:3, 45:3, 45:8, 46:2, |
| 34:21, 42:23, 43:25, | 37:25, 55:25, 56:7, $57: 25$ | relatively [1]-30:21 | $\begin{aligned} & 50: 11,50: 13,60: 25, \\ & 61: 18,62: 4,62: 6, \end{aligned}$ | $46: 19,55: 3,58: 13,$ |
| 51:3, 51:13, $55: 13,68: 22$ | reading $[1]-24: 22$ <br> ready $[1]-5: 4$ | relaying [1]-31:23 <br> release [2]-42:12, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 68:11, 68:16 } \\ & \text { respond [2] - 44:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 61:5, 62:6, 62:7, } \\ & \text { 65:18, 66:18, 67:10 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{array}{r} 55: 13,6 \\ \text { prose } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { real }[1]-32: 20 \\ & \text { really }[10]-45: 19, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 61:13 } \\ & \text { relevance }[7] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | ```59:21 responding [1] - 60:22 response [2] - 20:7,``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sandusky's }[7] \text { - } \\ & \text { 13:3, } 32: 4,34: 2, \\ & 34: 18,34: 20,42: 18, \\ & 45: 11 \end{aligned}$ |
| protecting [1] - 67:6 | 47:2, 52:17, 53:21, 55:9, 55:12, 57:5, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:21, 18:12, 21:12, } \\ & 30: 17,30: 19,38: 5, \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 49:25 } \\ \text { proto } \end{gathered}$ | 63:5, 63:8 <br> reasonable [1] - 66:8 <br> reasons [2] - 14:8, | 42:14 <br> relevant [6] - 10:5, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 33:25 } \\ & \text { responsibilities [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | Sassano [12] - 3:2, <br> 5:6, 5:14, 13:12, <br> 18:16, 21:20, 33:20, |
| 28:13, | ```68:5 rebut [1] - 15:25 received [2]-55:7,``` | $18: 13,18: 14$ <br> relieved [2] - 67:14 | 67:7 responsibility [3] - | 38:4, 38:7, 43:11, $43: 24,67: 9$ |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { relieved }[2]-67: 14 \text {, } \\ & 67: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 66:1, } 67: 14,67: 18 \\ \text { responsible [1] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 43:24, 67:9 } \\ & \text { SASSANO [1] - 5:8 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $26:$ | recent ${ }_{[1]}$ - 8:2 recollection [5] - | remarkable [2] - $63: 8,65: 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58: 14 \\ & \text { rest }[1]-45: 17 \\ & \text { rests }[1]-39: 9 \\ & \text { result }[3]-6: 7,9: 14, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 65: 3 \\ \text { saved }[1]-42: 6 \end{array}$ |
|  | 12:20, 32:23, 36:20, |  |  | saw [10]-16:10 |
|  | $52: 5$ <br> recollections [2] - | 44:18 repeat [3]-11:18, | 9:15 retained [1] - 28:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:5, 17:11, 19:20, } \\ & 33: 12,34: 5,43: 12, \end{aligned}$ |
| finance/busine central [2]-11: | 51:19, 51:21 record [23] - 10:4, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 30:24, } 60: 13 \\ & \text { repeated }[1]-58: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { retirement }[4]- \\ \text { 12:23, 13:4, 32:4, } \end{gathered}$ | 66:11 scene [1] - 56:17 |
| 23:18 |  | repeatedly [2] - | 60:20 | SCHULTZ ${ }_{[1]}$ - 1:9 <br> Schultz [33] - 2:9, |
| 46 | 27:15, 27:17, 27:18, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 57:21, } 58: 7 \\ & \text { repetitive }[1]-52: 17 \end{aligned}$ | retrieved [1]-42:8 | 11:15, 11:21, 12:3, <br> 13:4, 19:21, 23:2, <br> 23:22, 23:24, 24:2 |
| 57.3, 65.16 | 32:13, 38:15, 38:17, | replete [2]-58:17 $67: 2$ | retrospect [1] - |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 57:3, } 65: 16 \\ & \text { pulled }[1]-61: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $43: 17,43: 18,47: 15$ | 67:2 replies [1] - 66:2 |  | 24:8, 24:10, 24:24, |
| -58 | 48:8, 50:19, 67:2 records [3] - 10:15, | report [26]-6 | return [1]-9:2 | 25:1, 25:19, 33:15, |
| purposes [1] |  | 6:16, 6:17, 6:19 | reveal [1] -6:15 | 42:16, 43:19, 48:19, 52:12, 60:15, 60:20, |
| pu | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 22:14, 27:3 } \\ & \text { recovered }[4] \text { - } \\ & 12: 10,12: 13,12: 16, \end{aligned}$ | 25:16, 25:23, 26:7, 26:17, 26:18, 27:8, 28:2, 28:10, 28:17, | revered [1] - 46:6 | $\begin{aligned} & 52: 12,60: 15,60: 20, \\ & 60: 25,61: 9,62: 1, \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12:10, 12:13, 12:16, } \\ & 12: 21 \end{aligned}$ |  | review [4] - 38:18, | 60:25, 61:9, 62:1, 62:3, 62:12, 62:24, |
| quarreling ${ }_{[1]}$ - 35:8 | $\mathrm{RECROSS}_{[1]}-3: 1$ | $50: 19,50: 21,55: 23$ | reviewed [1] - 57:11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 63:17, 63:19, 65:6, } \\ & \text { 65:10, 68:17 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $38:$ | redirect $[1]-39: 5$ | 62:11, 62:15, 62:22, | revisit [1] - 58:14 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Schultz' [6] - 12:11, } \\ \text { 32:16, 41:18, 42:7, } \end{gathered}$ |
| question | REDIRECT [1] - 3:1 <br> reference [10]-6:16, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 62:23, 62:25, 64:23, } \\ & 65: 3 \end{aligned}$ | revisited [1] - 58:10 ridiculous [1] - 64:11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 53:14, 61:21 } \\ & \text { Schultz's }[2]-41: 16, \end{aligned}$ |
| $35: 11,53: 12$ questions | $\begin{aligned} & 6: \\ & 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { reported }[4]-6: 13, \\ & 10: 24,28: 7,66: 7 \end{aligned}$ | Roberto [1] - 13:15 | 61:16 |
| 15:12, 20:7, 21:16 |  | Reporter [1] - 70:14 | ROBERTO [4]-2:5, | 18:15 |
| $\begin{gathered} 33: 17,33: 25,52: 8 \\ \text { quick [2] - 30:22, } \end{gathered}$ | referred $[3]-7: 7$, $8: 24,28: 12$ | $23: 23,66: 23,67: 6$ | 39:15, 52:10, $56: 4$ role [3]-62:6, 68:1, | screwed [1] - 40:20 <br> search [3] - 32:2, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 60:12 } \\ & \text { quickly [2] - 14:23, } \\ & \text { 14:24 } \\ & \text { quite [2] - } 37: 15 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | referring ${ }_{[1]}-15: 2$ <br> refresh [1] - 36:20 <br> refused [1]-56:18 <br> regard [1] - $8: 6$ | ```represent [2] - 13:14, 33:23 represented [1] - 10:1``` | room [1] - 34:6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 53:13, 54:13 } \\ & \text { second }[4]-25: 1, \\ & 44: 13,50: 6,64: 3 \end{aligned}$ |




