D-1

MR. WEBB: Your Honor, may I approach? It looks like the county's firewall might be getting in the way of me pulling up these videos. So I'm able to on my phone and show them the first one.

THE COURT: Okay.

BY MR. WEBB:

Q. You had referenced in one of the e-mails a TikTok link. If you just kind of describe what that is for the Court.

A. This is a TikTok link and it says at the top "There is no contract." And it is an e-mail that I sent to Mr. Thomas and it just says, "Regarding your request for a contract between the Montgomery County Coroner's Office and the Clinton County's Coroner's Office made on August 18th, there is no contract, therefore, I have no record to provide."

Q. And it's sort of repeating over and over again and posted on the Internet, correct?

A. Correct.

Q. And then another e-mail or I'm sorry, TikTok video that I just want to show you. We can play this.

MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, we were

told last time that if we bring in evidence on phones, you have to keep them. Will you be keeping his phone?

MR. WEBB: I'm not introducing them as evidence, I'm just asking questions.

THE COURT: Mr. Webb indicated that he's not admitting these documents into evidence. He's just showing them to ask her questions on them. So if you're admitting something into evidence, that's when I have to keep the phone.

MR. THOMAS: I understand.

BY MR. WEBB:

Q. All right. And what is concerning about you about this video?

A. So it says, "Regional crime lab is caught, what if it were your child? E-mail the Director." And then it has my e-mail address. And then it says, "Do they really work for us," below it. And then the initial photo is of our office.

Q. In addition, you're aware of videos that were posted of their trip to your office that particular day, correct?

A. Yes.

Q. Brooke, what is it you are

requesting that this Court order as a result of what you've presented here today?

A. I am requesting that the temporary order be made for five years.

Q. And that would protect you, your husband, and your children in that protection order?

A. Yes.

MR. WEBB: No further questions at this time, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, sir. Mr. Thomas, do you have any questions for this witness?

MR. THOMAS: I do.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. THOMAS:

Q. If I may, I would like to first read our First Amendment in the constitution. Reads, "Congress shall make no law respecting any establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech or the press or the right of the people to peaceably or assemble."

MR. WEBB: Objection.

MR. THOMAS: Excuse me, Your Honor.

D-2

THE COURT: Sir, I don't need you to read it. The document speaks for itself and it's been admitted into evidence. So I can read that in my review of this case.

MR. PETREY: Okay. Well, in that case could we review Exhibit -- Exhibit I. And this would be the Dayton police and this is -- this is one of the allegations she's saying where the Dayton police escorted us out of there. So this is the Dayton police.

THE COURT: So this would be Dayton police TikTok video?

MR. PETREY: Yes. And in this video notice that they denied me my 14th Amendment Constitutional Right when they deny us equal protection of law.

THE COURT: Any objection to playing --

MR. WEBB: I don't know what it is.

THE COURT: All right. We'll start playing it and you can raise an objection as we -- (playing video.) I'm sorry, sir.

MR. PETREY: This is after the one incident that we had with the -- Glen and the investigator. Because someone called me and the

phone cut out so then I had to start recording again. So it's the same day, 24th of February, 20 --

MR. WEBB: I would object. I understand it's the same day. I understand. Again, this is after the interaction with even anyone from her office more or less my client. This is them interacting apparently with the Dayton PD.

MR. PETREY: And this is when she's alleging that the Dayton -- Respondent removed from place of business by Dayton and here it is. They didn't remove me from place of business. They even admit in there that they don't have jurisdiction. So if they don't have jurisdiction then this should be stricken from the record. They admit in here that they do not have jurisdiction.

THE COURT: So it's your testimony that you were not trespassed from the property?

MR. PETREY: Yes, I was not trespassed from the property. And they cannot provide anything because we have spoke to the Dayton police and they're actually investigating her agency at this time. And it was not on our

behalf. It was -- it was -- if you look -- you can see where I'm trying to present -- I asked the Court to review this considering that it's put right here as one of the menacing --

THE COURT: One of her allegations in her petition?

MR. PETREY: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Webb, are you maintaining the objection as to this?

MR. WEBB: Yeah. I mean he's already testified that he was escorted out. We've seen the video where the gentlemen -- you're well aware of the trespass law that says I can trespass you from my house or business anytime I want. You've seen the video where they've said that. He's testified that he was escorted out.

MR. PETREY: I've never said I was escorted out.

MR. WEBB: You just said it.

MR. PETREY: No, I didn't.

MR. WEBB: Okay. Well, it's on the record. And so, in any event, this is an interaction with a Dayton police officer. I mean I really don't care if the Court wants to review this video too much. I just truly don't think

it's relevant. And we're going to sit here for another nine minutes.

THE COURT: I think that's -- he makes a fair point. I'm not sure where we're getting with this.

MR. PETREY: This is what she's using against us, though. And what I'm saying is this should not be used against us because if you watch it you'll see it's not -- they're not aggressively pushing us off.

THE COURT: So to be fair, yes, that is in her petition. However, there has been additional testimony today that is what needs to be rebutted. Not necessarily what's in the petition. So I'm going to sustain the objection because I just don't think this issue is relevant to what has been testified to today.

MR. PETREY: Okay. What about the TikTok videos? Now, he was able to show the TikTok video. Can we go ahead and review that?

THE COURT: Do you have a TikTok video you'd like to play?

MR. PETREY: Yes, I do. It's Exhibit I.

THE COURT: I think this is Exhibit

I.

MR. PETREY: Exhibit I? Then that would be even more relevance then if it was used to target of several TikToks. So I would hope to sustain on this.

THE COURT: I'm not going to play Exhibit I, so let's move on with your testimony.

MR. PETREY: Okay. So it all started out with Marvin Napier's case. And we went -- we went trying to find these records. Same thing, Clinton County telling us to call Montgomery County. We're getting the runaround. And, you know, the woman that her father was a disabled plaintiff. So I got in there and I helped her out because I see she was being -- taken advantage of and they were railroading her.

So I got in there and I helped her. She's got a lawsuit there, it's that big stack of papers there. It's in the appellate court. And it's against her agency right now for the death of Andy Napier. And I'd ask to be able to provide all of the documents that I have that you can review everything. Because, you know, our counterclaim is she's alleging that we're -- that we're menacing by stalking.