



Registry Matters Podcast

Episode 289

Recorded 1-13-24

Announcer 0:00

Registry Matters is an independent production. The opinions and ideas here are that of the host and do not reflect the opinions of any other organization. If you have problems with these thoughts, F Y P.

Andy 0:19

Recording live from FYP Studios, east and west, transmitting across the internet. This is Episode 289, almost your age, Larry! ...of Registry Matters. How are you this evening? Is it cold over there or what?

Larry 0:32

No, it warmed up today. It's a balmy fifty-two degrees.

Andy 0:36

Fifty-two! Holy crap. And have you taught your furnace a lesson yet?

Larry 0:41

It has not responded favorably so far.

Andy 0:43

(laughs) Make sure that you go over to YouTube and press Like and Subscribe and notification bell, leave a five-star review over on your favorite podcast app, iTunes, or whatever they call it these days. Wherever you want to, leaving a review would be fantastic, especially if it's a nice one. Anyway, so tell me what we're doing this evening.

Larry 1:04

Well, we have a special guest that practices law in the state of California, and elsewhere, possibly. The purpose of having this guest is for a segment we're going to be doing on what it's like when you talk to the police, and whether that works to your advantage or not. We've actually done this several times, even more recently, we've done episodes, but some people prefer to hear it from a lawyer. So we have one here. Some of our critics do not even approve of us telling people not to talk to the police. We also have a case from Alabama that was decided in our favor, from federal court in the Middle District of Alabama. And we're going to discuss that case in a little bit of detail. We have a listener question submitted and, I think that's about it. Because this "don't talk to the police" is probably going to take the biggest part of this episode. You've even got some audio clips you're gonna play, I think.

Andy 1:22

Even video ones. Wait! Can you just clarify, that you said something *positive* from Alabama? Well, I don't know if the Alabama population would think of it that way. I guess it is about perspective, huh?

Larry 2:11

But in terms of our movement, a case was won in U.S. District Court in Alabama and I don't know who appointed the judge. I

didn't do that research. I know that's your fixation, to know who appointed them. But I'm not sure which president appointed this judge.

Andy 2:27

I see. All right. Well, we really appreciate that you can join us this afternoon. This is Chance Oberstein. And for those of you who may not know him, he is a criminal attorney representing clients throughout California. Since starting his practice, he has handled hundreds of cases involving misdemeanor and felony crimes at the state and federal level. Today, his primary focus is sex crimes and post-conviction relief. Mr. Oberstein is highly trained in this complex area of the law and has had many years of experience negotiating with prosecutors, litigating in court, and obtaining exceptional case outcomes. He is also a former president of the Alliance for Constitutional Sexual Offense Laws (ACSOL) in California. Welcome to Registry Matters, Chance! How are you tonight?

Chance 3:10

I'm doing very well. Thank you for inviting me.

Andy 3:13

I appreciate it very much. So first out of the gate, we're going to talk about this situation of not talking to the police. Could you just kind of speak off the cuff, and give me just a quick overview of why you wouldn't want to talk to the police? Because they're there to help you, right? That's what my kid has been taught. Is the police are there to help you.

Chance 3:35

They're definitely there to help you, all right. Let me give you six reasons why you should not talk to the police. And, you know, we'll start at number one.

Andy 3:46

Okay.

Chance 3:46

NUMBER ONE: Talking to the police never helps you. No matter how comfortable they may make you feel, or how intelligent you think you are, denying the offense or trying to be of some help will only hurt you. For example, showing the police where your acquaintance hid his stash before he exited your house to talk to the police about a stolen vehicle he arrived in. What do you think's going to happen?

Andy 4:09

And I do know that, in prison, snitches get stitches. So you don't want to snitch.

Chance 4:17

Yeah, that doesn't go for what happens outside of those prison gates.

Andy 4:22
(laughs) Please continue!

Chance 4:25
Okay, so NUMBER TWO: Even if you think you're guilty, you should never talk to the police. A confession is never a good idea. Retain an attorney and let them handle it. They may be able to substantially diminish your liability or get rid of it altogether. For example, in a he-said/she-said situation, an attorney might point out the lack of forensic or corroborating evidence that you may be unaware of at the time.

Andy 4:51
Just continue from there. I could come up with snarky things to say.

Chance 4:30
Okay, good. Absent the Snark, let's move on to reason NUMBER THREE: Even if you're innocent, getting caught up in small lies to help yourself will destroy your credibility. Most people, and I *mean* most people, are totally rattled when talking to the police and tend to embellish a little by telling little white lies to distance themselves from the alleged crime. These inconsistencies can destroy your credibility, and put you at risk of being processed into the criminal justice system, anyways. And, as we all know, you know, it is the processing that's the punishment.

Andy 5:15
Hey, so Larry, do you remember -- god, was it a year ago, a year and a half ago? -- that we did that whole thing with the law professor?

Larry 5:35
I do. We played a college professor lecturing classes about not speaking to the police.

Andy 5:44
But one of the things, he wove this intricate story about somebody embellishing this tiny little piece of the story and how then the police just turned that all the way up, they just ramped that all the way up into a big accelerant to apply a lot of pressure to you, to get you to admit to, potentially, something that you didn't do.

Larry 6:02
Well, Chance. I have a question here. I hear this all the time. If you don't have anything to hide, why would you not talk to the police? I mean, I've got nothing to hide!

Chance 6:14
Well, because the police may cherry-pick your statement. You know, they might include things that you didn't say, or leave out things you did say, in their final report, because they do not always recall your statement with 100% accuracy. That depends on their motivation and personal bias with regard to you, your background, and what's happened. Their report is

then submitted to a DA for review and filing. The bottom line is, you might find yourself charged based on the officer's *interpretation* of what you said, rather than the truth of your statement. And that's your answer, Larry.

Andy 6:49
Wait, so does your attorney help protect you from that?

Chance 6:56
Well, if you remain silent, yeah! Then your attorney takes control, and whatever information is exchanged is filtered through somebody who has the experience to counsel you, and appropriately advocate on your behalf.

Andy 7:16
Because the way that I'm thinking about it, you don't have access, necessarily, to the recordings that they're making in this interrogation room. So your attorney would be at least somebody in your corner that can help recall what you did or did not say.

Chance 7:33
Well always, always! If you say it to begin with, then you're married to whatever you say. And you know, what do you do, then? I mean, then you're "stuck like Chuck" with what you have!

Andy 7:56
(laughs) Sure, sure.

Larry 7:46
Let me launch into this a little bit deeper, Chance. Okay, so my observation from twenty-plus years of experience (that doesn't seem to count for anything) there are people who do not know the elements of a crime, and that's what the lawyer either knows, or will research, for you. Florida, for example, unless it's been declared unconstitutional, has a strict liability drug possession statute, meaning that if it's in your vehicle, your teenage son, or your nephew, or somebody could have thrown it in your vehicle. Well, the adult has no thought about it, because they didn't know it was there, theoretically, and they get an investigation from the police. And the person is like your son, who believes that the police are there to help and they just want to clear it up. And the person admits to the police, it's their car. And yes, they've owned the car consistently for some period of time. And no, they didn't lend it to anyone else. And all of a sudden, the police have got you. You've admitted to a strict liability offense, meaning that just simply that you had possession. Even without knowledge of your possession, you've committed that crime in the state of Florida. Well, if you didn't mention anything to the police about owning the car, yes, they would possibly figure out it was registered in your name. But they wouldn't have your admission that you're the only one that had driven it for the last six months. They wouldn't have all these things that you would think are innocuous, because you don't know that Florida has a strict liability offense that could put you in prison.

Andy 9:05

Can one of you explain "strict liability", please?

Larry 9:15

I'll let Chance explain it. I'm not qualified.

Andy 9:17

(laughs)

Chance 9:18

Well, strict liability is that there is no defensible position. You know, if it is what it is, you're liable for it. But as Larry points out, and it's very true, most of the time you help make the case when you make the statement. The statement itself is made with unpredictable consequences because you really don't understand essentially, what the elements of the charge are, or what the officers are looking for, because often it's *hidden* in between the questions they're asking you. And so, you know, in this case, it's dominion and control of all things within that space. And you know, by not making a statement, it makes that an issue of itself, and therefore something that can be handled by your attorney, rather than you making that statement, and being liable strictly for that offense.

Larry 10:17

Chance, what would happen in that scenario, let's play a little bit further. Suppose grandma did not know that the car had been utilized. Maybe she had her grandson house-sit for her and she didn't know that he had figured out where the keys were, and he'd been using the car for some period of time, unbeknownst to her while he was house-sitting. She wouldn't have known the contraband was in the car. And she's already told the police that no one has driven that car but her!

Chance 10:45

That's correct. And if he left the gun under the floor mat, in the corner of the car, that wouldn't bode well either, would it?

Larry 10:54

So her credibility has already sunk, in the eyes of the court system, not necessarily, per se. But with the law enforcement, once you go down that path, they say, "Well, wait a minute, wait a minute. Now we got a problem with what you said here", and then you're trying to backpedal, dig yourself out of the mess you made by talking to the police. And somehow or another, people don't connect those dots. But anyway, I didn't mean to steal your segment. Go ahead.

Chance 11:18

No, you didn't. You actually improved it, and I think this is a good discussion. Well, let's move on to NUMBER FIVE, because I think it's part and parcel with what we're saying: Police lack authority to negotiate a better deal for you or obtain leniency for your cooperation. And often they'll *say* that, but they lack total authority to do that. They are perfectly comfortable lying to you to get what they're looking for. They may promise

you the moon, but they'll never deliver it, because they simply can't. However, they look upon these efforts as a very valuable investigative technique, which will leave them in a position to clear the case, at your expense.

Larry 11:56

And Chance, explain what "clear the case" means because when I tell people, "The officers are trying to clear cases", that is apparently some complicated mumbo-jumbo. Clear the case means what?

Chance 12:10

Clear the case just means close it up. It's done. No more investigation. We've found what we were looking for, and we move into the next position, which is prosecution. We've closed our investigation, we're done. That's what "clearing the case" is.

Larry 12:27

Okay, now I'm gonna get on the political side of this, because, again, this is your segment but, on the political side of this, for the voters out there who pay the taxes to support law enforcement, clearance rates are very important from a political angle. If your police department is taking too long, and you're only solving 37% of serious crimes, then that police chief, and that city council, and that Mayor, are going to be under intense scrutiny. So folks, there are political pressures in play to solve and close cases because the police can wash their hands of it and they can say, "Well we can't help it that the court's all clogged up, that the DA's not prosecuting these cases. But we've cleared and solved 84% of our serious crimes." If they were trying to be the buddy-buddy to you, and get the best possible outcome for you, they would leave cases open until they have more information. But they're pushing closure, because that is a political agenda that's in play for law enforcement. Okay, sorry about that. Let's keep going.

Chance 13:28

No, that's correct Larry. And it's not just political, it runs into dollars, and it runs into efficiency. You know, it's making the agency look good, it's good for their overall budget, and asking for more money. There's a lot of reasons why there's pressure to close the case. And if they can do it on your dime then, you know, you're the one holding the bag. So last, but not least, NUMBER SIX: Your statements can and will be used against you. One mistake can cost you your freedom. Even an innocent statement can conflict with what other witnesses might say, as Larry's already mentioned. And that may cast doubt on your innocence, or be used to attack or destroy your testimony at trial. Always assert your right to remain silent. Don't talk to police. There's no downside to remaining silent. Let me repeat that: There's no downside to remaining silent. The better choice is to let an experienced counsel advise you appropriately, and advocate on your behalf.

Andy 14:32

Is that true, though? I feel that if you decline to speak, they're going to assume that you're guilty, if you're not willing to just openly talk.

Chance 14:49

No can do. Your right to remain silent's a right, a constitutional right. And better to stand on that constitutional right, than to dig a big hole for yourself so that everybody can shovel dirt on you.

Andy 15:00

(laughs) Larry, can you think of a way that, when we move over to your side, that we can interweave these video clips in?

Larry 15:08

Sure, since I have a few more points than Chance had, we can stop. But when you posed that question, I would like to respond to it as well. The police may believe you did it, but it's not what the police believe that matters. It's what can be proven beyond a reasonable doubt that matters. The police can say, "Well, we know you did it." And you can say, "Well, that's nice. Do you think you can prove it?" But everybody says, "Well, the police know you did it." That's okay that they know in their mind that you did it. But they've got to be able to convince twelve (in most jurisdictions) beyond a reasonable doubt, that you did it. And the only thing you can do with the police by talking is help them get to that end-game of being able to force you into a plea, or you're going to get convicted because of your own confession. And I would say, from my experience, again, which over my entire lifetime, I've dealt with police on both sides. A good police agency will stop the interrogation when you invoke your right to remain silent. I saw a high-profile case in Colorado back in the early 80s, where the guy's name was "Tattoo Bob" Landry. And they had done a murder, and they had fled Boulder to Florida. And the Boulder detectives went to Florida, they tracked down Landry and his cohort, I think named Cerezo, Debbie Cerezo. They tracked them down to Florida. But the Boulder detectives immediately wanted to discontinue interrogation. But the Florida people said, "No, we know what we're doing here." So when they get back to Colorado, because the suspects had asserted their right to remain silent, Judge Neighbors, a Boulder District Judge, declined to allow those confessions and anything that they were able to assemble from that, to be used. They were still convicted anyway. But that's the type of thing that can happen. Good police agencies will stop when you tell them that you don't want to talk.

Andy 17:15

The only time (we see this in movies and TV shows, Larry) the only time the person says "I know my rights, and I plead the fifth" is when you're looking at the guy that is guilty, and the police are trying to do everything that they can to catch the person that we know (because we can see everything because we're watching the show) but we know that the person is guilty. The innocent person never, ever asserts their right to remain silent.

Larry 17:37

That's in the movies, but that's not in real life. You may be guilty of something, but the attorney needs to look at the elements of each charge the police level at you, because oftentimes the elements have not been met. And it tickles me to death when the media will make a comment, "and the person was arraigned today in their first appearance" or the arraignment or whatever they call it, "and they pled not guilty." That's all you *can* do at your first appearance, because a good judge, in any jurisdiction in this country (with exception of possibly Alabama) is not going to accept an uncounseled guilty plea on a serious felony charge that has life-altering consequences! So that's the only plea you can enter is "not guilty". And even if you could enter an uncounseled guilty plea, you'd be a moron to do it because you would not know if those elements could have been met. Even with all the evidence they have, they still may have charged you with something that, on the face of the statute, you just would not be able to be convicted. And we would file a motion here under Foulent (https://law.justia.com/cases/new-mexico/court-of-appeals/1995/15787-2.html) that's the name of the case. We would say "Yes, my client did everything that that was alleged. But unfortunately, it doesn't meet the elements of any crime. So yes, everything that you see in this complaint facially is correct. But there's no crime committed." So the police will overcharge you, the DA's will overcharge you. There's no way that it's responsible to even contemplate a guilty plea without being counseled. But I hear that all the time. I mean, Chance, haven't you heard a thousand times in your life, "and they made their first appearance today, and they pled not guilty"?

Chance 19:14

Yeah, I hear it all the time. And you know, my comment to that is this: You want to help assist your counsel in your defense, but you certainly don't want to help the prosecution. So I think remaining silent goes a long, long way in accomplishing both objectives.

Larry 19:33

Well, I think on my side I can skip my TRICK #1 because we've already hammered that quite a bit. The police are not there to help you. So that one was "I can't help you if you don't talk to me." The police are not there to help you, and we've already covered that. I like the one on TRICK #2: They want you to "come down to the station. I just want to talk to you and hear your side of the story." This is never going to go the way you think. Because, once you're in the station, you're in a custodial interrogation. Although they might tell you, "You're free to go," and they may very well say, "This is a voluntary thing." The officer is a professional interrogator. You're dealing with detectives that are trained, and they're comfortable in their own backyard. There's all kinds of buzzers and doors you're going to have to get out, if you're at the police station, and once you get to the station, they're never going to let you just tell your side of the story. They're going to hit you with questions that they want yes-or-no answers to, and you'll

begin to realize that you're actually being asked questions where they already have certain answers they're looking for. I mean, that's the way it goes. And you're not free to leave. But yet, they will tell you that you are. Try leaving a police station and tell me, when you're in an interrogation room, how well that goes for you.

Andy 20:48

I'm trying to not be in one, to even come up and tell you anything, Larry.

Larry 20:52

So I mean, Chance, do you have any observation on Trick #2 "Come down to the station"?

Andy 20:51

Well, you know, that's just not a good invitation at all. And it also is license for them to lie in order to get what they're looking for. And so yeah, no, I'd say "No, thanks" to that one.

Larry 21:09

Okay, then (TRICK #3) they'll tell you, "We're off the record." And in this modern age that we live in, you can rest assured that everything is being recorded. Now they may, in some departments, have the capacity to turn on and off the body cam, but you're being recorded. And so when you're dealing with the police, even if you're not being recorded, they're going to tell their side of the story, and their side of the story may not match what you actually said. And so there's no "off the record". You can't have an off-the-record discussion with police. So, junk that idea. So Andy, do you have a clip or two you want to play so we can set up why we're going down this path, because we have this lovely situation that developed for a young lady who talked herself into handcuffs.

Andy 21:57

(laughs) Well sure. Let's start with the first encounter. And so this is a young woman who gets pulled over because, they say (no idea if that's true or not), but the car had been reported ...stolen? And let's just dive in. This first one, a couple of them are like thirty seconds, but the other ones are just ten and fifteen seconds long. But this one, just to set up the situation:

Officer Hanton 22:21

Hello!

Woman 22:21

Hi!

Officer Hanton 22:21

I stopped you because the car is coming back as an abandoned vehicle.

Woman 22:25

Oh! Really?

Officer Hanton 22:26

Yes. Who's car is it?

Woman 22:28

Oh, it's my dad's car, but...

Officer Hanton 22:30

Did he have it towed, in like Miami?

Woman 22:32

It was towed in Miami. I had it towed in Miami and we had to get it back.

Officer Hanton 22:37

So you were driving it in Miami?

Woman 22:39

Yes. And he knows. He had to get the whole thing notarized.

Officer Hanton 22:44

Um, I gotta confirm it with Miami because, when a car gets towed and the owner is not present, they usually enter it as an abandoned vehicle.

Woman 22:53

Oh, really?

Officer Hanton 22:54

Yes.

Woman 22:54

Okay.

Officer Hanton 22:55

It's going into the system so, if a cop runs your tag, it's gonna pop up as abandoned.

Woman 22:59

Oh, wow. Okay, I got towed like, a month ago, so I'm surprised this is the first time.

Officer Hanton 23:04

Yeah. Alright, well, I'm gonna have them confirm it, and get that taken outta the system and, I'll be right back.

Woman 23:09

Okay.

Andy 23:12

The only way that they would have known that, is if they didn't have the license plate readers.

Larry 23:18

What do you mean by that, the only way they would have known that?

Andy 23:21
They're not just running every license plate that goes down the road. They pulled her over because one of their license plate readers triggered them to pull her over and interrogate because, like I said, the license plate reader flagged that car as having been abandoned.

Larry 23:35
Okay, I didn't snap to that, good point.

Andy 23:39
And so the next clip that I have kind of fits with some of the things that have been said, that you just shouldn't talk to them. But the second clip is, the second officer shows up and she's very, very, very friendly with her:

Second Officer 23:54
Hi! What's going on?

Woman 24:00
Not much.

Second Officer 24:01
Not much?

Woman 24:01
No.

Second Officer 24:01
Okay.

Woman 24:02
Just driving home.

Second Officer 24:03
Oh, yeah? Alright. I'm just her backup, so we're seeing what's going on. So what happened? So where was this car?

Woman 24:13
I was in Miami, and I went down to get a tattoo, and I parked in front of a fire hydrant and didn't realize ...

Second Officer 24:19
Oh, you don't want to mess with the boys.

Woman 24:22
Yeah and within five minutes of being there, it was towed.

Second Officer 24:26
So we're just gonna sit here and wait a little bit.

Woman 24:29
Ok.

Andy 24:31
So she got chummy-chummy with her. She's like, "Hey, what's going on?" You're both saying that like, already? She should say, "I'm not talking to you"?

Larry 24:46
I'm gonna punt on that until Chance responds.

Andy 24:46
(laughs)

Chance 24:46
Okay, all right. I'm gonna say okay, yes. You know, brevity is everything. If it's a common question that has nothing to do with the situation, the best thing to do is to be brief. Use "Yes", "No", "Thank you". Do not talk. Do not talk about anything. Do not allow the police to ingratiate themselves. Do not bond with them. They're not your friend. They're not interested in you. They're interested in getting down to what they're looking for. So brevity is everything, short answers rule. And best of all, you know, try to be as quiet as possible.

Larry 25:23
I would expand on that, Chance. I would say that I always try to direct back to the reason for the stop. So I would try my best, in a polite way, to get back to the purpose of the stop. "It's an abandoned car. Okay, we've addressed that. It's not abandoned. What do we need to do next to get me back on my way?" And you keep redirecting.

Andy 25:48
Isn't that kind of being an asshole though?

Chance 25:51
No, not really. It is a technique. And, you know, some people favor that. If it's already been expressed, and we already know the purpose of the stop, I think that is a good way of doing it. There's other techniques. I mean, the best way to do it is, "What else? What else do you need? And if not, I'll just wait." And there are going to be commands, and things to do, and there's going to be questions as to reasonableness. Again, brevity is everything, and redirecting is fine. But I think that you want to stay as close to quiet as you can.

Andy 26:34
I'm just trying to think in that "Hey, what's going on?" Well, I guess she could just say, "Well, the other officer says that the car was reported abandoned? And that's why I was pulled over." And that would be the end? Because that's all she knows, I guess, at this point?

Chance 26:52
Yes.

Larry 26:53
Well, the "what's going on" is they're wanting her to give them information to justify additional questions.

Andy 27:01
Okay, which she does do!

Larry 27:01
But they're presenting it like they're friends because it's so collegial and so I prefer the redirect because I consider myself a legal professional, and I'm going to redirect them to the point of the stop and say, "You know, I'd like to get this stop over with. Is there anything else you need from me?" And, you know, at that point, when they try to redirect me, because they're gonna do the same thing, they're gonna say, "Well, but just where were you coming from?" And I'm gonna say, "I'm not sure that has anything to do with this. You pulled me over because my taillight's out. Do you intend to write me a citation?" So I've redirected them from "Where were you coming from?" to "My taillight was out. That's the reason why you stopped me." They may give me a citation. But that's what I tend to keep doing. And I don't get pulled over very often, but I redirect them back to the purpose for the stop. And now sometimes they haven't told you the purpose of stop. And then the only thing, if I'm gonna say anything, is, "Why did you pull me over, officer?" "We'll get to that". "Well, we need to get to it pretty fast because you've pulled me over, and you've intruded on my day. So what was the reason for this engagement?"

Andy 28:04
How long could they reasonably keep you on the side of the road?

Chance 28:10
Well, that's a good question. Not that long. If they're just detaining you, it's got to be short. And Larry comes from a sophisticated point of view because he understands things in a professional and experienced way, but most folks don't. And so, rather than try to beat them at their own game, because each person has an objective. This is why I always say "Brevity is everything". The less you say, the better it is. You don't want to direct them to areas that they can exploit. You just want to sit quietly and answer only if you're compelled to answer, and it doesn't reasonably relate to anything that's going to incriminate you. Which means yes, no, that type of thing, "I'll wait." And "Is this your car?" "Uh, Yes."

Announcer 29:12
Are you a first-time listener of Registry Matters? Well then make us a part of your daily routine and subscribe today. Just search for "Registry Matters" through your favorite podcast app, hit the subscribe button, and you're off to the races. You can now enjoy hours of sarcasm and snark from Andy and Larry on a weekly basis. Oh, and there's some excellent information thrown in there too. Subscribing also encourages others of You People to get on the bandwagon and become regular Registry Matters listeners. So what are you waiting for? Subscribe to Registry Matters right now. Help us keep fighting, and continue to say F Y P.

Larry 30:03
Well, I can go on with TRICK #4

Andy 30:06
That'll be fine.

Larry 30:07
Okay, so another thing that the police do, to make you believe they're your friend is "I will personally speak to the judge" (and Chance has already dealt with this a little bit) "and the prosecutor, if you cooperate with me." That's generally a total fabrication, you know. They seldom speak to the judge. I fell for it when I was a teenager when I got my first traffic citation. The officer wanted me to go ahead and sign the penalty assessment, and I was wanting to not receive the points on my driver's license. And the officer said, "Oh, well if that's your only concern, I will speak to the judge." Well, I'm in Municipal Court in Riverdale, Georgia and I'm thinking, "Well, I can trust this guy. I've been taught to respect the police, you know. They're our friends and he said he would speak to the judge." I didn't know that it's not really all that proper for the officer to speak to the judge, unless he was putting on testimony. So I say, "Oh, well, he's gonna get me where I'll just get a slap on the wrist. And maybe I'll pay a fine, but I won't get points." Well, he had not talked to the judge. And he didn't have the capacity to talk to judges, which was explained to me later. So, when they tell you this, that they're going to go easy on you, and that they're going to put in a good word for you... Now we've got many years of law experience here, Chance, how often has a police officer spoken to the judge, or the prosecutor, that's resulted in a more lenient outcome in your professional career?

Chance 31:35
Oh, let's see ... this is thirty years later, uh ... ZERO!

Larry 31:43
(laughs) Okay, so folks, when they tell you that they're going to talk to the judge or the prosecutor, do not believe it. And TRICK #5 is they lie profusely. And the Supreme Court has upheld their right to lie, decades ago (and I couldn't remember the case, but Chance so graciously either knew it or looked it up for me last night). So tell us about that case, Chance. What does the Supreme Court say that the police can do?

Chance 32:09
Well, the key rulings I cited were *Frazier vs. Cupp*, which is a 1969 case, and *Oregon vs. Mathiason* which is 1977. Basically, the Supreme Court says "that doesn't affect the overall outcome of anything." In other words, these methods that they use, even though they commonly produce false confessions and all kinds of things, are okay. They're just their "investigative techniques". And so that gives license to them to lie profusely in order to get to clearing the case.

Larry 32:46
So another TRICK #6 that they'll do is they say, "We already know what happened", and that ties into "You should talk to

us." If they truly already knew what happened, they would not need to talk to you. When they're telling you, "We already know what happened," and they're still wanting to talk to you, they may have a theory that they've put together in their head about what *may* have happened, and the puzzle may look like it fits together, based on what they see. But they really need you to talk to them, to confirm their theory. And when you talk to them, and you confirm their case theory, you've just shot yourself in the foot! So, Andy let me know when you've got that tape ready, and we can play those clips.

Andy 33:30

I hope so. We'll try. Alright, so here would be clip three. I think it's gonna work:

Second Officer 33:37

I just didn't want you to be like, nervous.

Woman 33:39

Oh, no. I'm okay.

Second Officer 33:41

Ok I have people that cry all the time.

Woman 33:47

I was speeding, so.

Second Officer 33:47

Oh, ok.

Andy 33:52

And then I just need to move right into this, because we already started kind of moving down this path. If you don't keep your mouth shut, then you start revealing secrets about what, like they may be able to surfboard their way in, and completely trash you. So here's where things go south. So for those listening, she starts kind of noodling around in her purse a little bit, and the officer notices it. And from there, she's going to ask if she can search her car. So let's try this again. So she starts kind of futzing around in her purse. There's text on the screen telling us that she's moving her purse out of the officer's line of sight.

Second Officer 34:39

I'm gonna ask you a question alright? Mind if I search the car?

Andy 34:44

And so she asked if she could search the car! She's like, "Sure, no problem" and then the girl gets out of the car.

Larry 34:49

Okay, Chance. Tell people what they should say, specifically, when they say "Do you mind if I searched the car?"

Chance 34:56

Yeah, I think the answer is clearly: no. No, thank you. And I know a lot of people say "Get a warrant," but that's kind of confrontational. It's just "No, thank you." And remember, in

this particular clip, the officer already has her face in the window and everything you do and say is in plain view, plain smell, and everything else. The officer has a right to be where they're at. Okay, so you have to take that in consideration, as you speak and as you move. The answer clearly is "No, thank you."

Andy 35:31

Like, just say, "No, thank you"? "Pound sand. Have a nice day"??

Chance 35:35

No, the answer is No. "No, I do not consent to a search." It's very easy. Or just "No." And I like the clearer, more definitive "No," because they're asking you for consent, and you're not going to give your consent. So the answer's no.

Andy 35:56

Doesn't that then unleash The Dogs of Hell on you? of them getting search dogs and SWAT teams?

Chance 36:02

Well, it may or may not, depending on what they hear, what they see, and what they smell at that window. But one thing's for sure: if they don't have enough to go on, it precludes the search. And you got to kind of roll the dice on that because if you start to do things other than that, in other words, if you consent, hey, the whole car is game, including the trunk. So no, the answer is no. And, you know, they may bear down on you, they may try to intimidate you, they may do a hundred different things. But the best thing you can do for yourself is just say no, and be quiet.

Andy 36:38

You were gonna say, Larry? I'm sorry. I don't mean to interrupt you.

Larry 36:39

Oh, it's okay. Well, this has the potential to escalate, as Chance said. They will tell you these things like, "Well we're going to call the canine" and now, as a legal professional, I'm going to say well, "I hope you at least have reasonable articulable suspicion to do that." Now, I would not advise you to do that, folks. Listen carefully: I'm telling you, this is what *I* would do, because I know what I'm doing. And I would say, "Well, I hope you can articulate some suspicion for doing that that's reasonable." But once you say, "Yes, you go ahead," she set herself up for a world of hurt that comes crashing down on her. You want to go to the next clip, or you want me to go to my next point?

Andy 37:22

Let's see. So they start asking her questions. The thing that they ask her is, if she has a medical marijuana card. Can you weave what you're gonna say in with that?

Larry 37:31

No, go ahead.

Andy 37:32
Okay:

Officer Hanton 37:35
Do you have a medical marijuana card?

Woman 37:37
I do not.

Officer Hanton 37:37
No? Do you ever smoke weed?

Woman 37:39
I have.

Officer Hanton 37:40
When was the last time you smoked weed?

Woman 37:42
Um, I smoked yesterday.

Officer Hanton 37:43
You did? You don't use it in your vape do you?

Woman 37:48
No I don't.

Andy 37:48
(laughs) When's the last time you smoked?

Chance 37:53
Oh my god!

Andy 37:53
Yesterday! (laughs)

Larry 37:54
So, when you tell a police officer you smoked weed yesterday, it would be a reasonable proposition for the officer to think "Well, maybe if they smoked it yesterday, they just might be in possession of some!" I mean, you've just given them some reasonable articulable suspicion that you might be carrying contraband. So big screw up, girl! Big screw up. Like, okay, so now they're getting somewhere and it only goes downhill from here.

Andy 38:27
It does. This one is super quick:

Second Officer 38:29
Has she been read anything or no?

Officer Hanton 38:31
No.

Andy 38:34
What is she going to be read? Nobody, nobody?

Chance 38:38
Well, her Miranda rights of course.

Andy 38:42
Yes. Her Miranda rights. That seems like that's going, like, nuclear.

Chance 38:51
Oh, yeah.

Larry 38:52
Okay, you have another one?

Andy 38:53
I do. I have thirteen, total. We're approaching number seven.

Larry 38:58
Okay.

Andy 38:59
And so this will be number seven:

Woman 39:02
I do have a weed pen.

Officer Hanton 39:05
You have a weed pen?

Andy 39:08
So she said she has a weed pen in the car.

Larry 39:11
She's digging the hole very deep here.

Andy 39:15
And then and then this is, I think, where everything goes really off the rails:

Officer Hanton 39:19
Yeah, she says she has a Marijuana pen in there.

Woman 39:23
And a fake ID.

Officer Hanton 39:25
And you have a fake ID??

Andy 39:26
(laughs)

Chance 39:29
How fun, How fun!

Larry 39:31
Now, for the audience to understand, she told them that they could search. Now her purse was in the car. And they found

the fake IDs, which I'm assuming is at least a high misdemeanor or felony in Florida.

Andy 39:46
They said it's a felony.

Larry 39:47
So now she's got fake IDs that she gave them permission to find. And she's got admission that she uses dope. And a strong probability they're going to find dope in the car. So what do you think they're going to do next, say, "Well you've been kind of cooperative. We think we'll let you go now"?

Andy 40:08
Or, she is hoping that before they search, that they somehow magically disappear.

Larry 40:12
Where would they go?

Andy 40:13
I don't know. But that's what people think is like, (whispers) "Maybe they won't find them. Please, don't find them."

Chance 40:23
Maybe she was thinking, "Well, you know what? They like me. They like me because I've cooperated. And, you know what? They're gonna use their discretion to say, 'Ah, you know, we could do this, but we're not. You know, we'll just keep these things and you be on your way.'" But that's just not gonna happen.

Andy 40:41
There were other parts that I clipped out where they were asking her about her nails, and she has like some eyelash brushes, and all this stuff. They were being totally like -- forgive me for the way this is gonna sound -- but they were being like girly-girly with her. You know, they were going to start swapping makeup secrets, perhaps. Alright, so she admitted to those things. And this is more fun:

Officer Hanton 41:02
Oh you had these made up.

Woman 41:06
They were ordered.

Officer Hanton 41:08
You had them made up.

Woman 41:09
Um, not me personally.

Officer Hanton 41:11
What do you mean, "not me personally"

Woman 41:10
Um, my friend did.

Officer Hanton 41:14
Did you ask your friend to? People don't usually just....

Woman 41:20
No, I know. Yeah, Okay. Like I was just saying I didn't physically make them.

Officer Hanton 41:25
You went there and asked for them. You got three of them? Any more?

Woman 41:29
No, there's just only those three.

Andy 41:33
She held the line! "There's only those three." She held the line.

Larry 41:37
(laughs) Alrighty. So....

Andy 41:42
Then, the next one is they're going to ask about testing the vape pen:

Second Officer 41:50
You have a test thing?

Officer Hanton 41:50
Yeah I do.

Andy 41:55
Then, I'm gonna do this one first. It's chronologically out of order:

Second Officer 42:01
(putting the vape pen in a test baggie) Where did you get it from?

Woman 42:05
Um. One of my friends.

Officer Hanton 42:10
Ordered? Your friend bought it for you?

Woman 42:12
Uh yes. I don't know.

Officer Hanton 42:13
Sounds like your friends do a lot for you.

Woman 42:15
Yeah.

Officer Hanton 42:16
They probably didn't ... I know. It's hot. (shakes baggie, shows it to second officer) It's already purple. So yeah, it's positive.

Andy 42:33

You dope experts out there know what purple means. I'm assuming it's instantly like super-potent strong, whatever. It's testing positive or whatever.

Larry 42:40

I want to get her to the handcuffs because that's where this totally ends up at.

Andy 42:50

Yeah, that's just a couple away.

Chance 42:52

One thing, Andy, which sticks out at me, is that she's trying to help herself. She's misunderstanding the process, which most people do, because they get rattled. And she's thinking that, you know, if she uses the "some other dude did it" defense, and she's just holding, she's gonna wiggle out of this thing! And this is what we were talking about. This is how you start to dig, and dig deep.

Larry 43:17

I completely agree. Alright, so this rolls back, just like ten or twenty seconds of time. And anyway:

Second Officer 43:24

So what was the deal with those?

Woman 43:28

They were in my purse.

Second Officer 43:30

Yeah I get the obvious. But what's the, I guess? What's the ... like, what are they for?

Woman 43:37

Um I don't know. I have them. My friends got them. We're all in college. And they want me to come with them ... in college.

Second Officer 43:47

How old are you?

Woman 43:47

I'm twenty. I'm gonna be twenty-one in six months, five months.

Andy 43:51

(laughs) Not relevant. And then, yeah, okay. So this is the finale:

Officer Hanton 44:02

Um, let me see your phone? It's a felony to be in possession of fraudulent driver's licenses and the marijuana vape pen, okay? So, unfortunately, I do have to place you under arrest.

Woman 44:17

(starts crying)

Second Officer 44:17

(slaps the cuffs on)

Andy 44:22

And I don't want to like drag her through the mud that bad. We are not laughing at you. I apologize for all of this. It's just, it's an example being used. But, they put her in handcuffs. Can I tell you the conclusion though, Larry? I don't know if you watched that far into the video that she got released and she had like seventy-five hours of community service, and I think they dropped it down. And she just had to do that part.

Larry 44:50

So, well. It's a tragedy. I'm going to skip a couple of my "tips and tricks" that police use. TRICK #9: "We can get a search warrant in a few minutes" They very well may be able to get a search warrant, but they may not be able to. But what it does, is it puts them in a more difficult position. Because they've got to be right. When they intrude on a prosecutor and they call, and say, "I got this twenty-year-old college student. Here are the facts." And they dictate 'em -- I'm sure they do the same thing in California -- they dictate what they've got, and the prosecutor will say, "Yes, there's enough here. I'll sign this warrant." But they may or may not be able to get the warrant. So the right answer is, "Well, I know you've got a job to do, and I can understand that. And I'll just patiently wait. But no, I'm not going to consent to search. And you'll just have to go forward with your probable cause, and try to get the warrant." I mean, you might not want to put it in quite that legalese, but you just tell them "No, sorry. I'm still not going to consent." And Chance, do you have any problem with that, before we move on?

Chance 45:50

No, I think that's just absolutely the correct way to respond.

Larry 45:55

And I'll say that, in closing, for my part of this, you really create real problems for your attorney when you talk to the police because you put us in a position on this side. My boss comes to me and tells me to go through this case, and write a suppression motion. And I look at it, I say, "Well, this is a college girl. She reads and understands the English language perfectly. She's articulate, there's no language barrier. The video, I've watched the whole thing. I see nothing that would suggest that there's any basis for a suppression hearing." "Well, what are we going to tell the client?" "We're going to tell the client, 'We're going to lose this.'" And if we make this motion to suppress all this stuff and we lose it, the sweetheart deal is gonna go right out the window because the prosecutor is not gonna like to have to respond to the motion to suppress the fruits of the search. And so, when you do that to us, we don't have anything to work with because you've sealed your fate. Thirty-year Chance, do you see that the same way?

Chance 46:58

Same way. And that is why the number one reason that I've started with is "Talking to police never helps you, nor does it

help your attorney." But you know, underline that first reason: Never Helps You. And you know, that's the best thing to remember in these situations.

Andy 47:15

I think we need to have some sort of rudimentary dialogue back-and-forth coaching of: "They're going to try and twist, and poke, and prod, and get you to say more than." We need to internalize and memorize some kind of script of how we politely hold the line and say, "No, I'm not talking to you any more than 'What have you stopped me for?'" Okay, they say the car was abandoned. How do we not ever get out of that? Like, we would just have to go through and have practices, is all I'm getting at. And not here, not now. We're already forty-five minutes into this.

Larry 47:16

So yeah, well, the abandoned car is where I would have kept directing them back to. You know, "It's not abandoned. It's my dad's car. Is there anything else?" But she wanted to be nice to the police because, like your son, she believes that the police were there to help her. She probably grew up middle-class, and that's what was drilled into her head. Chance, you're going to be here with us next week. Can we move this question to the next episode? Because I want to get to the Alabama case. Is that okay?

Chance 48:14

Yeah, we absolutely can.

Larry 48:18

So the person who submitted this, Sylvia, we're going to take this up with Chance next week because he's gonna come back and we're going to do some good stuff that people are going to be really happy about. I've got some agendas for next week that I want to cover in terms of registration removal and how the process works. And he's going to be talking about how the California process works in real life. So okay, Andy it's yours now, to talk about Alabama.

Andy 48:42

Very good. So you have this case in here from the U.S. Middle District of Alabama. It's a victory for PFRs with children, or "chirrens" as I like to call them. The case is *Bruce Henry vs. Ron Abernathy*. It was just released a couple of days ago. The opening paragraph states, "The court is tasked in part with weighing fundamental rights accompanying parenthood against the state's interest in protecting the health and safety of minors." This is the challenge that came about because Alabama's PFR registration statute prohibits a PFR from residing with his or her own biological "chirrens". I know you're not a big fan about how the governor and the government is over there in Alabama, but now that you've read this, what is your current opinion?

Ronald Reagan Audio Clip 49:27

"... run by the strangest collection of misfits & Looney Tunes, since the advent of the Third Reich" (applause)

Larry 49:37

(laughs)

Andy 49:37

Now can you set this up for us please?

Larry 49:39

Sure. Mr. Henry currently resides in Tuscaloosa, Alabama and in 2013, he pled guilty to one count of possession of CP in the federal system (no need for the statutory citation). He was released from prison in June of 2018 and registered as a PFR. Henry later married and, on August 4, 2021, he welcomed a son into the world. His conviction alone prevents him from "residing" or "conducting an overnight visit" with his son until his son reaches age 18. And that's appropriately cited in Alabama code, Section 15-20A-11(d)(4) for anybody who wants to go look it up.

Andy 50:20

According to the court, Alabama's "ASORCNA" is the most comprehensive and debilitating sex offender scheme in the nation, citing *McGuire vs. Marshall*. I can't read all those letters, it's the same thing that you said before. Yes, it's the same thing. All those letters and numbers "prohibits adult PFRs convicted of a sex offense involving a child from conducting overnight visits or residing with any minor, including their own children. But it permits" ... this is so nice of them, Larry, but ... "it permits qualifying adult offenders, four" -- count them, four -- "hours per day of unfettered, unsupervised access to a minor between the hours of 6 am and 10:30 pm on two, but not three, consecutive days at a time, and not more than nine days total in a month." How 'bout that?

Larry 51:13

Well, it might be worthwhile to point out that "reside" is further defined in the statute. The term "reside" includes, but is not limited to, spending more than four hours a day at the place on three or more consecutive days; spending more than four hours a day, in the place on 10 or more aggregate days during a calendar month; or spending any amount of time" -- god, this is great stuff -- "coupled with statements or actions that indicate an intent to live at the place or remain at the place for periods specified in" that sentence that we did not read. But yes, it's a very, very debilitating restriction on parental involvement, if you're on the PFR list.

Andy 51:16

Now, I gotta tell you, there's a thing called orbital mechanics and they need supercomputers to actually calculate where the planets are going to be, Larry. That would be simpler than figuring out when you're allowed to visit your "chirrens".

Larry 52:14

Well, can you admit that that language is funny?

Andy 52:17

Oh my god that's ridiculous. Yes, Larry, that's funny. I thought we had a New Year's resolution?

Larry 52:23

We do, I'm hoping that you'll realize things are funny.

Andy 52:26

No. Alright, the state argued that Henry cannot show he possesses, nor that the statute burdens, a fundamental "right of a person convicted of a sexual offense involving a child to reside with a minor child." The court stated, "The state misreads Eleventh Circuit precedent and conflates the identification of the right at issue with the tailoring analysis. Henry is correct that the fundamental right at issue here is the "care, custody, and control" of his son. More specifically, that fundamental right's guarantee that a parent may reside with his child. And that right is undoubtedly "deeply rooted in this nation's history and tradition."

Larry 53:11

Well, before I commend the court for doing a great job, what I think is ironic about this: Now, conservatives, I know the emails are gonna come flowing in. But these are the same people who claim that they believe that only parents should make critical decisions for their children, and that the government should not be meddling in family affairs. You know, these are the people who espouse that on the conservative side of the aisle and, amazingly, they forgot all about what they claimed that they believe, when they crafted this statute to basically cut one parent completely out of raising the child. But anyway, the court did a great job on this case. I'm noting some highlights from the opinion, "The fundamental" -- you should read this because you read so much better than me. So yeah, go ahead and read this because I was gonna have it for Chance but he didn't feel comfortable because this case was sprung at the last minute.

Andy 54:05

The "fundamental right" "of parents in the care, custody and control of their 'chirrens' is perhaps the oldest and fundamental Liberty interest recognized by [the Supreme] Court." *Troxel vs. Granville* 530 U.S. 57, 65 from 2000. "This primary role of the parents in the upbringing of their children is now established beyond debate as an enduring American tradition."; *Stanley vs. Illinois* 405 U.S. 645, 651 from 1972, (explaining that the right to raise one's children "ha[s] been deemed 'essential'", and that "the custody, care and nurture of the child resides first in the parents" the citation's omitted, but that's *Prince vs. Massachusetts* 321 U.S. 158, 166 from 1944 ("it is cardinal with us that the custody, care, and nurture of the child reside first in the parents, whose primary function and freedom include preparation for obligations the state can neither supply nor hinder."); And that's from *Pierce vs. Society of Sisters* 268 U.S. 510, 534-35 from 1925 -- back with your people, in your "yout", Larry -- (holding that the "liberty of parents and guardians includes the right to direct the upbringing and education of children under their control") ("The child is not the mere creature of the State; those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right, coupled with the high duty, to recognize and prepare him for additional obligations.); *Meyer vs. Nebraska* 262 U.S. 390, 399, 401 in

1923 (holding that the "liberty" protected by the Due Process Clause includes the right of parents to "establish a home and bring up chirren" and "to control the education of their own"). Then further along, Larry, the Eleventh Circuit said, "in order to trigger substantive due process protection [the statute] must either directly or unduly burden the fundamental rights claimed by the plaintiffs. That's from *Doe vs. Moore*, 410 F.3d 1337, 1344 and that's from 2005. The state argued that Henry lacked a viable claim based on Moore. So what did the court think of that? ... not in your opinion, reading from it. What it says, not your opinion.

Larry 56:12

Okay. Well, you know, that was a long string citation and I even cut out some of the string citation. But, man, they had a lot of stuff backing it up, on why the parents should not be cut out of the child's life. The court said "Henry's complaint does not suffer the same infirmity as in Moore. He specifically invokes his Fourteenth Amendment right as a parent to the "care, custody, and control" of his son and seeks to vindicate that right's guarantee of a parent's ability to reside and stay overnight in the same location with his child." And then the court said "the overbreadth of Section 15-20A-11(d)(4) is breathtaking. It commands that no "adult PFR [who] has been convicted of any sex offense involving a child" may "reside or conduct an overnight with a minor." It applies to any sex offense involving a child, including CP possession. It applies for life. No exceptions. No ability to petition for appeal. No relief. No ability for a parent to ask for relief by showing that he bears no risk of harm to his or her child. And they noted that "No other state has crafted or enacted such a broad, unyielding rule in this context." Now do you understand why I say that they're so crazy in Alabama?

Andy 57:34

(laughs) Is this individual off of supervision, and "just on the registry"? (whispering: not just on a website), but actually registering?

Larry 57:45

Yes, as I understand it, his supervision may be over with. But even if the supervision isn't over with, that's not relevant for the analysis of the statute because this is not a supervision requirement. This is a statutory imposition so whether or not he's on supervision doesn't really matter.

Andy 58:02

Well, the reason why I'm asking is because Georgia has that, as one of their special conditions of probation, that you can't live with any minor, including your children.

Larry 58:13

Well, in a supervised setting, they have some additional latitude of conditions. They have to be reasonably related to the offense that the person's under supervision for, they have to be narrowly tailored not to deprive the person unnecessarily of liberty. And that's where the probation authorities break down, when they put these blanket restrictions on, that just

apply to everyone. Those could be, in my opinion, shot down fairly easily because there's been no analysis of the individual case. Probation and supervision (particularly probation, not so much parole) but probation is supposed to be rehabilitative. And it's supposed to deprive you of no more liberty than is reasonably necessary. And it has to be related to something. They can't just pull stuff out of thin air and say that, you know, "This is applied to you", particularly when it's getting into such a liberty as the right to parent your child. So, I would say to the people in Georgia, if that's a standard condition, that would be ripe for the court to review. And I would be delighted to hear what Chance thinks of that.

Chance 59:20

I would agree with that. And you know, California has "what child", which is a case that says substantially the same when you're speaking in terms of conditions of parole and probation. But I would agree with that.

Andy 59:32

I know I've shared this with you, Larry, and I probably have shared it here, but it would have been the first year that I was off, it was only like six months out of "the inside" so-to-speak. And I was going to visit where the mother of my kid is, and obviously the kid, for Thanksgiving or something like that, or Christmas, whichever it was. And I was getting a motion to modify my terms of probation so that I could come visit them. But I had to do that. I had to get a sentence modification so that I could do that.

Larry 1:00:03

And you omit the funny part of the story.

Andy 1:00:06

I know, there's another part there, where my attorney sent me on a Dummy Mission, and she gave me the order to get the judge to sign, but under no circumstances should the person involved in the case be going to visit the judge. If I were like a normal runner, not representing myself, I guess it would have been okay? But she sent me down there representing myself, on behalf of her, or something like that. And the judge's secretary looks at me. She goes, "Is this you?" And I said, "Yes." And then I mean, I don't know what's going on. I'm just sitting in a chair. I'm dressed in Khakis and a polo shirt. I don't know what's happening. And I mean, she picks up the phone, I don't know what's happening, she musta pressed the panic button under the desk or something. This woman that's like eight feet tall, with big arms, says, "Come with me" and they start walking me down the hall, away from the judge's chambers. And there's a cop a hundred feet away from me, charging towards me down the hallway. And he's just freakin' haulin' ass towards me. And I was like, "Is he coming for me?" And she says, "Yes" I didn't do anything! I was there on behalf of like, whatever. Anyway, so then I've got seven cops surrounding me, like ready to just jump on me like that guy that was in Monsters, Inc. that came out with the sock on his back? And there are all these people that are to just jump on me, and pound me into the sand! And everything went fine.

The guy was a musician, the sergeant-at-arms or whatever, at the courthouse. He was a musician. I was asking him about guitars and stuff. Next thing I know, *he* took it to the judge, and the judge signed it, and out I walked.

Larry 1:01:34

Well I've run dozens, if not hundreds, of documents to judicial chambers, and sat and waited oftentimes, sometimes, and even had a word with the judge, if they knew me personally. But, you know, that was not a very wise decision for your attorney to send you down as the runner!

Andy 1:01:51

(laughs) That went poorly. I was freaking the eff out. Yeah, so Middle Georgia. Yep.

Larry 1:01:58

Well, they've clamped down security so much here, in recent years, that now we don't do that anymore. Now we leave them in boxes for the judge. And then you come back and pick it up and hope it's in the box. And you make return trips if it's not in the box. But we don't get to sit in the judge's outer office, and sometimes be invited in while the judge is looking at things, like we used to.

Andy 1:02:19

Yep, I can understand that because it was in Georgia where the guy was in front of the judge, and grabbed one of the bailiff's guns and started shooting people in the courtroom and ran out?

Larry 1:02:30

Yep, that's where it was, in Fulton County Courthouse.

Andy 1:02:33

Michaels or something like that? I can't remember the dude's name.

Chance 1:02:38

So Andy, your attorney "swatted" you I guess, huh?

Andy 1:02:43

Like, yeah, she says, "Hey, go do this" (all laugh) "I got one for him, you just wait!" Good grief, man! But yeah, I was on a plane that afternoon or the next day. I mean, it was like, imminent. And I needed this, like, today so she said, "Well," and I'm like, "If there's anything I can do to assist in this and help out." I don't know what that means, but I offered it and she says, "Well, yeah, that would make my life a lot easier." And she just sends me off on a Dummy Mission!

Larry 1:03:08

So well, as we wrap up, folks, Chance is going to be back next week, right? You're going to talk about the removal process and the clients you've had removed, some of them (not by name), but the particularities of how one gets off the registry in California.

Chance 1:03:26
Absolutely.

Andy 1:03:27
Fantastic! Can't wait to have you back. People in chat are saying that they are excited to have you back as well.

Chance 1:03:33
All right! Well, thank you very much.

Larry 1:03:35
So well, it's been a blast. It really has. Thank you.

Andy 1:03:39
Thank you very much. I appreciate it, Chance, and look forward to seeing you again next week! And so everybody, if you head over to registrymatters.co you can find the show notes to the podcast. And if you want to leave voicemail -- god, nobody has called in forever! We're gonna have to pay somebody to call,

Larry. (747) 227-4477. And if you want to email me, I will likely forward it to Larry and that's RegistryMattersCast@gmail.com. And thank you to all of the patrons that support us at patreon.com/registrymatters. For just \$1 a month, you can go back and listen to that episode 194 or 195 with the guy that flew away in the helicopter. And that's all I got, Larry and Chance. Thank you so very much for joining me on this Saturday afternoon, and evening, and night, and all that stuff. And we'll talk to you soon. Have a great night.

Chance 1:04:25
You too. Thank you.

Announcer 1:04:29
You've been listening to F Y P.

You've been listening to Registry Matters Podcast.

Registry Matters Podcast is a production of FYP Education.

More show transcripts are available at <https://RegistryMatters.co> (that's right... just C O with no M)

In prison and can't get the podcast? Have a loved one "subscribe" at <https://patreon.com/registrymatters> at the **\$15 level**, and include your prison address information. Or send a check to cover at least 3 months.

**REGISTRY MATTERS
MAIL-IN SUBSCRIPTION FORM**

Sign me up for _____ months X \$6 = \$ _____
(Minimum 3 months) * **We do accept books or sheets of stamps. No singles please.**

First Name Last Name

Name of Institution ID Number

Address

City State Zip Code

**Make check payable to FYP Education and send to RM Podcast,
Post Office Box 36123, Albuquerque, NM 87176**