EXHIBIT "E"

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

RONALD T. WHITAKER, SR. AND DALEA LYNN, CO-ADMINISTRATORS OF THE ESTATE OF RONALD TAYLOR WHITAKER, JR.; AND RONALD T. WHITAKER SR., TAYLOR WHITAKER, BRANDI WHITAKER AND CHRISTOPHER: HAMMERSTONE, INDIVIDUALLY, **PLAINTIFFS**

CIVIL ACTION

NO:1:08-CV-00627

SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP, SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP POLICE DEPARTMENT, CHIEF OF POLICE DAVID ESHBACH AND POLICE OFFICER: GARY UTTER, **DEFENDANTS**

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

VIDEO

DEPOSITION OF: DAVID ESHBACH

TAKEN BY:

PLAINTIFFS

BEFORE:

DIANE A. SMITH, REPORTER

NOTARY PUBLIC

DATE:

JANUARY 16, 2009, 10:15 A.M.

PLACE:

HAGGERTY & SILVERMAN 240 NORTH DUKE STREET LANCASTER, PENNSYLVANIA



A I think I'm okay.

Q All right. Had you ever -- have you ever been deposed before?

A Yes, I have.

Q All right. In what -- first of all, how often or how many times, if you know?

A Honestly, I don't know. It would be less than a half a dozen.

Q All right. The times that you were deposed, do you know what types of claims they were?

A Oh, I was deposed in an accident, like a wrongful injury claim, that -- an accident that I investigated years ago as a police officer, mostly things like that from what I -- the best that I can recall.

Q Have you ever been involved or provided testimony in any other type of litigation or claim that involved an alleged civil rights violation?

A Not that I'm aware of.

Q Okay. If you could, just give us a little bit of a background of who you are. Where did you grow up as a child?

A Sure, my name is David C. Eshbach. I'm the Chief of Police for Springettsbury Township Police Department.

I've been employed by Springettsbury Township Police

Department since January 13, 1986. I was promoted to Chief

of Police on March 3rd, 1997. I graduated from Dover Area High School in 1982. I attended Gettysburg College, and I received then later a degree from York College in criminal justice in 1998, December of 1998. I've also attended the FBI National Academy Program in Quantico, Virginia, Command Institute for Police Executives in a multitude -- just a -- basically a pleather of other training involving police operations, police management, you know, budgeting, administration of a police department, that kind of thing.

Q And I assume you've also taken some courses post receiving your degree at York in 1998 in training?

A Yes, we -- we train regularly in our police department.

Q And prisoner safety, have you taken courses on that?

A A course in prisoner safety, no.

Q Have you taken any courses in the law relating to what the legal obligation is as it relates to handling prisoners?

A Not a course, no.

Q Okay. Are you a member of any organizations, you know, Fraternal Order of Police, other -- a chief's organization, anything like that --

A I am.

Q -- currently?

A I am.

Q Can you, please, tell me what you're involved --

I'm a member of the Fraternal Order of Police, the lodge for the county, in York County. I'm a member of the International Association of Chiefs of Police. I'm a member of the Pennsylvania Chiefs of Police Association.

I'm a member of the Central Pennsylvania Chiefs of Police Association. I'm a member of the York County Chiefs of Police Association.

Q The organizations that you just indicated you are a member of, do you hold any positions or have you hold -- or have you ever held any position, you know, like a director or vice president, anything like that?

A Yes, they are elected positions.

q okay.

A I mean I've been past president of the York County Chiefs of Police Association. I'm a member of the Law and Legislative Committee for the Pennsylvania Chiefs of Police Association. I'm a past member of the Membership Committee for the Pennsylvania Chiefs of Police Association. I'm a past member of the Education and Training Committee for the Pennsylvania Chiefs of Police Association. I'm the First Vice President of the Central Pennsylvania Chiefs of Police Association and Chair of the Training and Education Committee. And I'm also a member of the Community Oriented

Policing Committee for the International Association of Chiefs of Police.

- Q You had mentioned you were the Chair of the Training and Education program of which -- what was that? I'm sorry.
- A For the Central Pennsylvania Chiefs of Police Association.
- Q Let's focus on -- on that particular organization for a moment. How long have you been a member of that organization?
 - A Since 1997.
- Q And how long have you been the Chair of the Training and Education Department?
 - A It's not a department. It's just a committee.
- Q Sorry.

- A without going back and looking at the past minutes, I really don't recall. But it's probably been five years.
- Q Okay. Do you know if the Central Pennsylvania
 Chief of Police organization has -- has any type of mission
 statement or goal? Well, let's just start -- I'm sorry.

 Does it have a mission statement that you know of?
 - A I'm not aware of it.
- Q All right. Do you know what is the goal or the purpose of that organization?

3

4 5

6 7

8

9

11

10

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

Central Pennsylvania Chiefs of Police Association is we basically are a group of chiefs located from the central region of the state. And each -- in the PA Chiefs of Police Association, the state is divided into four regions. Central is one of those. There's the west, central, northeast and southeast. Central is one of the sub-organizations of the Pennsylvania Chiefs of Police Association. We do a variety of things. One of the things we try to do is provide training, in regards to your question, at a very beneficial cost to organizations that are members of that Central Pennsylvania Chiefs of Police Association.

Would you agree it's kind of an opportunity for all of the other chiefs to get -- to get together in a -in a way that they can kind of share ideas, exchange ideas, learn what they know so hopefully to make everybody better at what they do?

Yes, there's a -- I mean there's a certain amount of networking that goes on within the Association, but it's not a policy-formulating board of any kind.

Okay. The -- the Training and Education Q Committee, what's the -- what is the purpose of that particular committee?

Basically what we do is we review training requests that are brought to us by members. If a member

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

wishes to have training sponsored by the Central Pennsylvania Chiefs of Police Association in a monetary way, the member brings an application -- forwards an application to me. I review it. I send it out to the Training Committee. They review it. If it passes mostly with the Training Committee, it goes to the Executive Board of the Central Pennsylvania Chiefs of Police Association. we take a final vote on whether or not to approve funding for that training or not.

Okay. Can you just give me an example of a Q situation?

of? Α

well, let me -- let's back up. Has your department ever submitted a request for additional training through the Central Pennsylvania Chiefs of Police?

Yes, we probably have. It may have been -- it's been a lot of years since I chair the committee. I typically don't send requests in since I'm the chair of that committee. Typically the requests come from other entities. We -- we look at -- if we have a request, we basically meet quarterly, and we review those requests prior to the quarterly meeting and then vote on them.

Okay. Now how long have you been the chair of Q that department or that committee?

As I said before, I don't recollect without

looking at the minutes, but I would say probably about five years.

Q Okay. And you're currently the chair?

A Yes.

Q All right. Just again, I'm a little -- I'm having a little hard time understanding because I don't do what you do. But just can you give me an example of what somebody may ask for and kind of go through how it would work?

A Yeah, two -- the two most frequent -- or I'm sorry -- the two most recent requests were we had a request to sponsor a crime prevention through an environmental design class that was hosted up in Hershey. That was one. And then another recent request was a request from the Center for Highway Safety to put on a seminar on safe traffic stops, traffic safety, new changes in the law regarding to traffic.

Q And -- so the last one you said, who -- and I don't mean who like John Smith or John Doe. But would that come from another chief of a department typically?

A Not necessarily. It could come from another chief of a department. It could come -- like the Center for Highway Safety, because they work closely with the chiefs' organizations, they make the requests themselves.

Q Okay. And so when they make the request, who are

became a patrolman in January of 1986 at Springettsbury Township. In -- sometime in 1988, I was assigned to criminal investigations. And at the end of 1990, beginning of 1991, I was assigned to the York County Drug Task Force as a plain clothes investigator. I remained in that position until mid 1992 when I was promoted to the rank of corporal. Near the end of 1993, I was promoted to the rank of sergeant. In January -- I'm sorry -- in March of 1997, I was promoted to chief, and that's the position in which I serve today.

So you've been the chief for the last 11 -- or 0 almost 11 years?

I'll be starting my 13th year actually in March because I started in the beginning of 1997.

Q '97?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Α Yes.

Oh, okay. My math was off. I'm sorry. Okay. And when you were at the Drug Task Force, you were still with Springettsbury. Right?

Yes, I was a Springettsbury Township police officer just assigned to that assignment.

All right. Would it be fair to say that in your Q long career that you've arrested many people?

Yes, that would be a fair assumption. Α

Okay. After you left the Drug Task Force, you Q

said you became a corporal?

- Yes, sir. Α
- what year was that? Q
- 1992.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Let's focus to prior to 1992 when your -- would Q your title be police officer at that point?
 - Patrolman.
- Patrolman. Okay. And I recognize as a patrolman 0 certain days you're doing different things, whether you're doing traffic stops or investigating, you know, a burglary. And at some point, you were on the Drug Task Force. But is your overall duties kind of the same? In other words, not your -- I guess, you know, on day-to-day activities, you might do different things. But are your overall duties as a police officer the same?
- Yes, I think I understand your question. you're asking me if my overall duties as a patrolman were the same as to what Officer Utter testified to as his overall duties, yes, they were similar.
- All right. Now as you then go to the next level 0 as a corporal, how does a corporal differ than a patrolman other than hopefully a higher pay rate and a little more respect from your --
- A corporal in our department is a first line supervisor. They're what we would -- we would refer to as

Page 12 of 68

a road supervisor. They are a supervisor that's out on the road with the officers. If they have a question, a decision that needs to be made or if there's an assignment that needs to be given, a corporal does that.

- All right. So you're kind of like the -- the boss in the field so to speak?
 - So to speak. First line supervision.
- All right. Do you still have the same or Q primarily the same duties as a patrolman would have, plus the ability then to supervise?
- Yes, although you're not tasked as much as a corporal with answering every call that comes in. Your task is to direct traffic and make sure that the calls get to who they need to get to and that they're handled. yes, you could still answer calls and do very many times.
- So, in other words, like if a call comes in that there's five ducks crossing the road at three in the morning, can somebody come get them, you'd have the ability to tell someone else to do it? Whereas a patrolman, you'd have to go do it?
 - Correct. Α

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Okay. Now when you got promoted to a corporal, do Q you have to go through any specific additional training?
- There's no requirement that you do. I did go to a class called First Line Supervision.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

would have.

All right. And when you went to the class First Q Line Supervision, where is that provided? Who provides it? That particular class was held and sponsored by the Harrisburg Area Community College. Is it one course, two courses? I mean what kind of time involvement? Honestly, I can't recollect It was a course. Α how -- how long or how many hours it was. It was multiple I don't remember. days. Did you get any type of certificate to show Q completion of the requirements? Yes, I believe that I did. Okay. Now it looks like relatively quickly you Q were promoted from corporal to sergeant from '92 to '93? Α Yes. As a -- what are the difference in the duties of a 0 corporal to a sergeant? A sergeant's duties are more administrative. They are still obviously like a platoon commander or a watch commander. They are -- they have the overall responsibility for running the shift, not necessarily on the road like the corporal does. But they have more

All right. So you're on the road less? Q

administrative duties above and beyond what the corporal

Correct. 1 Α

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

If we were going to kind of do an analogy to a football team, would you kind of say the corporal might be like the quarterback and the sergeant might be like the coach on the sidelines?

I quess so. I mean it's a pretty simple analogy. But I guess you could do it like that.

Q okay.

The sergeant -- my charge as a sergeant, I was in charge of our Criminal Investigations Unit. So a lot of what I did had to do with that.

Okay. How many units are there in the -- you Q know, your police department?

Currently?

Currently. Q

we have three platoons with a sergeant and a corporal on each platoon and five patrolmen under each. So there's seven members of each platoon, A, B and C. then there's also a Criminal Investigations Division that has a sergeant, whose charge is to run that show, and there are three plain clothes detectives that work under him. Then we have some other officers that -- we have school resource officers. We have two that are assigned to the school on a full-time basis during the school year, and we also have officers that -- what we -- we have them in

MR. GABRIEL: Just an objection to the form of the question so far as your recitation might not match the testimony. Right. The record speaks for MR. SILVERMAN: itself. And I'm clearly not trying to mischaracterize

BY MR. SILVERMAN:

anything.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But what -- let me ask you a different question. Q Hopefully it will clear up the objection. You recall that Officer -- Ex-Officer Utter and I did discuss the staffing issues. correct?

- Yes, I do recall that. Α
- And what was your understanding of his answer? Q
- I believe he stated that our compliment was 32 officers plus the chief. That's incorrect. Our compliment is 32 sworn officers. I'm a sworn officer. So I'm one of those 32.
- Okay. Were -- when -- in July of '07 when the 0 whitaker shooting took place, was your department fully staffed in accordance with the way you wanted it to be staffed?
- with our compliment as of July 2nd, 2007, we had 32 officers sworn and working. The 32nd officer was in the police academy.
 - Okay. Now you had talked about the A, B and C. Q

Page 16 of 68

Can you -- how many people were in that? 1 There are seven members of each platoon. 2 Okay. And you have a -- what, a corporal and six 3 Q Is that how it is? patrol? 4 No, it's a sergeant, a corporal and five patrol. 5 Α Okay. Now on the shift that Ex-Officer Utter was 6 Q on on the date of the Whitaker shooting, was there a 7 sergeant, corporal and five patrol people on duty? 8 There was a sergeant and four patrol people on 9 Α 10 duty. No corporal? 11 Q No, not everybody works every day of the week. 12 Α Okay. Is there a minimum -- when I ask if there's 13 0 a minimum, do you have internal requirements that you --14 that either you put into effect or they're in effect 15 through the department that direct how many officers need 16 to be on duty on any given shift? 17 we have no minimum staffing requirements in our 18 Α labor contract nor do we have any minimum staffing 19 requirements in any rule or SOP that I've written. 20 Okay. How about in ones that are -- that anyone 21 Q else may have written? 22 23 Α No. All right. Now do you have a belief as to what 24 Q

you believe is the appropriate minimum requirements for any

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

given shift the amount of officers, including sergeants and 1 2 corporals, that should be on duty? Sure, I have a personal belief. 3

> And what is that? Q

Basically a minimum of three people on day shift, four people on second shift and three people on night shift.

Okay. And the shift that Ex-Officer Utter was on Q on the day of the shooting was what shift?

Α It was night shift.

Now it was -- they were on the transition. Q Correct? Wasn't there a transition going on then or am I mistaken?

I'm not sure if I understand what you mean by transition.

All right. What times do the shifts begin and end Q or is it always the same? Sorry.

No, it's not always the same. It's staggered. Like, for instance, on day shift, we have people that come in at 6 a.m. and work till 2 p.m. We have people that come in at 7 a.m. and work till 3 p.m. On second shift, we have people that come in at 2 p.m. and work till 10 p.m. we have people that come in at 3 p.m. and work till 11 p.m. On the night shift, we have people that come in at 7 p.m. and work till 3 a.m. We have people that come in at 10

Yeah, I was off. Α

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Okay. When did you first hear about the Whitaker 0 shooting and how did you hear about it?

The 9-1-1 Center called my residence. Α

Okay. And when you heard about it, what did you Q do?

I took the phone call, got the information from Α the dispatcher. I probably asked her a couple of questions if it was a -- I don't even know if it was a she or a he. I don't remember what the dispatcher was. But right thereafter, I called the station then to try to get some more information about what was going on because the information that the 9-1-1 dispatcher had was pretty limited at that point because it was pretty much right after it happened I think.

Did you -- on that day, did you go to the station? Q

Yes. I did. It actually was the next day though. I got the call -- by the time I got the call -- this incident happened on a Saturday shortly before midnight. got the call shortly after midnight on a Sunday. I'm off on both Saturday and Sunday. But, yes, I did respond to the station on Sunday morning.

About how long after you got the call was it till you actually got to the station?

This is an approximation. About 30 minutes. Α

- Yes, sir. 22 Α
- And he was a lieutenant back then? 23 Q
- Yes, sir. 24 Α
- How long had Lieutenant Laird worked with you 25 Q

prior to that incident? 1 He was hired to the Springettsbury Township Police 2 Department in February of 1985. So I worked with him my 3 entire career. 4 was there any particular reason you selected 5 Q Lieutenant Laird to head up the investigation? 6 That's part of his duty as the operations 7 Α lieutenant. 8 Okay. What is operations lieutenant? 9 we have two lieutenants in the department. One is 10 an administrative lieutenant. One is an operations 11 lieutenant. The operations lieutenant basically oversees 12 the patrol division and the criminal investigative 13 division. 14 Okay. And how about the administrative? What are 15 0 his duties? 16 I'm just giving you a smattering of their duties. 17 Α understand. 18 0 There's way more than that. 19 Absolutely. And you probably have a book on what 20 Q 21 they do --22 Α Yeah. -- but understood. 23 Q The administrative officer is in charge of support 24

staff, scheduling, records management system,

25

would not have investigated it?

23

24

25

Thev

```
overseeing them and patrolling them. Would you agree that
1
   your job -- a part of your job is to oversee and control
2
    the people under you?
 3
 4
             Yes.
        Α
             And when I ask that question, I'm not asking for a
 5
        Q
   legal conclusion because what the responsibilities may be
6
    for you -- if somebody does something on a legal basis may
7
    be something different. But I'm talking on a -- kind of as
8
    running it, like, as a business. You're ultimately
9
    responsible what everyone does?
10
             Correct.
11
        Α
             Now when this was assigned to Lieutenant Laird,
12
    would you agree that -- strike -- well, forget that.
13
    Officer Laird was investigating this internally for you.
14
15
    Correct?
             Lieutenant Laird, yes.
16
        Α
             Lieutenant Laird. I'm sorry. And the State
17
        Q
    Police were also investigating this I guess on behalf of
18
    the Commonwealth.
                       Correct?
19
             Correct. At our -- at our request.
20
        Α
             At your request. All right. And the -- are you
21
    suggesting that if you didn't request it the State Police
22
```

They don't -- they would have to receive the

request from us to come and investigate the incident.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

don't come on their own, in other words.

Okay. So are you suggesting then -- and I don't think you are -- that if you didn't make the request, that this would not have been investigated by an outside agency?

Not necessarily. What I'm saying is if I didn't request the State Police the State Police would not have shown up on their own will. Our policy requires that we have the State Police and the district attorney's office investigate it jointly or whatever -- however you want to say that. But we contact both entities. The State Police, we contacted them, and they responded. We contacted the district attorney's office, and they responded also.

Okay. You said you have -- I think you said an obligation -- and if I misstate it, correct me -- to contact the district attorney and the State Police to investigate. What are -- what times must you ask either one or both of those organizations to conduct an external investigation?

MR. GABRIEL: Just in terms of the form, he referenced the policy.

MR. SILVERMAN: Okay.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.

MR. SILVERMAN: I'll re-ask the question.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

BY MR. SILVERMAN:

Under what circumstances do your policies or 1 your -- require you to ask an outside agency such as the 2 district attorney or the State Police to investigate a 3 4 matter? use of deadly force. 5 Α Okay. So anytime deadly force is used, you would 6 Q agree that you are required by your own internal procedures 7 to contact the district attorney and the State Police to 8 investigate? 9 10 Α Yes. All right. The -- we know this was a fairly --11 well, there was a lot of press coverage on this. Would you 12 13 agree with that? There was -- I don't know what your definition of 14 a lot is. 15 16 Q Fair enough. 17 But there was press coverage on it, yes. And you spoke to some of the press? 18 Q I did. 19 Α All right. Do you recall if -- when the press 20 0 investigated, did this make the news on the television? DO 21 you remember seeing any articles on TV on this? 22 MR. MACMAIN: I'm sorry. The question was when 23 the press investigated the incident? 24 MR. SILVERMAN: I'll rephrase it. 25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that, yes, that, you know, that some of this was captured, you know, by video. I don't remember if I said it or they I honestly don't. introduced it.

Okay. Do you remember what, if anything, you said relating to your thoughts as to whether or not what Ex-Officer Utter did in your mind was appropriate?

I think I made a statement to the effect that the State Police and district attorney's office were investigating it. We weren't trying to rush to judgment. But preliminarily from what I saw, he was justified in what he did.

Okay. All right. At that point in time, do you Q recall what information you had at your disposal that you actually reviewed?

Not particularly. I mean there was -- a lot of the information that I had was through conversation with, you know, my lieutenant, the officers, the other officers that were on duty and whatnot. Very minimal conversation with Officer Utter that evening, just to get an idea of what had occurred. And I had seen the video at that point.

I don't think I asked you this. And if I did, I Q apologize. But when the shooting took place, who was the sergeant on duty? Did I ask you that?

I don't think you asked me that. You asked Officer Utter that. It was Sergeant Gregory Witmer.

relates to that area of questioning, yes. 1 MR. SILVERMAN: All right. 2 BY MR. SILVERMAN: 3 when you asked Officer -- or Lieutenant Laird --4 Q and I don't -- and I apologize -- to investigate the 5 shooting of Mr. Whitaker, was there a specific scope that 6 he was looking into? What was the scope of the 7 investigation? 8 Just to find out what the facts of the incident 9 was. 10 would you agree that the reasons Officer Laird 11 would investigate would be different than the reason -- or 12 some of the reasons that the State Police would 13 investigate? 14 Yes, Lieutenant Laird was doing administrative 15 review of the incident. That's not what the State Police 16 was doing. 17 Okay. What was the purpose, if you know, of the 18 0 State Police review? 19 To determine whether or not there were any 20 violations of law committed. 21 Okay. Any criminal violations? 22 Q 23 Α Yes. All right. And can we agree as a general 24 proposition that the fact that there may -- the fact 25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

interaction between Utter, the police department and Whitaker?

when he -- he talks to an officer, a situation Α like that, I mean he wants to get all the information he can of what occurred before, during and after, whatever led up to the incident. So he would have -- when he talked to the officers in regards to that, he would have spoken to them about all those things.

Okay. And would part of his investigation focus Q on whether or not there was any criminal conduct conducted by Utter?

No, what happens is when we internally investigate something, if we find during that internal investigation that there is a violation of criminal law, then that is outsourced to an outside agency to investigate so that there's no appearance of impropriety on our part. That was not the case in this instance. The State Police was called in immediately because that's what our policy requires. was not done subsequent. It was done immediately. Actually they were investigating before Lieutenant Laird was.

Okay. What is the -- the purpose of -- since Q you're not -- you said your internal investigation has nothing to do with the criminal investigation. Correct?

Right. Up until the point -- if they would find

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

during that investigation a violation of criminal law that they weren't aware of at the beginning of that investigation, then they would turn that part of it over to an outside agency such as the State Police or the district attorney's office. But up until that point, it's an internal review of what occurred and what, if any, violations of our policies and procedures occurred.

would you agree that -- well, what is the purpose Q of conducting that type of investigation?

To find out whether there were any violations of Α our policies or procedures or rules.

Is also part of the purpose used to evaluate 0 whether or not your rules need to be amended or revised or changed in any fashion?

Yes, that could be part of it.

Okay. Now in this instance, when Laird Q investigated the Whitaker shooting and the relationship with Ex-Officer Utter, did you find any violations of your operating procedures?

MR. GABRIEL: Just -- you are asking basically for the Laird memo.

MR. SILVERMAN: No, I'm not. I'm not. I'm asking him factually what he found.

MR. GABRIEL: But that's based on the Laird memo. Laird did the investigation. He concluded what he

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You're asking him --

```
you agree that -- you said you read the Laird memo. And I
don't have it here. Maybe if you'd like, I'll be happy to
take a break and let you look at it because I think your
counsel probably has it or can get it. Would you like to
look at the Laird memo so we -- you know, there's no
question as to what's in there and what's not? So I'll
give you the opportunity to do that.
         That would be fine.
    Α
         MR. SILVERMAN: Let's take a break.
         VIDEO OPERATOR: We're going off the video record.
The time is 11:27.
         MR. SILVERMAN: Do you have it. If not --
         MR. GABRIEL: It's in my car.
         MR. MACMAIN: It's really not that complicated.
         MR. SILVERMAN: Here's the deal. I'd like him to
read it.
         MR. GABRIEL: Here's the thing though. The court
reviewed it. The court --
         MR. SILVERMAN: I understand that. What's the big
deal? I just want to make sure we're straight and that the
facts are all disclosed. You made a representation, and
I'm going to ask him if it's accurate.
         MR. GABRIEL: Well, the court found it accurate
basically, and that's the problem with your question.
```

MR. SILVERMAN: Are you going -- I'm asking to 1 have him read it. Do you want him to do it or not? It's 2 3 really simple. MR. GABRIEL: I can walk to the car and dig it 4 out. I don't see the purpose in it. 5 Please. I don't want to go back 6 MR. SILVERMAN: and forth. Do you want him to do it or not? I'm not going 7 to fight with you. 8 MR. GABRIEL: I'll walk to the car and get the 9 I think it's a waste of time. He's reviewed it 10 memo. before, and he can review it again. 11 MR. MACMAIN: What is it you want him to --12 MR. SILVERMAN: Let him review the memo. We're 13 spending more time talking about it. Let's just do it. 14 MR. MACMAIN: You can ask him what did so and so 15 16 say. MR. SILVERMAN: Please just show it to him. 17 Ιt 18 will be much easier. 19 MR. GABRIEL: I'm not following, but sure. MR. SILVERMAN: You know, we were discussing the 20 court's order of November 14th, 2008, and there's an issue 21 as to what it means. I guess my position is subparts C, 22 disciplinary reports of the discussion, and paragraph four 23

of the order provide that we are entitled to obtain

information relating to disciplinary action other than as

24

25

- A The purpose of the rule is officer safety.
- Q Okay. Would you agree that it's officer safety and prisoner safety?

A It's officer safety because the prisoner has no access to the radio. So they couldn't call and do anything. I mean there's no -- there's no way for the prisoner to access the radio. You know, the intent is to document from when the person leaves point A and when they arrive at point B with the prisoner so -- number one, for officer safety; number two, that there's no allegation that something happened in between point A and point B.

Q Okay. The next operating procedure that we've discussed in relation to what Officer Utter did relating to the locking of the handgun, how should that -- back in July of '07, what was the standard operating procedure with regard to how that should have happened?

A He should have walked into the department from the sally port with the prisoner handcuffed. He should have taken the prisoner into the holding room handcuffed. He should have secured the prisoner in the holding room handcuffed. He should have then locked up his weapon. He should have then returned to the room and unhandcuffed the prisoner if he felt it was okay to unhandcuff the prisoner. After which, then he could have gone back and reholstered and should have gone back and reholstered his weapon in the

event something else came up while he was on the station.

Q When you say that he should have gone back and reholstered in case something else happened in the station, do you mean in case something literally happens in the station or in case that he's called out of the station?

A No, in case something happens either literally in the station or on the station grounds. Many times we have people come to the doors, beating on the doors asking for assistance, and we've had domestic disputes in the parking lot. We've had people try to run people over in our parking lot. So the officer has to be ready to act upon whatever situation is put before him whether or not there's a prisoner there.

q okay.

A And the other reason that they can re, you know, holster their weapon is if there's an emergency in the holding room involving an officer or a prisoner they can enter the room at that point armed.

Q Are there any standard operating procedures that you had in July of '07 that dealt with minimum requirements of officers that need to be at the station when there is a prisoner?

A No, the first SOP that you're referring to as far as the holding rooms requires that either the arresting officer or the officer that's in charge of the custody of

6 7

4

5

9

8

10 11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

that person be present on the station when the prisoner is on the station. So the requirement without being stated is one. It's either the arresting officer or the officer in charge of the custody of that person.

Okay. Now if you could go through the -- what you understand the standard operating procedure is from the time an officer, whether it's arresting officer or an officer in charge of the prisoner, gets back to the station, gets out of the car. What are they supposed to do from that point until either release or transfer to sheriff?

It's a pretty broad question. I mean there's a lot of things that they have to do.

Let's talk about what they have to do.

As I stated before, the officer would bring the prisoner into the building, place them in a holding room, secure the holding room while they're still handcuffed, secure their weapon, go back in and then unsecure the prisoner, that is remove the handcuffs if they feel that's okay to do that. Obviously if they didn't feel that was okay to do that, they would leave the prisoner handcuffed in the holding room. If the prisoner is handcuffed in the holding room, as long as they're handcuffed, there's no requirement to relinquish the weapon to the safe box.

Okay. Let me -- let me interrupt you a second. Q

So they get to the holding room with the prisoner. And you used the word secure the holding room. What does that mean?

Shut the door. Α

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Okay. Is there a requirement to go in and Q actually inspect the holding room?
- Yes, there is to make sure that there's not contraband or something laying in there that could be used as a weapon against the officer.
- And would you agree that the requirement to Q inspect the holding room is a non-discretionary mandatory requirement?
- Yes, it's stated in the policy. It doesn't say how you have to do it. It just says that you have to check the room and make sure that there's no weapons or contraband or anything like that in the room.
- when you viewed the video -- and we'll look at it later -- did you observe Ex-Officer Utter inspect the room for contraband?
- The video you can't -- I don't even know if you can see, like, the heads of the people on the video all the But if he opened the door up and looked into the time. room, that's a visual inspection of the room. I don't know if you can tell or I can tell you that's what he's doing. I don't know if I can do that or not.

Is sticking your head in the room and looking 1 0 around, is that a sufficient inspection of a holding room? 2 It may be. It depends on what the officer sees. 3 Okay. Were you involved at all in writing the 4 Q standard operating procedure relating to checking the 5 holding room before you unhandcuff a prisoner? 6 Yes. all the SOP's within our department come out 7 Α under my signature. If you're asking do I write personally 8 every single SOP, no, I don't. 9 That wasn't my question. But you're involved in 10 Q 11 the --12 Yes. Α Now would you agree that the purpose of 13 okay. Q that SOP is to make sure there is no weapons or other 14 contraband in that room? 15 Yes, I would. 16 Α And would you agree that rule is in place for many 17 Q reasons, including prisoner safety? 18 Yes, that could be part of it. 19 Α officer safety? 20 Q Yes, that would be part of it. 21 Α Okay. So now when that rule was put into place, 22 Q did -- was it your expectation that all you had to do was 23 kind of look around the room and -- and that would be 24 sufficient to comply with that standard? 25

BY MR. SILVERMAN:

Q Did you understand what I meant when I said -- asked that question?

A well, if you mean is there a training course that an officer goes to to decide when to take handcuffs on and when -- when to take them off and when not to --

Q I don't mean --

their field training, during -- you know, during their field training, the field training officer would instruct the field trainee that if you have somebody that's violent, you know, if you have somebody that is actively trying to harm you even though they are handcuffed, don't take the handcuffs off of them. You either leave the handcuffs on; or if they get extremely violent in the holding room, they can be handcuffed to the detention bench.

The training that happens with that as far as -in other words, let's go back in time a little bit. When
that holding room SOP was formed -- I believe it was formed
in 1995 -- there was training given out when that was given
to the officers. If an officer was hired post 1995, when
they got their SOP manual, they were trained in that SOP
then. And anytime that SOP was updated, they were trained
in it again, that training being their supervisor providing
them with the material, going over the material with them,

3 4

5 6

7

8 9

10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25 asking them if they have any questions about it, explaining what any of the changes are or clarifying any of the questions that they might have had and then having them sign saying that they received it.

would you agree that you expect -- back in July of '07, you would have expected your officers to do a -- to make -- do, like, a screening process? It could be just a check in their head or some type of screening process to determine whether or not they should take the handcuffs off?

It's basically something that's done in their head. I mean the officer has to know what they're comfortable with and what they aren't comfortable with.

Is there any type of standardization that you expected of your officers relating to, you know, under what situations they should and should not take handcuffs off?

Basically if somebody is violent, if they're destructive, if they are trying to hurt themselves, hurt the officer, damage the room, you know, desecrate the room shall we say, you know, if they're doing something like that, then they should not be unhandcuffed.

Is there any type of formal screening process Q that -- like a checklist or something that they must go through before they make that determination?

Not before they make that determination.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

we have checklists as far as inventory reports for property and transporting of the prisoner and things like that. it's not something that they have to go over the checklist before they take a handcuff -- the prisoner and unhancuff them.

Okay. Are there any medical reports that are Q required to be complied with -- or done before you determine -- or strike that. When you take a prisoner back to the station, do you have to do any type of a medical screening?

we aren't doctors. We aren't nurses. We don't medically screen anybody. There's an observation report basically that does list some medical factors on that. But it's not required to be done before they are at the station. It's not required to be done before they are unhandcuffed. It just becomes part of the report after the person is a prisoner if they live past the incident, if you will.

Understood. Is there any type of checklist that Q officers must do to find out if someone is -- strike that. would you agree that there are certain factors that the officers are trained to look for to determine if someone is at a higher risk of suicide?

Yes. Α

Okay. What other -- can you tell me what maybe Q

- A They don't get the 200.
- Q Never get the 200. Okay. They get cheap bread or something. So basically when someone comes into the station, one of three things hopefully is going to happen. They are either going to go to prison, they are going to go to Central Booking or they're going to release -- if it's their right situation that they're released for?

A Correct. If it would be a situation that would allow a summons to be sent after all the appropriate information is gathered, then they can be released either on their own recognizance, if you will, if they're non-intoxicated or into the custody of somebody else if they are.

Q And is there a normal amount of time -- and I understand there are times you're busy. You're not -- and I'm not asking for the extremes. But is there a normal amount of time that somebody would be kept at the station?

A with Central Booking operating, it's typically about an -- no more than an hour now.

Q All right. So you're normally -- I mean your typical prisoner is at your station for an hour give or take?

- A or less.
- 24 Q or less.
- 25 A It just depends. I mean it depends what the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

situation is. If it's a situation where you're going to interview the prisoner, they may be there a little bit longer than that until the interview is done and they are taken to Central Booking. But if it's just a situation where there's no interview necessary, you're preparing charges and taking them down there -- it basically depends on how long it takes the officer to prepare those charges.

Take a situation like Whitaker. I don't mean --Q where, you know, if the arresting officer was the one who took him to process --

Α okay.

-- and, you know, you're not dealing with other calls or called out on, there's no snow, Central Booking is not, you know, crazy.

Okay. Α

So in that situation, that prisoner would not Q expected to be at the station more than hour. Is that correct?

MR. MACMAIN: Objection to form.

MR. GABRIEL: You can answer.

THE WITNESS: It's very dependent on the incident. I mean this man was involved in a felony crime. you know, reported to us as a robbery that was being investigated by us as a robbery. And those types of crimes take longer to deal with than a summary offense.

BY MR. SILVERMAN:

4 5

3

6 7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

case.

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25 just -- and the other factor is the speed of the officer, how quick he can type and everything else.

Okay. But what I was saying was not -- I'm not 0 talking about this incident. I'm talking about your typical incident where, you know, you're not going to investigate him, you're not going to question him so to speak. You're doing your outside investigation. And everything being your normal flow of business, an hour or less you would expect the prisoner to be in and out?

MR. MACMAIN: Objection to form. He's testified there's all kinds of variables.

MR. SILVERMAN: I said --

MR. MACMAIN: You're asking him to give a typical

BY MR. SILVERMAN:

Do you have typical cases? Q

I don't know. It depends what your definition of Α typical is. In reference to what you said, if it's stated the way you stated it --

Right. Q

-- that there's no investigation to be done, there's nothing other than to bring them in there, do what you got to do to get them ready to transport them, yes, typically it would be an hour or less.

All right. And would you say that that is most of your prisoners, that situation? Hour or less is most of your prisoners?

I can't answer that question. Α

Fair enough. All right. So after the officer, Q you know, leaves the prisoner in the holding cell, what is he next expected to do?

Prepare the necessary paperwork. If he's the Α arresting officer, to take that person forthwith to the Central Booking area so that the judge that is going to arraign that person has everything necessary to do so.

- Now in the Whitaker situation, Ex-Officer Utter Q was not the arresting officer. Correct?
 - That's correct. Α

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- who was the arresting officer? Q
- It would have been Officer Ford.
- All right. Now is there a standard operating procedure that you're aware of that relates to how an arresting officer that stays at the scene is to transfer the prisoner to the custody of someone else? So, like, as an example, in this situation, Ford was the arresting officer. Correct?
 - Α Yes.
- And Officer Ford stayed at the scene to do further investigation. Correct?

4

3

1

2

5 6

7

8 9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25 Correct.

All right. And when Officer Utter got there, he Q volunteered or was asked somehow to take the prisoner back to the station. Correct?

Α Yes.

Now is there a -- when a situation like that Q occurs, is there a standard operating procedure that relates to what information, if any, the arresting officer is supposed to give to the officer who is taking him back to the station?

- I don't believe so, not specifically like that.
- All right. Now again not on the Whitaker case. Q So after the prisoner, you go back, you start filling out your paperwork. Is that what you said?
 - Did you say not on the Whitaker case?
- I'm just talking about generally. I'm not talking 0 about what happened. Again what should have happened and what -- if -- if whitaker had not been shot and was processed in accordance with your standard operating procedures and was eventually taken to Central Booking, I'm trying to figure out what your expectation would have been, what would have happened. And I think we got to the point where you would have expected the room to be searched, the prisoner to be searched, Whitaker to have been left in the room, the officer to have then left -- locked up the room,

left the room, and then I think you said go back and start doing the paperwork. Correct?

just presented it. But, yes, if we're to the point like what happens after the prisoner is placed in the holding room, the officer then there that's in charge of that prisoner would -- if there was property that was removed from him, they would inventory that property and put it in a locker until which time the person is released or transferred into somebody else's custody. They would most likely run, like, criminal history information, try to verify the identification that the person has on their person, if they have any. If they didn't, start the work on identifying the person, try to find out if who they say they are is who they really are because we have issues with that all the time.

And basically if the person is non-violent, isn't, you know, showing any signs of any type of destructive behavior, they're required to personally monitor that person every 30 minutes and note that on a report. That's above and beyond the video monitoring, which they can pretty much do continually while they are in the squad room because there's video monitors there. If the person was extremely violent or showed -- exhibited signs of violent behavior, then they are required to monitor them every 10

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Okay. All right. You had said that the -- about 0 the monitoring of the prisoner, that it can be done continually through video system?

Yes, as long as you're looking at the video Α system.

And is there a -- do you have an expectation that Q your officers will continually monitor or will not continually monitor?

No, the expectation is what I had said previously, that the monitors are there for their use, but the expectation is 30 minutes if the person is non-violent. They have to personally go and monitor them or 10 minutes if they are violent.

MR. SILVERMAN: Okay. Why don't we take a break since we're almost done with this.

VIDEO OPERATOR: This is the conclusion of tape number one. Tape number two will follow. The time is 12:38.

MR. MACMAIN: One just housekeeping. It doesn't necessarily have to be on the video. Occasionally you refer to Officer Utter as ex-officer.

MR. SILVERMAN: He is ex-officer.

MR. MACMAIN: I'm making sure we're clear. If you use the transcript or the tape if this matter goes to trial, the fact he was terminated may not be admitted.

Define for me what you mean differently. We treat 1 2 all people the same but --Okay. The way -- the way it -- they're processed. 3 As an example -- all right. Let me ask you this question. 4 In -- do you agree that in July of '07 it was not your 5 standard operating procedure to remove belts from 6 7 prisoners? In July of '07, it was not our standard operating 8 procedure to remove belts from prisoners. That's correct. 9 In July of '07, was it standard operating 10 Q procedure to remove shoe laces from prisoners? 11 12 Α No, it was not. Okay. Today is it standard operating procedure to 13 Q 14 remove belts from prisoners? 15 Yes. Α Today is it standard operating procedure to remove 16 Q shoe laces from prisoners? 17 Yes, as well as a multitude of other things. 18 Α Okay. Why is it that now -- what is the purpose 19 Q of removing shoe laces from prisoners as a standard 20 operating procedure now? 21 The purpose of it is so it can't be used as a 22 weapon against the officer or used to hurt themselves. 23 Okay. And that -- that procedure is in place for 24 Q whether or not there's a suicide risk. Correct? 25

4

5

6

7 8

9

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25

That's correct. It's across the board.

All right. When did that -- do you believe Q there's a need for that?

- Do I believe that there's a need for that?
- That procedure. Q

If I didn't think there was a need for it, I wouldn't have put it in place.

Okay. Prior to July of '07, had you been aware Q that other -- other police departments or organizations where prisoners are detained as a standard operating procedure took away shoe laces from all prisoners?

MR. GABRIEL: Objection to the form of the question. You can answer it.

THE WITNESS: No, I don't -- I don't have all the standard operating procedures of other police departments, from other prisons or anything like that. We have what we have. And what we had prior to July of 2007 as what we have today both meets the accreditation standard for the Pennsylvania Law Enforcement Accreditation Commission, which we were accredited at the time of that particular incident on 7/7/07.

BY MR. SILVERMAN:

The -- the accreditation that you just mentioned, Q does that -- to be accredited, does it require -- today, does it require that your standard operating procedures

BY MR. SILVERMAN:

23

24

25

provide that all prisoners must have shoe laces taken away 1 if they are going to be held in custody? 2 No, it doesn't. 3 Okay. Now going back to before July of '0 -- of 4 0 2007, had you received any training -- I don't mean a 5 training course -- it could be from an organization member 6 or from something you learned in a school, from other 7 people -- about the risks associated with having prisoners 8 have shoe laces in a cell? 9 Not training. 10 Α Okay. And before the Whitaker shooting, were you 11 0 aware that prisoners could be -- not would be -- could be 12 at a greater risk to harm themselves if they had shoe laces 13 while locked up? 14 MR. MACMAIN: Objection to form. Are you asking 15 him -- are you asking him whether or not or are you stating 16 that that's --17 MR. SILVERMAN: I'm asking whether or not. I'm 18 not -- I'm not stating anything. 19 THE WITNESS: Can you ask me the question again? 20 MR. SILVERMAN: Can you read it back? 21 THE WITNESS: Whether or not what? 22

I'll rephrase it. Prior -- prior to July of '07,

prior to the Whitaker incident, did you have any beliefs as

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to if allowing a prisoner to keep his shoe laces on prior to being held, you know, in a prison while unhandcuffed created any greater risk for that prisoner to harm himself?

MR. GABRIEL: Objection to the form of the question. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: No, I didn't. We had never had an incident where anybody had tried to use a shoe lace to kill themselves. I'd never heard of an incident where anybody tried to use a shoe lace. I had heard of other incidents in prisons and whatnot where somebody had used a bed sheet, a T-shirt, a belt or something like that. But I had never heard of anything about a shoe lace up until this incident. BY MR. SILVERMAN:

Okay. So would you agree that prior to the Q whitaker shooting, you were aware or you had heard of other incidents where prisoners tried to hang themselves with belts?

In a prison -- I'm sorry. In a prison cell Α situation, yes, where they had used the belt to hang themselves from, like, a bar from the bars in the prison cell.

Okay. Now as it relates to -- do you agree that Q when you take a prisoner or a person into custody they -you're taking away their freedom of -- freedom of to come and go as they please?

duty to safequard your prisoners?

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

Yes, I think I said that.

Okay. Right. And my question is, do you believe that the duty that you have now is the same duty that you had in July of '07?

Yes, we had a duty of care in July of '07, and we Α have a duty of care now.

Okay. Now you had said -- all right. Now you had Q said previously that prior to the incident, the Whitaker shooting, you had heard of situations where prisoners not in your custody or control but in other prisons, that you had heard of those prisoners trying to hang themselves with belts?

I heard of it, yes. I didn't witness any of it. I didn't -- I wasn't partial to that or privy to that or anything. I just heard of it.

Okay. Prior to July of '07, it was not the Q practice of your department to remove the belts of all -of all prisoners. Correct?

Correct. I think I've already said that I Α believe.

All right. The -- was the reason that your 0 standard operating procedures relating to removal of belts and shoe laces from prisoners related at all to the whitaker shooting?

MR. GABRIEL: Just only an objection continuing in 1 nature in terms of subsequent changes. 2 MR. SILVERMAN: I'm not asking that. 3 MR. GABRIEL: But you can answer the question. 4 THE WITNESS: If you're asking did we change the 5 SOP as a result of that, yes, we did. 6 7 BY MR. SILVERMAN: were you aware in July of '07 that when a prisoner 8 Q was transferred from your facility to Central Booking that 9 Central Booking required all prisoners to remove their shoe 10 laces and belts? 11 MR. MACMAIN: Objection to form. Are you asking 12 him whether or not he knew that or whether it was a fact? 13 MR. SILVERMAN: Whether he knew it. Whether he 14 knew it. 15 MR. MACMAIN: Well, are you stating --16 MR. SILVERMAN: I'll ask him. 17 18 BY MR. SILVERMAN: 19 All right. Were you aware that in July of '07 Q when a prisoner was transferred to your -- from your 20 facility to Central Booking that the sheriff's department 21 required all prisoners to remove their belts and shoe 22 23 laces? MR. MACMAIN: Same objection. The way you're --24 25 let me just tell you why, and then you can cure it. You're

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 51 of 68

Can we agree that a guideline would be a minimum Q standard?

- It could be a minimum standard. Α
- The guidelines which you have -- had signed off Q on, did you expect all of your officers to comply with them?
 - Α Yes.
- And you expected Ex-Officer Utter to comply with Q them?
- 10 Yes. Α
 - what procedures were in place, if any, to ensure Q compliance with the standard operating procedures back in the months prior to -- you know, the few months prior to July of '07 through July of '07?
 - MR. GABRIEL: Just a point of clarification. You're talking in general?
 - MR. SILVERMAN: In general.

THE WITNESS: Our rules of conduct require that an officer follow the rules, policies, procedures, SOP's and things like that. And also when the officer is given those SOP's, whether it's in field training or in-service, during in-service training or any other time that they are updated, they are also given instruction on what the changes are, what's expected of them and then they sign off saying that they have read and understand them and agree to

follow and abide by them. 1

BY MR. SILVERMAN:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Other than what you just testified to, are there any other systems in place to basically check up or follow up on the officers to make sure they're doing what you want them to do?

Yes, as part of our accreditation, we have to show Α proofs to an on-site assessor that the SOP is not just written but it's also followed. Part of the accreditation process is having the written standards in place, and then the second part of it is showing proof that you do follow the standards.

O okay. Do you agree that part of the purpose of the standard operating procedures relating to holding rooms is to afford the highest degree of safety for detainees while in police custody?

Α Yes.

And now previously you -- strike that. Where Mr. 0 whitaker was placed, the room he was placed in, that would be considered a temporary holding area?

No, that's a holding area. Α

And what's the difference between a temporary Q holding area and a holding area?

A holding area is a secure area. In other words, when the door is closed, it's a locked door. The person

23

24

25

Α

Q

revised in April of 2006. 1 Okay. Obviously it says an effective date of 2 January 26th, 2005, but we know that it's been revised 3 since then. And clearly the revisions couldn't be 4 effective prior to the revisions being put in here. 5 6 Correct? That's correct. 7 Α All right. So is there a way to tell -- and maybe 8 0 what you said these numbers. What do the PLEAC stand for? 9 Pennsylvania Law Enforcement Accreditation 10 Commission. 11 Okay. Now these numbers, can you, please -- and 12 Q just take the first series. It looks like it's 3.1.1 --13 what does that stand for? comma. 14 It stands for basically the first standard in 15 Chapter 3 of the Accreditation Standards Manual and that 16 every one subsequent is a different standard. 17 Okay. So if I had that book in front of me, I Q 18 probably would be able to follow it? 19 Yes, you would. 20 Α All right. And the designated ones at the top, 21 are they the ones that reflect how the versions have been

changed from subsequent -- from subsequent versions?

Not the PLEAC numbers.

All right.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Α	They	have	nothing	to	do	with	revisions	of	the	SOP
---	------	------	---------	----	----	------	-----------	----	-----	-----

Okay. All right. So -- all right. Is there a Q way by just looking at this particular one to ascertain the revisions either made from the very first one, which would have been sometime in January '05, till now or the revisions that were made from this one to the one that had immediately preceded this?

Not on this current copy. What happens is when Α this was revised in April of '06, whatever the revision was, it was highlighted. The next time it came up for review, if there were no more revisions, those highlights were removed from it so that it's no longer new information. It's information that's already been in effect.

- So is it possible you could have a revised Q document with no changes?
- Yes, because the revision could be just taking out -- taking the highlighting off of it.
 - Understood. Q
 - Yeah.
- Okay. So if we would look through this and if we Q saw something highlighted, that would simply mean that that was a revision from the last revision. Correct?
- Yes, and it would also mean that we haven't reevaluated it since that revision date. Because once we

2 3

4 5

7

6

8 9

10 11

12

13

15

14

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

do, then we take the highlights off.

Right. And is there any way of looking at this one to say, okay, we know this one is now April '06, when we revised it before without looking at the actual -- the previous document?

Not by looking at this there's not. Α

All right. Now under -- what's the -- when and Q why do you decide to revise standard operating procedures?

We have -- we probably have well over 100 standard Α operating procedures, and we have those set up on a revision matrix so that every procedure is reviewed and either revised or kept the same at least one time during every calendar year. We have them split apart by month. we have a monthly staff meeting. We review the SOP's that come up on the matrix for that month, which may be five or six of them for one month, seven or eight of them for another month. It floats back and forth. But when that month comes up, we review the SOP. If there's no change to be made to the SOP, there's no change made obviously. Other than if there's highlighting on there from before and now we get to that and it's no longer new information, we take the highlighting off. So the next time if there is a revision and the highlighting comes on, it's very easy to see what the revision is.

Understood. Okay. So standard operating Q

25

same book.

procedures then get revised on a kind of ongoing cyclical 1 basis depending on when it comes up. That's one way? 2 3 Yes, sir, that's one way. And the other way is if you determine that there 4 is a need based upon either a change in the law or a change 5 in your perception of what needs to be done. Correct? 6 Correct. That's correct. 7 All right. So if we just -- again let's just take 8 Q If you look at page two of twenty-four, I don't a look. 9 see anything highlighted on here. So that would mean that 10 this page, whatever it says on here, is the same as the 11 12 most --MR. MACMAIN: Continue. You said there's nothing 13 highlighted. The one -- unless we're looking at a 14 different -- the one that I thought we were talking about, 15 16 there appears --MR. SILVERMAN: This is why it's hard not having 17 bate stamped documents. But go ahead. I don't see 18 anything highlighted. 19 MR. MACMAIN: Would it be helpful --20 MR. SILVERMAN: Just tell me what you need. 21 MR. MACMAIN: well, let me back up because it 22 ain't going to be helpful. So we're all reading off the 23

MR. SILVERMAN: I agree with that.

```
1
    Correct?
 2
             Yes, and it also goes out to the garage.
             Okay. So he literally -- if he had secured his
 3
    weapon the first time, he could have gone back into that
 4
    room and unsecured it and then take it back in here.
 5
 6
    Correct?
             He could have. He could have.
 7
                                             But I mean it
        Α
    wouldn't be wrong if he had secured it within --
8
             And kept it --
9
        Q
             -- that short of time frame he kept it secured and
10
    then went back and got it after the second time. That --
11
12
        Q
             That I understand. But my question is a little
13
    different. Once he -- assuming -- once it was unsecured,
    however -- for whatever reason, he had an obligation to
14
    secure it before he went back in the second time?
15
             MR. GABRIEL: Objection to the form of the
16
17
    question.
             THE WITNESS: The weapon, just for the record,
18
    was secured in his holster. He did not secure it in a
19
    weapon's locker per the SOP, yes.
20
21
    BY MR. SILVERMAN:
             Right. All right. Now this is the -- obviously
22
        Q
23
    the event?
24
             Right.
        Α
25
             All right. Let's talk for a second before we go
        Q
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

on about the use of deadly force. Before the actual discharge of deadly force, are there any requirements to provide verbal warnings?

No, there's no requirement to. It's in the officer's perception. If they are in fear of their life or committing serious bodily injury, they may use deadly The law doesn't require any type of verbal warning. And we don't require a verbal warning. A verbal warning is on the use of force continuum. It's suggested, but there are times that you may not be able to do that.

Okay. I had tried to ask this question artfully 0 before, and I had trouble with it. Maybe I'll do better But do you agree that there could -- you could go through a continuum -- an officer go through a continuum, think he's in -- you know, his life is at risk, could determine I now have the right to save myself by using deadly force; and just because that happens, doesn't mean he can stop evaluating the situation such that if the -- the risk changes he now would have to kind of re-assess -- or if he can re-assess and then determine should I still be using deadly force? As an example -- let me try to give -- a guy is coming after you, you think he is going to kill you and now you come up when you're -- I'm allowed to use deadly force. I go through my continuum. You pull your weapon. You're ready to use it. If

25

1	A because they may be charged with public							
2	drunkenness and they may not be severely intoxicated. They							
3	may just be intoxicated or mildly intoxicated.							
4	Q So are you suggesting that you could be charged							
5	with public drunkenness but not be have severe alcohol							
6	intoxication?							
7	A Yes.							
8	Q Okay.							
9	A You could be charged with public drunkenness and							
LO	not even come in as a detainee. You might be cited and							
11	released to somebody.							
L2	Q Well, I understand that. But we're not we are							
L3	talking about people that are detained.							
L4	A Okay. Yeah, I don't have to be severely							
L5	intoxicated to be publicly drunk.							
L6	Q Now can we also agree if you look at subpart C							
L7	of that same section							
L8	A Okay.							
١9	Q that even though it's under the heading of							
20	segregation of certain prisoners, that subpart C truly is a							
21	different standard that you expect of your officers if							
22	someone is severely intoxicated? Take a second to look at							
23	it.							

A Yeah, I got it. It's not a different standard. I

mean that standard is referred to in other parts of the

25

But when dealing with segregation of certain 1 SOP. prisoners, it's just a reiteration of what's already been 2 stated before; where if they display those aspects of 3 behavior, they have to be checked on every 10 minutes as 4 opposed to every 30 minutes if they don't display those. 5 Okay. And that personally check, is you're 6 talking about literally walking up to the facility and --7 you know, looking in the window or opening the door? 8 9 Yes. Α Okay. Now it also says persons meeting a list of 10 Q criteria shall be constantly monitored through the video 11 surveillance system? 12 13 Yes. Α Okay. Are you saying to me that that requirement 14 0 is for all prisoners whether they're intoxicated or not? 15 MR. MACMAIN: What requirement? 16 MR. SILVERMAN: The requirement to constantly 17 monitor through the video surveillance system. 18 THE WITNESS: They are monitored through the video 19 surveillance system. So it's done automatically by the 20 21 system. BY MR. SILVERMAN: 22 Okay. So is it then -- so what -- so are you 23 Q

saying that all prisoners must be constantly monitored

through the video surveillance system?

MR. GABRIEL: Just -- when you say monitor --

I'm reading it right from there. MR. SILVERMAN:

But we're -- he's talking MR. GABRIEL: I know. about -- you have TV monitors.

MR. SILVERMAN: Let him answer. If he can answer, he can answer.

MR. GABRIEL: Well, objection to the form of the question.

MR. SILVERMAN: Okay. That's fine.

BY MR. SILVERMAN:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I just want to know. I mean it says what it Q says. And I'm just -- all I'm asking is, the standard, whatever it means, the first line of subpart C, does that apply to all prisoners or only prisoners that meet the criteria in Al through 4 above?

I'll try to clarify it for you. All prisoners are constantly monitored via the video monitoring system. It's done automatically by the system.

I understand. 0

what it means is is if you're in the squad room working on your paperwork, as you're working on your paperwork, you have to look up and look at the monitor every so often to make sure nothing is going on in the room. That's -- the constant monitoring is when they're taken into the room they are constantly monitored by the

4

9 10

11 12

13

15

14

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

When you're out working in the room, you can sit there and look at the monitor and watch what they're doing. But every 10 minutes you got to go personally and check on them to make sure that they are okay --

okay. Q

-- because -- I'll explain that so that you understand it. Somebody that appears to be sleeping might not be sleeping. They might be suffering some kind of a medical problem. So if you go and personally check on them, then you'll know whether or not they're sleeping or suffering a personal medical problem.

But you might not be able to tell looking through Q a window. Could you?

But you could yell. And if they You might not. don't respond, then go in and check.

Okay. But this -- because the words are the Q words. Whatever they mean they mean. But it says persons meeting a list of criteria shall be constantly monitored through the video surveillance system. And then it says But let's just leave it to where we got. So I just and. want to make sure I understand. Is that standard the same for all prisoners?

Yes, they are all constantly monitored through the Α system.

Okay. Now if you look at 224, please, where it Q

```
1
    talks about the purpose of the video surveillance.
    take a look and -- I assume you agree that this -- as it's
 2
 3
    set forth, this is the purpose of the system?
             Yes, I'm looking at again the version that's April
4
    of 2006.
 5
 6
             Okay. And it doesn't seem to be any different
        Q
7
    than page 224?
8
        Α
             Probably not.
             Okay. And if we could just take a look under B.
9
10
    It says monitoring of the video surveillance will be
11
    conducted by the arresting officer or in this case the
12
    officer in charge of the detainee?
13
        Α
             Yes.
             The obligation of an officer to monitor the video
14
15
    surveillance, does that change at all based upon the
    criteria described in the paragraph we discussed before,
16
    which -- I lost that page -- that's at Roman Numeral 18?
17
18
             MR. GABRIEL: Objection to the form of the
19
    question.
20
             THE WITNESS: Yeah, there's -- there's a
21
    difference between somebody that's not showing any of these
    signs listed. They have to be checked every 30 minutes
22
    personally. Somebody that is showing those signs has to be
23
24
    checked personally every 10 minutes.
    BY MR. SILVERMAN:
25
```

Α

All right. But that's different than monitoring 1 Q 2 the video surveillance? Right. The video surveillance system 3 automatically monitors anybody anytime they are in a room. 4 well, again looking at -- at Roman Numeral XXX --5 I guess that's 30 --6 7 Α Thirty. -- do you agree that when the first sentence --8 Q when it talks about the monitoring of the video that it 9 makes reference to the officer's obligation to monitor the 10 video? 11 Yes, in other words, you can't put somebody in a 12 Α room and never look at the monitor screen. Because if you 13 did that, you wouldn't know something was wrong or not. 14 15 Agreed. Q Yes, that's correct. 16 Α But my question to you is -- and you may have 17 answered it earlier -- does the obligation to monitor the 18 video surveillance screen change or is it always the same 19 20 for each detainee? No. they have an obligation to monitor the video 21 Α It doesn't say how many times they have to look at 22 screen. 23 the screen. 24 Q Okay. But, yes, they have to check it.

```
Okay. Is use of deadly force permitted if a
 1
        Q
 2
    prisoner is trying to escape?
             MR. GABRIEL: Objection to the form of the
 3
    question. There aren't any other facts with your
 4
 5
    hypothetical.
 6
             MR. SILVERMAN: I'm just asking the question.
 7
    can answer it. If he can't, he can't.
             MR. GABRIEL: You can answer it.
 8
 9
             THE WITNESS: Under the law, it is permitted if
    they're incarcerated in, like, a prison. Like if they are
10
11
    committed to an institution, it is permitted in that
12
    instance.
13
    BY MR. SILVERMAN:
14
             Okay. How about if they are in your station?
        Q
15
             No, we're not -- we're not a detention facility.
16
             Okay. You have standard operating procedures
    dealing with, like, mentally ill. Correct?
17
             Yes, we do.
18
        Α
             All right. Does mentally -- do any of the
19
20
    provisions consider alcohol or being drunk as a temporary
21
    mental illness or temporary medical condition which could
    require things to be handled differently?
22
23
             MR. MACMAIN: Objection. It's a compound
    question. You said alcohol or drunk. Which --
24
25
             MR. SILVERMAN: Okay. How about -- we'll --
```

BY MR. SILVERMAN:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Are you aware if the standard operating procedures related to dealing with mentally ill have provisions relating to intoxicated people?

I'd have to go through and review the entire SOP. But it's not -- it wasn't written to deal with intoxicated persons. It was written to deal with mentally ill persons or people that suffer mental illness. Now if you're asking could one of those people also be intoxicated, yes, they In that case, the provision would provide what an could. officer is supposed to do for a mentally ill person that's intoxicated. But I don't know if it specifically states that.

Okay. Now we had talked about the -- why it is Q that you'll change standard operating procedures. And we know that we have the ones relating to the holding rooms from '06, and then they did change after the Whitaker shooting. Were any of the changes -- and you may have answered this -- and if you did, I apologize -- related to the Whitaker shooting?

Α Yes.

Okay. Were there any other standard operating 0 procedures that were related to the Whitaker shooting other than ones relating to holding rooms?

That were -- are you asking that were revised?

3 4

5 6

7 8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25

Yeah. Were there any other -- were there any Q standard operating procedures other than the ones relating to holding rooms that were revised as a result of the Whitaker shooting?

MR. GABRIEL: Just an objection to the form of the question.

THE WITNESS: We revised quite a few since that But as far as it relates to that shooting, that's the only one that I can recollect right now. When you ask me that question, that's the only one that I can recollect that was changed as a result of that.

BY MR. SILVERMAN:

- Okay. And if I could, you -- we talked earlier Q about securing and control. And I will show you -- it has not been bate stamped, but it is on the revised 10/07 SOP's for the holding rooms. And I think we had looked at this earlier, Roman Numeral four-three. Is that the only -sitting here today, is that the only provision of the standard operating procedures that you can think of that were changed as a result of the Whitaker shooting?
 - Do you have the beginning of this SOP? Α
 - I do. I'm sorry. Q
- Let me look at the whole thing real quick. Yes, that -- out of the changes in that SOP that I just looked through, that appears to be the one that was changed as a

```
result of that incident. There's some others that were
1
 2
    changed for accreditation purposes, but it had nothing to
    do with that incident.
 3
 4
             VIDEO OPERATOR: Do you want to change?
 5
             MR. SILVERMAN: Well, he needs to go.
             VIDEO OPERATOR: Do you want to just quit, end it?
6
7
             MR. SILVERMAN: Yeah, we can end it.
8
             VIDEO OPERATOR: This concludes the deposition of
    Chief of Police David Eshbach. The time is 3:52.
9
10
             MR. SILVERMAN: You know, a couple things.
    Certain documents were handed to me that I didn't -- and I
11
12
    also want to let the Chief out of here. I know he's got
13
    somewhere to go. My suggestion -- and it's up to you
    guys -- is that, you know, we have four depositions
14
15
    scheduled for Tuesday, that we end today and with -- with
    reserving the right to come back if need be. I don't want
16
    to keep him.
17
18
             MR. GABRIEL: That's fine.
19
             MR. SILVERMAN: If you say no, then we're going to
20
    keep him here.
             MR. GABRIEL: I don't want to do that at all.
21
22
             THE WITNESS: Do you think we're going to do this
    another hour or five more minutes?
23
24
             MR. SILVERMAN: If I didn't have any other
    depositions that were scheduled, it would probably be at
25
```