

AUG 07 2017

IN THE DISTRICT COURT IN AND FOR OKMULGEE COUNTY  
STATE OF OKLAHOMA

CHARLY CRIVER, COURT CLERK  
Deputy

IN THE MATTER OF A MOTION TO DISQUALIFY )  
DISTRICT JUDGE KEN ADAIR FROM HEARING )  
ALL CASES PROSECUTED BY THE OKMULGEE )  
COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE )

Case No. CV-2017-70

**MOTION TO DISQUALIFY DISTRICT JUDGE KEN ADAIR FROM HEARING ALL  
CASES PROSECUTED BY THE OKMULGEE COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S  
OFFICE**

Comes now O.R. Barris III, District Attorney of Okmulgee-McIntosh Counties, District 25 and hereby moves to disqualify District Judge Kenneth Adair from hearing all cases prosecuted by the Okmulgee County District Attorney's Office.

This Motion to Disqualify is submitted pursuant to Rule 15 of the Rules for the District Courts of the State of Oklahoma, Article 2, Section 6 of the Oklahoma Constitution, Title 20 Section 1403 of the Oklahoma Statutes, and Canon 2 of the Code of Judicial Conduct as adopted by the State of Oklahoma as set forth by the Oklahoma Supreme Court Order 2010 OK 90, effective April 15, 2011.

Before the filing of this Motion to Disqualify, on August 3, 2017 the State first asked for and made an in camera request of Judge Adair to disqualify based upon partiality, bias and/or prejudice against the Okmulgee County District Attorney's Office and law enforcement operating in Okmulgee County. Judge Adair denied this request on August 4, 2017. The Court indicated a request to recuse must be made on a case by case basis stating there was no mechanism in place for a "global request." As a result of that ruling, the State again approached the Court requesting an in camera hearing presenting a list of all criminal and civil forfeiture cases currently pending before the Court, again asking the Court to recuse and/or transfer those cases to another judge. This request was also denied. The State again asked for a stay of proceedings, but this request was denied as well. Therefore, since the oral motions have been denied, the State of Oklahoma would submit the following written motion in support of its Motion to Disqualify pursuant to Rule 15.

The State contends that the language of Rule 15 does not prohibit the Movant from making the request to the Judge to disqualify pertaining to all cases the State is prosecuting before the Judge. However, in an effort to provide some degree of clarity and to afford the opportunity to notify those persons who may be effected by this Request, the State attaches hereto and incorporates by reference as a part hereof a list of all criminal and forfeiture cases currently set for hearing before the Judge from August 7, 2017 to December 31, 2017 as State Exhibit "A". The State intends to notify

counsel of record in these cases with a copy of this Motion. This is the same list as presented to the Court during the August 7, 2017 in camera hearing.

## GROUND ONE

### THE JUDGE, THROUGH CONDUCT AND STATEMENTS ON THE RECORD, HAS ESTABLISHED CIRCUMSTANCES IN WHICH THE JUDGE'S IMPARTIALITY MIGHT REASONABLY BE QUESTIONED

Judge Adair, through conduct and statements made on the record in multiple criminal proceedings has established circumstances in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned. Canon of Judicial Ethics Rule 2.11 establishes this as the proper standard for consideration for purposes of this Motion to Disqualify. As set forth specifically in this Motion, Judge Adair has made statements, findings and rulings on the record which have stated that various law enforcement officers' testimony has been untruthful and has used such findings and statements in reaching his decisions in those cases.

Specifically, the Judge has, in the cases noted hereinafter, made statements, findings and rulings on the Record which indicate that he has determined that two different Oklahoma Highway Patrol Officers, one Oklahoma Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs Agent, one Okmulgee Police Officer, the Office of the District Attorney of Okmulgee County and specifically the District Attorney's Chief Investigator as being involved in the presentation of false or untrue evidence to the Court. Such statements, findings and rulings indicate a pattern of statements and/or conduct which give rise to circumstances concerning the Okmulgee County District Attorney's Office and multiple law enforcement agencies in which the Judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned.

In Court proceedings, Judge Adair has made specific findings that an officer has been untruthful in four different cases. The first case in which he made such a statement was ***State v. Mario Alexander***, Okmulgee County case number CF-14-543. In a motion hearing held on August 7, 2015, the Court made the following statements about Trooper Brad Giulioli:

Based on the credibility determinations I have to make based on everything. What he said at the Preliminary Hearing, what he said under oath twice, falsely, that he had to get Mr. Alexander out of the car and had to handcuff him and put him in his patrol unit in the furtherance of his investigation of a cracked windshield, and a third brake light out. That's not true.

It wasn't true that day. It wasn't true the day of the Preliminary Hearing.

But he was so dead set on not wavering that he forgot to tell the truth.  
And it would have been so easy if he had just told the truth. And he didn't.

(Transcript of Motion hearing held August 7, 2015, p. 82, lines 14-25, p. 83, line 1)

In ***State v. Isaac Caviness***, Okmulgee County case number CF-2013-501, in a hearing on the defendant's motion to suppress a search warrant held on October 16, 2014, the Court ruled that Oklahoma Bureau of Narcotics Agent Spencer Gilmore had to embellish his story and either lied, or had reckless disregard for the truth in his affidavit for the search warrant. This hearing was not transcribed.

In ***State v. Kelly Strawn***, Okmulgee County case number CF-2016-75, in a hearing on the defendant's motion to suppress and dismiss held on October 7, 2016, the Court made the following statements about Trooper Daran Koch, a seventeen year veteran with the Oklahoma Highway Patrol:

Because he kind of even lied his own specialized relationship with that dog by saying I'm not sure if he's certified for Ecstasy or not. (Transcript of hearing, p. 16, lines 16-18)

He went on to claim the Trooper was "faking" his technical knowledge by stating:

But when I have these other reasons to be concerned, about the officer using pretext and faking – not yawns, but faking specialized technical knowledge to justify delaying the detention of this Defendant. (Transcript, p. 18, lines 13-17)

In ***State v. Michaele Johnson***, Okmulgee County case number CF-2016-18, in a hearing on the defendant's motion to suppress held on April 6, 2017, Officer Tyson Fuqua testified that he observed the defendant's vehicle pull up next to another vehicle on a dead end road, after dark on New Year's Eve, 2015. After approximately 30 seconds to a minute, she backed up, and left traveling left of center a block away. That traffic violation was the basis for the stop. In response to the Court's numerous questions during the State's direct, Officer Fuqua testified the defendant had a "brief encounter" with this other vehicle before leaving the area. When the Court asked him to describe "encounter" he stated "Pulled up next to it. I *assume* she had interaction with whoever else was in the other vehicle." (Transcript of 4/6/17 hearing, p. 12, lines 6-8) Upon further questioning by the Court, Officer Fuqua clarified it was only an assumption on his part that someone pulling up next to a parked car on a dead end street late at night for approximately one minute actually had an interaction, but stated he did not witness them actually interacting, only that he observed them parked next to each other. This is the one and only time in which Officer Fuqua described the two vehicles parked next to each other as an "encounter".

From this testimony, however, the Court made the following findings regarding Officer Fuqua:

I also want the record to reflect that I'm very concerned that on at least **three** different occasions, even after being pressed and asked to clarify, Mr. Fuqua saw fit to exaggerate and embellish what he observed. Called it an interaction. He called it an encounter. He said – even after all that, he said I saw Ms. Johnson meet with the other vehicle. And when pressed, he saw nothing of the sort. And it was clear that he was trying to exaggerate or embellish what he thought he saw to justify his stop. (Transcript of 4/6/17 hearing, p. 45, lines 15-24)

It should be noted that even defense counsel called this situation wherein her client pulled up next to the parked car on a dead end street “an interaction” stating: “And I’m also including the first interaction, the interaction where the vehicles were there for a short minute.” (Transcript of 4/6/17 hearing, p. 32, lines 20-22). The Court himself also called it an interaction stating: “And from position 1, you observed this interaction immediately in front of the pink house?” (Transcript of 4/6/17, p. 36, lines 12-14). Even though the Court and defense counsel both used the term “interaction”, the Court chastised Officer Fuqua for the use of the term the one time he stated it, and then himself misstated how many times Officer Fuqua used it.

Even after stating his ruling and concluding the hearing, the Court went on to state:

And again, Ms. Iski, I apologize for my obvious irritation. I was not irritated with you.

But I was irritated by the repeated attempts to embellish or to exaggerate or to bolster what he saw that he couldn't have seen. And, also, I have never, in all my years ever been involved in any case, civil or criminal, where going to the actual scene did not benefit me dramatically.

(Transcript of 4/6/17 hearing, p. 46, lines 15-25)

As a result of the Court actually going to “the scene” and then interjecting into the record his findings from the scene, the State filed a Motion to Reopen requesting an opportunity to refute the facts asserted into the record by the Court based upon its viewing. These facts were not presented by either party, only by the Court. Because the record was silent at this point as to the State's position regarding the Court's findings based upon its visit to the scene, the State also filed a written Offer of Proof in the event the Court denied the Motion to Reopen. The Court set this Motion to Reopen for hearing on June 5, 2017 and stayed the proceedings until that date.

At that hearing, the Court made the following statements:

And there has been an effort, by the State's submission of the offer of proof, to change the testimony and narrative of Officer Fuqua, which I find extremely troubling. (Transcript of June 5, 2017 hearing, p. 4, lines 12-14)

He further states:

Other than he didn't think well enough of the stop that he did make, that he kept trying to create this narrative and give false testimony about what he did see, when, in fact, he didn't see it. (Transcript 6/5/17, p. 12, lines 13-18)

Any effort by the State or anybody else from the Okmulgee Police Department, or the D.A.'s Office, that wants to change Officer Fuqua's story or to change the facts, that is not permissible. (Transcript 6/5/17, p. 12, lines 23-25, p. 13, lines 1-3)

And to the extent that that is what was attempted in the offer of proof . . .

(Transcript 6/5/17, p. 13, lines 4-5)

In a written Order issued after this June 5, 2017 hearing, the Court stated:

Again, because Officer Fuqua did not observe, and could not have observed any conduct by the Defendant on or near 1<sup>st</sup> Street and Muskogee, and because Officer Fuqua attempted, through improper exaggeration to the Court of what he did and did not observe (ostensibly a drug deal going down), the entirety of his testimony is not worthy of belief.

The Court then ordered the State's Offer of Proof stricken from the record. The State then gave oral notice of its intent to appeal as is required by statute and the hearing was concluded.

In preparing the Notice of Intent to Appeal, the State included the Offer of Proof as part of the record to be submitted to the Court of Criminal Appeals. In response, without a request from either party, the Court on its own filed another Order dated June 12, 2017. In that Order, the Court states:

" ... at the direction of O.R. Barris, District Attorney in and for the 25<sup>th</sup> D.A. District, dispatched two officers, Okmulgee Police Chief Joe Prentice and DA Investigator Robert Frost, to review the transcript of the April 6<sup>th</sup> hearing and to confer with Officer Fuqua (the officer who testified at the April 6<sup>th</sup> hearing), and to visit the scene of the arrest and conduct further investigation.

Had Chief Prentice or Officer Frost been endorsed as witnesses and appeared at the April 6<sup>th</sup> hearing, they would have been barred under the rule of sequestration from reading or talking about testimony, or from conferring with Officer Fuqua about his testimony.

Accordingly, this Court hereby orders and directs that if Plaintiff has failed to withdraw its "Written Offer of Proof", or if said "Written Offer of Proof" is in any way included in the record transmitted to the Oklahoma Court of

Criminal Appeals, this Order shall be included as part of the "Entirety of the Court File in this matter..." referenced in Plaintiff's "Notice of Intent to Appeal and Designation of Record."

It should be noted that the State's Written Offer of Proof contained affidavits, photographs and Officer Fuqua's body camera video. The thrust of the offer was to address the issues raised by the Court after its visit to the scene. It should also be noted that in Officer Frost's affidavit, he clearly states that his only role was to examine, document by photograph and measure the roadway and bridge that the Court determined was too narrow and inferior to allow a motorist to maintain his or her lane. He did not review the transcript or interview Officer Fuqua about his observations. This wholesale castigation of Mr. Frost by the Court was totally without factual basis.

It should also be noted that the Rule of Sequestration the Court references to justify exclusion of testimony from Officers Prentice and Frost, was never invoked by defense counsel.

In the case of *C.R.B. v State*, 1978 OK CR 22, in paragraph 2 the Court of Criminal Appeals stated as follows:

Article II, Section 6 of the Oklahoma Constitution provides that ... "right and justice shall be administered without sale, denial, delay, or prejudice." As we stated in *State v Brown*, 8 Okl.Cr 40, 126 P. 245, Ann. Cas. 1914C, 394 (1912), both the State and the accused are entitled to a hearing before an impartial judge.

The standard is not whether the Judge personally believes himself to unprejudiced, unbiased or impartial. Rather the standard is where there are circumstances of such nature as to cause doubts as to a judge's partiality, it is his duty to disqualify. *State Ex.Rel. Larecy v Sullivan*, 1952 OK 290, 248 P2d 239. In that case, at paragraph 20, the Court said:

In *Heard v Sullivan*, Judge, supra, we said that where there are circumstances of such a nature as to cause doubts as to a judge's partiality, bias or prejudice, it is his duty to disqualify, notwithstanding the fact that he personally believes himself to be unprejudiced, unbiased, and impartial.

## GROUND TWO

**THE JUDGE, THROUGH RULINGS IN ON-GOING CASES AND STATEMENTS MADE EXTRAJUDICIALLY TO MEMBERS OF COURT STAFF, DISTRICT ATTORNEY PERSONNEL AND/OR LAW ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL, HAS ESTABLISHED CIRCUMSTANCES IN WHICH THE JUDGE'S IMPARTIALITY MIGHT REASONABLY BE QUESTIONED**

Judge Adair, on various occasions, has made statements concerning pending criminal cases wherein he has expressed his lack of confidence in the truthfulness of law enforcement officers and members of the District Attorney's Office of Okmulgee County. He has also made specific findings on the record in four criminal cases that the officer involved was untruthful in his testimony. Specific references and sources of this information are set forth above and incorporated by reference into this Ground. Judge Adair has also made comments and statements out of court to others which imply his suspicion of law enforcement, partiality, bias and prejudice, as listed below.

On July 10, 2017, Deputy Sheriff Duston Todd was in the chambers of Judge Pandee Ramirez signing returns on search warrants. Judge Adair entered and made the statement to Deputy Todd that law enforcement will not call him for search warrants because they do not trust him.

Attorney Kenneth Butler reports that Judge Adair has made comments to him about calling police officers liars from the bench.

The Judge has also, on more than one occasion, made extrajudicial statements to District Attorney Office personnel that a different Okmulgee Police Officer and an Okmulgee County Sheriff Deputy have made false statements in his opinion in cases in which he was the Defense counsel. Specific references as to this information are as set forth below.

Judge Adair has made comments to First Assistant Carol Iski that Okmulgee Police Officer Charles Reed is untruthful. Judge has made this comment on several different occasions. The comments centered on a case in which Officer Reed was involved and either testified or wrote in a report that the vehicle in question was driving left of center. Judge Adair claimed he refuted this information by showing the road lacked a center line. As a result, Judge Adair has repeatedly stated that Officer Reed will not look at him when they see each other. On other occasions, Judge Adair has made similar types of statements to Carol Iski claiming that former deputy sheriff Mark Dawson is a liar. He did not relate the specific instance from which he formed this opinion.

Judge Adair has made numerous statements to Special Judge Pandee Ramirez regarding police officers and in his opinion, their lack of veracity. He told Judge Ramirez that he believes that the Okmulgee Police Department promotes lies, and that this problem is systemic. He has stated that he knows for a fact that officers talk about their lies in the locker rooms of the police department and call this "testilying". When Judge Ramirez questioned how he would know this, he stated his brother told him. It should be noted his brother was a Henryetta Police Officer but has not worked for that department for approximately seventeen years. Judge Ramirez reports that when she expressed her concern over his belief that he needed to "fix" law enforcement by calling them liars from the bench, he replied that he "had to start somewhere". This implies to the State that the Court has some sort of an agenda, rather than maintaining a fair and

impartial position as required by law and the judicial canons. Lastly, when Judge Ramirez pointed out that First Assistant Carol Iski was not an attorney that would ever promote perjured testimony, Judge Adair replied that she had “succumbed to the pressure”.

In summary, the judicial and extrajudicial statements made by the Judge to various people as set forth herein establish circumstances in which the judge’s impartiality might reasonably be questioned. Movant would incorporate the authority, both in the Canon of Judicial Ethics and case citations set forth previously in this Motion to support Grounds One and Two. As Rule 2.11 clearly states, the Judge is mandated to Disqualify based on the facts set forth herein.

### **GROUND THREE**

#### **THE JUDGE IN HIS VIOLATION OF CANON OF JUDICIAL ETHICS RULE 2.9 HAS CREATED FURTHER CIRCUMSTANCES IN WHICH THE JUDGE’S IMPARTIALITY MIGHT REASONABLY BE QUESTIONED**

As stated above, in the case of *State v Michealle Johnson*, Okmulgee County case number CF-2016-18, and previously discussed in GROUND ONE AND TWO, the Judge went to the physical scene of the events involved in that case. The Judge did so in the midst of the hearing and did so alone. The Judge then made observations and took what he observed into account when he made his findings and rulings in that case.

The Judge did these acts initially on April 6, 2017 and referred to those observations at that hearing in making findings that the testimony of Officer Fuqua was not believable and used his observations to support, at least partially, his ultimate ruling to grant the Defense Motion to Suppress. It should be noted that the events which were the subject of this action occurred December 31, 2015 at approximately 9:00 p.m., a time in which it is dark outside. The Judge visited the scene some sixteen months later in broad daylight without the benefit of having vehicles staged in the locations as testified to by Fuqua, and without knowledge as to how much the considerable vegetation which was present in this area had changed in the interim growing seasons.

As stated above, the State objected to this action at the time the Judge did it. Subsequent to the adverse ruling being announced and reference being made by the Judge to his observations and conclusions from his scene visit, the State filed a Motion to Re-Open the Record in this case based on the action taken by the Judge and the “facts” gathered by the Court on its own without the benefit of either counsel being present. A hearing on that Motion was held on June 5, 2017 and a record made.

During that hearing, the Judge again referred to the scene visit and his conclusions from it and denied the Motion to Re-Open the Record filed by the State. In so doing, he again acknowledged that he had in fact gone to the scene alone to acquire information he subsequently used in the decision-making process in the case.

Such a visit, Movant urges is a violation of Rule 2.9 of the Canon of Judicial Ethics, which states in pertinent part at (C):

“A judge shall not investigate facts in a matter independently, and shall consider only the evidence presented and any facts that may be properly judicially noticed.”

In Comment (6) to this Rule, this prohibition of independent investigation of facts includes “all mediums, including electronic means.”

The Record in the Johnson proceeding is clear that the information obtained by the Judge outside the presence of the State and the Defendant was used by the Judge to reach his conclusions as to the lack of believability of Officer Fuqua’s testimony and the ultimate disposition of the Motion being heard. The scene visit and the consideration of the results of the scene visit are in direct violation on Rule 2.9(C).

That violation and the use of the matters obtained from it to determine that Officer Fuqua has presented false testimony is an additional circumstance that in which the Judge’s impartiality might reasonably be questioned.

### **CONCLUSION**

The standard of proof for instances where Disqualification of a judge is the remedy requested is the establishment of circumstances “in which the judge’s impartiality might reasonably be questioned”. As quoted above, the determinative issue is not whether or not the Judge believes he can be impartial but rather have there been circumstances established in which the Judge’s impartiality might be questioned.

As set forth in GROUND ONE Movant has demonstrated that in multiple cases involving the Okmulgee County District Attorney’s Office and law enforcement that the Judge’s conduct and statements on the Record rises to the level in which the Judge’s impartiality might reasonably be questioned, which pursuant to Rule 2.11 mandates the Judge to Disqualify himself.

In addition to the facts produced in support of GROUND ONE, the Judge, through both judicial and extrajudicial statements has established circumstances in which the Judge’s impartiality might reasonably be questioned as set forth in GROUND TWO. These statements both independently and in conjunction with the Judge’s on the Record statements establish an environment in which the District Attorney’s Office and law enforcement are being perceived and pronounced by the Judge to be untruthful and which translates to an environment where the District Attorney’s Office submits it cannot receive a fair hearing or trial in any of its cases conducted before the Judge.

As set forth in GROUND THREE, the instance wherein the Judge violated Rule 2.9 (C) and relied upon investigation conducted by him outside of the courtroom and presence of the parties indicates circumstances in which the Judge’s lack of impartiality

as to the District Attorney's Office and law enforcement might reasonably be questioned.

When the cumulative effect of the Judge's statements and actions as set forth herein over a period of time spanning at least the last eighteen months through July 2017 is considered, there exist circumstances in which the impartiality of the Judge could reasonably be questioned. Movant would respectfully request the Judge to Disqualify himself from any proceedings prosecuted by the Okmulgee County District Attorney's Office.

Respectfully submitted,

OR Barris III

O.R. Barris III, OBA #561  
District Attorney in and for Okmulgee  
County, Oklahoma

VERIFICATION

I hereby certify that I have read the above and foregoing, as well as all the attachments, and verify the contents therein are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

OR Barris III

O.R. Barris III, OBA #561

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 7th day of August, 2017.

Kelany Kestabadi  
Notary Public

My Commission Expires:

March 22, 2019  
07002893

CERTIFICATE OF DELIVERY

I hereby certify that on the 7<sup>th</sup> day of August 2017, I hand delivered a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing Motion to Disqualify to The Honorable Judge Ken Adair, Judge of the District Court of Okmulgee County, Oklahoma.

OR Barris III

O.R. Barris III

CERTIFICATE OF DELIVERY

I hereby certify that on the 7<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2017, I caused a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing Motion to Disqualify to be sent via email delivery to all Counsel of Record for the cases set forth in State Exhibit "A".

OR Barris III

O.R. Barris III

CASES SET BEFORE JUDGE KENNETH E. ADAIR  
AUGUST 9, 2017 TO JANUARY 31, 2018

DA	CASE NUMBER	DEFENDANT	DATE SET	HEARING	DEFENSE ATTORNEY
CI	CF-2016-145 CF-2016-157	JOHNNIE BRANSON	8-9-2017	SOUNDING	CINDY DAWSON
CI	CF-2016-436	JAMES FOUST	8-9-2017	SOUNDING	CORI FELKINS
CI	CF-2016-375B	NATHANIEL PANGLE	8-9-2017	SOUNDING	KYLE KILLIAM
CI	CF-2016-59	BILLY STEVENSON	8-9-2017	SOUNDING	JAY RAMEY
CI	CF-2016-366	MARK FISHER	8-9-2017	SOUNDING	PAT LAYDEN
CI	CF-2016-425 CM-2016-476 CM-2016-790	MARCO HERNANDEZ	8-9-2017	SOUNDING	KYLE KILLAM
CI	CF-2016-115	STEPHEN JONES	8-9-2017	SOUNDING	ANGELA BONILLA
CI	CF-2016-491	WILLIE FRAZIER	8-9-2017	SOUNDING	ANGELA BONILLA
CI	CF-2016-139 CM-2016-203	ROSS WHITE	8-9-2017	SOUNDING	ANGELA BONILLA
RB	CF-2016-45	BART DEATON	8-9-2017	SOUNDING	
CI	CF-2016-466	NATHAN GRIFFIN	8-9-2017	SOUNDING	CORI FELKINS
CI	CF-2016-410	ANFERNEE SHANNON	8-9-2017	SOUNDING	KATHY FRY
RB	CF-2015-305	RUBEN GRIFFIN	8-9-2017	SOUNDING	REGINA MEYER
RB	CF-2014-250	RONALD BROWN	8-9-2017	SOUNDING	CECIL DRUMMOND
RB	CF-2016-237B	CINQUE GADSON	8-9-2017	SOUNDING	KYLE KILLAM
CI	CF-2016-408	AUDREY MINYARD	8-9-2017	SOUNDING	GLEN HICKERSON
CI	CF-2017-14 CF-2017-74B	WALLACE TOWNSEND	8-9-2017	SOUNDING	KYLE KILLAM
RB	CF-2014-580B CM-2017-256	CHRISTOPHER LANCASTER	8-9-2017	SOUNDING	REGINA MEYER
CI	CF-2017-41	DARNELL PACE	8-9-2017	SOUNDING	BLAKE LYNCH
CI	CF-2016-335C	ALLAN YOUNG	8-9-2017	SOUNDING	JAY RAMEY
CI	CF-2016-100	VICTOR ORTIZ	8-9-2017	SOUNDING	JEFF CONTRERAS
CI	CF-2016-368	PRUDENCE TROTTER	8-9-2017	SOUNDING	CORI FELKINS
CI	CF-2014-287	WILBERT RIVERS	8-9-2017	SOUNDING	ARLAN BULLARD
CI	CF-2016-365	KIM SMITH	8-10-2017	MOTION HEARING	BOB STUBBLEFIELD
CI	CF-2017-69	DANIEL SIMMER	8-11-2017	SENTENCING	ANGELA BONILLA
CI	CF-2016-475 CF-2013-578	ELVIS JONES	8-11-2017	SENTENCING	KYLE KILLAM
CI	CF-2016-478	BLAKE CHILD	8-11-2017	MOTION HEARING	JAY RAMEY
RB	CF-2016-196A	AMY CAMP	8-11-2017	SENTENCING	MARK MATHESON
CI	CF-2014-283A	JUANITA POWELL	8-11-2017	REVOCATION	GLEN HICKERSON
RB	CF-2013-317A	DENISE JACOBS	8-11-2017	JUDICIAL REVIEW	SARAI COOK
RB	CF-2016-248	QUINTON PERRY	8-14-2017	SENTENCING	CORI FELKINS
CI	CF-2016-345	DEREK SIMPSON	8-14-2017	PLEA	ANGELA BONILLA
CI	CF-2016-368	PRUDENCE TROTTER	8-14-2017	PLEA	CORI FELKINS
CI	CF-2017-81 CF-2016-37	DUSTIN BROWNFIELD	8-14-2017	PLEA	TONY ALLEN

DA	CASE NUMBER	DEFENDANT	DATE SET	HEARING	DEFENSE ATTORNEY
CI	CF-2017-127	TERRY POLLARD	8-14-2017	PLEA	TONY ALLEN
CI	CF-2017-183	LISA RAGON	8-14-2017	PLEA	JUSTIN MOSTELLER
RB	CF-2017-61	IRVIN ROBERTSON	8-14-2017	PLEA	KENNETH BUTLER
CI	CF-2017-19	CALVIN TURPIN	8-14-2017	PLEA	KENNETH BUTLER
CI	CF-2017-150	ERIC BAGBY	8-16-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	BRENDA GOLDEN
CI	CF-2017-165	LOLA BARBARICK	8-16-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	TONY ALLEN
CI	CF-2017-24	REBA BIBLE	8-16-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	CORI FELKINS
RB	CF-2017-100	ANGELA BRADFORD	8-16-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	JOSEPH NORWOOD
RB	CF-2017-101	PRECIOUS THIERRY	8-16-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	CINDY DAWSON
RB	CF-2015-77	KIMBERLY BURGGRAF	8-16-2017	REVOCATION	BRENDA GOLDEN
CI	CF-2011-497 CF-2011-498	ROY CHRISMON	8-16-2017	COMPLIANCE	ANGELA BONILLA
CI	CF-2016-143	GARY COLLER	8-16-2017	STATUS	ANGELA BONILLA
CI	CF-2016-138	LEONNA CROOK	8-16-2017	ACCELERATION	CORI FELKINS
CI	CF-2015-188 CF-2013-482 CM-2013-869	HEATHER FOWLER	8-16-2017	STATUS	KENNETH BUTLER
CI	CF-2017-83	MONTEL FOX	8-16-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	PHILLIP PEAK
CI	CF-2017-45	TROY JEFFERSON	8-16-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	HEATHER YOUREE
RB	CF-2011-500	JEREMY KNIGHT	8-16-2017	STATUS	KENT HUDSON
CI	CF-2017-78	MARIA PALMA-SAUCEDA	8-16-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	CINDY DAWSON
CI	CF-2017-78	FELIX RIOS-RAMIREZ	8-16-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	DONN BAKER
RB	CF-2017-114	PAUL ROBERTS	8-16-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	CHARLES GRAHAM
CI	CF-2015-290 CM-2015-649	JASON SADLER	8-16-2017	REVOCATION	CORI FELKINS
RB	CF-2011-195	AMY SCHATT	8-16-2017	STATUS	NATHAN MILNER
CI	CF-2017-131 CF-2017-132	JIMMIE STARR	8-16-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	CORI FELKINS
RB	CF-2008-230	BOSSOM STRONG	8-16-2017	REVO SENTENCING	KENNETH BUTLER
CI	CF-2016-391	MELISSA TEAGUE	8-16-2017	REVIEW	ANGELA BONILLA
RB	CF-2014-157	TAMMY TOWNSLEY	8-16-2017	REVIEW	ANGELA BONILLA
CI	CF-2016-65 CM-2017-316	KAYLA YOUNG	8-16-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	ANGELA BONILLA
CI	CF-2004-63	ANGELINA PULSE	8-16-2017	REVIEW	MATT HALL
RB	CF-2015-455	SHANE CANADY	8-16-2017	STATUS	TONI BEACH
CI	CF-2013-177	RUSTY CARPENTER	8-16-2017	STATUS	JAY RAMEY
RB	CF-2015-80	SABRINA DAWSON	8-16-2017	STATUS	CORI FELKINS
CI	CF-2010-212	JENNIFER GRIFFIN	8-16-2017	STATUS	CORI FELKINS
RB	CF-2017-143	ELI LEYBAS	8-16-2017	STATUS	BRENDA GOLDEN
CI	CF-2015-107	LEEROY SOAP	8-16-2017	STATUS	BRENDA GOLDEN
RB	CF-2014-42	JOSHUA HENDERSON	8-16-2017	STATUS	ROBERT SEACAT
RB	CF-2015-58	OMAR COLUMNA	8-16-2017	STATUS	ROD WIEMER
CI	CF-2016-344 CF-2017-73	TERRY POTTS	8-18-2017	MOTION HEARING	GLEN HICKERSON

DA	CASE NUMBER	DEFENDANT	DATE SET	HEARING	DEFENSE ATTORNEY
CI	CF-2017-45	SCOTT FRANKLIN	8-21-2017	PLEA	CINDY DAWSON
RB	CF-2015-436	NICHOLAS BLACKBURN	8-23-2017	STATUS	CORI FELKINS
RB	CF-2016-353	GUY ANHOLT	8-23-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	ANGELA BONILLA
CI	CF-2017-91	KEVIN BOLTON	8-23-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	DARELL BOLTON
CI	CF-2016-268	LUCAS BURLEIGH	8-23-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	OLIVER ARBOGAST
CI	CF-2017-133 CM-2017-413	JEFFREY GARNER	8-23-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	KENNETH BUTLER
CI	CF-2017-186	RICHARD GASPARD	8-23-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	CORI FELKINS
CI	CF-2016-350	CODY HAHN	8-23-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	ARIYA ADIBI
RB	CF-2017-201	RONALD HAMILTON	8-23-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	JAVIER RAMIREZ
RB	CF-2014-227	ANDREA HOWELL	8-23-2017	REVIEW	KEITH BERGMAN
RB	CF-2017-180	JASON JOHNSON	8-23-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	JUSTIN MOSTELLER
RB	CF-2017-119	MICHAEL NATEN	8-23-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	ANGELA BONILLA
RB	CF-2016-351	GARRETT RAYNOR	8-23-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	KEITH BERGMAN
RB	CF-2017-82	MICHAEL SANCHEZ	8-23-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	CORI FELKINS
CI	CF-2016-485	JEREMIAH SANDERS	8-23-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	ANTHONY ALLEN
CI	CF-2017-138	JOHN SEVERS	8-23-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	CORI FELKINS
RB	CF-2017-145	NATHANIEL SMITH	8-23-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	TOM SAWYER
CI	CF-2017-164	JEREMY SMITH	8-23-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	CORI FELKINS
RB	CF-2017-182	CHELSIE SMOTHERMON	8-23-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	CORI FELKINS
CI	CF-2016-471	JACOB SNIDER	8-23-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	JUSTIN MOSTELLER
CI	CF-2011-455 CF-2017-59	ALISON SREAVES	8-23-2017	STATUS	SWARTZ
RB	CF-2016-356 CF-2017-30	WILLIE TAYLOR	8-23-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	CORI FELKINS
CI	CF-2017-188	JEREMY TECUMSEH	8-23-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	CORI FELKINS
CI	CF-2017-187	TERRY TRAYWICK	8-23-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	ANGELA BONILLA
RB	CF-2013-191B	CASIE CORELY	8-23-2017	REVIEW	ANGELA BONILLA
RB	CF-2014-222	MICHAEL GOFF	8-23-2017	REVIEW	CORI FELKINS
RB	CF-2015-310	RICKEY PEREZ	8-23-2017	REVIEW	BRET JENNINGS
RB	CF-2014-151	EARL WALKER	8-23-2017	REVIEW	ANGELA BONILLA
RB	CF-2015-248	TINA WILLIAMS	8-23-2017	REVIEW	CORI FELKINS
RB	CF-2015-160	ANNA OBRIEN	8-23-2017	REVIEW	DARRELL BOLTON
RB	CF-2017-167	KEVIN SOUTHWICK	8-23-2017	REVIEW	ANGELA BONILLA
RB	CF-2017-120	BOYD DIXON	8-25-2017	SENTENCING	CORI FELKINS
CI	CF-2016-4 CF-2016-22 CF-2016-493 CF-2016-494	GEORGINA TIGER	8-25-2017	SENTENCING	CHARLES GRAHAM
CI	CF-2017-26	CORY BAKER	8-25-2017	SENTENCING	STEPHEN EDGE
DP	CF-2016-435	DON TRAYLOR	8-25-2017	MOTION HEARING	ORENTHAL DENSON
CI	CF-2017-86	CHARLEY ALLEY	8-30-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	STEVEN KERR
CI	CF-2017-156 CF-2017-189	BLAKE COLEMAN	8-30-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	DENNIS SEACAT

DA	CASE NUMBER	DEFENDANT	DATE SET	HEARING	DEFENSE ATTORNEY
RB	CF-2017-146	LORI FRYE	8-30-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	CLARENCE WIND
RB	CF-2017-209	JAMES GASTON	8-30-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	ANGELA BONILLA
CI	CF-2017-44	DEWEY HORSE	8-30-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	BRENDA GOLDEN
CI	CF-2017-178	TYLER JACKSON	8-30-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	ANDREW HAYES
KK	CF-2016-359	TYLER MARRIS	8-30-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	MATT HALL
RB	CF-2017-193	TAMMY PARSCAL	8-30-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	ANGELA BONILLA
CI	CF-2015-414	ANTHONY RODRIGUEZ	8-30-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	CORI FELKINS
CI	CF-2017-84 CF-2014-82	ALEX SARKISSIAN	8-30-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	CORI FELKINS
RB	CF-2017-226	KAYLAN SCOTT	8-30-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	CORI FELKINS
RB	CF-2017-219	JOHN THOMPSON	8-30-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	ANGELA BONILLA
RB	CF-2017-471 CF-2016-332	SHAUN UNDERWOOD	8-30-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	STEPHEN LEE
CI	CF-2013-288	ANDREW BELMONTES	8-30-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	CORI FELKINS
RB	CF-2017-80	RONNIE ASTON	8-30-2017	STATUS	TONY ALLEN
RB	CF-2016-400	ROBERT GODINHO	8-30-2017	STATUS	GLEN HICKERSON
RB	CF-2016-487	WILLIAM SHIRLEY	8-30-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	BRIAN ASPAN
RB	CF-2017-97A	ISAIAH WILSON	8-30-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	KATHY FRY
RB	CF-2017-97B	VICTOR WILSON	8-30-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	MIKE MANNING
RB	CF-2014-534	DANIEL COLLINS	9-1-2017	ACCELERATION	CORI FELKINS
CI	CF-2016-166	JEREMY FOSTER	9-1-2017	SOUNDING	SCOTT HJELM
RB	CF-2014-356	ALETHA HARLEY	9-1-2017	REVOCATION	CORI FELKINS
RB	CF-2017-102	ANTONETTE ANDERSEN	9-6-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	PAT LAYDEN
CI	CF-2016-28 CM-2014-995 CM-2014-1014	JOSEPH CARMICHAEL	9-6-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	CORI FELKINS
CI	CF-2017-124 CM-2016-808	EVERETT HORN	9-6-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	TONY ALLEN
CI	CF-2014-381	BROOKE JOHANSON	9-6-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	ANGELA BONILLA
CI	CF-2016-348	TROY LE BLANC	9-6-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	CORI FELKINS
CI	CF-2013-311	WILLIE MAYES	9-6-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	ANGELA BONILLA
RB	CF-2012-171 CM-2017-264	CARL NIKLAS	9-6-2017	REVIEW	ANGELA BONILLA
CI	CF-2015-220	ROSALIE WAGNER	9-6-2017	REVIEW	DAVID DUNLAP
RB	CF-2014-334	LORETTA BUTCHER	9-6-2017	STATUS	LOWELL HOWE
CI	CF-2016-489	DAWANYA DAVIS	9-6-2017	STATUS	ANGELA BONILLA
RB	CF-2016-458	ROGER KELOUGH	9-6-2017	STATUS	CORI FELKINS
RB	CF-2014-581	DAVID RODRIGUEZ	9-6-2017	STATUS	ANGELA BONILLA
RB	CF-2014-6	DALTON SALISBURY	9-6-2017	STATUS	PHILLIP PEAK
RB	CF-2016-293	ELDON WHITE	9-6-2017	STATUS	ANGELA BONILLA
CI	CF-2015-384	JOSHUA DANGOTT	9-6-2017	REVIEW	
RB	CF-2015-334	CASSANDRA HARLEY	9-6-2017	REVIEW	CORI FELKINS
RB	CF-2011-411	BARRY HUDNALL	9-6-2017	REVIEW	DEBBIE JOHNSON
RB	CF-2015-219	CHAWNTA WILLIAMS	9-6-2017	REVIEW	ANGELA BONILLA

DA	CASE NUMBER	DEFENDANT	DATE SET	HEARING	DEFENSE ATTORNEY
RB	CF-2015-133	CHRISTOHER PSAREAS	9-6-2017	REVIEW	JUSTIN MOSTELLER
CI	CF-2016-108	LAKISHA WIND	9-6-2017	REVIEW	CORI FELKINS
CI	CF-2016-294	ARCHIE BAKER	9-8-2017	PLEA	DEBBIE JOHNSON
CI	CF-2017-123	ROBERT BICE	9-20-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	ROBERT SEACAT
CI	CF-2017-148	JILL COLEMAN	9-20-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	LOU ANN MOUDY
CI	CF-2017-159	JAMES HUTCHINS	9-20-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	ROBERT STUBBLEFIELD
RB	CF-2013-106	SHARON PEEBLES	9-20-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	CORI FELKINS
CI	CF-2017-39	KATY CARNEY	9-20-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	KYLE KILLAM
CI	CF-2016-165	JENNIFER ROYAL	9-27-2017	STATUS	ANGELA BONILLA
RB	CV-2014-48	TERRY SHIELDS	9-27-2017	FORFEITURE	
CI	CF-2016-235	JARED BLAZER	10-2-2017	JUDICIAL REVIEW	JEREMY PITTMAN
CI	CF-2017-48	KAYLA BROWN	10-2-2017	PLEA	CORI FELKINS
CI	CF-2017-121	MAC COOK	10-2-2017	PLEA	ANGELA BONILLA
CI	CF-2017-111	TY JOHNSON	10-2-2017	PLEA	ANGELA BONILLA
CI	CF-2017-89	DAMIEN MORRISON	10-2-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	ANGELA BONILLA
RB	CF-2017-171	APRIL SPARKS	10-2-2017	STATUS	MIKE ASTON
RB	CF-2013-374	CHRISTOPHER LANDRUM	10-4-2017	STATUS	CORI FELKINS
RB	CF-2012-242	DONNA BARNETT	10-4-2017	SENTENCING	CORI FELKINS
RB	CF-2016-292	JACOB HART	10-4-2017	STATUS	CORI FELKINS
DP	CF-2015-380	DANNAKA HUNT	10-4-2017	STATUS	DENNIS SEACAT
RB	CF-2016-450	STEVE PERRY	10-4-2017	STATUS	GLEN HICKERSON
RB	CF-2015-300	BILLIE FULTON	10-4-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	CORI FELKINS
CI	CF-2014-224	LARRY HALL	10-4-2017	STATUS	CORI FELKINS
CI	CF-2014-613	BRADLEY HARVEY	10-4-2017	STATUS	W.C. SELLERS
CI	CF-2016-30	ALEXANDER MARQUIS	10-4-2017	REVIEW	J. LUNDY
RB	CF-2016-488	TINA BURNS	10-6-2017	SENTENCING	KYLE KILLAM
RB	CF-2017-134	LEVI WOMACK	10-6-2017	SENTENCING	CORI FELKINS
CI	CF-2016-362	GERALD WACOCHÉ	10-6-2017	SENTENCING	CORI FELKINS
RB	CF-2017-25	JAMES MOORE	10-6-2017	SENTENCING	GLEN HICKERSON
RB	CF-2014-432	AARON BELL	10-11-2017	STATUS	DENNIS SEACAT
CI	CF-2014-168	TY BENNETT	10-11-2017	STATUS	STEVEN LEE
CI	CF-2017-163	CHARLES GREEN	10-11-2017	STATUS	ANGELA BONILLA
CI	CF-2016-78	KENDALL TARWATER	10-11-2017	STATUS	CORI FELKINS
RB	CF-2014-346	LEODICCI GREEN	10-11-2017	STATUS	CORI FELKINS
RB	CF-2016-16	MICHAEL LOWERY	10-11-2017	STATUS	CORI FELKINS
RB	CF-2010-145	TRACY ONEAL	10-11-2017	STATUS	CINDY DAWSON
RB	CF-2015-114	REBECCA SIMS	10-11-2017	STATUS	CORI FELKINS
RB	CF-2017-179	BRENT VAIL	10-11-2017	STATUS	ANGELA BONILLA
RB	CF-2012-466	CARL MORTON	10-13-2017	REVOCATION	CORI FELKINS
RB	CF-2017-152	TOPAZ STALLINGS	10-18-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	CORI FELKINS
CI	CF-2014-593	TONY POTTER	10-25-2017	REVOCATION	BRET JENNINGS
RB	CF-2017-126	JASON GREENWOOD	11-15-2017	STATUS	ANGELA BONILLA
CI	CF-2015-239	CHRISTY STOIGNER	11-15-2017	STATUS	SCOTT HJELM
RB	CF-2012-224	JOSHUA KOUPLÉN	12-6-2017	STATUS	MATT HALL

<b>DA</b>	<b>CASE NUMBER</b>	<b>DEFENDANT</b>	<b>DATE SET</b>	<b>HEARING</b>	<b>DEFENSE ATTORNEY</b>
CI	CF-2016-218 CF-2016-392	CAYMEN COLEMAN	12-6-2017	ARRAIGNMENT	STEPHEN LEE
RB	CF-2017-90	BOBBY EATON	12-6-2017	STATUS	CORI FELKINS
RB	CF-2014-99	MICHAEL PANGLE	12-13-2017	SENTENCING	ANGELA BONILLA
CI	CF-2016-76	PAIGE HARP	12-20-2017	REVIEW	CORI FELKINS
CI	CF-2012-206	STACEY NATION	1-3-2018	REVIEW	KYLE KILLAM
CI	CF-2016-1	BENJAMIN FRAIR	1-24-2018	STATUS PENDING APPEAL	TOM SAWYER
RB	CF-2014-369	SHANNON LOPEZ	1-24-2018	STATUS	ANGELA BONILLA