## ORIGINAL

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA JUDICIARY COMMITTEE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIME AND CORRECTIONS

HEARING ON HOUSE BILL 106

ABINGTON TOWNSHIP BUILDING 1176 OLD YORK ROAD ABINGTON, PENNSYLVANIA 19001

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 2000, 11 A.M.

#### **BEFORE:**

HON. JERRY BIRMELIN, CHAIRMAN

HON. ELLEN BARD

HON. KATHLEEN MANDERINO

HON. PETER DALEY, II

#### ALSO PRESENT:

DAVE BLOOMER, RESEARCH ANALYST BERYL KUHR, ESQUIRE LEE ALBRIGHT, RESEARCH ANALYST

SHERRI A. REITANO, REPORTER NOTARY PUBLIC



### ARCHIVE REPORTING SERVICE

2336 N Second Street (717) 234-5922 Harrisburg, PA 17110 FAX (717) 234-6190

1	INDEX	
2	WITNESSES	PAGE
3	Michael Gallagher	6
4	Jan Marino	25 16
5	Bruce Castor	25 lb 16 25
6	Carol Pallis and Wayne Jones	37
7	Joan Kubrick	52
8	Robert Bolus	65
9	)	
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: We'd like to get started if we could. I'm Representative Jerry Birmelin. I represent Wayne and Pike Counties. I'm the Chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime and Corrections. I'll be conducting this hearing this morning.

In a moment I will introduce those seated here with me or ask them to introduce themselves. We are here today to hold a public hearing on House Bill 106. The crime sponsor is Ellen Bard seated to my left. She will have some opening remarks here for us in just a minute.

The agenda and the copies of legislation and some of the testimony are on this table to my left and to your right. Those of you who are being called to testify will please be seated at one of the chairs here in front to my right, your left. And try to use the microphone. We are recording today's testimony.

We have a stenographer here who is going to take down your every word, and it will be part of the transcript that will then be recorded into the record. It will be presented to the members of the Judiciary Committee who are not able to be here with us today so that everybody on the committee will have a copy of that testimony from all of you who testified.

And there are also some letters that will be entered into the record and there is some supporting

evidence that some of those who are testifying will be 1 2 presenting as well. And we will make sure that all of them are entered into the record on this particular occasion. 3 With that having been said, let me ask the 4 5 members of the panel to introduce themselves. I'll start 6 with my immediate right. MR. BLOOMER: Dave Bloomer, research analyst for 7 8 the committee. 9 REPRESENTATIVE BARD: Representative Ellen Bard. 10 I represent Abington Township right here in Southeastern 11 Montgomery County. 12 MS. KUHR: My name is Beryl Kuhr. I'm legal counsel to the minority chair of the committee. 13 14 MS. ALBRIGHT: My name is Lee Albright. 15 research analyst for the minority chair. CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: If other members of the 16 17 committee join us at a later time, I'll do my best to remember to introduce them. And I'll start the hearing 18 19 today by giving the opportunity to Representative Bard to 20 make an opening statement. Representative Bard. REPRESENTATIVE BARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, 21 22 members of the committee. I appreciate your organizing this 23 hearing today to take testimony on this important 24 legislation.

I introduced House Bill 106 in an effort to help

protect innocent people like my constituent Mr. Gallagher who will testify today about the devastating effects of false accusations of rape.

Also it is the intent of this legislation to help true rape victims like Jan Marino who will appear before you today as well. Because of those who falsely accuse or falsely report criminal activity, true victims are viewed with greater suspicion and thus these true victims are caused to suffer more.

Pennsylvania has some of the best statutes on the books for victims of rapes including a date rape drug law that I sponsored. But now it is clearly evident that we need better laws to deal with those who are falsely accused and those who are victimized by false charges.

At a recommendation of District Attorney Bruce

Castor, I had drafted legislation that amends the crimes

code and upgrades the crime of false accusation and

fictitious reporting to a felony in cases where the alleged

crime is a felony crime.

By this upgrading from a misdemeanor to felony status, falsely incriminating another with a felony would now carry a maximum penalty of seven years incarceration with a potential for \$15,000 fine. Fictitious reports of a felony would carry a similar penalty.

Currently the penalties are two years

incarceration and \$5,000 fine for false reporting and one year and \$2,500 fine for fictitious reporting of information relating to an incident.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that these hearings will help to speed this legislation through the legislative process and into law.

And I would like to thank our witnesses today, particularly Mr. Gallagher and Jan Marino and Mr. Bolus who are testifying regarding circumstances which have caused them great personal pain and anguish. And their efforts on behalf of this legislation are greatly appreciated. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Before we call our first witness, I also want to make mention for the record that we have a letter that we've received from the American Civil Liberties Union that is entered as part of their testimony. They were not able to testify today even though they were asked to send a representative.

For all of you who are here who are scheduled to testify today, you should have a copy of the agenda. And what we have done is essentially given each person or each set of testifiers a 20-minute time period.

We will try to do our best to hold to that 20-minute time period. That may include you giving testimony but also answering some questions as well. If

members of our staff or Representative Bard or myself have questions, we will do so at the end of each person's testimony.

So with all of that having been said, I will call our first witness. Mr. Michael Gallagher, if you would, come forward. Mr. Gallagher has his testimony in writing for those of you who are here with me at the desk. Mr. Gallagher, welcome and you may proceed to give your testimony whenever you are ready to do so.

MR. GALLAGHER: Okay. In December of 1997 I was questioned without an attorney about sexually molesting at that time a student I had taught in fifth grade 12 years ago. I denied to the police any wrongdoing. I even permitted them to search our house for alleged pornographic pictures of her.

Of course, they found nothing. A month later I was arrested. I later found the reason. My accuser's story was so detailed that the authorities sincerely believed her. They had no witnesses, no evidence, and had done very little investigation.

From that January day until the following

October, my family, all my relatives, and I suffered

immensely from this false accusation. My arrest with me in

handcuffs was shown on the evening news of all the Delaware

Valley television stations and in all the morning

newspapers.

During the following nine nightmarish months, daily living was a struggle. I felt as if I had no future.

Two days after my well-publicized arrest, I remember finally going outside.

I was nervous but I knew that I had to face the world. With courage I managed to do so. It was not easy for my family or me to go to the local supermarket, our church, or to walk in our neighborhood. People would stare at us but say nothing. I felt so ashamed even though I knew in my heart that I had done nothing wrong.

I went into teaching to help children, not to hurt them. Imagine, working with children was my career and now I was allowed no contact with them. I even had to ask my lawyers if I could visit my grandchildren.

During these nine months of pure hell, my attorney would tell the District Attorney's office that we had "bombshell" evidence against my accuser which we did. The prosecutor called her in again in October and her story literally fell apart.

A polygraph was given. The operator admitted it was the worst in the county all year. A press conference was held by the District Attorney. This time media coverage of my innocence and subsequent exoneration was exceptional.

In December of 1998 <u>Dateline</u>, <u>NBC</u> ran the story

of my false accusation. Many people after my vindication asked me how I could have dealt with this nightmare and still have my sanity. I believe it was my faith in God and unending support of my family and friends that took us through. It showed me there are many, many wonderful people in the world. It taught me a lesson, never again will I just stand by when a friend is suffering in mind or body.

I had a son in the eleventh grade at the high school at the time right here in Abington. He bravely went through that year unharmed in spirit and yet I knew he worried.

I have a son with a top secret clearance. I was concerned about him, but it never affected his job. I have a son though who had to be treated as a patient in Abington Hospital partially because of my ordeal. Thank God today he enjoys good health and a good job.

I believe I was very fortunate to have a wife that stood by me during my entire false accusation. I could never have traveled that rocky road without her.

The story of my exoneration ran in the <u>NEA Today</u>, a national newspaper of the teachers' association. As a result, I received over 40 e-mail messages from education employees across the country who had also been falsely accused.

Presently there are two teachers in the

Pittsburgh area being prosecuted for sexual molestation of students. One goes on trial tomorrow after a yearlong wait. He has 32 years experience as an award-winning teacher. He is a good, good family man with a supportive wife and two grown daughters. Now he goes through the nightmare I once had to endure.

It is difficult enough to recruit teachers with excellent credentials to teach our state's most precious resource, our children. Male teachers for elementary education are a rare commodity and are especially sought.

Cases such as mine and other such cases in our state hinder that recruitment. Who wants to go into such a vulnerable profession?

My accuser to this day has never been charged for perjuring herself in a court of law. I hope that will soon change. My total defense bill amount was over \$43,000. And because of a technicality, the liability insurer only paid \$25,000 instead of the current \$35,000.

They stated that since this alleged incident happened in 1985, that is the rate they would pay. And they did. Through the generosity of the national and state teachers' association I was given \$12,500 to make up the difference. I had to pay over \$4,000 of that gift in state and federal taxes. I still have an outstanding legal bill of \$5,700. The school district has refused to pay anything

toward my defense.

Had I been convicted of this whole thing, my accuser could have sued them for millions. So here I am a law-abiding citizen of our Commonwealth and because of a false accusation, I have lost almost \$10,000.

I would like to respectfully suggest two implementations to this Bill. One, those convicted of false accusations should be made to pay the legal bills of the falsely accused; and, two, if an accused agrees to take a polygraph and passes, then the accuser should have to take one.

It is my feeling that this Bill protects those who truly accuse another of a felony offense. Because if such individuals are forthright and honest, then that threat of false reporting being a felony would have little impact on them.

Now, I realize that implementation of this Bill will not stop all false accusations. It will certainly though act as a powerful deterrent for those that do so. It would also save the taxpayers of the state money. I know much investigative time and effort went into pursuing the truth in my case by the county and the township.

So I plead with you to think seriously about bringing this measure to the House floor. There are so many who, as I, have had to bear the stigma of a false

1 accusation, a pain that will never really heal. Many 2 professions such as education, medicine, law enforcement, and sports could benefit by this legislation. 3 4 Just remember, any of us can be accused falsely 5 and have our entire career and family ruined by one devious individual. 6 Finally, I would like to read to you a short poem 7 I wrote during one of those dark days in February of 1998. 8 9 It summed up my feelings as I went through this horrible 10 ordeal. 11 I look upon the squirrels as they scurry up our 12 tree. Oh, if only I were them, how free I would be! 13 The world goes on without me; they hawk the same 14 15 old thing. If my mind would just be silent, what peace that 16 17 it would bring. But life is changed, yet only in my mind. 18 19 The friends they write; my sisters are so kind. 20 My wife and sons, brave souls, are supportive 21 through it all. 22 Their hearts are crushed but still they're 23 standing tall. 24 Yet here I am awaiting hope that seems to be 25 elusive.

1 And every now and then dark thoughts become 2 obtrusive. 3 I think of being punished for a crime I've never 4 done. 5 Let's hope the jury will believe me and my case 6 will soon be won. 7 Ah, yes, sunlight comes in early as I face 8 another day. 9 A day with new hope dawning. Keep me strong, 10 Oh God, I pray. 11 Thank you. 12 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Representative Bard. 13 REPRESENTATIVE BARD: I know that this has been a 14 very long ordeal for you and it is difficult to go through repeated remembrances of what you have suffered. 15 Perhaps you could tell us a little bit about some 16 17 of the support that you have gotten from the teachers and so 18 on and so forth and support for the legislation. 19 MR. GALLAGHER: Yeah. When I was first arrested, 20 the president of our local association called me and she 21 said she was going to raise some money because I was 22 suspended without pay. I didn't know where I was going to 23 get the money. 24 So she went not only to Abington teachers but she

went to the region. She went to the state and then national

conventions. She went there to raise money for us. And the teachers at the high school even collected canned goods. I think I still have some that I don't like. But we had one man -- my one sister gave me \$10,000 and my one sister gave me five. And a man named Stewart Rubinson gave me \$10,000. He said that was a loan.

And there were so many people that supported us.

It made me feel so good. I even had support from the

Monsignor Ken Beallo out in Chicago. If you recall,

Cardinal Bernadette was falsely accused out there. And he

heard of my story and he contacted me and we're still in

contact. So I had lots and lots of support. But, you know,

this thing is never -- it will never go away. It is a shame

that it ever happened.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Mr. Gallagher, I do have an interest in this legislation and have somewhat of a history. And I would like to relay that to you briefly. I've already done that with Representative Bard. A few years ago I was approached by a constituent who was a father who had custody of -- or excuse me, who had visitation rights and his ex-wife had custody of the children.

And she falsely accused him of molesting the children on the father's visitation day which I guess is a fairly common practice from what I hear. And as a result of that, I drafted legislation similar to what we have here

today but not nearly identical.

But my legislation dealt specifically with the child abuse reporting law in that because of the anger and attempts to get even with an ex-spouse is frequently abused. And we had a public hearing on that Bill. And I can tell you that there is a body of people and organizations in this State that are very adamently opposed to this type of legislation.

And what it boiled down to was they told me and they said that in no uncertain terms if my legislation had become law, that children would die in Pennsylvania.

Because people would be afraid to report child abuse because they would be afraid that they would be breaking the law and they would be in trouble. So they wouldn't make phone calls for children who were being abused. And I thought that was absolutely ludicrous, that was irrational, and that was a very below-the-belt type of response. And I indicated that to the people that testified at the time to no avail.

But I say that to you because we are in the same area here, you know. We're -- you have this certain segment of society that thinks that we can't do anything to -- do anything that might cut back on the number of complaints about children being abused.

Now, I support Representative Bard's legislation.

As I said earlier, I drafted similar legislation about four

or five years ago. And I will do what I can to help her, but I want you to be aware that's the uphill battle that we're facing with legislation of this type. You have people who think if you do anything to diminish the number of child abuse reports, and children are going to die out there. And it is a really emotional argument but it is not a valid one.

MR. GALLAGHER: Right.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: But that is the sort of thing that happens. And quite frankly those sort of people would say it is better to have a few Mike Gallaghers in life than have children dying at the end of the spectrum. I know it is not right. I know it is not rational. But I'm telling you that from my experience that's what I have seen happen.

MR. GALLAGHER: Thank you for saying that. It was just my feeling everybody would be for something like this. You know, I went through so much pain. And I know this man tomorrow in his trial is going through a year's worth of pain for those false accusations. And teachers in Abington have sort of changed their method of teaching because they are so worried and concerned.

And I have three sons. Thank God none of them are going into teaching. I just can't see it especially for a male. Because you don't even have to have your door open or shut or be alone with a child, because perhaps maybe 12 years later this girl came forward with this highly

1 believable story so detailed according to the police and I was arrested, you know. That's just what happened. 2 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: I understand. I appreciate 3 4 your story. Thank you very much for being here. 5 MR. GALLAGHER: Okay. 6 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Is District Attorney Bruce 7 Castor here? He's not here yet. He is scheduled next. Also I would like to introduce in the second seat to my left 8 is Representative Kathleen Manderino from Philadelphia. 9 10 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Good morning. CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: We will skip over Mr. Castor 11 and then put him in at a later time when he arrives. Our 12 13 next testifier is Jan Marino. Is she here? Is it Ms. or 14 Mrs. Marino? 15 MRS. MARINO: Mrs. Marino. 16 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Mrs. Marino, I want to 17 welcome you. Mrs. Marino has written testimony for those on the panel here if you wish to follow along with her. And 18 19 whenever you are ready to proceed, Mrs. Marino, you may. 20 MRS. MARINO: Good morning and thank you for the 21 opportunity to speak and express my concerns on this very 22 important issue. In August 1993, a stranger broke into my 23 house and raped me. 24 I can stand here today only seven years later and

remember it like it was yesterday. More than remembering

the physical attack, I can remember clear as a bell how I was feeling and what I was thinking. I remembered thinking I am going to die.

I could not take my eyes off the knife he was holding in front of my face as he raped me. In my mind the fact that he was looking at me and I could see him, he was talking to me, meant he was going to have to kill me.

He raped me in different rooms in my home. And when it was over, he told me to go into my bedroom and lock myself in it. He would retrieve his knife and then go. I ran to my room and closed the door. I leaned against the door waiting for him to barge in and kill me.

I got myself dressed but could not come out of my room. I was sure he was hiding in the house waiting to finish me off. I left my home through a window and ran to a neighbor's home.

As I sat there feeling safe, it dawned on me that maybe no one would believe me. I looked at myself, no stab wounds, no bruises. Who was going to believe my story? Why would I ever think such a thing? Why? Because society had told me so. Every movie produced told me so. Every evening television drama told me so. The daytime soap operas had told me so.

If I was crying rape, it had to be a lie. False reports to law enforcement agencies are harmful. And one of

the most devastating reports being that of sexual assault.

Can we understand or know what it is like to be accused, interrogated, and arrested for a heinous crime we did not commit? I believe we can empathize, but we truly cannot know it. After all, we have not experienced it.

And when the truth comes out, are we not glad?

Don't we say things like that poor man, at least now it is over? But is it? He becomes the victim now. He will forever live with the devastation, humiliation, and the loss of control over his life.

The one accused is not the only victim. Let us not forget the true rape victim. False reporting hurts them. I know because I experienced it. It is very frustrating telling the truth and not knowing whether or not you're being believed.

I remember during the trial telling my story, my rapist lying, denying it was him. I hoped and prayed the judge would believe my story. I was so angry and so frustrated. The truth never changes. The truth is the same story over and over. What more did they want me to say?

I can imagine the frustration in being accused falsely when you're telling the truth and no one believing you.

One of the first books I bought after my rape was Linda Fairstein's Sexual Violence, Our War Against Rape.

She has directed the sex crimes prosecution unit within the

Manhattan DA's office for more than 15 years. In it she

devotes a chapter to this very issue, chapter 18. "False

reporting -- A Terrible Foe of the Rape Victim." She ends

this chapter with three main points I'd like to read to you

now.

In it she writes, "First, these fabrications (which are themselves criminal acts) waste the time and resources of an already overtaxed justice system. Most municipalities do not have the manpower to respond to and fully investigate many real crimes; and, therefore, for each false alarm that is sounded some legitimate victim goes unaided."

"Second, for each false report that results in an arrest, a man is imprisoned -- whether for hours, days, or months when he has committed no offense."

"And most important, to me, is that these falsehoods degrade and trivialize the experience of every legitimate rape survivor who will ever tell her story to a police officer or jury. They encourage the ignorance and callousness of people who still fail to see the extent and significance of the problems of rape. Each false accusation makes too many skeptics think that every accusation is a false one which is a danger that cannot be overstated. False reporters are among the worst foes of real rape

1 victims and the deadliest enemies of legal protection for 2 women everywhere." I now ask you to take this Bill very seriously 3 with great consequences. House Bill 106 is a critical Bill 4 not only for the accused nor the true rape victim but for 5 6 all of society. Thank you for listening to my experience. 7 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Thank you, Mrs. Marino. 8 Representative Bard. 9 REPRESENTATIVE BARD: Thank you very much. 10 MRS. MARINO: If you have any questions. 11 REPRESENTATIVE BARD: It is so helpful that 12 you're willing to come forward and share your experiences 13 and your thoughts providing the legislation. I think oftentimes it is thought that anything that might stiffen 14 15 penalties or increase penalties like this for false 16 reporting would deter somehow victims from coming forward. 17 And I think that your testimony is so critical, 18 absolutely critical in this regard. And so I just want to 19 confirm that your feeling is that -- and certainly you are 20 in contact with other survivors -- this will be helpful --21 MRS. MARINO: Yes, absolutely. 22 REPRESENTATIVE BARD: -- if this legislation is 23 enacted? 24 MRS. MARINO: Yes. I think we have to tell

society. We have to say that this is wrong. It is very

wrong. Because what society does tell us is that, you know, if you're crying rape, it is a lie. Or if you are crying rape, you deserved it. We have to educate society here.

One way of doing this is by saying no more. No more getting off with a slap on the wrist or no charges or no anything, that there is a penalty if you are going to accuse falsely. Because I'm afraid of these women that are raped and don't come forward.

I didn't call the police. My neighbor called the police. I was like wait a minute, you know. I have -- I have to -- I have to think about this. What just happened here? And the reality was when I saw that he didn't stab me and he didn't even hit me, I really didn't think anyone was going to believe my story. And that's all because that's what I was programed to believe.

So I believe that with stiffer penalties, with it being a felony charge on an accusation of a felony offense that it would be a deterrent of false reporting, yes.

REPRESENTATIVE BARD: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Mr. Bloomer has a question for you.

MRS. MARINO: Certainly.

MR. BLOOMER: I apologize if I didn't see this in your testimony or if you didn't say, what was the result of your trial?

MRS. MARINO: Well, I was raped by a 16-year-old.

So I dealt with the juvenile system. So every nine months

he was reviewed. He did stay until he maxed out at 21 where

the State no longer has any jurisdiction. So he was

released at 21.

MR. BLOOMER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Mrs. Marino, you were here when I made the comments to Mr. Gallagher after his testimony. The public hearing at which we had regarding the Bill that I had introduced a few years ago, we had the DA's association testifying.

And I said to the DA's association representative, how many people do you know of in Pennsylvania who were prosecuted for falsely testifying to a public official last year? His answer was none.

I said, do you remember the last time anybody in Pennsylvania was prosecuted for falsely testifying before a public official? They had no idea. Now that doesn't mean it didn't happen. It is rare.

MRS. MARINO: Well, false accusations being similar to perjury, I know that was one of my things. I couldn't believe in a court of law and when you have taken an oath and been sworn in and people were getting up there -- my -- I took it very personally what I was saying was the truth.

And I only prayed and hoped that they would believe me. And then after the fact, you know, I even said to the officers like can you charge them with perjury or what can we do. And the truth is it is something that I don't know whether we don't want to spend the manpower or the tax dollars or whatever in doing it, but it needs to be done because it is out of control.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: And I agree with you. And hopefully legislation like this or something similar can be done. It reminds me of when I was a young lad. I actually spent some of my childhood years in New York City. And being in a city, you have on every corner fire alarms where you had the pull-down system of some sort.

And I remember when I was about 7 or 8 years old, one of the neighborhood kids falsely pulled down the fire alarm and had the fire trucks there. And it was a big, big deal because they -- I don't know what they did to this fellow who did that. I don't recall. I was too young to remember.

But I know the word went out that you don't do those things. Falsely reporting is not much different than falsely reporting a fire or calling an ambulance out or police or whatever.

It detracts from everything else that those people are supposed to be doing that they are very well

prepared to do. But it over burdens them when they have to respond to false reports, not to mention the devastation that happens to people that are being falsely reported like Mr. Gallagher.

MRS. MARINO: Correct.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: So I agree with you.

Sometimes we need to look beyond the immediate problems of false reporting and that is people who really are needing the court system and services and law enforcement not being able to provide it.

Even if you look at the child abuse reporting laws which legislators get a copy of every year, it usually varies but it is somewhere around 70 percent are unfounded reports. And that's incredible, 70 percent of child abuse reports are unfounded. There is no substance whatsoever.

So that's the burden that we put on society. And I think we need to start telling people that if you're going to make false accusations, you're going to pay a price.

MRS. MARINO: Exactly. That's what I'm asking you to do now. There has to be. We have to say no more. And I think with this Bill that will definitely help.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: I want to thank you for your testimony. The next testifier is Bruce Castor, the District Attorney of Montgomery County. And I see that he has entered. Mr. Castor, I thank you for coming. If you would,

please take a seat. And when you are prepared, you may give your testimony.

MR. CASTOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee. Before I read my prepared remarks, I knew that you would be hearing from Mr. Gallagher. So I tailored my testimony in another direction knowing full well that Representative Bard and I have discussed at length the situation which brings this Bill or helps bring this Bill before the House.

So I'm going to tailor my remarks in a different direction. Then I would be prepared to answer some of the questions raised by the Chair in questioning the previous witness.

On February 19th, just several days ago, <u>The</u>

<u>Times Herald</u> headline read: Woman Pleads Guilty to Falsely

Accusing Police of Sexual Assault. The woman had been

arrested for public drunkenness by Criminal Code Section

5505, a summary offense with the maximum penalty of 90 days

imprisonment and/or a \$300 fine. That occurred on September

5th, 1999.

The next day at a Philadelphia hospital, she reported she had been sexually assaulted by three Norristown police officers. The Montgomery County District Attorney's office investigated the alleged assault since the woman reported that she had been assaulted in Montgomery County,

in fact in a police station in Norristown Borough. The 16 video cameras at the Norristown police station however told a different story. Nothing had happened.

In 1991 the same woman had charged her boyfriend with raping her which was another baseless charge. She pleaded no contest and was placed on probation. Thus since this was her second offense, she faces a maximum of four years imprisonment and fines totaling \$10,000. Under the current law her crime is a misdemeanor.

Under the proposed changes to 18 Pa.C.S.A.

Section 4906, since the false information related to a felony such as rape, robbery, kidnapping, et cetera, the crime would be graded as a Felony 3 with a maximum penalty of three and a half to seven years imprisonment and a \$15,000 fine.

This is an important change because felonies are serious crimes and this was a serious case of false reports.

Look at the consequences of these false allegations. Three police officers were defamed and the entire department placed under a cloud of suspicion.

Shakespeare said it best in Othello, Act II,

Scene III, line 264. "I have lost my reputation. I have
lost the immortal part of myself."

The Montgomery County District Attorney detectives have spent endless hours which could have been

devoted to real, serious, unsolved crimes instead of chasing windmills.

Since the reports were made in Philadelphia, the Philadelphia police department and Philadelphia District Attorney's office became involved in the investigation; again hours were spent in useless, pointless investigation.

About 10 years ago two young men and a young woman reported the theft of a gun, third degree felony, to a local police department. They named the thief and an investigation ensued. Charges were brought, a jury selected, and trial held in which three friends who reported the crime testified. A verdict of guilty was returned by the jury. Bail was revoked. And the thief was remanded to Montgomery County Prison. Then, days later, the three friends confessed that it was all a joke. They went to prison as perjurers.

This is an extreme case but illustrates the waste, the cynicism, the personal harm that can result from false reports.

At the heart of the Christian, Jewish, and Islamic traditions is the command thou shalt not bear false witness against they neighbor. This proposed legislation recognizes the practical, the emotional, and long-term consequences of false reports.

If police officers are responding to the false

report of a robbery, they cannot at the same time respond to the report of a kidnapping of a young child.

A series of false reports cannot help but make officers cynical and potentially demoralized. And for all of us, there is the immense amount of money frittered away on fictional rather than real crime.

As District Attorney of Montgomery County, I enthusiastically support this change and salute those responsible for recognizing the need for an increased penalty for this serious crime.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Thank you. Representative Bard.

REPRESENTATIVE BARD: Thank you very much

District Attorney for being with us today. I appreciate

your taking the time to discuss this important legislation

with us and supporting the issue.

Now as I understood -- you'll have to help me here a little bit. Basically the local police department screen cases and false reports out for the most part before they would reach your level; is that right, or are you involved from the very first --

MR. CASTOR: Well, it would depend if it was a case that came in through our office or not. I mean the case involving the Norristown police officers was, in fact, investigated by us. But run of the mill cases, most of the

cases that come to Montgomery County Court start with the police department and then are transferred to county court after the preliminary hearing.

And what will frequently happen is it reaches the point where the local police officer is angry enough having been inconvenienced or the victim is angry enough having been falsely accused that then they will file a false reports charge or come to us and ask for approval for such a charge if they think it might be close.

One of the difficult areas is demonstrating it is in fact false. See, in a criminal context, we have to prove the Defendant is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. What that means is there could be -- we could have reached a point where we were not absolutely positive that the report is true. We suspect it may be false but it is hard to demonstrate that it is false. That's the sort of dilemma you're dealing with in this area.

When you have oath against oath, sometimes we are able to resolve a dispute with a polygraph. Sometimes that would confirm suspicions that we might have. I mean we are trained in picking up clues, recognizing inconsistencies. But it might demonstrate to us that the report is false as a matter of intuition, as a matter of our experience is not enough to prove it beyond a reasonable doubt. So while it might result in the exoneration of the accused, it may or

may not be enough to arrest the accuser.

REPRESENTATIVE BARD: I guess what would be helpful is in terms of speaking to the legislation directly which involves an increase in penalty and upgrading of the offense to a felony. Is this more likely to deter false accusers? And then secondly, does it make it more or less likely that the false accuser will be prosecuted do you think and actually end up as an example to others that would then deter?

MR. CASTOR: I'll answer the second part first.

I don't think this increases the likelihood that people would be prosecuted in Montgomery County. If we have any instance in which we think we can demonstrate that a false report occurred and prove it beyond a reasonable doubt, we will go ahead regardless of what the grade is.

I personally think this is a very, very serious matter because the entire system is grounded upon people telling the truth. And we can't operate if they don't tell the truth.

If this legislation passes, there is going to have to be companion work done increasing sentencing guidelines for this type of offense as commensurate with a felony grading as opposed to a misdemeanor grading which call for a jail sentence. Now if people start going to jail over it and it becomes publicized for that reason, then I

think it will deter crime.

Again in the extreme case, some investigation we're all familiar with is the killing of James Wayne who was the owner of the General Wayne Inn. I see some heads nodding up and down. The important part of that is when someone lies to the grand jury and we convict him of that, he's going to jail for three years.

That does get the word out that we're serious when we can prove somebody is lying before the grand jury. But again, the way we were able to prove that case was we got him on a wire. The witness told the grand jury. Sometimes it is very difficult.

One of the biggest problems in law enforcement and the most frustrating thing in law enforcement -- I've been at it for 15 years -- is I can tell when somebody is lying and I can tell when there is something not right. But knowing it and proving it are different things.

REPRESENTATIVE BARD: Just one follow-up question. Can you make an estimate of the number of cases or in some way quantify how many false reports initially come in to law enforcement agencies?

MR. CASTOR: Well, I can't do that because I don't know how many come into the police department that they don't move forward on for one reason or another.

Again, a police detective might suspect something is false

but not being able to demonstrate it.

But I would say our office probably prosecutes about a half dozen cases like this a year. We investigate a number of others that we can't proceed on. And then there are companion cases like the situation the Chairman was talking about somebody calling in the ambulance or fire department, those kinds of things which are similar and also flat perjury cases.

REPRESENTATIVE BARD: Just to clarify, you say you investigate about half a dozen to a dozen cases a year where you're considering filing false accusation charges?

MR. CASTOR: Yeah. I would -- yeah, I would say probably about a half dozen and we probably investigate another half dozen more. So a total of 12 probably just taking a rough guess. But I think back over the years cases that I handled, sometimes they are not felony-type cases either. But when someone is accused of rape or robbery or burglary, these kinds of things, that's a very, very serious thing and we take it very seriously.

REPRESENTATIVE BARD: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: District Attorney Castor, how long have you been in the District Attorney's office as the DA or I gather from what you just said you were an assistant at some time or may have been associated with the DA's?

MR. CASTOR: That's right. I've been associated

with the DA's office for 15 years.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: And during that period of time, how many false accusers or false reporting incidents in the area of child abuse have you investigated or has your office investigated?

MR. CASTOR: Well, dozens. I mean when we get those forms about suspected child abuse, our detective has to investigate them. You had mentioned when questioning the previous witness a percentage of cases that were determined to be unfounded. And unfounded means what it says. It means that there was no evidence to support. It doesn't mean that it didn't happen. The detectives -- again, this is the United States where people are innocent until proven guilty. And us thinking someone is guilty and knowing it are different.

towards how many people do you think made false accusations knowing there was no substance to the accusation? Did you prosecute or follow-up on any of those? You said you did about six a year. But they weren't all child abuse. They may have been other situations. I was wondering how many of those six per year were related to false child abuse reports?

MR. CASTOR: I would say that between false sexual complaints, child, adult, and false beating

complaints, that would comprise most of them. But I can't quantify better than that.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Do you in the reports that you do each year -- I'm not sure who gets those reports. Somebody in the State does because we get it every year, the legislature gets a compendium of all criminal cases that have been handled throughout the year.

Do you report those as false accusation reports?

Are they broken down to that level where you look at the reports and say here there were X number of people who were prosecuted for making -- for knowingly making false accusations in certain areas?

MR. CASTOR: I do not believe that we do as the DA's office. I believe the Office of Children and Youth probably does that. But I don't know the answer to that.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Thank you very much. Did you have any questions?

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you, District
Attorney Castor, for your testimony. I have a couple of
questions. My understanding of the legislation we're
considering is that it deals primarily with how we grade the
offense of false reporting but it doesn't change the
standard or the burden of proof of the Commonwealth.

You will still have a burden of proving a knowing intent with regard to the false reporting; is that your

understanding as well?

MR. CASTOR: Yes, it is.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: So, for example, in the General Wayne case that you mentioned that you were able to proceed on because you had hard evidence so to speak in terms of a tape recording and in the case that you cited in your testimony where you had literally the three "friends" coming forward and saying it was a joke, you had something to proceed on.

Is it -- am I correct in assuming that you didn't have a level of factual evidence that you felt you could have proceeded on, for example in the case of the false accuser of Mr. Gallagher, and that's why that -- I'm assuming nothing went forward because no one said anything about it.

MR. CASTOR: Well, don't assume that because there may be things that are going on that I'm not at liberty to discuss. But that does not mean anything will result from that. But that case is not over.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: So, therefore, whether the case proceeds is not something that is going to be addressed by this Bill but what the penalty would be if you're able to proceed is something that would be addressed by this Bill?

MR. CASTOR: The potential penalty, as I said

earlier, there would have to be companion work done on the sentencing guidelines if it is the intent of the legislature that a jail sentence resulted from this which is my impression and what I would support. But, yes, the potential penalty would increase.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Another kind of line of questioning that I want to touch on -- and if it is beyond the scope of your knowledge I'll understand. I was kind of getting that indication that maybe it was from the last line of questioning.

But I'm a little uncomfortable with some of the questions so far this morning not as regards the witnesses who have testified in their particular instances but I feel like we're mixing apples and oranges a little bit from the panel with regard to child abuse reporting laws which allow anonymous suspected reporting of child abuse from everyone from doctors to teachers to other adults in authority versus false accusations of a criminal act.

So my question to you is that my understanding of reports to the child abuse hot line is that those are then investigated by Children and Youth at the county level before they even get to a prosecutor's office. Is that a correct assumption or do you get everything that is called in on the anonymous hot line?

MR. CASTOR: No. The Office of Children and

1 Youth is the initial screening agency as it were. 2 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: So if they screen and 3 determine that a third of the calls that have come in are 4 what they would at least classify as founded, then it is those cases that make it to your detectives? 5 6 MR. CASTOR: Yes. REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: So you don't get the 7 66 percent or whatever the percentage is that they have 8 9 screened and decided that we don't see anything founded here 10 to pass on to the law enforcement authorities? MR. CASTOR: I believe that that is true. 11 12 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you. 13 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: We've been joined by Representative Daley of Washington and Fayette Counties as 14 15 well. 16 REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: Good morning. 17 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: I want to thank you, District 18 Attorney Castor, for your testimony today. Our next 19 testifiers are Carol Pallis and Wayne Jones. If you two 20 would please come forward. 21 MS. PALLIS: Did you people get copies of our 22 papers? 23 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Yes, it has been circulated. 24 MS. PALLIS: My name is Carol Pallis. I'm Wayne 25 Jones' mother-in-law. Wayne was accused -- falsely accused

of raping a 14-year-old girl in August of 1993.

I wish to thank the members of this committee for the opportunity to speak to you today and urge all of you to pass House Bill 106.

Perhaps when you hear the story I'm about to tell you of how the false accusation of rape against my son-in-law, Wayne Jones, almost sent him to jail for 20 years, ruined his reputation, cost him over \$30,000 in legal fees which he had to borrow, put him in a mental hospital, took away his ability to earn a living, you will understand why it is important to pass this Bill.

Wayne is married to my daughter Carol. They have a child. He never had any prior convictions or arrests, worked at a steady job for over ten years delivering produce for a local produce company. He had the same delivery route without any incident for ten years.

August 16th, 1993, he was told to make a delivery to a customer in Newfoundland, Pennsylvania, who operated a small roadside stand which was located near a busy mini-mall and a highway.

Wayne arrived there at 9:30 a.m. and unloaded his order and left at 10 a.m. Instead of being checked in by the older woman who generally worked there, he was checked in by the woman's teenage 14-year-old daughter who stated she was there because her mother was ill.

About 1:00 in the afternoon the same day while
Wayne was making another delivery, a State Police officer
approached him and asked him if he had raped a young girl in
Newfoundland who worked at the produce stand where Wayne had
made a delivery. Wayne told him he did not rape this girl.
The Trooper told Wayne he could proceed to make his
deliveries, and he would call him if necessary.

At that point the State Police officer had probable cause -- see Exhibit A -- to hold Wayne as a suspect because the girl made a positive ID. Wayne then could have requested to be tested and proven innocent.

By letting Wayne go, this ruined Wayne's chances of preserving vital evidence and made it harder for Wayne to prove his innocence. Wayne returned to his place of employment and told his employer what had happened. Then he came home.

When he arrived home, he had a phone call from the Bloomingrove State Police barracks to come up there, that he was going to be charged with rape. I had just gotten home from work and Wayne told me what happened.

It was 5 p.m. that same day, and I called a well-known Scranton attorney to represent Wayne. He knew me by name and he asked me if the rape occurred in Newfoundland that morning.

I became excited and asked him, how did he know

that; was it broadcast on the news. And he said, no. He said he had a phone call from the girl's parents to sue Wayne's employer for \$1 million. He said he received this call between 10:00 and 11:00 that morning.

He told them he could not sue Wayne's employer because Wayne would have to be proven guilty first. He did not take our case because it was a conflict of interest.

And I never could use what he told me in court because he blurted out something he shouldn't have told me.

Immediately I called another lawyer and he took
Wayne's case. We arrived at Bloomingrove barracks and Wayne
had a hearing before a magistrate. Bail was set at \$25,000.
He was handcuffed, put in jail for about three days until I
could arrange to put my home up for bail bond.

Then I had to take the money I had put away for retirement to give it to Wayne for his defense. I am a widow who took care of a sick husband for 18 years. I worked all of my life and now must put retirement off as the legal system put a large dent in my assets.

Wayne was arrested because there was a second

Trooper from Dunmore barracks who met the alleged victim at
the hospital and wrote in his report -- see Exhibit A, page

2 -- that the examining doctor told him the girl had
ripping, tearing, swelling, and discoloration of the vaginal
area. This report was untrue.

See Exhibit B, the doctor's testimony. The doctor said he did not say that in his report. This Trooper also took the rape test kit, put it in the trunk of his car in 90 degree heat, left it there for a day. This kit was supposed to be preserved on ice, sent to a laboratory for testing.

The Trooper also sent the alleged victim a

T-shirt the next day after the alleged rape because as she
said in her deposition he felt sorry for me.

Could it be that he had known the alleged victim as her parents lived across the street from his former sister-in-law at the time and he also lives in that area. He was also in the newspaper -- see Exhibit C -- because his firearm fell out of the holster and shot the desk sergeant.

A third Trooper took over the case. The girl changed her story of how she was raped and he never did anything about it. Wayne was never tested until nine months later at our insistence.

The first test was sent to the Wyoming

Laboratory. They said sperm heads were found. Yet they

failed to do an acid phosphate test to see if they really

were sperm heads. Also a chemist at this lab was arrested

for falsifying reports. See Exhibit D. I don't know if he

was involved in our case at the time.

The CMC Hospital found no sperm heads. See

Exhibit E. Wyoming Valley police lab found no match to Wayne. See Exhibit F. Cellmark Lab found no match to Wayne. See Exhibit G.

Greenburg Lab found no match. See Exhibit H.

Yet Wayne was brought to trial and found innocent in March
of 1995.

Enclosed is a letter from a man who served on that jury to Judge Thompson saying it was a shame Wayne was brought to trial. See Exhibit I.

The lawyer who won Wayne's case said he was going to sue these people. He took \$2,000 more from Wayne and never did anything with the case. And he is judgment proof having many other judgments against him already.

Wayne then hired a group of lawyers from

Philadelphia to sue the State Police, the girl, and others
in federal court because his civil rights were violated.

The lawyers admitted in the middle of the case before it came to trial that they failed to do their job and the federal court judge left them off the case.

Now Wayne had to find another lawyer to try to finish this case. The other lawyer failed to bring people in for questioning who were subpoenaed and failed to get a default judgment against the girl who is now 20 years old and working.

She wrote the federal court judge a letter

stating she could not afford an attorney and thought the Pennsylvania State Police was going to represent her. It would have been easy for Wayne's lawyer to get a default judgment against her but did not do it.

The case is now closed. Every one of the Defendants scot-free. Wayne is marked for the rest of his life and left in debt. He was afraid to drive truck anymore and Wayne took a job inside the produce warehouse where heavy lifting was required.

He hurt his back which required surgery at Temple Hospital in Philadelphia, both knees had to be operated on, and his SI joint is still torn. Wayne is only 44 years old and ruined for life.

He sent a letter to the Pennsylvania victim's compensation fund because he is truly the victim and a letter to Governor Ridge asking for help in getting the funds to compensate him for his losses.

Enclosed in your packets you will find the form letter Wayne has sent to the fund asking for your help to please intercede for him in getting compensation for all his legal expenses, Exhibit J.

Our family has been tormented by harassing phone calls, damage to our property, tire slashed on my car, a rock thrown through the door of Wayne's truck for which we filed police reports and no one was ever found who did the

damage.

I know it wasn't my neighbors because I was born and raised in the house I live in and have been there for 61 years and my family and me are respected in our community.

In your packet, Exhibit K, you will see the girl's mother and stepfather's home was being Sheriff saled on August 19th of 1993. The alleged rape was August the 16th, '93. I believe they needed money.

The stepfather also had a criminal record. See Exhibit L. He was prosecuted -- or not prosecuted but he was brought up on many charges. The girl was a runaway. See Exhibit M. The girl also was in counseling for being unable to tell the truth. See Exhibit N, part 1 and 2.

The case also has an ironic twist to it because the girl's stepfather was a witness in 1990 for the man who owned the roadside stand where they worked because he was arrested for indecent assault of his niece.

The case was similar to Wayne's because it was handled by the same State Police barracks, the same District Attorney, and they went before the same judge.

I mentioned this to the State Trooper who was handling Wayne's case that I thought a pattern was set between the cases and he did nothing. You see these people went through the system of rape. They knew how it worked.

Enclosed is a newspaper article of the State

police officer from the Bloomingrove barracks who admitted
he raped a lady while on duty. Yet he wasn't prosecuted.

Exhibit P, part 1 and 2.

I believe some housecleaning needs to be done in some of the State Police barracks as internal investigations sweeps things under the rug. God help the person who has no funds to defend themself from lies or false accusation as a system sometimes fails the innocent.

It was our faith in God that Wayne is free.

Additional Exhibits Q and R shows the dysfunctional background of the girl's mother and stepfather which this young girl was exposed to.

You will see that the mother drank heavily and that the stepfather took a gun and held it to the mother's head, beat her up, put her in the hospital. She had to have facial surgery and he broke her ribs. This kid was subjected to that.

Exhibits S and T show Wayne was found innocent and was granted an expungement. Also is the story of Wayne and Carol Jones and how they fought the rape charges.

Exhibit V is newspaper articles of the actual trial because I had the Scranton Times newspaper come to Pike County and do the trial so that nothing would be left out of the case. I thank you. Are there any questions?

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Representative Bard.

REPRESENTATIVE BARD: Thank you very much for offering your testimony today and taking the time and effort to be with us. Obviously this case is extremely involved.

MS. PALLIS: Yes, it is.

REPRESENTATIVE BARD: It is heart wrenching. And at this time having not studied any of this material, I don't have any questions presently.

MS. PALLIS: He is ruined. He is ruined for life. And even to have a child come over and play with his child anymore, he can't do it unless one of us is there.

Because what is not to say that he wouldn't be accused a second time. His child is a little girl. And if she brought a little girl in the house and one of us isn't there, what is saying if he even touched another child he wouldn't be bought up on these charges again?

He's ruined. I myself had a nervous breakdown.

I had to go to the hospital myself. When this happened, his wife had to go to the hospital. I was left by myself to try and gather material. I walked through Newfoundland. I knocked on the doors. I went to the neighborhood.

I introduced Wayne and myself to the people of Newfoundland. I said this is the man who is accused of raping a girl down the street at the roadside stand. I said, Can you tell me anything about these people? We don't know anything about these people.

- 0

And then the stories started coming out. I went to the courthouse myself -- and I still hold a full-time job. I looked through records. I found what they did. Everything in those papers, that's not my doing. That's from the courthouse. That's their doing.

And they can prove how they did one case after another. And it is ironic -- I guess Representative Birmelin is your name. And you're from Pike County, are you not?

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Wayne County.

MS. PALLIS: Well, then if you look in your records, you will see that the man who owned that produce stand was brought up on charges of raping his niece or assaulting his niece. The girl's stepfather was his witness to get him off in 1990.

And the man who owned the produce stand got mad at his father-in-law because his father-in-law testified against him. He turned around and accused his father-in-law of molesting his daughter but they left him off.

Now, do you mean to tell me they don't know about the system of rape? Yes, they did. He had a sitting duck over here. They thought this boy didn't know anything and they were just going to collect a million dollars and they were going to pay all of their debts off.

And the District Attorney had no mercy for him.

He would not listen to reason. I begged and I told him and I called that one Trooper. I told that Trooper, please check. There is a pattern here. Watch it:

I had to have this man tested. I said I'll give you the \$3,000 to test him at Cellmark. They didn't want to do it. They didn't want to test that man. A red flag should have went up.

I got this man out of jail. Three days after that the stepmother -- the mother was so clever, she knew when he got out of jail. She called the District Attorney up and told the District Attorney he's trying to break into my house. It is 5:00 in the morning. He's at my door breaking the lock trying to get in. Go and arrest him and put him back.

Fortunately his boss took him back to work. He was punched in at work working in the warehouse at 5:00. I took him, my sister and the whole family went to Dunmore barracks and said you're looking for this man. Because the lawyer called us and said they are going to come and get him. I went up to the Dunmore barracks. I said, Here, do you want his timecard? He was at work. He wasn't breaking in her house.

Why didn't the District Attorney then pick up the red flag and say, whoa, something is wrong here. This is another lie. They didn't. I had that man

1 tested when he got out.

The day he got out of jail, I took him to a private hospital and had a rape test kit done unannounced to them. I didn't tell them because I didn't want to let them switch anything, blood, nothing. That kit they never found a hair. That kit they never found dirt on that kit. This girl was supposed to be rolling on the ground. They found no dirt.

And then they send her brother down to where Wayne worked posing as Wayne's brother-in-law because Wayne was sick in a mental hospital and he wanted to know where he was. And we got alerted to that. They tipped us off and said, whoa, Wayne doesn't have a brother-in-law.

I have all of these documents. I have every bit of documents. They have put me through hell. I have faced death. I have faced my husband's death. I have faced terrible illnesses in my life. Nothing was worse than when I seen that man being taken out in handcuffs after going to do a day's worth of work and not hurting nobody.

I faced a lot of things in my life but I can't face that. I could never face that. And as long as I live and breathe if I got to come to Harrisburg and walk in front of Harrisburg with signs, come to every one of you legislators and say why this Bill has got to be, I will. They won't shut my mouth because I've got nothing to be

afraid of. But I'm not judgment proof like the rest of the 1 2 trash who do this to you. They are judgment proof. 3 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Please stay seated. We may 4 have some questions for you. Representative Daley. REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: I just want to say, 5 6 Carol -- is that right? --7 MS. PALLIS: Yes. 8 REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: -- that you're a remarkable lady and Wayne ought to consider himself very 9 10 lucky to have a mother-in-law that would fight for his 11 name --12 MS. PALLIS: Thank you. REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: -- and his family's name 13 14 like you have. I mean I have seen cases which are very 15 similar where peoples lives were ruined by false accusations 16 by people that really had so much to gain and nothing to 17 lose as this situation is. 18 MS. PALLIS: I could have lost everything. 19 Because when I went out searching in the town and knocking 20 at the door, I went to the post office. And I checked the 21 post office. And I got to know I think it was Karen Zane 22 and a couple of girls. Stories didn't jive. 23 Like they were supposed to have drove to the post 24 office got a -- like a man was supposed to have run to the

post office and called it in. And Karen said that wasn't

the time. It was a different time.

And different elements didn't come up. But I'm going to investigate yet. I'm not done. Because supposedly this lady who stopped in at the open roadside stand, supposedly the girl was crying and supposedly she said to the girl what is wrong. The girl said, well, I've been raped.

I'm going to check and see if she's not related to somebody up there. A million dollars is a lot of money to split a lot of ways. And that State Trooper should be looked at too more carefully.

I understand there was a few cases up there. I think you have a murder up there that was unsolved. It was a camp counselor a long, long time ago. I could be off the wall on this but --

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: We should send you up there to investigate.

MS. PALLIS: I understand he might have been one of the first ones on the scene and a lot of stuff was missing like the vital evidence needed. I think a State Trooper from Trooper R barracks needs an overhaul.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Excuse me. Representative Mandarino, do you have any questions?

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: No questions.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: I want to thank you folks for

coming.

MS. PALLIS: Thank you for having us. I hope that we can do something with this because I'll never stop. I want to get on a program or have the story written in a book. That is how --

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Representative Bard will help you do that. Our next testifier is Joan Kubrick. If you would, please come forward. You are Mrs. Kubrick?

MRS. KUBRICK: Yes, Mr. Birmelin.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Thank you for coming here today and when you're ready.

MRS. KUBRICK: I thank you, Mr. Birmelin, and all of the panel for having us and looking into all of this and listening to this. It is heart breaking. But mine is a bit different but a lie is a lie and what it can do to a person.

We've heard all of these lies from kind of street people and what they have done. But to me -- and this is horrible. But to me it is very -- my lie that I'm going to talk about is very faith shattering when we look to our officials who are sworn to uphold the law and actually to protect us. And when we find them to lie and especially in lies about the estate of dead people, this is also devastating.

I'm from Lackawanna County and I'm just a mother.

I'm a mother who experienced what probably every parent is

their most dreaded thought is having a policeman knock at the door and tell you that your son is dead.

There is just after -- this is what happened to me. And after I talked to Tim 15 to 20 minutes and then -- on the phone and then a policeman is there to knock on the door and tell me that my son is dead.

I know that you'll understand all of you when I try to relate to you what happens when you face something as this. I was actually numb, maybe I could say paralyzed, whatever, you can't think.

In short, like you are prey to anybody that really wants to take advantage of you to whatever or whomever. The most that you can do -- the most that I could do is for years is I just tried to handle my own grief.

An investigation took place by the State Farm

Insurance Company. They asked me if I had an attorney. And
I said, no, no. No one expects anything like this. You
don't plan and you don't have attorneys. And she did
suggest to me that it was -- I had best to have an attorney.
An attorney was suggested from a very prestigious law firm.
I took their advice and gave -- put all of these matters in
the hands of this law firm.

All that I did ask, I didn't want -- I couldn't handle this. All that I did ask was because of so many untruths, so many inconsistencies, and lack of remorse from

people who were involved into this death, I just sought -- I said I want a court hearing.

No one can just knock on a parent's door and say your son is dead. I want to know why, how, when. I want to know all of the details about this. I'm his mother. I had him for 29 years. I have to know this. So I asked that we would go have a court hearing and that I have all of these inconsistencies and so forth before a jury.

My son's name was Timothy. He was 29 years old, educated, he was a hard worker. And he was holding a very responsible job and he did earn a decent salary.

Due to all of this, they did take a financial study I believe they called it to determine what a person's life is worth. It was estimated that Tim's life was valued at somewhere near \$2 million.

I did not know it until just probably very, very recently the amount of insurance that was available which was far exceeding that amount of money. And it is hard to talk about money because I was never interested in the money. And years past and finally I was summoned to appear before the courts.

And when I got there, I was told that there was a settlement for me; and that this money was available for us.

I said I was not interested in this settlement and that I was promised this. The only thing that I had asked for was

my day in court to put this all before a jury and have all of these facts come out.

I was told that I couldn't have this because I had already signed a release and a settlement agreement and my attorney presented this to the judge and that indeed there was a release with my husband's and my name on it.

I looked at it. The judge said to me, is this your name, is this your signature. Yes, judge, it certainly looks like my signature and that of my husband. But yet I had known that I had never and would never and he would never sign anything like that. And yet that did exist.

The settlement was for \$125,000 which I wouldn't accept that. They had to take me to court and the money is still standing in court somewhere. I was guaranteed my day in court and I hadn't gotten this.

And what I really wanted, I wanted the people that were responsible -- I wanted them to be made accountable and receive the appropriate punishment. Too often these people if they know this one or that one they get off with this. But what happens the following time when they go down the road, whose life may they take then?

When we know something is wrong, I think it is our duty to correct it. When we see something, so many times people, they look the other way. Oh, well, it didn't happen to me so I don't really care about it.

I don't feel that God has that plan. I think if

I see something wrong, I am -- I'm not going to say, oh, I

didn't see it. We see this many times in court. People

don't want to come forward. I'm just as guilty as the one

who did.

After much investigation and much denials -- I worked very hard -- it was proven. I had proved and it is now acknowledged -- they have acknowledged that the two signatures on that were not my husband's and mine. They had taken documents -- I think it was my marriage license -- got copies of our signatures and photocopied it on this document. Which amounts --

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: May I interrupt for a second?

MRS. KUBRICK: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Who did this?

MRS. KUBRICK: The attorneys.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Okay. Go ahead.

MRS. KUBRICK: And in the documents I haven't mentioned their name. But you will see who the law firm is -- in fact, if you look in your telephone book, you'll surely know. On the back end, on the back page, they advertise I think in ten back covers of phone books which is a very, very costly thing to do.

It was hard for me to understand. Even at this point I'm trying to understand this. Why after I found out

like the insurances that were -- I was never concerned about that. I didn't know about that. But now I'm concerned.

They have all of this money on the table,
millions of dollars. They have a young person who was 29
years old, educated, productive, and they are coming up
taking this \$125,000 settlement. I just couldn't
understand it.

And could any of you, could you understand why someone -- and you have to remember that these people were going to get a third of whatever they collected. So why would they if there were million dollars on the table, wouldn't they want to take their just fair share of this? And I couldn't understand it.

So more time past and it is very hard to get people to do things for you or what. But when I was -- I was 62 years old when I enrolled in paralegal school. I should have been home praying for a happy death. But here I am going to school with a bunch of kids and lawyers' wives sitting in a classroom and going through this.

But I did learn how to research and some legal procedures. What I did find is my prestigious law firm before I went to them while they were handling my son's estate and up until I think two years ago were the chief defense attorneys for State Farm. Now how could they defend my dead son against State Farm when they were doing all

State Farm's work? That told me something.

I can't help -- I don't know. I can't prove this. But I have to -- I'm trying to rationalize what has happened there. What they did is I think they were loyal. My law firm were loyal employees of their employer. They were faithful to their employer of many years. They save insurance companies an awful, awful lot of money.

And this I don't feel is unique. There are so many mothers, so many people out there. I have gone through hell. I've gone places asking questions, doing these things and they can't do it.

But I think our problem is most of us are undereducated and we're unaware. We all know a little medical thing. You know, we can doctor ourself up with some herbs and teas and liniment and all of this stuff. Most of us know, especially the men, even women, how to change the oil in the car and we can help, you know, and know when we're getting ripped off by a mechanic. We know a little bit about this.

But what do we know about the law? Even educated people -- I am uneducated. I'm just a mother. And I prided myself to raise my children properly and with God in mind and teach them right from wrong and make bread and clean the house and that's all I knew.

But how many of our people even our young people

today do not know anything about this? And I think it is wrong. I wish when I was in high school instead of studying geometry that I had had a course in law. Not because I ever wanted to be a lawyer because I think the most important thing that I ever have done -- and I thank God for my Tim because I had him for 29 years. And I thank God I had him for those 29 years -- that being a mom was the best job I ever had. And I wouldn't give that up to be any doggone lawyer.

But I do think that we need someone to look over their backs. My daughter is a school teacher today. She teaches gifted. She is the only one -- of course, they don't like her -- not the children, the children like her. But she takes her students to the courthouse, shows them how to read a brief and look up a docket and all of this stuff.

And they will say, why do we have to do that?

We're not going to become lawyers. I think that her thought is I hope that none of you ever have to do what my mother has had to do. But just in case you do -- because I would like to tell everyone out in that world that none of you will ever face the loss of a child. But that's not true.

Because I don't know which one of you out there is going to have grandchildren or children is going to face this. When that comes and if it comes, I would not want anyone to be further victimized. That's bad enough.

But then I just kind of feel it is being like raped by the system. It really is. It is so, so wrong. I couldn't understand why Tim died. I was very, very upset, very bitter. But I think I know now.

I think his life had a great deal of meaning to a lot of people. I still have the kids come over and we keep in touch and that. I want his -- I think he died because his death needs to take meaning that no other parent shall ever have to go through this. That when these tragedies happen, that they won't be taken advantage of.

And I know this is a different kind of lie and it probably doesn't fit in with what we're doing today, but I think that there has to be -- I look at it. I think we have to have stern laws for these people.

And I know there is a tremendous amount of great people who really respect the law that are on our bench and at our bar. Well, I think politics many times controls them. And they daren't speak up.

If you have a grievance against an attorney, do you think in especially in our counties, Mr. Birmelin -- do you think that Wayne, Lackawanna, Monroe you could find an attorney to represent you in malpractice? I don't think so.

I called one time the board to -- the recommending board. And I asked them and the phone went dead. I said, are you there, are you there. No answer.

She said, no, ma'am we don't have anyone to recommend.

I think even if you go into as far as

Philadelphia it is even difficult to get representation

there. I don't know for sure. But is it mandatory -- is it

mandatory -- it is mandatory for each one of you and

everyone sitting in the audience and for me, we cannot sit

behind even the wheel of our automobile to drive if we don't

have the proper credentials, the proper license. Yet we

have an attorney in our Lackawanna County, he doesn't have a

license and he practices. And they let him get away with

it. He's doing it right now as a matter of fact. He skis

well too.

Do they have to have malpractice insurance? Is it mandatory that an attorney has to have it?

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Is it, Representative Manderino?

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: She says yes. She is an attorney. That's why I looked to her for an answer.

MRS. KUBRICK: Well, thank you. My thought was if they didn't, I thought perhaps it would be a good deterrent to make them have it. But since they do, well that answers one of my questions.

And also if an attorney is found to violate -- and these are the keepers of our law. If they are found to

1 do
2 re
3 bo
4 we
5 co

do something of this nature, shouldn't they suffer some repercussions? And I don't want to hear the disciplinary board. This is a self-disciplining thing. Just like if we're a family and I do something wrong, well, okay. I'll come to you people and you slap me on the wrist and cover it over.

And besides when you go to the disciplinary board, one of the things that you have to do is you have to sign your name to this and you are not allowed to speak about this out in the open. That seals it. This is wrong.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Well, I'm going to let
Representative Manderino who is our resident expert on
lawyers and legal affairs answer some of your questions.

MRS. KUBRICK: If I may just interject something here, my last thought this was just in the last month. The insurance company is sending me another check which I'm not going to cash because I would really have to give this some serious thought knowing what I know, how these operations work. Why are they sending me a check for \$50,000 now?

And then they go on to say, well, I know there was other money sent to you but you didn't get it and you're going to have to take it up with your attorney and the courts because we don't know where that money went. I'm confused.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Mrs. Kubrick, why don't I

just make a couple comments. Number one, most of the testimony that you've presented today is probably not in connection with the legislation that is before us and you stated that yourself.

MRS. KUBRICK: Yes, correct.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: I don't want to belabor the point or spend a lot of time on the issue. It is not that we are not concerned, but it is not something that we're here to solve for you today.

MRS. KUBRICK: No. But it is lies.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Representative Manderino is going to briefly respond a little bit to some of the comments that you made as a courtesy to you.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: First of all, I just gave you a wrong answer. I don't know -- from a practical point of view, I don't know many attorneys who will practice law without carrying liability insurance. But when I re-thought my answer, I don't believe that it is mandatory that one carry malpractice insurance.

However, when I was practicing law in the City of Philadelphia, one of the main things that I did was legal malpractice, defense for the insurer for legal malpractice.

I can tell you there was no lack of attorneys in the Philadelphia region that were willing to bring malpractice charges against a fellow attorney. I can't speak to how it

1 is up in your county.

But all I can tell you is we had a whole caseload of malpractice claims against attorneys. So again I can't address what happens up in your county. I just can tell you it is alive and well down in southeastern Pennsylvania.

MRS. KUBRICK: We're in a different area.

Northeastern Pennsylvania, there is none other in the world like it. It is called the good old boy system. I think the one attorney -- yes, it would be foolish for an attorney to practice law without having that.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: It would be very foolish.

MRS. KUBRICK: However, there are certain attorneys and that's why I question that. I believe he is judgment proof and they have all of their assets tied up in other people and so forth. So if he commits a wrong, what does he have to lose?

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Well, in addition to monetary loss, he has -- I'm telling you an answer you already said you didn't want to hear. But he can lose his license.

MRS. KUBRICK: He did for something but he is still practicing law. And the courts up there which has the responsibility -- the president judge has a responsibility to stop this and he has not.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: I can't address that.

1 MRS. KUBRICK: I know. I thank you very much for 2 this opportunity and I just hope that I can go on so this 3 cannot happen to any other mother. It was horrible. CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Thank you, Mrs. Kubrick. Our 4 5 next testifier is Mr. Robert Bolus. Mr. Bolus, please come 6 forward. Do you have your testimony in writing today? 7 MR. BOLUS: Yes, I do. CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: If you would give it to my 8 assistant David here so he can give that to us. I think 9 10 everyone has a copy at this point if you would like to 11 proceed. 12 MR. BOLUS: My name is Robert Bolus, Sr., 922 Sanderson Street, Throop, Pennsylvania 18512. And if I may, 13 I'd like to read the letter that I have written into the 14 record and then --15 16 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: That's fine. MR. BOLUS: -- explain the exhibits as needed. 17 This is to the attention of the House Judiciary Committee, 18 Subcommittee on Crimes and Corrections. Re: 19 Public 20 Hearing, House Bill 106. 21 Dear Representatives, I appear before you today 22 in regards to the destructive action and subsequent 23 consequences that were inflicted upon myself and my family 24 when a person or persons deliberately and knowingly

perpetrated the heinous crime of lying and providing false

information as represented in Section 4906 of Title 18.

Beginning on October 30th, 1990, false information (refer to Case No. 91-CR-127, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania versus Robert Bolus, Sr.) was provided to Sergeant Thomas Scales of the Pennsylvania State Police by informants who chose to remain anonymous (referred to as A-1 and A-2) regarding stolen truck parts. The details of this testimony can be referred to on pages 27a through 35a on the search warrant that is before you.

If I may, I would now like to explain the history of the criminal actions taken against me. I was convicted of the following: Two counts of receiving stolen property; one on a Caterpillar front-end loader, the second on an Autocar Tractor/Rogers low-boy trailer. One count of tampering with evidence, one count of criminal solicitation.

On September 19th, 1991, on each receiving charge, I was sentenced to two months to one year, both charges to run consecutively therefore spending four months in the Lackawanna County Work Release Program with the remaining time on probation, plus a \$1,000 fine for each charge.

On tampering with evidence and criminal solicitation, fines assessed were \$500 each on each count. These fines were paid and the sentences were served satisfactorily.

To this day I maintain my innocence. This

statement, I'm sure, has been made by many convicted of a

crime. However, in my particular case, information has

surfaced as to the true value of the Caterpillar front-end

loader with the alleged perjured sworn testimony which could

possibly clear the felony charges from my record.

And as any lawyer knows, value is the whole basis of receiving stolen property. In my trial, values were hypothetical and far exceeded the true value of the Caterpillar front-end loader.

Now that my sentence has been completed, the laws as they stand today prevent me from presenting any of this information in a court of law to clear my name.

Only if I were still incarcerated would I have appeal rights. I no longer have rights of appeal regarding new information. Unless the law is changed, I must live with the felony convictions for the rest of my life.

Moving forward I will now explain the second set of charges precipitated by A-1 and A-2 and Sergeant Scales (refer to Case No. 93-CR-1512, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania versus Robert C. Bolus, Sr.)

This second set of charges stemmed from the same search warrant executed in 1991, Case No. 91-CR-127.

Wherein all of my places of business located in Throop,

Dunmore, and Bartonsville, all in Pennsylvania which is

Lackawanna County, were raided by Sergeant Scales and the Pennsylvania State Police, the Internal Revenue Service, Department of Revenue, National Theft Auto Bureau and Lackawanna County District Attorney.

All my records, tractors, truck parts, trailer, and allegedly stolen vehicles and parts were confiscated in this action.

On June 18th, 1993, based on information of the 1991 search warrant, I was arrested on numerous criminal charges including a charge under corrupt organizations, herein referred to as Exhibit 12A.

Rather than all of the charges being tried in one trial since all information was obtained out of the same search warrant, Sergeant Scales and the District Attorney's office were determined to deliberately separate them extending the length of the trials extensively causing without concern unnecessary burden of the court system at the expense of the taxpayers and in addition adding the burden on to myself and my family financially, emotionally, and physically.

This action unquestionably aided in the deliberate and malicious destruction of my business, my reputation, and my credibility which took a lifetime to build.

After securing an appointment to review the

records along with my attorney and an accountant, upon arrival we were denied any rights by Sergeant Scales to review my records.

Sergeant Scales indicted the only way to obtain any of the information from the records would be through him only, denying me my constitutional right of confidentiality and self-incrimination. To this date I have never been allowed to review my records.

From June 18th, 1993, to March 20th, 1997, I was never brought to trial by the District Attorney's office.

After an omnibus pretrial motion and hearing before the Honorable Judge Donald D. Dolbin on March 20th, 1997, in the Court of Common Pleas of Lackawanna County, an Order of Court was entered on the 3rd day of April, 1997.

Wherein Judge Dolbin stated, "It appearing that Defendant's constitutional rights (state and federal) have been violated, it is hereby ordered that the charges in the within case are dismissed with prejudice." See Exhibit A-Bolus.

The District Attorney and Sergeant Scales dissatisfied with Judge Dolbin's decision followed by filing an appeal from the Order April, 3rd, 1997, in the Court of Common Pleas of Lackawanna County to the Superior Court of Pennsylvania, Case No. 1560 Philadelphia 1997, continuing their efforts to curtail my life from returning to normal.

My finances would be depleted in ongoing court costs and personal strains would continue to take physical and emotional toll on myself and my family.

On July 17, 1998, the Superior Court of Pennsylvania entered an Order affirming Judge Dolbin's decision to dismiss the charges.

Again dissatisfied with the Superior Court's decision, the District Attorney and Sergeant Scales filed a Petition for Allowance of Appeal from the Superior Court to the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania continuing with their agenda to destroy my personal and professional life.

However, the end to their malicious prosecution of me came to an end on February 22nd, 1999. The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania denied their petition for allowance of appeal.

But the story does not end here. Sergeant Scales and the District Attorney following the three court decisions dismissing my case refused to return all of the confiscated property to me. Again the vindictive prosecution at the hands of Sergeant Scales and the District Attorney continue.

From the final order on February 22nd, 1999, and after a hearing before Judge Corbet where a verbal agreement was reached and was to have been committed to writing by the District Attorney's office to return my property.

The agreement was never submitted. Subsequently a second hearing was to be held before Judge Nealon but was continued due to his trial schedule.

Finally, a third hearing was held before

President Judge Walsh whereby he issued an order on January

23rd, 2000, ordering the return of all properties seized

from me during the 91-CR-127 case which included return of

the Caterpillar front-end loader and all property in the

93-CR-1512 cases forthwith. Said order is attached as

Exhibit D-Bolus.

If I may add, this order to date has not been adhered to by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. In summation, I believe the law should be changed as stated under House Bill 106.

I also believe additional laws should be changed to give all individuals an equal right to prove their innocence, face their accuser such as unnamed informants A-1 and A-2, to be able to be proven right or wrong.

Instill stiffer penalties for law enforcement members of all offices when it is proven they have lied and abused their power and abused the legal system for their own personal goals.

In addition that they be made to personally pay restitution both to the Commonwealth and to the individual they have unjustly acted against which in most cases they do

under the cloak of immunity. Let this immunity be removed.

I quote Sergeant Scales, "The law is the law and it's for everyone." Yet this is not so. Sergeant Scales has been recently charged with a DWI involving a crash and rolling over a State Police cruiser while intoxicated and off duty.

In addition he has been charged with assaulting his wife. He was involved in another accident in the private development where he lives. Yet no charges were filed.

While Sergeant Scales is under suspension, he is still a member of the Pennsylvania State Police and entitled to all of its benefits.

The District Attorney became a Lackawanna County judge and his Assistant District Attorney Jack Brier as well as others have and continue to enjoy their status and secure positions of power assuming they will never be called upon to be made accountable for any of their actions perpetrated against myself and my family and possibly countless others.

And I ask you members of this committee, if the law is the law, is it really for everyone? Respectfully submitted, Robert C. Bolus, Sr.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Mr. Bolus, in relationship to the legislation that this hearing is being conducted on, is it your contention that the two unnamed informants, A-1 and

A-2, were lying about you and what had occurred?

MR. BOLUS: Yes, I am.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: And that you did not have the opportunity to know who they were or to confront them?

MR. BOLUS: That is correct. There was testimony before a grand jury which I have a lot of the documentation here. I don't want to burden you with so much paperwork. I probably could have filled the room here.

Testimony was given before a grand jury in

Lackawanna County which naturally for all intent and purpose
that testimony is supposedly secret. The informants never
came forward. They were never even going to be brought into
the courtroom to face me as I guess they were accusing me.

There were statements made that there were trailer loads of stolen engines and transmissions and cabs and all this. Yet when the State Police raided our properties, they found no such equipment or motors or parts or anything of this nature. What were taken were allegedly stolen vehicles that if I may add in the four or five years they never brought me to a trial on any of the charges and that was what the dismissal was.

So just based on an assumed accusation by informants who have the capability to remain unknown and never suffer the penalties, people like myself and many others suffer the destruction of their lives, their

businesses, and everything else.

And it is my feeling that the legislation should not only be as recommended in House Bill 106 but it should also make them accountable to the individual. There should be no unnamed informant. If someone wants to point the finger, they should be allowed to face their accusers or vice versa. In this case it has never happened.

To this day we never received anything back. And Judge Walsh's order that is before you, the final order, as you can see anything and everything seized from our property allegedly stolen, whatever it may have been, to the date that this order was signed, the District Attorney's office and State Police could not sit before Judge Walsh in the hearing and factually say this is definitely a stolen piece after nine years.

That equipment has deteriorated. Our trucks that they took have just literally rotted away. Trailers that were loaded with brand new inventory truck parts have been pilfered through where there is absolutely nothing left.

And they were parked in a PennDOT salt station outside of Scranton.

The individual on the Caterpillar loader that Judge Walsh signed that order was before a federal court hearing last week. He's a prominent businessman in the city. He owns the landfill and everything, Mr. Denaples.

And he took this loader under the auspice of a sworn statement that he had bought it from the insurance company after it was seized from us. And what he paid for it was no one's business.

When our attorney asked him what was the value you paid for this loader in an omnibus hearing, his statement was it is nobody's business what I paid for it. When we asked Judge Walsh to order him to answer the question and Judge Walsh's response was, is it important. And the attorney I had, Mr. Martino, said not at this time, Your Honor. It may be in the future. From there my life went downhill.

Not knowing the criminal system, I became a victim. Because as everyone knows, value is the whole aspect of what receiving stolen property is. In this case the value never came out until this day. And this all started with the lies created by A-1, A-2, and the contributing factor of Sergeant Scales not looking for the truth but looking for the vindictive nature to get us.

Because I had sued the Pennsylvania State Police over our heavy-duty towing service which I had been in for almost 30 years whereby we were the nearest available heavy wrecker service on the interstate system having seven locations in the Poconos, Lackawanna County, and up.

And because they played games and didn't follow

the list to call who they should have called, they just called who they felt like calling. When challenged because it is thousands and thousands of dollars that you lose in your business when a Trooper calls someone who shouldn't be called and forces you out of business -- because I stood up for my rights, you can now see the consequences I've paid and the prejudice that was enacted against me.

Whether A-1, A-2 even exist, whether there is a validity to who these individuals are where they could have any knowledge of my personal business, I have never had that opportunity to question them.

Yet Sergeant Scales has reaped the benefits of his labor and yet he broke all of the laws and he still takes a free ride. And it is all based on the informants. So that's why I came here today on the House Bill because there should be no secretive testimony on anyone.

Because a law enforcement officer doesn't really care. His problem is only one thing. I want to win. They don't want to lose. And they will do whatever it is to win. And I'm a perfect example of what that is.

It was just that I had the stamina to stand for what I believed is right and that's why I'm here before you today. I survived, many can't.

And I'm here today to hope that this legislative body takes a very hard look to change the laws that A-1

helped create and A-2 helped create by giving false information.

Because that information that they gave never sufficed to the point of a conviction in a trial. The case was dismissed again not on its merits, just because they never took me to a trial. And we were well prepared to go there.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: You said you never had a trial but you mentioned in the first page of your testimony that you were convicted of a felony?

MR. BOLUS: That's correct. First there were two separate charges filed against me. In the first case I was convicted on the front-end loader, receiving stolen property, only because testimony that now has come out now was never presented in my original trial.

After I served the sentence and the probation and all and work release and I just went back running my life, through whatever appeals they were doing, no one ever knew the true value. I subsequently purchased this front-end loader from the insurance company that had possession of it.

It is presently stored at Mr. Denaples' property who has used this loader for over two years, destroyed it, and now wanted to charge storage for it. I own the loader. I paid \$14,000 for it the second time around. The original time was \$25,000.

However, had Mr. Denaples or had the judge who was in charge of that judicial hearing ordered Mr. Denaples to testify and tell the truth as to the value he paid, I wouldn't be sitting here before you telling you I have a conviction. Because the value he claimed he paid later on was \$25,000. I, by purchasing it from the insurance company, established the actual cash value, the realistic value, not what A-1 says or A-2 or Sergeant Scales or someone who wants it appraised, the actual cash value.

I cannot clear my name today because I'm not incarcerated. I'm not sitting in a prison. I don't have some of the rights that criminals in jails do. Therefore, I can't clear my name and this is all precipitated by the lies created by A-1 and A-2.

We can today clear our name without question to this machine and the theft charges filed against me, but I have no more rights.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Any questions, Representative Bard?

REPRESENTATIVE BARD: No.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: I guess Representative Daley is not here to ask any questions. I guess in closing the only thing I would say is we want to thank you for coming and sharing this testimony. I'm not sure how it will fit into the legislation should it be passed.

You don't know the informers. I don't think this legislation would force them to tell who they were. But if you know who they were, then this would certainly apply in your case.

MR. BOLUS: What I would ask this body to do is just what you said, to be able to force these individuals to be made available since in fact the cases were dismissed against me. So that unquestionably determines that the District Attorney's office and the State Police knew full well they did not have the horse, so to speak, to take me to trial and suffice.

And in view of the testimony these individuals gave, it was definitely an absolute lie. And they ran with the lie to use that testimony. And I believe legislation should be changed in this House Bill not only for penalties that are there for the misdemeanor to felony conviction but it should also be made that they are accountable. Because how do you bring them forward and punish them if we never know who they are?

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: I'm not sure why you weren't able to ever ascertain who they were.

MR. BOLUS: The State Police would not reveal them. They were unnamed informants, period. So the thief or the liar who destroys your life like that could sit there and just keep every day going by.

It is just like the informants we have today that know everybody who bought drugs. And what do they do? They are allowed to go back out on the street every single day feathering their nest selling illegal drugs just because they will come back and give a State Police officer, a cop, or whatever information on someone else.

Yet our society is inundated with illegal drugs that they are still permitted to dispense and disperse through the area without ever being made aware of who they are. Yet many people, families are destroyed by the same concept that who are the informants.

The police are there to do their job. They want to know what is going on. Let them go out on the street and do their job. Don't sit in the doughnut shops, the side of the road with radar guns playing games. Let them come out and be cops. That's what they are for instead of using an electronic system in life to make it a lot easier and punish us, the citizens, with the fact that they are not doing the job they should be doing. We shouldn't have informants out there.

If the police want to know what is in your place -- just like they raided my place with 30 State Police officers. They wouldn't even wait for us to come there with a key to open the door. They smashed the windows out just to be heroes, play games like little children.

We had the key. Here is the key. I'll be there in two minutes. They took sledge hammers and smashed windows and there was nobody running out of the building.

They were closed.

And this is what happens when someone puts that badge on and straps that gun on. They are above the law.

And that's what is happening here today. And that's what is continuing to happen.

A law enforcement officer like Scales who has a DWI, now this is a man who could pull you over or shoot you literally and be justified because he's an officer. He's a cop. He's above the law.

The District Attorney, they are above the law.

The informants, they are above the law. Because they are never made to pay for what they create. So really we're the guilty ones. A person whose life is destroyed and can't straighten it out like I can't.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: We're hoping that legislation if not in its current form in some form will correct that problem.

MR. BOLUS: That's why I came here today.

Because I believe the firsthand knowledge that I've given

you -- I'll give you a little history.

I was a former congressional candidate when Bob Casey ran for Governor. I've been in politics. I've been

involved in a lot of different major things. And they
destroyed that with these lies literally, my life.

I couldn't carry a hunting rifle to hunt with

I couldn't carry a hunting rifle to hunt with my children that I taught them to hunt when they were kids because I have a felony conviction.

And it is all precipitated because someone lied.

Today I've struggled and I built a business back up. I'm

still fighting them. I have an Order from a judge that says

you have to return the property. Where does it all end?

When do we have an equal foot in with these people who are above the law? And that's why I hope this House Bill that you're putting there and maybe other House Bills that may be presented by members of this committee and various others change it a little. We have too much police out there and not enough restriction on what they can or cannot do.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: This would make some changes for sure of that. We want to thank you for your testimony.

MR. BOLUS: Thank you very much. I appreciate it. If there is any additional information that this panel or anyone else would need, we can give you just about anything that you need.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE BARD: I know a number of you have traveled a good distance to be here, and I would like to

1	invite everyone across the street to my office for lunch.
2	CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: In that direction.
3	MRS. PALLIS: I have one thing to say.
4	CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: I'm sorry but I can't accept
5	your testimony. If you want, you can talk to me personally.
6	Thank you very much. The meeting is adjourned.
7	(The hearing concluded at 1 p.m.)
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately in the notes taken by me on the within proceedings and that this is a correct transcript of the same. Sherri A. Reitano Notary Public Notarial Seal Sherri A Reitano, Notary Public Harrisburg, Dauphin County My Commission Expires Aug 28, 2003 Member Pennsylvania Association of Notaries 

cost_			
NUMBER OF PACES/TAPES			
COPIES SENT TO:			
PERSON/TITLE	LOCATION	DATE SI	
Ryp. Blaum		4/5/20	
Rep Birmelin		4/5/2	
Rep James		4/5/2	
Republican Kesearch	(Kathy Reighten)	8/6/	
	*****************		
	*****	On the two top you are not one you say.	
*************		The first first two laws and then then then and and the	
		" na na un un pr de, en de per de per de	

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_