IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT, IN AND FOR LEON COUNTY, FLORIDA

CASE NO.: 2018CF1592

STATE OF FLORIDA

VS.

DENISE WILLIAMS,

Defendant.

Volume VII

Page 831-931

PROCEEDINGS: JURY TRIAL

BEFORE: THE HONORABLE JAMES C. HANKINSON

December 14, 2018 DATE:

Commencing at 8:32 a.m. TIME:

Concluding at 7:42 p.m.

Leon County Courthouse Tallahassee, Florida LOCATION:

Johana M. Kesterson, Official Reporter REPORTED BY:

Notary Public in and for the

State of Florida at Large

JOHANA M. KESTERSON Official Court Reporter Leon County Courthouse, Room 341 Tallahassee, FL 32301

1	APPEARANCES
2	
3	REPRESENTING THE STATE:
4	JON FUCHS, ASSISTANT STATE ATTORNEY JAMES ROGERS, ASSISTANT STATE ATTORNEY OFFICE OF THE STATE ATTORNEY
5	LEON COUNTY COURTHOUSE TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32301
6	<u></u>
7	REPRESENTING THE DEFENDANT:
8	ETHAN WAY, ESQUIRE WAY LAW FIRM
9	P.O. BOX 10017 TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32302
LO	PHILIP J. PADOVANO
L1	BRANNOCK & HUMPHRIES 131 N. GADSDEN STREET
L2	TALLAHASSEE, FL. 32301
L3	
L4	
L5	
L6	
L7	
L8	
L9	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	DRACEEDINGS
1	PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: All right. We're here in State of Florida versus Denise Williams, 2018-1592. Let the record reflect Ms. Williams is present with her attorneys.

I sent in what I hope is the final version of the jury instructions for y'all to look at. Mr. Padavano had pointed out a couple of things. So let me just tell you what's changed from what we had before.

On page 2 and on the renunciation defense, I decided the wording -- I mean, he had pointed out it was grammatically in question. I thought -- I decided the wording of it was just unnecessarily wordy. So I just put murder instead of unlawful killing of a human being.

I think I worded it that way to start with because there were potential lesser includeds and I didn't want to be too specific. But those have been done away with. So I think that language is more to the point and clearer.

There was also, in the first paragraph of the renunciation, on the -- it had voluntary renunciation of his criminal purpose. It should be "her" criminal purpose and I've made that change. Everybody with me on that change?

MR. FUCHS: Yes, sir.

1 MR. WAY: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: There were a couple of others that were

just typographical fixes. And then the only other

substantiative change was in verdict. It has referred to

lesser includeds. Of course, we don't have any lesser

includeds, so -- that's on page 10. Those are the only

substantive changes.

Anybody found anything else or have any issues to raise?

MR. FUCHS: No, sir.

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. WAY: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So, as I recall, and correct me if I'm wrong, the only substantive objection is by the defense as to the principal definition. And the State is objecting to the renunciation language. That's my recollection of the only objections that have been --

MR. FUCHS: And, Your Honor, I think the objection by the State was because I misunderstood what you were saying. I actually do not have an objection to --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. FUCHS: The language that's in here, I have no problem with.

THE COURT: Okay.

24 MR. PADAVANO: And the remaining part, that's correct, Your Honor.

1 THE COURT: Okay. 2 MR. PADAVANO: Your recitation is correct. 3 THE COURT: All right. So any other issues this 4 morning before we proceed to instructions? 5 MR. FUCHS: None from the State, Your Honor. 6 MR. WAY: No, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: And, I guess, y'all assume -- I guess I shouldn't assume that you know, but I'll instruct on 8 the -- I'll instruct first and then have the closings, 9 10 except for the final provision after that. 11 MR. FUCHS: Your Honor, I do apologize. I do have 12 one ore tenus motion in limine regarding closing 13 arguments. And I don't believe Mr. Way will do this because he knows it's not proper, but there should not be 14 15 any mention of the sentences or potential sentences for Ms. Williams during the course of the closing arguments. 16 17 That would be my motion. 18 THE COURT: Mr. Way. 19 I've done this long enough to know not to 20 step on that third rail, Your Honor. 21 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. All right. We don't have all the jurors. 22 23 tell them to be here until 8:45. So if we figure we'll 24 start as soon after 8:45 as we have all the jurors

25

present.

1 MR. FUCHS: Yes, sir. 2 THE COURT: You have something, Mr. Way? 3 MR. WAY: Your Honor, are there going to be any time 4 limitations on summation? 5 THE COURT: Well, I mean, I think good attorneys put time limitations on themselves. I'm not going to -- I 6 don't think either one of y'all are going to ruin your 7 case by talking forever, so --8 9 Anyhow. All right. 10 MR. WAY: Yes, sir. 11 THE COURT: Anything else? 12 MR. FUCHS: No. sir. 13 We're in recess, correct, Your Honor? 14 THE COURT: Yes. 15 (A recess was had.) 16 MR. PADAVANO: Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Do we need to go back on the record? MR. PADAVANO: I think so, Your Honor. 18 19 On the first paragraph it -- did you mean to say renunciation of his criminal purpose on the first 20 21 paragraph of --THE COURT: Right. I changed that. That's one 22 23 thing I said. I know your copy doesn't have that. MR. PADAVANO: Okay. I didn't realize this was not 24 25 the final.

1	THE COURT: I have changed that.
2	MR. PADAVANO: Thank you.
3	(A recess was had.)
4	THE COURT: All right. Let's have the jury, please.
5	(Jury enters.)
6	THE COURT: All right. Everybody be seated, please.
7	Thank you for being back here this rainy morning. I
8	understand Mr. Adams is keeping y'all with a sugar high
9	with some donuts. Is that what I understand?
10	So, anyway. Next thing I'm going to do is instruct
11	you on the law. You will be allowed to keep these jury
12	instructions with you, so you don't necessarily need to
13	take any notes, unless we find a typo or something. But
14	I would ask that you read along with me as I go through
15	them.
16	All right. So everybody has a copy. He did that
17	pretty adeptly. I was trying to follow.
18	All right. As I say, I'd ask that you read along
19	with me as I go through them so that I can be certain
20	that everyone's been through them in their entirety on at
21	least one occasion.
22	Members of the jury, I thank you for your attention
23	during this trial. Please pay attention to the
24	instructions I am about to give you.

Denise Williams, the defendant in this case, has

1	been accused of the crimes of conspiracy to commit
2	first-degree murder, first-degree murder and accessory
3	after the fact of first-degree murder.
4	Count 1 conspiracy to commit first-degree murder

Count 1, conspiracy to commit first-degree murder.

To prove that crime the State must prove the following

two elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

- 1. The intent of Denise Williams was that the offense of first-degree murder would be committed.
- 2. In order to carry out the intent Denise Williams agreed, conspired, combined and confederated with another person, Brian Winchester, to cause first-degree murder to be committed either by them or one of them or by some other person.

It is not necessary that the agreement, conspiracy, combination or confederation to commit first-degree murder be expressed in any particular words or that words pass between the conspirators.

It is not necessary that the defendant do any act in furtherance of the offense conspired.

First-degree murder will be fully defined for you below under Count 2. And I'm not going to repeat it twice.

It is a defense to the charge of criminal conspiracy that Denise Williams, after conspiring with one or more persons to commit a murder, persuaded Brian Winchester not to do so or otherwise prevented commission of the murder under circumstances indicating the complete and voluntary renunciation of her criminal purpose.

Renunciation is not complete and voluntary where the crime that was conspired to was not completed because of unanticipated difficulties, unexpected resistance, a decision to postpone the crime to another time or circumstances known by the defendant that increase the probability of being apprehended.

If you find that the defendant proved by a preponderance of the evidence that she persuaded Brian Winchester not to commit the murder, or otherwise prevented the commission of the murder under circumstances indicating a complete and voluntary renunciation of her criminal purpose, you should find her not guilty of conspiracy to commit first-degree murder.

If the defendant failed to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that she persuaded Brian Winchester not to commit murder, or that she did not otherwise prevent commission of the murder under circumstances indicating a complete and voluntary renunciation of her criminal purpose, you should find her guilty of conspiracy to commit murder in the first degree, if all the elements of the charge have been proven beyond a reasonable doubt.

Count 2. In this case Denise Williams is accused in

Count 2 of first-degree murder. A killing that is excusable or was committed by the use of justifiable deadly force is lawful.

If you find Jerry Michael Williams was killed by Denise Williams, you will then consider the circumstances surrounding the killing in deciding if the killing was first-degree murder or whether the killing was excusable or resulted from justifiable use of deadly force.

The killing of a human being is justifiable homicide and lawful if necessarily done while resisting an attempt to murder or commit a felony upon the defendant; or to commit a felony in any dwelling house in which the defendant was at the time of the killing.

The killing of a human being is excusable, and therefore lawful, under any one of the following three circumstances:

When the killing is committed by accident and misfortune in doing any lawful act by lawful means with usual ordinary caution and without any unlawful intent; or when the killing occurs by accident and misfortune in the heat of passion upon any sudden and sufficient provocation; or when the killing is committed by accident and misfortune resulting from a sudden combat, if a dangerous weapon is not used and the killing is not done in a cruel or unusual manner.

"Dangerous weapon" is any weapon that, taking into account the manner in which it is used, is likely to produce death or great bodily harm.

I now instruct you on the circumstances that must be proved before Denise Williams may be found guilty of murder in the first degree.

To prove the crime of first-degree premeditated murder the State must prove the following three elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

- 1. Jerry Michael Williams is dead.
- 2. The death was caused by the criminal act of Denise Williams.
- 3. There was a premeditated killing of Jerry Michael Williams.

An "act" includes a series of related actions arising from and performed pursuant to a single design or purpose.

"Killing with premeditation" is killing after consciously deciding to do so. The decision must be present in the mind at the time of the killing.

The law does not fix the exact period of time that must pass between the formation of the premeditated intent to kill and the killing. The period of time must be long enough to allow reflection by the defendant. The premeditated intent to kill must be formed before the

killing.

The question of premeditation is a question of fact to be determined by you from the evidence. It will be sufficient proof of premeditation if the circumstances of the killing and the conduct of the accused convince you beyond a reasonable doubt of the existence of premeditation at the time of the killing.

If the defendant helped another person or persons commit the crime of first-degree murder, the defendant is a principal and must be treated as if she had done all the things the other person or persons did if:

- 1. The defendant had a conscious intent that the criminal act be done.
- 2. The defendant did some act or said some word which was intended to and which did incite, cause, encourage, assist or advise the other person or persons to actually commit the crime.

To be a principal the defendant does not have to be present when the crime is committed.

If you find that the crime alleged was committed, an issue in this case is whether the crime of murder in the first degree was an independent act of a person other than the defendant.

An "independent act" occurs when a person other than the defendant commits or attempts to commit a crime which

the defendant did not intend to occur, and in which the
defendant did not participate; and which was outside of
and not a reasonably foreseeable consequence of the
common design or unlawful act contemplated by the
defendant.

If you find the defendant was not present when the crime of murder in the first degree occurred, that, in and of itself, does not establish that the murder in the first degree was an independent act of another.

If you find that the murder in the first degree was an independent act of Brian Winchester, then you should find Denise Williams not guilty of the crime of murder in the first degree.

- Count 3. To prove the crime of accessory after the fact in Count 3 the State must prove the following four elements beyond a reasonable doubt:
- 1. A first-degree murder was committed by Brian Winchester.
- 2. After the first-degree murder was committed
 Denise Williams maintained, assisted, aided or attempted
 to aid Brian Winchester.
- 3. At that time, Denise Williams knew that Brian Winchester had committed the first-degree murder.
- 4. Denise Williams did so with the intent that Brian Winchester avoid or escape detection, arrest, trial or

punishment.

It is not necessary for the State to prove that

Denise Williams' assistance was successful in allowing

Brian Winchester to avoid or escape detection, arrest,

trial or punishment, nor is it necessary for the State to

prove that Brian Winchester was convicted.

The intent with which an act is done is an operation of the mind and, therefore, is not always capable of direct and positive proof. It may be established by circumstantial evidence like any other fact in a case.

First-degree murder has been fully defined above under Count 2.

The defendant has entered a plea of not guilty.

That means you must presume or believe the defendant is innocent. The presumption stays with defendant as to each material allegation in the indictment, through each stage of the trial unless it has been overcome by the evidence to the exclusion of and beyond a reasonable doubt.

To overcome the defendant's presumption of innocence the State has the burden of proving the crime with which the defendant is charged was committed. And the defendant is the person who committed the crime.

The defendant is not required to present evidence or prove anything.

5

whenever the words reasonable doubt are used you must consider the following: A reasonable doubt is not a mere possible doubt, a speculative, imaginary or forced doubt. Such a doubt must not influence you to return a verdict of not guilty if you have an abiding conviction of guilt.

On the other hand, if after carefully considering, comparing and weighing all the evidence there is not an abiding conviction of guilt, or if having a conviction it is one which is not stable but one which wavers and vacillates, then the charge is not proved beyond every reasonable doubt and you must find the defendant not guilty because the doubt is reasonable.

It is to evidence introduced in this trial and to it alone that you are to look for that proof. A reasonable doubt as to the guilt of the defendant may arise from the evidence, conflict in the evidence, or the lack of evidence. If you have a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant not guilty. If you have no reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant guilty.

It is up to you to decide what evidence is reliable. You should use your common sense in deciding which is the best evidence and which evidence should not be relied upon in considering your verdict. You may find some of the evidence not reliable or less reliable than other

4	
	evidence.
L	evidence.

23

24

25

2	You should consider how the witnesses acted, as well
3	as what they said. Some things you should consider are:
4	Did the witness seem to have an opportunity to see
5	and know the things about which the witness testified?
6	Did the witness seem to have an accurate memory?
7	Was the witness honest and straightforward in
8	answering the attorneys' questions?
9	Did the witness have some interest in how the case
10	should be decided?
11	Does the witness's testimony agree with the other
12	testimony and the other evidence in the case?
13	Has the witness been offered or received any money,
14	preferred treatment or other benefit in order to get the
15	witness to testify?
16	Did the witness at some other time make a statement
17	that is inconsistent with the testimony he or she gave ir
18	court?
19	Has the witness been convicted of a felony or
20	misdemeanor involving dishonesty or false statement?
21	Whether the State has met its burden of proof does
22	not depend upon the number of witnesses it has called or

The fact that a witness is employed in law

upon the number of exhibits it has offered, but instead

upon the nature and quality of the evidence presented.

enforcement does not mean that his or her testimony deserves more or less consideration than that of any other witness.

exception. The law permits an expert witness to give his or her opinion. However, an expert's opinion is reliable only when given on a subject about which you believe her to be an expert. Like other witnesses, you may believe or disbelieve all or any part of an expert's testimony.

You must consider the testimony of some witnesses with more caution than others. For example, a witness who claims to have helped the defendant commit a crime, who has been promised immunity from prosecution or who hopes to gain more favorable treatment in his or her own case may have a reason to make a false statement in order to strike a good bargain with the State.

This is particularly true when there is no other evidence tending to agree with what the witness says about the defendant. So while a witness of that kind may be entirely truthful when testifying, you should consider his or her testimony with more caution than the testimony of other witnesses.

However, if the testimony of such a witness convinces you beyond a reasonable doubt of the defendant's quilt or the other evidence in the case does

so, then you should find the defendant guilty.

It is entirely proper for a lawyer to talk to a witness about what testimony the witness would give if called to the courtroom. The witness should not be discredited by talking to a lawyer about his or her testimony.

You may rely upon your own conclusion about the credibility of any witness. A juror may believe or disbelieve all or any part of the evidence or the testimony of any witness.

The Constitution requires the State to prove its accusations against the defendant. It is not necessary for the defendant to disprove anything, nor is the defendant required to prove her innocence. It is up to the State to prove the defendant's guilt by evidence.

The defendant exercised a fundamental right by choosing not to be a witness in this case. You must not view this as an admission of guilt or be influenced in any way by her decision. No juror should ever be concerned that the defendant did or did not take the witness stand to give testimony in the case.

These are some general rules that apply to your discussion. You must follow these rules in order to return a lawful verdict:

You must follow the law as it is set out in these

instructions. If you fail to follow the law, your verdict will be a miscarriage of justice. There is no reason for failing to follow the law in this case. All of us are depending upon you to make a wise and legal decision in this matter.

This case must be decided only upon the evidence that you have heard from the testimony of the witnesses and have seen in the form of the exhibits in evidence and these instructions.

This case must not be decided for or against anyone because you feel sorry for anyone or are angry at anyone.

Remember, the lawyers are not on trial. Your feelings about them should not influence your decision in this case.

Your duty is to determine if the defendant has been proven guilty or not in accord with the law. It's my job to determine a proper sentence if the defendant is found guilty.

Whatever verdict you render must be unanimous. That is, each juror must agree to the same verdict.

The jury is not to discuss any question that a juror wrote that was not asked by the Court and must not hold that against either party.

Your verdict should not be influenced by feelings of prejudice, bias or sympathy. Your verdict must be based

on the evidence and on the law contained in these instructions.

Deciding a verdict is exclusively your job. I can not participate in that decision in any way. Please disregard anything I may have said or done that made you think I preferred one verdict over another.

A separate crime is charged in each count of the indictment. And although they have been tried together, each crime and the evidence applicable to it must be considered separately and a separate verdict returned as to each. A finding of guilty or not guilty as to one crime must not affect your verdict as to the other crimes charged.

You may find the defendant guilty as charged in the indictment or not guilty.

The verdict must be unanimous, that is, all of you must agree to the same verdict. Only one verdict may be returned as to each crime charged. The verdict must be in writing, and for convenience the necessary verdict form has been prepared for you.

All right. Let's look at the verdict form with me, please. I think it's pretty self-explanatory. But you have three counts. First you have as to Count 1, you would choose either the defendant is guilty of conspiracy to commit first-degree murder or not guilty. You would

1 check the one option you unanimously agree upon.

Same as to Count 2, either guilty of first-degree murder or not guilty. Again, you would check the option you unanimously agree upon.

Same as to Count 3, either guilty of accessory after the fact of first-degree murder or not guilty.

So, when you get through you should have three check marks on your verdict form. It will be dated and signed be the foreperson. The foreperson will bring the verdict form back to the courtroom with them after you've completed your deliberations.

Sometimes I get a question from the jury whether everybody has to sign the verdict form. No, just the foreperson signs on behalf of the jury. I'll go over the concluding remarks after the attorneys have made their closing arguments.

The attorneys now will present their final arguments. Please remember that what the attorneys say is not evidence or your instructions on the law.

However, do listen closely to their arguments, they are intended to aid you in understanding the case.

Each side will have equal time. But the State is entitled to divide this time between an opening argument and a rebuttal argument after the defendant has spoken.

Mr. Fuchs.

- 1 MR. FUCHS: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 2 Good morning again.

3 THE PANEL: Good morning.

MR. FUCHS: I'd like to thank you once again. I know I previously thanked you for being potential jurors, and the fact that you are, in fact, jurors. And now I'd like to take the opportunity to thank you again for doing exactly what it is that we knew you would do.

You were selected because myself and other counsel felt that you were the best that there was in order to sit there and listen throughout the course of this trial, and pay attention to everything going on in the courtroom. I know I pay attention. I know the Judge pays attention. I know they do.

And you've done exactly as it is that we thought you would do, and you paid attention throughout all the testimony, as well as everything else going on in the course of this trial. And thank you very much. Once again, we literally cannot do this without you. You are a vital part of the criminal justice system.

That being said. Closing arguments. As the Judge says, I get to talk to you twice. I talk to you the first time. And then Mr. Way will come up and speak with you -- or Mr. Padovano -- and I will come back and get to address you one last time.

The way I like to structure this a little bit, just to give you a little bit of guideline, is I want to go over the elements of the crime in the jury instructions as the Judge just read to you. Okay.

So let's start off with what we know. We know that on December 16, 2000, Jerry Michael Williams, Mike Williams, was murdered. It was initially classified as a missing person case. It was a shoddy homicide investigation because it was not a homicide investigation.

But we know now that man murdered him. Brian
Winchester. We know that everybody involved here are
long-time friends; Brian, Denise, Cathy Thomas, Mike.
All long-time friends. Went to North Florida Christian
School together. Went to Florida High -- I mean, went to
Florida State University together.

This started out as a homicide -- a missing person case. Ended up being a homicide investigation. Brian Winchester killed Mike Williams. Brian Winchester was in love with Denise Williams for a long time. We know that Brian and Denise actually got married on December 3rd of 2015, thirteen days from the anniversary, the fifth anniversary, of the murder.

We know at the time that he died that Mike Williams had multiple life insurance policies \$250,000, \$500,000

and \$1,000,000. All of which Denise Williams was the sole beneficiary of. We know that final one, that \$1 million policy, was drafted by Brian Winchester the summer before he murdered Mike Williams. That's what we know. That's what we know coming in here.

The question you have is, how does she fit into the picture? How does she fit into the murder, the conspiracy for murder and helping him after the murder?

As I said, I go through the elements. I'm going to start off on the back side because I think it puts everything in a little bit more perspective.

Accessory after the fact. The elements, the Judge has read to you that a murder was committed by Brian Winchester. No question. After the murder was committed, Denise Williams maintained, assisted, aided or attempt to aid him. And at the time she knew he had done it. And she did so with the intent for him to avoid arrest, trial or punishment.

Remember Dr. Mnookin. Very brief witness, but a very important one. Because one of the things the defense has alluded to during opening statements is that this -- and, of course, they're probably going to here shortly -- was that this was all something that Brian Winchester did and came up with to get revenge on Denise for turning him in. Dr. Mnookin says otherwise.

1	Brian Winchester goes and talks to Dr. Mnookin prior
2	to the arrest. And what does he tell him? He says, I'm
3	worried that Denise is going to go to law enforcement and
4	that she's going to tell them about a murder that
5	happened and what she knows from many years ago. The
6	murder of Mike Williams. Prior to the arrest.

Elements of accessory after the fact. After the arrest, within the week, within the week of Denise going and talking to law enforcement and being interviewed by Florida Department of Law Enforcement and talked to about the murder of Mike Williams, she calls her good friend Cathy Thomas and says, Tell Marcus to tell Brian I didn't say anything. Marcus, if you don't remember, is Brian's dad.

Cathy Thomas came. She testified to you and told you that's what happened. But you don't have to take her word for it.

(Audio playing.)

MS. THOMAS: Well, I mean, I know that you know something, Denise. Because whenever I was going out to see Marcus you're like, tell Marcus to tell Brian I'm not talking.

- MS. WILLIAMS: Yeah.
- MS. THOMAS: And I knew what that meant.
- 25 (Audio stopped.)

)

MR. FUCHS: So we know that she has knowledge of the homicide because Brian has told Dr. Mnookin already. And now she's sending a message to Brian to say -- let him know that she didn't say anything.

And you go back and you think about Brian Winchester's testimony. And they had a pact, an agreement, that nobody would say anything to another person. Nobody would say anything to law enforcement. And that's what she was saying. She was continuing that pact, and letting him know that she didn't say anything to law enforcement on that day. And she takes it one step further and she makes sure that she knows -- he knows this. So that way he doesn't then turn around and confess and dime her out, in accord with the agreement they had.

That right there, ladies and gentlemen, meets all the elements of accessory after the fact. Knew the murder was committed; aided, maintained, assisted, abetted, attempt to aid him, knew he had done it. And was the intent to avoid arrest, trial or punishment? Accessory after the fact, all the elements have been proven by the State.

So let's turn to the elements of conspiracy. Now, the reason I went with the accessory after the fact first is because of that statement. Because of the statements

of Dr. Mnookin. Because now, with the conspiracy, a lot of this you're going to have to rely upon Brian Winchester's testimony. No question about it. But when you're relying on Brian Winchester's testimony, take it in light of the fact of what you heard from Dr. Mnookin, from Cathy Thomas. And as the jury instruction tells you, does the testimony -- one of the things you have to do when weighing the evidence is figure out whether the testimony of a witness, no matter who it is, does it comport with the other evidence and other testimony from other witnesses?

So when you have Cathy Thomas, Dr. Mnookin telling you what they told you, it changes things a little bit when you're paying attention to Brian's testimony. It puts it in more context.

When you go back and you listen and you think about the elements of conspiracy. Denise Williams intended that Mike Williams be killed. In order to do so she agreed with or conspired with Brian Winchester to kill Mike Williams. It is a defense if she decided not to carry out the homicide by persuading and not stopping it. But it is not complete and voluntary when a crime wasn't committed because of an unanticipated difficulty or decision to postpone the crime to another time.

As I said, this all relies upon Brian Winchester's

testimony. And you have to do that evaluation we just talked about.

So let's talk about Brian Winchester's testimony.

Brian Winchester tells you this affair actually started three years prior, in 1997, at a concert in Floyd's off Tennessee Street. Been going on for three years. Well, let's take a look at how the other elements and other testimony, how that stacks up.

Lindsey Lockhart, a different concert, but another concert at Floyd's Music Hall. She's there with her friends. And, actually, Brian -- I mean, Mike's there as well. And she sees Brian Winchester and Denise acting in a manner that is not just friendly. It's above friendly. As if they were dating. Arms around each other, Brian standing behind her. Three years prior to Mike's death, just like Brian said.

Angela Stafford, there at the concert as well, sees the same thing. Three years prior to Mike's death. She even a little bit farther. She's there when Denise is seven months pregnant, two years prior to Mike's death. And her and Brian are flirting or whatever, hanging out and go out drinking. And what happens? Denise changes the way she's acting towards her. Is it something glaring? No. Keep in mind, affairs are secretive by nature. Conspiracies are secretive by nature. But she

changes the way she's acting towards her. Why? Maybe a little jealous that Ms. Stafford was able to go out and have drinks with him and she wasn't.

Cathy Thomas; found movie ticket where they had gone out together, found the "Meridian" necklace, had suspicions of them dating. The recording, she always knew that they were in love with each other.

You've got the tickets that Brian kept as momentos. Now, keep in mind that what he says is, yes, this affair started three years prior. But also, even after Mike's death they maintained secrecy until about 2003, 2004. One of those tickets from 1998. More from 2001, 2002, before they came out. They were kept because those are things that they did together and dates they went on to concerts.

The letter from Denise. The question about whether or not Brian tried to get back together with Cathy.

There's a letter from Denise of that time period, in which you heard a portion of it. You have it in evidence if you want to take a look at it.

But in that she talks about her love and she professes her love for him. How she's going to miss him. That didn't happen over night. Keep in mind, he's still married to Cathy at that time. That letter confirms that this is an ongoing relationship between Brian Winchester

and Denise Williams. It's from her handwriting and it's in her name, signed, Love you. At one point she says, I love you more than ever. You don't love someone more than ever if you didn't love them before.

And then, finally, the truck at the church. Joanie Chase, Tallahassee police officer. Nobody really thinks anything of it at the time. Obviously, it takes a different light in this situation. But remember what Brian Winchester said, he would park at different churches. One of which was a Grace Lutheran Church off of Miccosukee and Capital Circle. Right across from the CVS area. Kind of over there by the dealerships.

Sergeant Joanie Chase on patrol back in 1999, the year before Brian [sic] goes missing and dead, killed. She comes across a larger SUV. And she makes a phone call. Does the run, DMV. Unfortunately, those are all purged. But she remembers making a phone call to the wife of the owners. Usually you own a car, wife, husband. And she remembers having that conversation.

Cathy Thomas, Brian Winchester's wife, remembers that conversation. Remembers Joanie Chase saying -- describing the bumper stickers. But that wasn't supposed to be there because Brian was supposed to be hunting. But he wasn't. Because he was there and done something with Denise. Just like he said. Just like Brian told

1 you.

We talked about this in openings and in jury selection. You are here because you are to use your common sense, experience, education, life skills. And you use those tools throughout the course of your evaluation of all the situation here. Remember, affairs and conspiracies are secretive by their very nature. And they were good at it. They kept the secret of his murder for 17 years. Twenty-one, including the affair beforehand. Eighteen years now.

So now we turn to what Brian Winchester's testimony is about the actual conspiracy. Again, keep it in mind about the previous accessory aspect; Dr. Mnookin's testimony; Cathy Thomas's testimony; all the things we just went over that corroborated all the other things that Brian Winchester said. And that's the light in which you should look at his testimony regarding the conspiracy.

what did he tell you? Over a year they discussed it. That insurance was a motive, but it wasn't the sole motive. It was to be together, as far as he was concerned. The plan evolved over the time period.

At one point there was a conversation about whether they were going to kill both Cathy and Mike. A boating accident offshore where Denise and Brian were going to be

clinging to a buoy. And Mike and -- Mike and Cathy are dead.

He tells you that she has major concerns, given her upbringing, with being a divorcee. Didn't want to be a divorcee. Was concerned about custody of her child. Didn't want to share custody of her child. Balancing act between a divorcee or a widow. A widow with \$1.75 million, the sympathy of the community because your husband is missing in a hunting accident. A lot better than a divorcee.

And what did he tell you about the murder itself?

Again, Brian Winchester's testimony corroborated. The waders. The plan was to get him onto a boat, push him over so he would drown in the waders. Because of the myth that if you go into the water with the waders, you're going to, in fact, drown. You can't escape. They drag you down.

But the plan was to take him out onto Lake Seminole to the secret honey hole. But he had to put his waders on before he gets into the boat. And they head out. And he knows the depths in that area aren't real deep. So he's got to go to this particular 12-foot hole. Alton Renew told you about this 12-foot hole and the search, and all the things -- and how everything is focused around that one particular area. And when he gets to

that area, he pushes him over.

And somehow he's able to get out of those waders.

And we know that's corroborated because Joe Sheffield,
who's the man that found the waders six months later, he
says whenever he found the waders they were pulled half
way down, inside out, down to the waist area.

Howard Drew came in and said that, I taught him how to get out of those waders. We practiced it in the pool. And the first thing you do is, you get those straps off and you peel them down. And those waders were found in that 12-foot hole. Again, what he's telling you is corroborated.

So you shot him. And I'm not going to go into the details of how he shot him, because it was brutal. Brian Winchester is not a good person. He's a murderer, just like he told you. But that doesn't mean his testimony isn't accurate. And we know -- and it's corroborated that he was, in fact, shot because he told us where the body is. We were able to recover the body. And we found the body. And he was, in fact, shot in the face, just like Brian Winchester told you.

Brian Winchester told you about the murder, that he pulled the shirt over his head because he didn't want to have to look at his friend's face. Again, that's how the body was found. You saw the medical examiner's

- 1 photographs about that and her description of that.
- 2 Again, it's corroborated. And then he buried him. And

3 he took him and he buried him at Carr Lake.

Following his confession to law enforcement, he took them to Carr Lake and showed them where he was buried.

And that's where he was found. Again, Brian Winchester's statements are corroborated.

So what did he tell you? Three-year affair, corroborated. The murder itself, corroborated. What does it say about the other parts? Certainly when you're balancing weighing the evidence. If he's not lying about that, it's corroborated, what does it say about the rest of his testimony?

But then you go one step farther, the motive.

Follow the money. That's what Investigator Sparkman says. Homicide investigation you look to the spouse, follow the money. One-million dollars, \$500,000, \$250,000; 1.75 million dollars that she is the beneficiary of. Not Brian Winchester. She is. And when you add all that up, each and every element of that conspiracy has been met.

So now let's talk about the murder itself. How is she guilty of the murder? Mike Williams is dead. The death was caused by a criminal act. No question about it. Premeditation, no question about it. Definition,

you've already got it. Killing with premeditation
basically means you actually thought about it beforehand.
Sometimes it can be instantaneous.

We know that's not here because this was a long, thought-out process; get him into the waders, push him overboard. All the plans that went into this particular thing. No question, Mike Williams is killed after Brian Winchester decided to do so. No question he made it well before actually doing so.

So how does, again, Denise williams figure into this? That's where the principal comes into play. If the defendant helped another person or persons commit the crime of first-degree murder, the defendant is a principal and must be treated as if she had done all the things the other person did if she had a conscious intent that the crime be done.

Again, Brian Winchester tells you all the stuff that he told you regarding what it is that they conspired to do beforehand. Did she have a conscious intent that he go on that hunting trip and die and never come home again? And the answer, of course, is yes. Did she do an act, word or other thing that encouraged, assisted Brian to commit the crime? Absolutely.

To be a principal the defendant does not have to be present when the crime was committed. That's the law.

She is, in fact, a principal. And when you add it up,

when you add the conspiracy for murder, and you have the

murder that is actually committed, and you have a

principal to that murder, that equals murder.

And in the end, when you evaluate all that evidence and you evaluate the corroborated testimony of Brian Winchester and what Denise Williams's involvement is in all of this, and you evaluate the recorded statement, the testimony of Dr. Mnookin, the testimony of all the people that corroborated, once again, Brian Winchester's statement; and when you take it all into account, I am confident that you will, in fact, find her guilty of conspiracy to commit murder, first-degree murder and accessory after the fact. Thank you.

THE COURT: Why don't we take 15 minutes. Let the jury step out.

17 (Jury exits.)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

- 18 (A recess was had.)
- 19 THE COURT: Let's have the jury, please.
- 20 (Jury enters the courtroom.)
- THE COURT: All right. Everybody be seated, please.
- Mr. Way, you may proceed.
- MR. WAY: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 24 Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.
- THE PANEL: Good morning.

MR. WAY: I talked to you directly one time before on Monday. This is going to be my last chance to talk with you. You may note that I will probably try to slow down a little bit. Because I have been instructed by the court reporter that I was speaking at 330 words a minute yesterday, which was about a hundred over what she's rated for. So I need to try to pace myself a little bit. So if it sounds like I'm slowing down on purpose, I'm trying to help the court reporter out today.

Mr. Padovano and I and my team thank you for your careful attention to this case. No one thanks you more for your attention to this case than Denise Williams.

I'm going to talk to you in my closing argument about five distinct areas. I can't do Power Point presentations. I will probably, at some point, try to put something here and it will be upside down and you won't be able to read it. So I'm going to try to talk to you and I'm going to trust in your memories and in your note taking, and in what you've heard over the last three days of evidence. But, also, what you have not heard over the last three days in evidence.

The first thing I want to start with is just to remind you of something you already know. Something that you would recognize based on the instructions that Judge Hankinson has provided. This is not -- this is not a

case about feeling sorry for anyone. This is not a case about trying to get, quote, Justice for Mike. This is not a case about suspicions. It's not a case about guesses. It's not a case about trips. It's not a guess [sic] about pictures. It's not a guess about how you feel about Denise williams. It's not a case about how you feel about Cheryl williams.

It's not a case about how people mourn. It's not a case about how people grieve. It is not a case about whether people smile. It is not a case about whether people sit there and stare. This is a murder case.

I believe it would be helpful for you to consider the following: When evaluating all of the evidence or the lack of evidence that has been produced by the State of Florida in this case, please try for a moment, as an exercise, to remove from what you've heard any taint of Brian Winchester. Take the evidence that has been presented to you and take Brian Winchester out of it.

If you take Brian winchester out of the things that have been shown to you, you have nothing. That has been confirmed, ladies and gentlemen, by the Florida

Department of Law Enforcement agents. You recall Agent Devaney on Tuesday testified that there is no corroborating evidence. There was no physical evidence.

There is no tangible evidence that implicates Denise Williams in the murder of Mike Williams.

That this case began and was investigated over numerous years by numerous agencies. Let's talk about the agencies and the timing. Because this is a long time. Mike Williams was murdered by Brian Winchester at the end of the Clinton Administration.

Into the early part of the Bush Administration in 2002, the evidence shows that law enforcement had already sent an inquiry to Kansas City Life. It's 2002. There's a followup in 2004 to the same insurance company. Which, by the way, paid the premium -- paid the policy.

Because, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, that's what life insurance does. Life insurance pays out. You heard that representative of Kansas City Life testify that they did their investigation. They paid the policy.

The insurance, I want to call it a red herring. And Mr. Fuchs has a picture of the insurance with some red stuff on what looks like money. It's not even a red herring. It's not even really anything.

Mike Williams was insured. Mike Williams passed away. The insurance paid out. One thing the State didn't tell you in their model or in their movie, so to speak, is, based on what Investigator Sparkman said -- the one thing we know, of course, is that the Government

always thinks it's the spouse. But the State said, follow the money. Well, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, where did that -- where did they follow the money to? Did they present any evidence to you where the money went? Where the money is now. How the money was spent. No, they didn't. Because it's a throw-away line. It's a throw away. The policy is a throw away. And I'm going to tell you why that is.

But true law enforcement does follow the money. But in this case, they didn't. They didn't have to. And I'll tell you why a little bit later. But it is clear that the spouse is always the suspect.

But going back, if you take out Brian Winchester, what do you have? You have a couple of concert tickets to some marginal bands. Maybe they were in '98. Maybe they were in 2000. Maybe they were in 2001. You have some tickets.

You have testimony that in 1998 Angela Stafford went out with Brian Winchester after Denise's baby shower.

And the next morning Denise Williams gave her a dirty look. Maybe she gave her a dirty look because Brian Winchester was married to Cathy Winchester at the time.

Maybe, being best friends, Denise Williams took a dim view of Brian Winchester going out with another woman.

It doesn't corroborate anything. Two people went out in

1 1998.

You have testimony of a truck parked at a church.

But without Brian Winchester, what is that? That wasn't

Denise Williams' truck. It was Brian's truck. And we

already know, in 1999, that's after Brian had already

started fooling around with Ms. Stafford, we heard that

testimony from her own mouth. And we also heard the

testimony of, where did Ms. Stafford stay sometimes when

she was in town? Sometimes she stayed with

Ms. Winchester and Mr. Winchester [sic] at Centennial

Oaks.

So there was a car there. That doesn't prove anything. It's just another piece of something. Then we have some suspicions and we have some guesses. But without Brian Winchester, none of that amounts to anything.

And we know from the evidence and from the testimony by law enforcement, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, it did not amount to anything. It did not amount to an arrest. All of the things that have been presented to you by the State Attorney to suggest corroboration, standing on their own, do not prove anything. They never have. They never did. And they never will.

All of these pictures that you may see of boat landings and of duck waders, and of all of these other

things have that always existed, since 2000, do not independently prove anything about Denise Williams. You take Brian Winchester away, there is nothing about any of this evidence or any of this testimony that supports any of the three charges against Denise Williams.

Now, the Judge has given you a copy of the instructions. And you've listened to the Judge and you've read through the instructions. And I suspect, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, that when you retire to deliberate, you will look back through the instructions.

And I'm obligated to just point a few things out about the instructions. You have to prove that all of the elements -- or you have to show that all of the element have been proven. Mr. Fuchs went in reverse in his presentation and talked about accessory after the fact. You have to look at that. You have to look at what evidence there is that suggests that.

Now, in a minute when I talk about Brian Winchester I'm going to talk about that evidence -- accessory after the fact, because Mr. Fuchs says it is a phone call from Cathy Thomas, that communication that is the evidence of the accessory.

To be clear, before we get into Brian Winchester, there is nothing before he gets involved in this case and in this picture that substantiates any allegations against Denise Williams and doesn't do anything other than suspicions. Without Brian Winchester, I would sit down, you would go back, you would come back, it would be not guilty. There would be no reason to be here. It would stop.

Mike Williams was killed December 16, 2000. Law enforcement got involved. Law enforcement tried things. Law enforcement couldn't find anything. Nothing happened.

August 5, 2016, over 15 years later, Denise Williams was going through the divorce. A divorce. Did not appear to have any philosophical, religious or moral objections to divorce against Mr. Winchester. In fact, the testimony suggests that she had been separated from him since 2012 and had actually filed for divorce in 2015. No divorce problem there. No divorce problem at all.

It was a bad marriage. Brian Winchester was a bad husband. Mr. Winchester was a controlling husband. He was a controlling man. And he did not like to be told no. He was the type of man who did not like to have someone tell him what to do. Because what was he? He was a financial planner. He sold insurance. He planned and he sold. He planned and he sold. And on August 5, 2016, he would have you believe that he simply wanted to

go and talk to Denise.

Now, this testimony from Dr. Mnookin, ladies and gentlemen, shows absolutely nothing. Because you would have to believe the underlying statements that Brian Winchester gave to Dr. Mnookin. Dr. Mnookin's testimony is not evidence of anything. It's tainted, like everything else is, by the touch of Brian Winchester.

And you heard Dr. Mnookin say to himself, and you can recall your own memory and your own notes, that Dr. Mnookin thought it was a pretty bad idea if you're going to want to go talk to someone, to shove a gun in their ribs.

But on August 6th [sic], 2016, Brian Winchester went to Denise Williams' home at between 2:00 and 3:00 a.m. because, as he testified, that's when it's darkest. He brought a gun, a backpack. He says a blanket, agent Devaney says a tarp. He crawled into the back of her SUV and he sat there and he waited for hours. Periodically he would take a spray bottle of water and made sure he sprayed the window so she wasn't going to be able to see him when she went to her car.

Brian Winchester, at approximately 7:00 a.m., as

Denise Williams was coming out of her home on her way to

work, crawled over two rows of seats, scared her, put a

gun to her ribs and he kidnapped her. He kidnapped her

with a firearm.

He did not crawl over with a couple of concert tickets and ask her if she wanted to go see Sister Hazel. He kidnapped her at gunpoint. It is never disputed that he did the crime because, ladies and gentlemen, he pled to it. He admitted he did it.

So he takes her at gunpoint to do God knows what with a gun, with a tarp, with a sheet, with bottles.

What was he going to do with her? What was he going to do to her? But she talks him down. She calms him down enough to get him to let her go. This man who supposedly knows the deepest, darkest, most heinous secret, that Denise Williams plotted and planned for the murder of Mike Williams.

That's what the State has to have you believe, ladies and gentlemen. You have to believe that on August 5, 2016 she knew -- she knew she had planned, she had been an accessory. You have to believe that.

And if it's true, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, why does Denise Williams go to the police? The man with a secret that could lock her up, she goes to the police. She turns him in. Because he kidnapped her at gunpoint.

A reasonable belief that if she ever had any suspicion that Brian Winchester had killed Mike, she would have taken him to the police for that. But she

goes to the police and she has the man who supposedly has this great, deep, dark secret against her, and she goes to tell the police what he did.

Now, at this point, while she's at the Leon County Sheriff's Office giving her report, telling them what happened, telling them about the gun, about the tarp, about the blanket, about the threat, about being kidnapped. While she is there telling law enforcement about how she has been victimized, in comes Agent Devaney, FDLE.

anywhere. Didn't have anything. Boy, they had some suspicions. Why do they have suspicions? Because it's always the spouse. Doesn't take any rocket science or CSI or five hours of Law and Order. It's always the spouse.

So he decides he's going to come in and he's going to confront Denise Williams. He's going to confront her while she is in the sheriff's office preparing reports and giving evidence related to being kidnapped by Brian Winchester.

And Agent Devaney is mean to her. He just doesn't treat her well. She's there talking about being kidnapped, he wants to talk about her dead husband. And that's what he wants to do. He just wants to pester her

and needle her.

Denise Williams didn't have a hard time talking to law enforcement, ladies and gentlemen, because she went to them. She drove to the sheriff's office. Now, if a woman doesn't want to talk to law enforcement, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, driving to their office is a bad sign and a bad way to go about it. And, remember, she never had a hard time talking to Sergeant Wooten. She's willing to talk to these people, even though, supposedly, Brian Winchester has this the deep, dark secret over her because they planned it together.

So into jail Brian Winchester goes. August 5th of 2016 was Brian Winchester's last day as a free man. Or was it? August 5, 2016, Brian Winchester's last day as a free man. Or was it?

The testimony is uncontroverted that he was looking at life in prison. He was facing felony charges. He happened to have the misfortune, or luck, depending on how one looks at it, to have his case assigned to a division presided over by Hangman Hankinson. Looking at life in prison and the judge's colloquial nickname is Hangman.

Oh, young Mr. Winchester, he's got some issues.

He's got some issues. He's not a free man. He's in
jail. Denise Williams doesn't want him out of jail.

1 She's scared of him. She's terrified of him. He kidnapped her at gunpoint. Threatened her.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Young Mr. Winchester now is in jail. He doesn't like being there. And as he testified to -- and it's interesting because when he testified on Tuesday there were a lot more tears, tighter performance. Wednesday, nah, not so much tears. But he figured out he needed to use the word we a lot more on Wednesday. Didn't get so much we on Tuesday. Got a lot of we on Wednesday. You've got to work to your audience a little bit, is Mr. Winchester's presumption.

But what we know is Mr. Winchester is a murderer and a liar. And he's in jail. He doesn't like being in jail and he doesn't want to go to prison. From his own lips, I don't want to go to prison.

So what does Mr. Winchester decide to do? Well. what do we know about Mr. Winchester up to this point? He's a planner. He's a salesman. There's one other thing about Mr. Winchester that's relevant at this point, he's already planted evidence before. Don't forget the hat. Remember the hat?

Brian Winchester is out on Lake Seminole riding around with his dad. Lying to everybody about what happened. Lying about what he knew. Lying about what he did. That didn't stop him from planting evidence. He

put a hat out there. He planted evidence.

So we've got a man who plans. We've got a man who sells and we've got a man who doesn't have a problem planting physical evidence. So when you have those three skill sets, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, and your judge is Hangman Hankinson, and you're looking at life in prison, what do you do?

Let's start with some obstruction of justice. Let's go ahead and see if Wade Wilson can help me get some evidence out there that's going to discredit Denise.

Let's get Wade Wilson. And when I say Wade Wilson, I'm not talking about Deadpool. I'm talking about a guy who told Brian Winchester that he was a hitman and was a convicted felon. That he knew how to do this.

Brian Winchester, that's -- that's his people.

That's the people he must have an affinity for. So he decides he is going to try to get Wade Wilson to help him out with some witness tampering. Some obstruction of justice.

Wade Wilson is not -- not the only one. He's going to throw in Kimberly Adams. And these are all things that, in between tears and in between performance, Mr. Winchester tells you. Yeah, you know, going to get Kimberly Adams involved. And just to maybe round out my witness-tampering-obstruction-of-justice plan, I'm going

to throw my sister in on it. My only sister. I'm going to try to get my only sister to tamper with witnesses and to obstruct justice.

You don't have to have any black -- you don't have to have any more desire to pervert justice than to try to get your own sister drawn into witness tampering. But that's what he did.

He was in jail from August 5, 2016 and he was in jail in 2017. And all along he had never had a confession. He had never had any epiphany. He had never gone to law enforcement to say, oh, by the way, I killed Mike Williams and I want to be forgiven. I want to be redeemed.

Brian Winchester knew, just like every other person that testified, that the Mike Williams' disappearance was a big story. It was big news. People felt sympathy. People felt anger. People felt concern. It had high-value information.

So in the summer of 2017, after spending a year in jail and recognizing that his obstruction of justice and witness tampering plans were not going to work -- because, as Mr. Winchester said, lying only makes it worse. Probably a really late time in life to come up with that idea. But he said, well, lying made it worse. or did it?

I have tried witness tampering, sitting in jail. I

got nothing else to do. And I'm a planner, I'm a

salesman and I'll obstruct justice. So what do I have to

do? I will come up with -- not a life insurance policy,

I am going to come up with a Brian Life Policy.

I am going to come up with a way to not only get out of the serious, serious trouble I'm in, the life felony that I'm looking at with Judge Hankinson. I'm going to give the State something so good they're going to give me a free pass to murder. They're going to let me get away with it. And as icing on the cake, I get revenge on Denise Williams for turning me in to the police on August 5, 2016.

So what does Mr. Winchester, the salesman, planner, the liar, the murderer, what does he come up with -- of course I told you I'd put it upside down -- comes up with Defense Exhibit 1. Interestingly, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, you didn't hear about this in the State's opening. And you also didn't hear about it in their first closing argument.

You will get an opportunity to read this when you go back. It is a three-page contract. It's styled A Proffer of Brian Winchester, as you can see. It is not the Brian Winchester Life Policy. That probably would have been a little too obvious. But this three-page

document was entered into by the Office of the State

Attorney and Mr. Winchester and Mr. Winchester's lawyers.

And what does it do, ladies and gentlemen? We, the State

of Florida, will give you use and derivative immunity for

anything you tell us.

Now, what do we know about October of 2017? We know that up until then law enforcement has no independent evidence of the murder of Mike Williams. They have nothing. No one has been arrested. No one has been charged. They have a few little suspicions. They have a few little things that look funny.

They look at, well, she married him, she must know something. They want you to believe that's got something to do with something. That she married a guy that she's known since she was three. She didn't know he was a murderer. Did find out, ultimately, that he was a bad husband. Ms. Thomas knew that. I think Ms. Stafford knows that. I mean, everybody knows he's a bad husband. But up until October of 2017 there's no evidence. Nothing's going to happen on this case.

So Mr. Winchester sells the Brian Winchester Life
Policy to the State Attorney's Office. And what does he
get? He gets never arrested for Mike Williams' murder.
He gets never charged with Mike Williams' murder. He
gets never had to come into a court and account for a

murder. He will never get sentenced for that murder. He will never do will never do probation for that murder. He will never pay a fine for that murder. He will never pay a fine for that murder. He will never have to write a letter of apology for that murder. Nothing.

But he was a better salesman, because he added some more. The State agrees they're going to seek no more than 45 years in prison, as a cap. The State agrees that they will not tell Judge Hankinson about the witness tampering. Because it would be fair comment on the evidence to suggest that Judge Hankinson would not take kindly to that.

He got everything he could ever hope for for himself. And all he had to do was tell a little story and take them to where he had buried Mike. Because, of course, he knew where he buried Mike.

Because what we know is that he took Mike Williams to a place they had hunted before. A place they knew. Took his best friend. Talked to him every day. Known him since high school. Kids were about the same age. Starts a plan. Early morning when it's dark -- sounds a lot like what he was going to do to Denise Williams. Of course, he hadn't perfected his murder, disposing of bodies tarp plan in 2000.

But he took -- he went with his best friend to Lake

1 Seminole. Put him in a boat, and he threw him out of the boat.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, this thing about waders, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, has nothing to do with anything. Brian Winchester and Mike Williams hunted together. They knew each other for years. There was no reason to believe that Brian Winchester would not have known that Mike Williams had had that wader training.

He knew how to get out of waders. There's no reason to suspect that Mike Williams ever didn't tell Brian, hey, listen, I don't know how to get out of waders. Of course you do. You did it in the guy's backyard. You knew how to do it. That's what hunters tell each other. You know, hey, I know how to do it.

It's called drown proofing. People do it to their kids. Put them in waders, throw them in the water. How to get out. When you're a hunter, you learn these things. You know how to do these things. You teach your children how to do it. I teach my children how to do it.

But what does he do? He gets Mike in the water. He starts circling around him in his own boat, through the stump field. And in the cold water, the dark water, the black water, Mike makes it to a stump. And he's yelling. He's yelling at Brian Winchester. And Brian is circling him. Circling him in Mike's own boat. He's circling

1 him.

And he gets up close to him. He pumps his shotgun. Mike's yelling. He's bringing the boat. He gets up to three feet and he shoots him in the face. Looked him in the eyes, probably one last time, before he took away the front of his head. Three feet.

Circles around again. Reaches down in the water with his wet left hand. Goes all the way down, pulls the body. Drives over. Leaves the body on shore. Backs his truck up. He takes the lifeless, faceless body of his best friend and he shoves the head into a dog crate. Into a dog crate. And he speeds back to Tallahassee.

Says he gets in bed with his wife. Interestingly, his wife never testified about remembering that. She said, I saw him around three o'clock at the family function. Drives around, says he sees Mike Phillips at Wal-Mart. Mike Phillips didn't see him at Wal-Mart. But he did get a tarp and he got a tool. And he went out, he dug a shallow grave. Pulled his best friend out of the dog crate, rolled him up, put him in a tarp, put him in a hole. That's what he did.

Now, he says -- you know, when I ask him questions he says, we did it. I asked him if Denise williams was with him on that cold morning in December of 2000. He says, She was in my head. There's no telling what else

was in Mike -- Brian Winchester's head. What voices he was hearing. He said, She was in my head.

So he's got the story. Because, of course, he knows the details because he killed Mike. He knows the details. That, ladies and gentlemen, is not corroboration. That's called a confession. If I tell you where I buried the body, I am not corroborating another fact. I am confessing to you what I have done.

And he told whoever would listen, this is where the body is. Let's go dig it up. Let's have a field trip.

Because I'm good. I can feel relieved because I have the Brian Winchester Life Policy. It does not matter how bad this looks. It does not matter how bad it sounds. I am going free on the murder. Scot-free.

So a couple of months pass. Mr. Winchester is brought before the Court. He enters a plea. Judge Hankinson, who, by the terms of this agreement, is not aware of the Wade Wilson case. Read it carefully. Mr. Winchester and the State agreed not to tell the Judge about the witness tampering.

It's extremely unclear that the Judge would have even known that that agreement existed. Because they entered an open plea, the Judge considered only the kidnapping, only the armed assault. That was all that they told Judge Hankinson about.

1 2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So Judge Hankinson sentenced Brian Winchester to 20 years in prison. Twenty years. He hemmed and hawed a little bit about how much of that time he'll actually serve. But it's no more than 20 years from that date he got arrested in August of 2016.

So the longest -- from the testimony -- that Brian winchester is going to be locked up is until 2036. And it's only for kidnapping Denise. It's only for sticking a gun in her ribs. It is not for shooting his best friend in the face with a 12-gauge shotgun.

And so now the State has the Brian Winchester Life Policy. And they've got -- well, we found the body. we're prosecutors and so we're kind of in the somebody's-got-to-pay business. Brian Winchester is over there saying, hey, Denise helped me. Hey, why not? Denise did it.

Because what do we know about Brian Winchester? He's a liar and he's a murderer. I mean, he lied about -- you know, from the beginning of this case. lied to his father. He lies to all these women over the years. He lies about -- he just lies. He's a murderer and a liar. But he's also a salesman and a planner. And he -- the fifth thing, he likes to obstruct justice.

So now he's got these FDLE guys all on the hook. They are racked in on the Brian Winchester Life Policy. So what does law enforcement do? Well, let's set up some things where we're going to lie to her. Yeah, that's a good idea. Let's do some lying. We're FDLE. As if they take a page out of the Brian Winchester playbook. Let's not be truthful. Let's tape this phone call.

This so-called phone call, ladies and gentlemen, please listen to it. Don't listen to the edited parts. Look at your notes. That phrase, I'm going to tell --tell Marcus to tell Brian I'm not going to talk. That's not in that audio. What it is is, it's Cathy Thomas, who has been scripted by the Florida Department of Law Enforcement. Who is putting on a semi-Oscar-worthy performance with the snot and sniffling talking about her marriage. She's the one that's bringing that up.

There is no recording, e-mail, text message, any kind of evidence that suggests Denise Williams ever said, tell Brian to tell Marcus or whoever. And if she did make that statement, she would have made that statement, according to the State, some time in 2016. But all of these recordings that Ms. Thomas is doing, they're in 2018.

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, I don't mean to particularly harp on Ms. Thomas, but one of the instructions is, you can look to how a witness answered questions. If you think back on how Ms. Thomas was on

answering questions and time, and how things happened, and what order they happened in, she's confused and she doesn't really know exactly what that was about.

What she does know is Denise Williams told her, I don't want to talk to Mr. Devaney, because I don't like him. Mr. Devaney is a jerk. That's what she told her. And she and Ms. Thomas talked every day by phone or by text.

Ms. Williams didn't have a hard time talking to Leon County Sheriff's Office when Brian Winchester shoved a gun in her. It's something that kind of looks good. But it's got to work with the Brian Winchester Life Policy. Because somebody has to pay.

That's what the State needs you to do. They need you to come out and give them cover for not thinking about how bad this policy was going to be for them. They gave a free pass to a murderer and they got nothing else.

So, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, it's always the wife. Follow the money. Do the easiest thing you can do. Just throw it up there and hope something sticks. Let's help Brian get that revenge he needs. Let's go after Denise. Because that's the story everybody wants to hear. That's the easy story.

When Mr. Fuchs was talking to you and he was pointing to things, and he would say, you know, the

evidence corroborates, the evidence does this, the evidence does that. Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, hindsight is 20/20. If you know what lie you're trying to spin, you can look back in your catalog of memories and try to find things that maybe work with the lie or the story you're making up. If you know what the story needs to be in 2017, you can give the person who's listening the facts you think that help support it.

In the span of 21 years, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, without Brian Winchester -- without Brian Winchester, they have come up with this.

It is not your place, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, to feel sorry for anyone. Certainly not your place to feel sorry for the State Attorney's Office for the horrible decision they made to give the murderer a free pass. But you certainly don't have to try to help them undo that horrible decision.

This case is only about Brian Winchester. It is only about him killing Mike Williams. It is only about him doing the most heinous thing that can be done to another human being. He took his life. He took away Denise's husband. He took away Anslee's father. He took away Cheryl's son. He took away Nick's brother. He took away all of the friends and family. Brian Winchester did that. Not Denise Williams.

There is no evidence that supports any of the allegations against my client. Not accessory. Not principal. Not conspiracy.

I want to leave you with the final thought that I maybe touched on earlier, that when Brian Winchester was asked all these questions and I was standing there. And I was talking faster than I probably am now -- although I sense from the court reporter that I'm probably about 300 words a minute right now. Okay. Maybe a little under.

But as I was standing there and I was asking him questions, you remember that at every gratuitous opportunity he would say we, we, we. His scripted moment he would say we. Because he could think that maybe, maybe that fat, fuzzy lawyer is going to get up there in that little snarky tone he takes. He's going to poke at me, so I need to be prepared for that. Because what am I? I'm a planner and a salesman and a murderer and a liar and an obstructer of justice. But when that lawyer comes at me, I'm going to say we. I'm going to show him. And I'm going to show the jury that it's we.

He was waiting for those questions. You can tell.

Think back. Go through your memory. Go through your

notes. Think about all the times you heard the word we.

But then at the end I asked the two questions that every defense lawyer on the planet would hope to ask and

never expect an answer. Mr. Winchester, you are a murderer? Yes, I -- I am.

The next question, the one that every lawyer dreams of to ask a witness in a trial. Mr. Winchester, you are a liar? Yes, I am. There is no we, ladies and gentlemen of the jury. There is only the I that is him. That is Brian Winchester. Who viciously murdered his best friend, dragged his body back to town in a dog crate, buried him in a shallow grave.

To make this work for Brian Winchester, it doesn't really matter anymore. He's gotten all the benefit he's ever going to get out of that agreement, that deal, that Brian Winchester Policy. But, see, the State's left with it now. They bought the policy. They bought it. They agreed to it.

You don't have to. You don't have to buy a single thing that he sold them. You don't have to believe it. You don't have to do it. Because, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, you took three oaths to tell the truth. It got you to where you are sitting here today. And I'm going to respectfully hold you to those oaths. And Denise Williams is going to hold you to those oaths.

You're going to look at those instructions and you're going to see it. And you're going to look through it and you're going to look at that evidence. And you're

1	not going to feel sorry for the State. You're not going
2	to feel the need to somehow give them a conviction so
3	they get something out of this. That's not justice.
4	And these instructions will contain a phrase,
5	miscarriage of justice. We are counting on you to return
6	a verdict that speaks the truth and that verdict is not
7	guilty. To fail to follow the instructions is a
8	miscarriage of justice. We believe you will not do that.
9	We do know, however, ladies and gentlemen of the
10	jury, Brian Winchester will obstruct justice.
11	Denise Williams is not guilty.
12	THE COURT: Let's stand up for just a minute, if we
13	would. Everybody okay? We're going to go into
14	Mr. Fuchs' argument.
15	MR. FUCHS: Your Honor, before I go
16	THE COURT: Anybody need
17	MR. FUCHS: I'm sorry. Before I go into argument, I
18	also need a sidebar too.
19	THE COURT: Okay. Anybody need to take a break?
20	(No audible response.)
21	THE COURT: Okay. We're good.
22	All right. We'll go sidebar.
23	(Sidebar had as follows):
24	MR. FUCHS: Your Honor, yesterday there was a motion

in limine regarding statements having to do with whether

1 she cooperates or does not cooperate with law 2 enforcement. Mr. Way argued that extensively. 3 argue that it opened the door for me to talk about the 4 fact that the change of circumstances, her contacting law 5 enforcement -- she didn't respond to calls from Will Mickler and the other items that we talked about 6 7 previously. 8 THE COURT: Mr. Way? MR. WAY: I don't have a position. 9 10 I agree. He said several things that THE COURT: 11 opened the door. But, still, you need to do it 12 carefully. 13 MR. FUCHS: Yes, sir. Because it can -- if in-artfully stated, 14 THE COURT: 15 could become a comment on her right to remain silent. MR. FUCHS: Yes, sir. 16 17 (Sidebar concluded.) MR. FUCHS: Yes, I have a Power Point. It's how I 18 19 keep my notes. 20 Mr. Way said, let's take Brian out of the equation. 21 Without Brian there's nothing. Brian's a liar. Brian's 22 a murderer. Yeah, he is. 23 But let's start off by taking Brian out of the

equation and let's go to that recording. Previously,

I've already played to you -- you've heard the entire

24

25

	89
1	recording. It's 23 minutes. So I've taken snippets out
2	so you don't have to sit here for the full 23 minutes.
3	But there's more to that recording than just the one
4	statement.
5	And when you listen to this next one that we have
6	here, I want you to look at this through this
7	perspective. On the cross-examination of Cheryl
8	Williams, and they were talking about Anslee,
9	Mr. Padovano asked Ms. Cheryl Williams, If she was
LO	innocent and accused of murdering Mike talking about
11	Denise you would expect her to react in anger,
L2	wouldn't you? Yes.
L3	In that recording she accuses Cathy accuses
L4	Denise Williams of planning and plotting and her
L5	involvement in the murder.

(Audio playing)

16

17

18

MS. THOMAS: Brian told me that y'all planned it.

MS. WILLIAMS: Planned what? Oh, my gosh.

19 MS. THOMAS: And Marcus showed up at the shop later 20 that afternoon.

- 21 MS. WILLIAMS: Uh-huh.
- MS. THOMAS: You know, telling me how I would have 22 23 to take this to my grave.
- MS. WILLIAMS: Wait. Wait. 24 So --
- 25 MS. THOMAS: That it would ruin (inaudible) life.

1	It would ruin you know, apparently, Brian told Marcus
2	that he had talked to me. And he went on to just tell
3	me Marcus went on to tell me how my life would be
4	ruined. How I would never be able to start over if
5	Stafford's life was ruined. If
6	MS. WILLIAMS: So Marcus knew? When you said Brian
7	said y'all, you're talking about me and Brian, or Marcus,
8	or who?
9	MS. THOMAS: You and Brian.
LO	MS. WILLIAMS: And that Marcus is involved? I mean,
L 1	obviously, if he came and talked to you.
12	MS. THOMAS: Well, there's just a whole, you know,
L3	shut it down, shut down. So, you know, whenever
L4	MS. WILLIAMS: What in the world?
L5	MS. THOMAS: I mean, it's it's
L6	MS. WILLIAMS: And then you got a letter from Chuck.
L7	My parents got a letter too. But you got a letter from
L8	Chuck and he's talking about it too, or no?
L9	MS. THOMAS: Chuck told me what happened in Atlanta.
20	MS. WILLIAMS: In Atlanta. Okay. Yeah.
21	MS. THOMAS: So, here's the deal. Here is the deal.
22	Hang on. Somebody's texting me. Rex is not doing well.
23	MS. WILLIAMS: Aw. Yeah, you know, that's pretty
24	major. Especially with Marcus involved.

(Audio stopped.)

MR. FUCHS: She is just accused of murdering her
ex-husband by her friend and her concern is that Marcus
was involved. That's her issue? Brian told me that
y'all conspired, planned and killed Mike Williams. Wait,
Marcus is involved?

This is the same person that cut off the grandmother from the granddaughter because she made accusations against her. In this recording she's concerned about Rex.

Just accused of murder and the only thing she wants to know is, Marcus was involved. Why? Because the pact that she had with Brian Winchester was that nobody else would know. Just them. And that's how they kept it a secret for that 17, 18 years. That's why she's concerned about maybe Marcus is involved. It's not the fact that, oh, by the way, I've been told that you killed your husband. Her concern is Marcus is involved.

I'm not going to play the whole thing, but she actually accuses her twice. Two times. It's not even what she says. It's what she doesn't say. In this recording she's just accused by one of her best friends of plotting to murder her husband, who was, in fact, murdered, and never says, oh, no, I didn't. What she says is, wait, Marcus is involved.

You go back -- and you'll have the opportunity,

Ιt

because you have this entire recording to go back there.

Again, I'm not going to sit up for 23 minutes and just

play it again. But you have the ability to do so back in

5 lays out this entire case without Brian.

Accuses her of the homicide, we've already heard that part. Two times. Talks about the Chuck Bunker thing. And actually says -- and Denise admits to the fact that Chuck Bunker -- she was actually cheating on Brian by going with Chuck Bunker up there in Atlanta.

the jury room. Go back and listen to this recording.

When she accuses a second time, she goes, Why couldn't y'all have just gotten a divorce. She asked if Mike knew. And they talk about things like money. And Mike didn't find out about anything. That he didn't suspect anything. Didn't suspect the affair.

That recording goes beyond just the statement that implicates her for the accessory after the fact. That recording, without Brian, lays out the whole thing.

Listen to it. Use that common sense. Use those skills, your education, your life skills that you use each and every single day, and listen to that recording and what is said and what is not said. And even if you take Brian out of it, it tells you the whole story that you need to return a verdict of guilty.

Mr. Way says this is not about justice for Mike.

This absolutely is about justice for Mike. This is about holding that person accountable for it in what her role is. That's what you are here to decide, what her role was in all of this. That is solely what you are here for.

He says, take Brian out of the equation. That guy is a bad, bad, bad man. He held up the proffer agreement. My signature is on that proffer agreement. I had to make a decision to solve a 17-year-old homicide case. Was it a good decision? I don't know. Time will tell. That is a cross that I must bear.

To sit here and listen to him describe how he killed his best friend while asking him the questions turns my stomach, just like it did everybody else. But he is a part of this case, like it or not. He is not going free.

Jason Newlin, the investigator for the State
Attorney's Office that conducted the proffer agreement,
told you what we were there for on the proffer agreement.
The proffer agreement was to get closure for the family
and to find Mike Williams. At no point was this proffer
agreement about implicating Denise Williams.

We are here today because that's where the evidence took us. And it wasn't based upon -- solely upon Brian's testimony. It was based upon going back and looking at the things and finding the witnesses that we found

afterwards to corroborate not only his story, but also to get that recording that tells the picture. The totality of everything. And that's your job too, to sort through that as well.

Brian Winchester is not going free. He has 20 years in the Department of Corrections followed by 15 years of probation. While he's sitting there in the prison cell -- as he wakes up every day on that bed and stares at those bars -- at no point, I assure you, does he say, I'm glad I'm here on this and not that.

He is in prison. A prison cell looks the same whether you're there for murder or whether you're there for kidnapping. And he's got 15 years of probation. If at any point he violates that probation, gets in a fight at the prison, I assure you, we're coming after him.

But, also, let's take a look at that proffer agreement. You've got the entirety there, just like Mr. Way told you. If at any time he lies or purgers himself under oath about anything contained in any of his statements, the entire statement can be used against him and he can be prosecuted for murder.

Now, normally an immunity situation you think, well, maybe he's lying. Ladies and gentlemen, that man has absolutely every reason to tell you the truth. Because if he lies in any way, shape or form, that immunity

agreement gets shredded and he goes down for murder by

On its face you say, wait a second, immunity thing. But when you look into it, that man has got the ultimate motive to make sure that he is telling you the truth.

Yes, it's awful.

I don't in any way, shape or form think I'm Eliot

Ness or the U.S. Government, but that's exactly what they

did with Al Capone. They got him for tax evasion. Just

like Brian Winchester, he was a murderer as well. They

got him for what they could get him for. And that's why

the immunity agreement exists.

And the only thing the immunity agreement says is I couldn't ask for life imprisonment. I asked for 45 years. I got 20. If he violates, I'll get more.

This is about justice for Mike. And what her role was in all of this. Use your common sense, your experience, your education and life skills. Why send that message? Why send that message? Because she knew that she had went to law enforcement and she knew a very real possibility in this situation was that Brian was going to turn around and dime her out. And she wanted to make sure that she told him, hey, I want you to know I didn't say anything. Say anything about what? Tell Marcus to tell Brian I didn't say anything. Say anything

about what?

She's sitting there talking to law enforcement. Why send that message unless what Brian tells you is true, that there was an agreement that they would never talk to law enforcement together. It's the only thing that makes sense for that entire message. It's the only thing that makes sense.

She wants to make sure -- she understands that he has the ability now to dime her out. And she wants him to make sure that he knows that she didn't do it, and, therefore, he shouldn't do it either and he should stick to the pact. Stick to the agreement that they had.

It's the only logical reason for sending that particular message within the week of his arrest. Again, I'm not going to play it, but you don't have to take my word for it. We have it on the recording.

If nothing else, nothing else, argument will say that she wasn't part of the conspiracy, wasn't part of the murder, and found out later on that Brian was involved and actually did commit the murder of Mike Williams. That statement itself implicates her on the accessory after the fact.

As I said, you apply everything else back in now that we take and know what Brian told us. Because he is a part of this. He does have incentive to tell you the

truth. And what he told you is corroborated by the witnesses.

But let's talk about this, what we know about Denise Williams. We know that over the years there at Ketcham Realty she would regularly call up, Brian -- I mean, Mike, come get me my gas in my car, bring me food. I'm going to go talk to Brian instead of you. A little controlling, maybe?

Use your common sense, experience, education and life skills. How do they not have a conversation like this -- on the day of their anniversary when they're going to Apalachicola, how is it that he doesn't ask her for permission to go? Is it all right if I go hunting Saturday morning before we go to Apalach? Sure. Who are you going hunting with? Brian. All right. What time you going to be back? What time are we leaving? Okay. That works.

So use your common sense. Use your skills, experience, life skills. This conversation occurs, what's the first thing she says to law enforcement, or anybody for that matter, when Brian doesn't -- when Mike doesn't come back from hunting? Call Brian, he's the one that was with him. That's the first thing you would do.

Law enforcement will go talk to Brian. Where were you? Maybe we would have uncovered all this back then.

I don't know. But your skills, your education, your life skills tells you, this is the way it would have gone down. Unless they have a plan and a pact to set up alibis and not dime each other out. And she's involved in the homicide. Because then the answer is; I don't know. He just went hunting and he didn't come back.

She's arrested by law enforcement -- I'm sorry. On the day she goes for the kidnapping -- excuse me. On the day she goes for the kidnapping Mike Devaney says, involved in any way, shape or form. At no point does she say, you know, there have been rumors for years about this thing, but I never wanted to believe it. I was in love with the guy. But maybe after what happened this morning, it's true.

Nope. What she tells Devaney is, no way he did it.

I never would have married him if I thought he did. No
way he did it. Part of the pact. Part of the agreement.

Mr. Way talked a little about law enforcement. How cooperative she was with law enforcement. Think back. How cooperative she was with Dr. Woot -- with Sergeant Wooten. Yeah. Until Sergeant Wooten says, Florida Department of Law Enforcement is involved. And what does she know about Florida Department of Law Enforcement? Mike Devaney came in and said, I'm investigating the murder of Mike Williams and Brian's involvement in that.

And what happene	ed when Flo	rida	Departme	ent of Law	
Enforcement got	involved?	She	stopped	returning	Will
Mickler's phone	calls.				

If Brian's lying to you, why, why are you threatening the grandmother to stop the investigation on two occasions? And you'll never see your granddaughter again. Brian didn't make that threat. She did. The day before her birthday. If you don't stop this investigation, you'll never see your granddaughter again. The day before her birthday. And she never did.

Ladies and gentlemen, that's not the actions of an innocent person. That's the actions of someone who was in a plan to commit a murder. A murder was occurred. And was afraid of an investigation and all the hubbub that Ms. Cheryl was making. She was afraid Cheryl would succeed. And she did.

Let's talk a little bit more. Go back to the money, the motive. Follow the money. Brian can't get it.

She's the sole beneficiary. He can't get it.

\$1.75 million isn't a motive for him because he doesn't get a dime of it. Only Denise can collect that money.

And what did she do? She wasted no time. Kansas City Life, \$1 million policy, \$250,000, \$1.25 million submitted for, her signature. Look at the date, January 4th of 2001.

12 unt3 are4 the

Ladies and gentlemen, the search didn't even end until February. Brian's friends, family, law enforcement are on the lake looking for him. Extensive search all the way through February. And 19 days later she's filing for his insurance payment of \$1.25 million. Nineteen whole days. That's a cold individual. That's a person that's involved in a homicide.

Ladies and gentlemen, as I said, I was thanking you for the way that you pay attention. Not only to the evidence presented, but the things that happened in this courtroom. Think back three days ago. Brian Winchester is on the stand describing how he shot his best friend. How he circled around the stump. Approached, three feet away, shot him in the face. Everybody in this entire room was moved by that and the sheer horror of that situation, except for one person.

That one person sat here and listened to Brian Winchester describe how she had -- how he had shot and killed her husband -- the man she supposedly loved and cherished -- absolute stoned face. Didn't bat an eye. Didn't shed a tear. Use your life skills, your experience, your education. How does that apply in all of this?

Again, back to that recording. Go back, listen to it. You've got it. It lays the entire case out without

Brian Winchester's involvement.

But the simple fact is, Brian Winchester is involved. He's involved because he pulled the trigger. He's involved because he had a three-year-affair, prior to the murder, with Denise. He's involved because he helped plan it with her. Yeah, he got the immunity deal. He's serving prison time for what he is. But that doesn't change her involvement and that's what you're here for.

(Audio playing)

MS. THOMAS: Like, I've always thought to myself, if I had said, Mike, I think Brian has a girlfriend. I've always wondered if he would still be here. Like, why couldn't y'all just get a divorce? I've always known that you and Brian loved each other.

(Audio stopped.)

MR. FUCHS: Mr. Way made a little bit of an issue about the divorce. She could get a divorce from Brian Winchester because Anslee wasn't involved. That's why she couldn't get the divorce from Brian -- I mean, from Mike. She didn't want to have to share custody with her father.

Doesn't that make sense for the same person that took Mike Williams' daughter away from the grandmother?
Who 19 days later filed for an insurance claim. Who sat

here stone faced.

Ladies and gentlemen, Mike Williams was a devoted father. He was a devoted husband. Mike Williams died with his ring on. With that devotion. The only part of that that Denise Williams took to heart is till death do us part. And she took it to the extreme.

And she, along with Brian Winchester, made sure that death did him part. She helped plan it. She held up her end of the bargain by helping with alibis. She helped with her bargain by helping him afterwards. By making sure that even though she had him arrested, that she didn't say anything.

And when you take all that into account, that lady right there, Ms. Denise Williams, is guilty of conspiracy to commit murder, first-degree murder, and accessory after the fact. Thank you.

THE COURT: Let's turn back to page 10 of your jury instructions, please, folks. Submitting case to the jury at the bottom of page 10.

In just a few moments you'll be taken to the jury room by the bailiff. The first thing you should do is choose a foreperson who will preside over your deliberations.

The foreperson should see to it that your discussions are carried on in an organized way and that

everyone has a fair chance to be heard. It is also the foreperson's job to sign and date the verdict form when all of you have agreed on a verdict and to bring the verdict form back to the courtroom when you return.

During deliberations jurors must communicate about the case only with one another and only when all jurors are present in the jury room. You are not to communicate with any person outside the jury about this case.

Until you have reached a verdict you must not talk about this case in person or through the telephone, writing or electronic communications such as a blog, Twitter, e-mail, text message or any other means. Do not contact anyone to assist you during deliberations.

These communication rules apply until I discharge you at the end of the case. If you become aware of any violation of these instructions, or any other instruction I have given in this case, you must tell me by giving a note to the bailiff.

Many of you may have cell phones or other electronic devices with you. The rules do not allow you to bring your phones or any of those types of electronic devices into the jury room during your deliberations. Kindly leave those devices with the bailiff while you deliberate.

If you need to communicate with me, send a note

L	through the bailiff signed by the foreperson. If you
2	have voted, do not disclose the actual vote in the note.
3	If you have questions, I will talk with the attorneys
1	before I answer so it may take some time. You may
5	continue your deliberations while you wait for my answer.
5	I will answer any questions, if I can, in writing or
7	orally here in open court.

During the trial items were received into evidence as exhibits. You may examine whatever exhibits you think will help you in your deliberations. The exhibits will be delivered to you shortly.

In closing, let me remind you that it is important that you follow the law spelled out in these instructions in deciding your verdict. There are no other laws that apply to this case. Even if you do not like the laws that must be applied, you must use them. For two centuries we've lived by the Constitution and the law. No juror has a right to violate the rules we all share.

Let's go sidebar, please.

(Sidebar had as follows):

THE COURT: Any additional objections to the instructions as read?

MR. FUCHS: No, sir.

MR. WAY: No. Just renewal of previous objections.

THE COURT: I think the only objection was on the

- 1 principal instruction, correct? MR. WAY: Yes, sir. 2 3 THE COURT: My notes indicate Ms. Barney and 4 Ms. Barnes are our alternates. Are we in agreement about 5 that? 6 MR. FUCHS: Yes, sir. 7 MR. WAY: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: We'll hold those two jurors and send the 8 others out to deliberate. 9 10 I want the attorneys to go through the evidence. 11 Make sure what's being sent to the jury room is what's been properly placed into evidence. We need to be 12 13 particularly careful with the exhibits that were not admitted. The clerk has to make sure those don't get 14 15 mixed in. MR. FUCHS: Yes, sir. 16 17 THE COURT: You can be doing that while I talk to the alternates. Anything else from either side? 18 19 MR. FUCHS: No. sir. 20 (Discussion off the record.)
- 22 MR. WAY: No, sir. 23 THE COURT: All right.
- 24 (Sidebar concluded.)

21

25 THE COURT: Ms. Barney and Ms. Barnes, you need to

THE COURT: Anything else?

L	remain here with us. The rest of you may step out to
2	begin your deliberations. Take your notepad, your pen,
3	your instructions. Even if you didn't make any notes,
1	you might want something to write on so take that with
<u>.</u>	you. We'll be sending you the evidence.

All right. You may step out with the bailiff.

(Jury exits.)

THE COURT: Ms. Barnes, Ms. Barney -- everybody be seated, please, or you can step out.

We pick alternates in these cases. A lot goes into getting these cases started. We don't want to have to start all over again because we lose someone. We actually had two situations during the course of the week I thought we might lose a juror. It turned out we didn't.

Y'all need to keep it down just a little bit.

I hope you don't feel like we wasted your time. As I say, a lot goes into starting one of these cases. We don't want to have to start all over again because we lose someone. It is an important function for us that there is still a slight possibility that we would have to call upon you if some juror were to get indisposed before we reach a verdict.

Because of that, I would ask that you do two things for me: I would ask that you not discuss the case with

anyone until we get a verdict. You might get inquiry from media, from friends or whatever. I would ask that you just not discuss it until we get a verdict. I'll ask the deputy to call you when we get a verdict and let you know we have a verdict.

Once we get a verdict, you can discuss it or not as you see fit. You don't have to stay here, although you're welcome to stay here if you want to stay here and see what happens. The deputy will find a comfortable place for you to sit.

But if you want to go about your business, I would ask that you give him a phone number where he can reach you in an emergency. Like I say, you're welcome to stay or you're welcome to go. We just need a way to contact you in an emergency.

You can't go back in the jury room. Hopefully, the deputy has gathered your personal effects. We do appreciate your time and attention. I know that's a long time to ask you to sit and then tell you you don't get to take part. But it was very important to us and we appreciate that.

Have you gotten their things, Jay?

BAILIFF: Yes. sir. I believe so.

THE COURT: All right. I'll let you step out.

You'll have to step out -- not through the jury room,

1 Deputy. You can go out behind me here. 2 (Jurors exit.) 3 THE COURT: All right. Have the parties had a 4 chance to go through the evidence? 5 MR. FUCHS: Yes, sir. 6 MR. WAY: Yes, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Confirm that what's being sent to the jury is what was properly placed in evidence? 8 9 MR. FUCHS: Yes. sir. 10 MR. WAY: Yes, Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: All right. Any issues from either side? MR. FUCHS: No, Your Honor. 12 13 MR. WAY: No. Your Honor. Other than what's been previously raised. 14 15 THE COURT: All right. I do appreciate the professional manner in which both sides have conducted 16 17 themselves. It's been very aggressively but very professionally presented. Makes my job a lot easier. 18 19 for that I'm appreciative. 20 we'll be in recess until we hear from the jury. 21 MR. FUCHS: Your Honor, just so you're aware, I made 22 a copy earlier of my Power Point presentation for 23 supplementing into the record. I may go back and change 24 them, because based upon Mr. Way, I have to make a couple

of changes. So I'm going to go back, re-burn them and

1 then give them to the clerk. 2 THE COURT: All right. That will be good. Thank 3 you. 4 MR. FUCHS: And they're going to be marked -- how do 5 we want to mark those? Court Exhibit whatever is next. 6 THE COURT: All right. We'll be in recess. 7 8 (A recess was had.) 9 THE COURT: We've received a question from the jury. 10 I believe each of you have been given a copy of it; have 11 you not? MR. FUCHS: Yes, sir. 12 13 MR. WAY: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: It says, what is a series of, quote, 14 act, end quote, question mark. Paren, series of related 15 actions, closed paren. 16 17 I've drafted a proposed response to the jury. I'll read it and then I'll get your comment. 18 19 Dear Jurors, you have asked me about the statement

in the jury instructions, an act -- and act is in quotations -- includes a series of related actions arising from and performed pursuant to a single design or purpose. That would be the end of the quote.

20

21

22

23

24

25

These terms do not have any special legal definition. You should define these terms as you would

1 in everyday normal usage. 2 The explanation is given simply to say that the, 3 quote, act, end quote, might be a single act or it might 4 involve multiple acts. In the latter case, the multiple 5 acts have to relate to a, quote, single design or 6 purpose, end quote. 7 I hope this answers your question. If not, please clarify what you're confused about with another question. 8 State? 9 10 No objection, Your Honor. MR. FUCHS: Defense? 11 THE COURT: 12 MR. WAY: No objection, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: All right. We'll give that to the jury and wait to hear further. 14 (A recess was had.) 15 Be seated, please, folks. 16 THE COURT: 17 All right. We received a question from the jury. believe each side was given a copy of it; is that 18 19 correct? 20 MR. FUCHS: Yes, Your Honor. 21 MR. WAY: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. The question, for the 22 23 record, says, If we find Denise guilty on Count 1, does

that mean she is guilty on Count 2 because Count 1 is a

criminal act, question?

24

I've written a proposed answer. Read this and then
hear your comments.

Dear Jurors, your question asks me to apply the facts to the law. I cannot answer that type of question. It is your job to decide the facts and apply the facts to the law. However, I would remind you of the instruction on page 10 that provides -- and this is just a quote from our jury instructions on page 10 -- a separate crime is charged in each count of the indictment. And although they have been tried together, each crime and the evidence applicable to it must be considered separately and a separate verdict returned as to each. A finding of guilty or not guilty as to one crime must not affect your verdict as to the other crime charged. That would be the end of the quote.

If that provision does not answer your legal question, you will need to clarify your legal question.

Comments?

- MR. FUCHS: I believe that's a correct statement of the law.
- MR. WAY: Yes, Your Honor. That's very well written.

THE COURT: I did notice as I was reading this I should have said as to the other crimes charged, because there are more than two. But, anyway, I don't think I'm

1 going to get into changing it at this point in time. 2 That's the way the instruction was given, so... 3 Either side have objection? 4 MR. FUCHS: No. Your Honor. 5 MR. WAY: None from the defense. 6 THE COURT: All right. We'll give that to the jury and wait to hear further. 7 8 (A recess was had.) 9 Be seated, please, folks. THE COURT: 10 All right. We had an inquiry from the jury. I 11 believe you all have copies of it, do you not? 12 MR. FUCHS: Yes, sir. 13 MR. WAY: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. It says, Could we have 14 Brian's testimony? Is it possible? 15 I think what they're thinking is that we'll just 16 17 give them a transcript. Obviously, we're not going to just give them a transcript. From talking to the court 18 19 reporter, we're probably talking about, as a read back, about three hours worth of testimony. 20 21 What I'm inclined to do is bring them in and tell 22

what I'm inclined to do is bring them in and tell them that, you know, we can't give them a transcript. I don't think that would be appropriate. We don't have transcript to give them. But even if we could, I don't think it's appropriate to give them a transcript of trial

23

24

1 testimony.

That we can read back to them the testimony, but that it will take about three hours worth of reading. If they want that, we will do that. I'm not certain that we would try to do that tonight. I may make the suggestion that if we're going to do that, that we break for the evening.

But tell them that if they want to narrow down what it is they're wanting to hear, that we would be interested in hearing what it is in particular they wish to hear. And then send them out to see if, you know -- how they wish to proceed. And if they want to hear a read back, hopefully, to give us a little bit more guidance on what it is they want to hear.

The court reporter's have prepared it sufficient that they can do a read back. But, like I say, it's three hours worth. Obviously, they've got to break some while they're reading it.

So, I mean, we're probably saying if we were to start at seven o'clock with it. It would be ten o'clock before we even finished a read back. I'm not sure I want to have them start back deliberating at ten o'clock.

But, anyway, those are my thoughts. I'll hear from y'all, what you think.

MR. FUCHS: That was actually exactly what my

- thoughts were, sir. And I discussed with counsel.
- THE COURT: Mr. Way?
- 3 MR. WAY: Yeah, that -- Yes, Your Honor. That's
- 4 what we all came up with.
- THE COURT: Okay. So I'm going to kind of make
 those thoughts known to them. And it's going to be a
 little free wheeling. I don't have a script here. And
 then I'm going to send them back out to give us further
 guidance as to what we want to do.
- what I'll do is, before I send them back out, we'll go sidebar. And if somebody has something additional you want me to say to them, I'll give you the opportunity to do so. Anybody have a problem with that procedure?
- MR. FUCHS: No, sir.
- MR. WAY: No, Your Honor.
- 16 THE COURT: All right. Let's have them.
- 17 Well, let me -- I mean, I'd assume everyone agrees
- that it's not appropriate just to give them a transcript.
- 19 Are we in agreement on that?
- MR. FUCHS: Yes, sir.
- MR. WAY: Yes, Your Honor, I'd agree with that.
- THE COURT: All right. Let's have them in, please.
- 23 (Jury enters.)
- THE COURT: Well, I know y'all have been working
- 25 hard.

Everybody be seated, please.

I received your note. And let me -- I don't want anybody to say anything or react in any way. What -- I'm going to explain some things to you. And then I'm going to let you all step back out and send us a note as to, you know, how you wish to proceed. But I want to make sure there's a couple of things that you understand.

First, if your note is -- if what you mean by your question is whether we can give you a transcript of the testimony, the answer is no, we cannot give you a transcript of the testimony. That's not legally --

First, it's not practically possible. But it's not legally appropriate for us to send testimony back to the jury room with you in a written transcript. The Courts would say that we were emphasizing that testimony over some other testimony. So that's not a possibility.

You say, is it possible to have the testimony read back to you. It is possible to have the court reporters read the testimony back to you. But you need to understand it is about three hours of testimony. Court reporters are human, they need to -- they can't read straight for three hours. It takes -- it's going to take some breaks. So, you know, we're probably talking about three, three and a half, maybe four hours of reading it back to you to get it to you. That is possible. And if

that's what you want, we will in all likelihood do that.

Couple of, you know, other options. If y'all are able to narrow down if there's some particular part that you were wanting to hear. If you could give us a part or parts, frankly, that you want to hear, we can, you know, speed things up a little bit by that.

Frankly, if you want to hear it all, I would not be inclined -- I'm not making a final decision -- I would not be inclined to do that tonight.

I would probably, if that's what you want to do, break for the night and have you all come back in the morning. Because it's 6:35 now, you know, we're talking about seven o'clock before we get started on that. We're talking about it being ten or eleven o'clock before we finish reading to you. And then sending you back out to deliberate further. I don't think that's fair to anybody. So what we would probably do is break for the night and come back in the morning.

So, anyway, I kind of just throw those things out for you so you kind of understand the situation a little bit better. Obviously, we don't want to have you having a discussion here in the courtroom. But let me talk to the attorneys just a second, make sure they don't have something else they want me to indicate.

(Sidebar had as follows):

1	THE COURT: Anybody have a problem with what I've
2	said so far?
3	MR. FUCHS: The only thing I would say, Judge, is to
4	tell them that if you they do elect to just have a
5	portion read back, that we could probably accomplish that
6	this evening. And let them know that that's where
7	MR. WAY: We don't know until they tell us what.
8	MR. FUCHS: Agreed. But he was giving them an idea.
9	THE COURT: I think I was pretty clear.
LO	MR. FUCHS: Okay.
L 1	THE COURT: We're not going to do that tonight. You
L2	have objection to what I'm saying?
L3	MR. WAY: No, sir.
L4	MR. FUCHS: No, sir.
L5	(Sidebar concluded.)
L6	THE COURT: I guess the attorney I think I've
L7	said this, but I'll be a little clearer. Maybe if
L8	there's some portion if we can narrow it down to a
L9	smaller portion of the transcript, we may be able to do
20	that tonight. But what I was saying is, if we're going
21	to do all of it or most of it, it's probably too late to
22	launch into that tonight.
23	So what I'd like you to do is step back out, you
24	know, draft me a note as to how you wish to proceed and

we'll wait to hear from you. All right.

1 (Jury exits.) 2 THE COURT: Anybody have anything else at this 3 point? 4 MR. FUCHS: No. sir. 5 MR. WAY: No, sir. THE COURT: All right. We'll wait to hear. 6 (A recess was had.) 7 THE COURT: Be seated, please, folks. 8 I'm informed we have a verdict. I know that this is 9 10 an emotional issue for many of the people involved in 11 But, you know, this jury was drafted. They didn't this. 12 volunteer to be here. I know they've worked hard and 13 done the best they can. I'd be very offended if anyone were to react in front of the jury. There shouldn't be 14 15 any reaction at all. If you don't feel like you can abide by that, I 16 17 would suggest you step out. I would be very offended if somebody acts out in front of the jury. So if you don't 18 19 feel like you can, with dignity, accept whatever is said 20 by the jury -- and I don't know what that is, I'll be 21 learning about it at the same time -- you would do 22 everybody a favor and just step out.

23 We ready for a jury?

24 MR. FUCHS: Yes, Your Honor.

25 MR. WAY: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Let's have a jury, please. 1 2 (Jury enters.) 3 THE COURT: Ms. Idlett, I see you with the papers in your hand. Are you our foreperson? 4 5 MS. IDLETT: Yes, sir. 6 THE COURT: Has the jury arrived at a verdict? 7 MS. IDLETT: Yes. THE COURT: Would you hand it to the bailiff, 8 please? 9 10 State of Florida versus Denise Williams. We, the 11 jury, find as follows as to Count 1 of the indictment: 12 The defendant is guilty of conspiracy to commit 13 first-degree murder. 14 As to Count 2, We, the jury, find the defendant is guilty of first-degree murder. 15 we, the jury, find as follows as to Count 3 of the 16 17 indictment: The defendant is quilty of accessory after the fact of first-degree murder. 18 19 It's been dated and signed by the foreperson. Ms. Idlett, did I accurately reflect the verdict of the 20 21 jury? 22 MS. IDLETT: Yes. THE COURT: Either side wish to have the jury 23 24 polled?

MR. WAY: Yes, Your Honor.

```
1
                THE COURT: All right. Polling means that I need to
 2
           confirm with each of you that this is your individual
 3
           verdict, as well as the verdict of the jury as the whole.
 4
                I'll start with Juror No. 1. Is this your verdict.
 5
           as well as the verdict of the jury as a whole?
                JUROR NO. 1: Yes.
 6
                THE COURT: Number 2?
 7
                JUROR NO. 2: Yes.
 8
 9
                THE COURT: Number 3?
10
                JUROR NO. 3: It is.
11
                THE COURT: Number 4?
12
                JUROR NO. 4: Yes.
13
                THE COURT: Number 5?
14
                JUROR NO. 5: Yes.
15
                THE COURT: Number 6?
16
                JUROR NO. 6: Yes.
17
                THE COURT: Number 7?
                JUROR NO. 7: Yes.
18
19
                THE COURT: Number 8?
20
                JUROR NO. 8: Yes.
21
                THE COURT: Number 9?
22
                JUROR NO. 9: Yes, Your Honor.
23
                THE COURT: Number 10?
24
                JUROR NO. 10: Yes.
```

THE COURT: Number 11?

1	JUROR	NO.	11:	Yes.

JUROR NO. 12: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Number 12?

THE COURT: The jury has unanimously confirmed the verdict. It appears to be in order. It will be filed.

This will conclude your service with us. We do appreciate the time and the attention that you've given us. I know this is a difficult duty, to come in and make decision of this nature.

It's not appropriate for a judge to comment on a verdict one way or another, so don't take my comments as that. But I do appreciate the fact you came in and worked hard, given us many hours of your time. For that, we're appreciative.

Let me make you aware of one right that you have as a juror. You have a right not to discuss your deliberations. That doesn't mean you're prohibited from talking about them. You can talk about them if you wish. But it is possible someone would inquire of you. It's possible they would inquire to find fault with what you've done. You have every right to simply say, I'd prefer not to talk about it.

As I say, that's your right. And if you desire to talk, you're free to do so. We've taken up enough of your time so we won't be in any long speeches.

1	Have you made arrangements to get them safely out of
2	the building, Deputy?
3	COURT DEPUTY: Yes, sir.
4	THE COURT: I will let you step out with the
5	deputies.
6	COURT DEPUTY: All rise for the jury.
7	THE COURT: I'll have the audience remain until the
8	jury's cleared the floor.
9	If y'all will let me know when you've cleared the
10	floor, please.
11	COURT DEPUTY: Yes, sir.
12	(Jury exits.)
13	THE COURT: All right. Everybody be seated.
14	Ms. Williams is remanded to custody pending sentencing in
15	this matter. I know she's held without bond at this
16	point in time. Set a case management, Mr. Fuchs. I
17	think your next date is December 18th, next Tuesday.
18	MR. FUCHS: It will be Tuesday. Yes, Your Honor.
19	THE COURT: We'll set a case management date then.
20	Give you all a chance to discuss a sentencing date.
21	Does the defense request that we have a presentence
22	investigative report started?
23	MR. WAY: I would, Your Honor. And, respectfully,
24	is there any way we could do the case management perhaps
25	in early January versus

1	THE COURT: I mean, it's largely just to make sure
2	we have a date so y'all can start on getting the
3	sentencing date set.
4	MR. WAY: I'll find someone to cover for me.
5	THE COURT: What's that?
6	MR. WAY: I apologize. I scheduled something in
7	Jacksonville. But I'll make arrangements to get that
8	covered.
9	THE COURT: All right. And if you can communicate
LO	with Mr. Fuchs, we'll work out a sentencing date.
L1	MR. FUCHS: Yes, sir.
L2	THE COURT: Madam Clerk, would you order a
L3	presentence investigative report be ordered, please?
L4	THE CLERK: Yes, sir.
L5	THE COURT: Anything else from either side?
L6	MR. WAY: Your Honor, may I waive Ms. Williams'
L7	presence at the December 18th case management?
L8	THE COURT: Certainly. Certainly. We don't need
L9	her presence at the case management. We don't generally
20	have defendant's at case management. Although, I guess,
21	sometimes on the first-degree murder cases they do. So,
22	yeah, we'll waive her presence for then.
23	MR. WAY: Thank you, Your Honor.
24	THE COURT: All right. Anything else?

MR. FUCHS: No, Your Honor.

1	MR. WAY: No, Your Honor.
2	THE COURT: We'll be in recess.
3	(Proceedings in the matter concluded.)
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
LO	
11	
12	
13	
L4	
L5	
L6	
L7	
18	
L9	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	STATE OF FLORIDA:
4	COUNTY OF LEON:
5	I, JOHANA KESTERSON, Official Court Reporter, do
6	hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings were taken
7	before me at the time and place therein designated; that my
8	shorthand notes were thereafter translated under my
9	supervision; and the foregoing pages are a true and correct
10	record of the aforesaid proceedings.
11	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative,
12	employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor
13	relative or employee of such attorney or counsel, or
14	financially interested in the foregoing action.
15	DATED this 18th day of April, 2019.
16	DATED CITS TOCH day of Aprili, 2019.
17	
18	An tat
19	JOHANA KESTERSON OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
20	LEON COUNTY COURTHOUSE TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32301
21	TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32301
22	
23	
24	
25	