Filed: 11/20/2023 3:25 PM

### IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIANA

### Cause No. 23S-OR-311

State of Indiana ex rel. Richard Allen,	)
Relator,	) ) Original Action from the
v.	) Carroll Circuit Court
Carroll Circuit Court and The Honorable Frances C. Gull, Special Judge,	) Trial Court Cause No. ) 08C01-2210-MR-000001
Respondents.	)

## RESPONDENT'S SUPPLEMENTAL RECORD VOLUME I of I Pages 1-29

Matthew R. Gutwein (#16414-49) Christopher S. Stake (#27356-53) DELANEY & DELANEY LLC 3646 N. Washington Blvd. Indianapolis, IN 46205 Tel: (317) 920-0400

Attorneys for Respondent, the Honorable Frances C. Gull, Special Judge

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Transcript of In Camera Proceedings,	
State of Indiana v. Allen (October 19, 2023)	3
Verification	29
Certificate of Service	29

$_{1}$		
2	STATE OF INDIANA	) IN THE CARROLL CIRCUIT COURT )SS:
3	COUNTY OF CARROLL	
4	STATE OF INDIANA,	)
5	Plaintiff,	) )
6	VS.	) )
7	RICHARD ALLEN, Defendant.	) )
8		
9		
10		
11	REC	ORD OF IN CAMERA PROCEEDINGS
12		HELD ON OCTOBER 19, 2023
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22 23		
23   24		
25		

# 1 APPEARANCES 2 3 For State of Indiana: Nicholas C. McLeland/James Luttrell Carroll County Prosecutor/Deputy Prosecutor 4 101 West Main Street, Suite 204 Delphi, Indiana 46923 5 б For Defendant: Bradley A. Rozzi 7 Hillis, Hillis, Rozzi & Dean 200 Fourth Street 8 Logansport, Indiana 46947 9 Andrew J. Baldwin 10 Baldwin, Perry & Kamish, PC 150 North Main Street 11 Franklin, Indiana 46131 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

okay with whatever approach you want to take here.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. ROZZI: Well, I think -

THE COURT: I've got – Jodie's got our portable FTR going, just so that we've –

MR. ROZZI: Oh, okay. That's fine.

THE COURT: - got a record.

MR. ROZZI: You know, obviously, I'm happy to hear that the Court's gonna make some decisions on the pending pleadings today.

THE COURT: Um-hmm. (Affirmative response)

MR. ROZZI: I assume Andy feels the same way. We – you know, it's time to kind of get some closure, if you will, with regard to those items, so that we can move forward. It's probably obvious that the tension from our side is coming, you know, from the words "disqualification" that were murmured in the phone conference that we had a couple weeks ago. I'm assuming you understand how that kind of raises the intensity level of the circumstances. And I guess my – if I have a concern today, it's that, you know, we're gonna go out on the – kind of in the public, so to speak, in the courtroom, on the record, and have a discussion about an on-going investigation, and I – that's what I kind of gathered from the e-mail. You know, I think you invited Nick to talk about that if he wanted to.

THE COURT: Um-hmm. (Affirmative response)

MR. ROZZI: And, you know, it makes me a little uncomfortable, because I don't know – first of all, there are no pleadings that are pending, whether they're motions to disqualify or contempt citations or whatever they

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

might be, that really frame any of the issues. And I have no problem - I mean, I don't have any problem talking about this stuff privately on the record in a - you know, in an ex parte type confidential hearing. I just think it's a little - it's difficult to expect that there will be any kind of structure to the idea of, you know, "Hey, there's an on-going investigation and just tell us what's going on." And I don't know that it has any relevance to what we're really trying to accomplish today. And I also don't know why Nick would want to talk about an on-going investigation in public, knowing that that, in itself, could be a little damaging to their circumstances. And so we're lawyers, we're used to having issues framed, we're used to having an opportunity to prepare. And I don't have anything to hide and I know he doesn't have anything to hide. You've maybe gathered that we've cooperated, we ran into the State Police posts, our respective posts, if you will, and I had somebody advise me of my rights and I waived those and I gave a formal statement, he did the same. And I'm not sure that we're gonna benefit or that this will be productive to just open floor this, and that's my biggest concern today.

THE COURT: Um-hmm. (Affirmative response)

ATTORNEY ANDREW BALDWIN: I'm more of a – like, the due process side. I'm not really sure what will happen, but I just don't know – I don't know what's gonna happen and I would like the opportunity to know what's gonna happen and prepare for they're claiming or whatever before it happens. And I feel like – I don't feel like – I don't want to say ambushed, but it's just – it's hard to know, for me, what to do when I don't know what's happening, there's not a pleading we can respond to, things like that. So, you know, you had indicated that, you know, when he – when Nick said - I don't know if he said the

a summary of the investigation. I've got witnesses here and exhibits to present

25

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Defense. I know it may harm the investigation, but I think it would be important that the Court hear these things. I guess, the heart of it (inaudible) investigation, I think it's important – I think the importance of you hearing it is outweighed by that, and so I have those things. I'm concerned that the leak is not just a onetime leak. The evidence that we have shows it is an on-going leak, however it's being done, and it's just - what's next? That's - I have an issue, what's next? I mean, I spent the past 17 days investigating this night and day when I should have been focused on preparing for trial. And when I say night and day, I mean phone calls at 2 a.m., 3:30 a.m., night and day, and so that's where I'm at, Judge. Again, I'm an officer of the court, I'm reporting to the Court what I know, and that's kind of where I see my role.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ROZZI: You know, this is starting to scream due process to me. I've not – well, I haven't seen any of these exhibits and I don't know really, frankly, I don't know anything about any of this. And I'm not distancing myself from Mr. Baldwin, I'm just saying I have no connection with any of these people; And the idea that somehow the prosecutor is gonna get to roll out a okay? bunch of statements and exhibits and, you know, testimony without us having any forewarning or any idea - anyway of scrutinizing that, seems a little outside the boundaries of due process to me. Plus, again, I get back to what is the relevance to what is going on in this case? Why we – are we going to use an open courtroom to air an ancillary matter? It's not really connected in any way, at this point, to the proceedings that are on-going, whether it's the Franks issue or anything of that nature. And I will tell you this, and I am prepared to show the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

sit and try to marshal all of this stuff while this case is on-going, because there's no end to it. And – but the point is, is the Court needs to have some context that this is nothing new. I'm super – I lost sleep over the fact that there's a man who's dead that I don't even know and, frankly, Andy doesn't know, and it's tragic. I don't know what life circumstances he had or what surrounded this, we've not – none of that information has been shared with us. But at the end of the day, what's going on out in the cyber world and in the public, as you might expect in a case of this magnitude that's been publicized for six years, was beyond our control before we even got involved.

MR. BALDWIN: There's even a guy in Florida who says the guy in Texas who leaked all this stuff has received from a disgruntled Carroll County employee a whole file filled with stuff, and photos included. And I haven't seen – I haven't even seen the photos that were leaked, I don't know what they are, you know. I mean, if this could be set for a formal hearing in the future, where we have a chance to do it the right way, then that's one thing, but, you know, to go in there and we don't have any counter – way to counteract anything. If I know what it is, I can, "Oh, okay, that's – I know what that is" or "I don't know what that is." And it's – you know, and in the meantime, you know, we can – I don't know, we – honestly, this is the worst, lowest point of my career right now, because somebody did what they did to me, and I – you know, that has nothing to do with Richard Allen.

THE COURT: It certainly does not.

MR. BALDWIN: Richard Allen needs to have counsel there, so – I just don't want to go in there and not be able to fight back with – if it – with evidence that we – or witnesses that we have to counteract whatever they claim

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. Here are my thoughts, in no particular order: I don't know how many folks are out there, and I certainly don't wish to air publicly to the world the concerns that I have about this matter. My intent in having this hearing was to go through some of the pleadings that we have not yet decided. So I was going to start with reminding everybody about the decorum order, reminding everybody why we're here, to shut up, etcetera. There have been reports to my sheriff about disruptive people; and I will remind people, if they are disruptive, they will be removed, and my sheriff is fully prepared to execute arrests if necessary, because I know we've seen in our other hearings people have been disruptive and hateful. So under the rules - under the Canons of Judicial Conduct, I'm required to advise people within the room that the media is here and they are filming. They're doing pool coverage, so there's only two cameras in the courtroom and everybody's going to get coverage from that. And then, I want to talk about the pleadings. Defendant filed a verified motion for immediate transfer of custody. The State filed its response. The motion, again, has a lot of inaccuracies and some speculation, and it has been refuted ably I think by the affidavits that have been submitted by the State, and I'm going to deny the motion. The Defendant then filed a motion for broadcasting order. The State filed its response. Your motion's overbroad, it's got a lot of irrelevant verbiage in it, and I am required to consider individual requests for hearings, so I will - if the media wishes to have an individual request submitted, they know fully well how to do that and I've provided to counsel all of those requests that I've gotten so far for this hearing. So if you want to file them for particular hearings, you're certainly welcome to do that, but the media is all over this and

they're not - they know how to do this.

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

MR. ROZZI: Yeah.

I was just trying to understand, are you suggesting that you're gonna determine that on a case-by-case basis or a hearing-by-hearing basis?

THE COURT: Hearing-by-hearing.

MR. ROZZI: Okay.

THE COURT: Yeah.

All right. Okay. I just wanted to make sure I MR. ROZZI: understood what -

The State filed its motion for leave of Court to THE COURT: subpoena the third-party records. I think that was directed, again, to DOC. I, clearly, can't grant that. I'm gonna grant the Defendant's motion to quash. But if you continue to raise his medical and mental health in pleadings, that's fair game then for that to be provided to the State. You have also filed, Mr. McLeland, a motion for future pleadings and filings to be sealed prior to being released to the public. I've not gotten a response from the Defense.

> Can I speak on that? MR. ROZZI:

THE COURT: Sure.

I think it's important to note that, you know, we've -MR. ROZZI: so we had this discussion come up before and there was - basically, we decided, okay, we're done sealing stuff, we're gonna make it public. I had - before we filed that Franks brief, I had a long conversation with the court reporter, Karen Allen, over in Delphi, because I wasn't sure about - Allen or Roller? I always want to call her Karen -

MR. MCLELAND: Allen.

MR. ROZZI: Karen Allen – because I wasn't sure about the mechanics of how all of this stuff was moving from Delphi to your office, and I know that you had set up some kind of a website or something that people could access. And I was under the understanding, in speaking with Ms. Allen – I'm not blaming her for anything, but that when we file these things, they were going from them and they were hitting a button – we were filing with Carroll County, they were hitting enter, and they were sending it to you and you were, essentially, filtering this stuff or, at least, you were seeing it before it became public.

THE COURT: Nope.

MR. ROZZI: And so that's the way I – in talking with her, that's the way I understood the mechanics. Which, I think, is what happened to a pleading the other day, from what I understand. We filed something and you either put it in a queue – I think there's a – anyway, I tried to do some homework on that, and that's what I –

MR. BALDWIN: I was a part of one of those conversations and she – that's what she said.

THE COURT: So do – does that need a hearing? I'm happy to have a hearing on that, I don't have a problem with that.

MR. ROZZI: Well, I don't really – I guess, I'm just telling you for context, that's what I –

MR. BALDWIN: I mean, could there be a happy medium of we file it confidentially and then the – so the Judge then gets a chance to review it first? 'Cause I – that's what we thought was going on anyway, but if that's not what's going on –

THE COURT: No. It's being filed confidentially if you mark it as

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BALDWIN: I know. Yeah, I know that now.

THE COURT: I had my staff mark the memorandum confidential after it had been filed and disseminated to the public, because the actual warrant was in there, and that's covered under a miscellaneous cause number. I'm happy to have a hearing.

Well, what is your ruling, I guess to make sure I MR. ROZZI: understand? I don't want to fight about something that we don't need to argue about.

> I haven't ruled on that. THE COURT:

MR. ROZZI: Okay.

THE COURT: You haven't filed a response and that -

MR. ROZZI: Yeah.

THE COURT: -- my question is do we need a hearing on that or do you wish to file a response? The Franks motion, clearly, needs a ruling, and I'm working on that. The motion and exhibits are about 1500 pages and there are hours and hours of interviews that have been made available, that my IT staff has now cleaned to make sure they're okay. We already talked about that. And then, I mean, that brings us to my concerns that I had that I raised with all of you on our phone call. And I write everything out, and this is what I intend to say in open court: I have concerns regarding the defense team and the totality of the circumstances surrounding your representation of Mr. Allen. Candidly, my concerns began at our hearing on November 22<sup>nd</sup> of last year. Mr. McLeland filed a motion for gag order, and we were in chambers, and you assured me, gentlemen, "We don't want the media in our lives, we will not try

18

20

19

21

22

23

24

25

this case in the media." And less than two weeks later, you issued an undated press release that contained an awful lot of information that would not normally be revealed. I don't know, I think you knew or should have known those were potentially violative of Rule 3.6 of the Rules of Professional Responsibility, but it is that press release that prompted me to issue the order December 2nd, granting the gag order until further hearing. April 18th of this year, you filed a notice of tort claim against the Department of Correction. You stated in that notice that it was your intent to pursue, "Our client's claims against you. The full amount of damages sought on behalf of my client is unknown." I don't know how you could do that in representing Mr. Allen in a criminal matter and then launch off into a civil matter, I think that's inappropriate. May of this year, we were notified by the State of the Brandon Woodhouse arrest and the subsequent discovery of your work product, and I think it was an outline that you created for yourselves with the discovery. It was pretty detailed, I don't know if that's the right word. That, apparently, happened in December of last year, and that was not revealed to anybody, not shared with the Court, it wasn't shared with you - although, apparently, you guys knew about what was going on.

MR. BALDWIN: He didn't know.

THE COURT: You knew.

MR. BALDWIN: I did know.

THE COURT: So then, Mr. Woodhouse gets arrested and here we are. Grossly negligent to e-mail that to the wrong Brad. Your pleadings on the safekeeping order contain inaccuracies and falsehoods. That was proven in the hearing we conducted in June, the evidence presented by the State clearly demonstrated the falsity of your claims, and that was very troubling to me. And

then, the last couple of weeks that we have been dealing with. The State provided you discovery. That has been severely compromised. We now have an on-going investigation. I'm not gonna call it a criminal investigation, I don't know what it is, but it's clearly being investigated by the State of Indiana. Everyone involved has sought counsel, including you, Mr. Baldwin, you've had an attorney enter a written appearance this morning. I don't want to get into the investigation, candidly. You are the constitutional authority for the State of Indiana; if you choose to pursue it, that is up to you. If you choose to abandon it, that is clearly up to you. I'm glad to hear that you have cooperated. But Mr. Baldwin's attorney has, clearly, shared – I don't know if you've seen his pleading –

MR. MCLELAND: I saw it, Judge, yes. I got it kind of late. He e-mailed us and then -

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MCLELAND: -- I saw that was filed on the way here.

THE COURT: Well, yeah, so he's clearly shared it in his pleading, down to the fact that an individual has committed suicide. He included the fact that you left materials all over a conference-room table, accessible to anyone, and this is a friend of yours who, apparently, you have consulted with on this case. So again, it's up to you if you wish to pursue that. I'm looking at the totality of the circumstances. You know, when I look at a suppression, the case law requires me to look at the totality of the circumstances, and that's what I'm doing; and it pains me to say this, but the totality of these circumstances demonstrate gross negligence and incompetence on the part of the defense team. I am unsatisfied with your representation of Mr. Allen. I am gravely concerned about his rights to have competent, non-negligent representation. He currently

doesn't have that right now, because what you have demonstrated is negligence and incompetence. Now, I am sharing my thoughts with you privately. I don't want to say this in open court. I would encourage you to talk privately about what you wish to do. I don't want this coming out, it is not where we need to be with this case, but I will. But you don't know that, you have just now been made aware of my concerns and where I'm landing; so if you wish to have a private conversation, I would encourage you to do that. I don't believe your client is here yet. No, he's not. Clearly, you'll need to speak with him, as well. So —

MR. BALDWIN: I'm not good at reading between the lines.

THE COURT: You're a lawyer, that's what you do for a living.

MR. BALDWIN: When you say have a private conversation, are you talking the four of us or –

THE COURT: I'm talking about you. I am not accusing the State of gross incompetence and negligence. I am finding gross incompetence and negligence with you.

MR. BALDWIN: So - okay. So -

MR. ROZZI: Forgive me - go ahead.

MR. BALDWIN: No, no.

MR. ROZZI: I mean, obviously, reading the tea leaves here, what you're giving us a chance to do is bow out gracefully, if you will, if that's the right term. Is there a scenario where the Court would accept if I stayed in the case? I mean, I'm not – I'm a team player and I'm not the kind of guy that just bail out on somebody just for the sake of doing it, but I think it's obvious that, you know – he can speak differently, but I'm not as connected to some of, you know, this most recent circumstances as he is. Mr. Allen is in a situation where he's gonna

have counsel that's – if he has new counsel, it's gonna take them a year to get up to speed with the depth of information that continues to come in. And so, I think that his 6th Amendment rights matter. And, you know, I'm probably the one that can at least move this thing forward with some sense of judicial economy. I don't like it and that's not what I intended to do when I came in here today, but that would be kind of a worst-case scenario on our side. You know, I guess – and so is that an option that the Court would entertain?

THE COURT: No.

MR. ROZZI: So basically, what you're saying is "You guys either quit on your own accord or you make me fire you"? That's what -

THE COURT: No. I'm saying to you that this is my - this is what I plan to say in court on the record when we convene at two o'clock.

MR. ROZZI: Well, so are – is the culmination of that that you're removing us from the case?

THE COURT: I will, based on what I've just shared with you.

MR. ROZZI: Okay. Well, I just want to make sure we're -

THE COURT: And I'm just giving you the opportunity to have a conversation which – how do you want that to go? I don't want to do this. I don't want to do this, but I will if I have to.

MR. BALDWIN: How would – should we bow out gracefully, as Brad says, how – would we even have a hearing? How would that go? 'Cause if we're out of the case, then –

MR. ROZZI: Then you're gonna go ahead and rule on a bunch of stuff without lawyers in the room, that's -

THE COURT: No, I would not do that. If you decide that your best

course of action is to file a motion to withdraw, you can do that today, and I'll 1 send Mr. Allen back to the DOC after you've had a chance to speak with him. 2 MR. BALDWIN: Would that happen before the hearing or after the 3 hearing? That's -4 THE COURT: Your motion to withdraw would happen before the 5 hearing. 6 MR. BALDWIN: Okay. That's what I wanted - yeah. 7 THE COURT: Yeah. Because that's - I - he has rights, and I don't 8 want those rights compromised by having a hearing with him not having counsel. 9 I assume, if you choose to withdraw, that his financial situation hasn't changed 10 and he would still be entitled to court-appointed counsel. I can't imagine that 11 he has the ability, at this point, to hire counsel. I don't know that. 12 Brad and I need to go talk. MR. BALDWIN: 13 THE COURT: Yes, you do. Thank you, gentleman. 14 MR. MCLELAND: Yep. Thank you, Judge. 15 (Off record.) 16 (On record.) 17 THE COURT: Thank you, Jodie. 18 COURT REPORTER: You're welcome. 19 THE COURT: Okay. Yes. 20 All right. So obviously, we're kind of trying to figure MR. ROZZI: 21 out how to address this issue with very short notice, very little notice. The first 22 thing we did is really to talk to the client. 23 THE COURT: Um-hmm. (Affirmative response) 24 MR. ROZZI: Our client is a big part of this, the biggest part of this, 25

Vosupperelgorage 18

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

11

14

13

15

16

17 18

19

21

20

22 23

24

25

to go in here in an open courtroom and, essentially, defend myself against claims that I don't agree with without any notice and without any opportunity I think is unfair. But I'm also - I also have some common sense and, you know, me going in there and standing my ground because my client wants me to is just gonna make things worse for him, and so I'm gonna withdraw my appearance. I'm gonna walk out of here, I'm gonna go down to my car, I'm gonna call my staff, and have them prepare a motion, and I'm gonna withdraw my appearance, but I'm doing it because I don't think I have any other choice professionally, not because I want to, and not because my client wants me to. And I respect the Court has an opinion, but we're professionals and we can disagree -

THE COURT: Of course.

MR. ROZZI: -- and, you know, I am extremely, you know, I'd say frustrated's probably a soft word, with the idea that we showed up today without any real opportunity to prepare for any of this, and I just think it's improper, and that's where I am and that's my position.

THE COURT: Well, I think we talked about, when you asked for a disqualification, and I indicated on our phone conversation I'm inclined to do that.

MR. ROZZI: It was a phone conversation that was not on the record and then some follow-up e-mails.

THE COURT: True.

There's an informality to that. MR. ROZZI:

THE COURT: True.

And you also said that you hadn't even done any MR. ROZZI: research and you hadn't, you know, had time to talk to your senior Judge and

all these other things. And he hasn't filed a pleading with the Court, either.

THE COURT: No, I'm doing this on my motion.

MR. ROZZI: And I'm a lawyer who practices in lots of courtrooms and I've been through some disqualification actions. I've – in 20 years, I've never had a disciplinary complaint in my life that's been confirmed, if you will. But I've seen lawyers disqualified and there is a process for that and it's not this, with all due respect, where you walk into somebody's office, a judge's office, and they read a prepared statement to you and, essentially, that statement is an indictment on my professional, you know, activities, and then you're handed a – you know, essentially, a sheet of paper with two – you know, with two options and one of them is, is "I'm gonna go out here and shame you or you can quit." I just – you can understand how upset that would make any lawyer, and I just think it's – I don't think it's the right way to handle this from a due process standpoint. So I have no choice but to, you know, withdraw my appearance, 'cause I'm not gonna go in there and take a public shaming without having any notice of it, I just – you know, that's where I am with it.

MR. BALDWIN: I'm the same, withdrawing. I mirror what he said. I mean, I do appreciate giving us the advance notice. If there is some appreciation for that, I do appreciate that; but beyond that, I wanted to take this, you know – I wanted to take this and finish it out. I'm stunned, I don't know what to say, so I'll just say I'm moving to withdraw orally.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ROZZI: Is the Court gonna generate some further instructions on what to do with all of this discovery that we have and –

THE COURT: I already have.

MR. ROZZI: -- all of this information and -

THE COURT: There's an order. I granted the State's protective order on discovery.

MR. ROZZI: No, I'm talking about my possession of all of this information. Am I to take it out to the trash can? Am I supposed to wait for another attorney? Is the Court gonna give us some guidance on how to move all of this information from one law office –

THE COURT: I did.

MR. ROZZI: -- to another?

THE COURT: When I granted the State's protective order, the – I think it's the last paragraph of that protective order directs you to return it all to the State of Indiana, all the copies, all of the – whatever you gave them they are required, under that order, to return to you.

MR. ROZZI: At the conclusion of the case.

THE COURT: Or your representation.

MR. ROZZI: I know what order you're talking about, I read the order before I came today.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ROZZI: So we're supposed to just take everything back and give it to the State and then just retain our work product until somebody asks us for it?

THE COURT: Your work product is your work product. I mean, I would hope that you would share that with successor counsel, I would hope that you would help successor counsel just with the transfer of all of the information, because that's in your client's best interest to do that, but that's entirely up to

Volume 1, Page 24

THE COURT: Thank you. (THIS CONCLUDES THE PROCEEDINGS HAD IN CAMERA ON OCTOBER 19, 2023, IN THIS CAUSE.) 

1	STATE OF INDIANA	) IN THE CARROLL CIRCUIT COURT	
$\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}$	COUNTY OF CARROLL	)SS: ) CAUSE NO.: 08C01-2210-MR-1	
3			
4	STATE OF INDIANA,	)	
	Plaintiff,		
5	VS.	)	
6	RICHARD ALLEN, Defendant,	) )	
7			
8			
9	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER		
10	I Jodie I. Willian	ns, an official reporter for the Allen Superior Court, Allen	
11	]	hereby certify that I took transcribed from electronic	
12			
13	reporting equipment all of the proceedings had in camera on October 19, 2023,		
14	in said cause.  I further certify that the above and foregoing transcript is a full, true, and		
15			
16	complete copy of said p		
17	WITNESS my ha	nd and seal this 23 <sup>rd</sup> day of October, 2023.	
18			
19			
20		Jodie L. Williams  Jodie L. Williams, Reporter	
21		Allen Superior Court Allen County, Indiana	
22		Allen County, maiana	
23			
24			
25			

#### VERIFICATION

I certify that the document in this Supplemental Record is an accurate copy of the "Record of In Camera Proceedings Held on October 19, 2023," transcribed and certified by Allen Superior Court Reporter, Jodie L. Williams.

/s/ Matthew R. Gutwein
Matthew R. Gutwein (#16414-49)

DELANEY & DELANEY LLC 3646 N. Washington Blvd. Indianapolis, IN 46205

#### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on November 20, 2023, I electronically filed the foregoing document using the Indiana Electronic Filing Service ("IEFS"). I further certify that on November 20, 2023, the foregoing document was served on the following persons using the IEFS:

Cara Schaefer Wieneke WIENEKE LAW OFFICE LLC PO Box 368 Brooklyn, IN 46111 cara.wieneke@gmail.com

Mark K. Leeman LEEMAN LAW OFFICE 412 East Broadway Logansport, Indiana 46947 markleeman@leemanlaw.com

Bernice Corley Indiana Public Defender's Council bcorley@pdc.in.gov Joel Schumm Attorney at Law jmschumm@iupui.edu

Angela Sanchez Office of Indiana Attorney General Todd Rokita Angela.Sanchez@atg.in.gov

<u>/s/ Matthew R. Gutwein</u> Matthew R. Gutwein (#16414-49)

DELANEY & DELANEY LLC 3646 N. Washington Blvd. Indianapolis, IN 46205