

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF WOOD COUNTY, WEST VIRGINIA 1 2 STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA, 3 Plaintiff, 4 VS. CASE NOS. 11-F-101 5 16-F-25 THOMAS DEEGAN, 6 Defendant. 7 MOTION TO REVOKE HOME CONFINEMENT 8 AND ARRAIGNMENT 9 The following proceeding was held before the Honorable 10 Jeffrey B. Reed, Judge, on the 26th day of January, 2016. 11 APPEARANCES: 12 MR. SAMUEL C. ROGERS, II, Assistant Prosecuting Attorney, 317 13 Market Street, Parkersburg, WV 26101. Counsel for the Plaintiff. 14 MR. F. JOHN OSHOWAY, Attorney-at-Law, P. O. Box 156, 15 Grantsville, WV 26147. Standby Counsel for the Defendant. 16 MR. STEVE STEPHENS, Chief Home Confinement Officer. 17 MR. THOMAS DEEGAN, Defendant. 18 19 20 21 22 23 CYNTHIA A. SUTPHIN, CER, CET 24 #2 Government Square, Room 221 Parkersburg, WV 26101 25 (304) 424-1721

PROCEDINGS

(Whereupon, the following proceeding was held on the 26th day of January, 2016, beginning at 10:25 a.m. All parties present.)

THE COURT: This is Case Nos. 11-F-101 and 16-F-25, both State of West Virginia vs. Thomas Deegan.

MR. OSHOWAY: May it please the Court, present is Mr. Deegan, and I'm appearing on his behalf.

THE COURT: Okay. Let's see, 16-F-25 is set for an arraignment, and 11-F-101 is set on a motion to revoke home confinement.

We had, I guess, an issue common to both of them, which is counsel. And we were here earlier, and I don't remember when it was, in 11-F-101, I think it might have been at the arraignment in December, and the issue of counsel for Mr. Deegan came up.

And, Mr. Deegan, I certainly don't want to put words in your mouth. I'm trying to understand your position. So if you would please correct me if I'm incorrect when I say this. It's my understanding that you don't want to be represented by a licensed attorney, because the licensed attorney is licensed through the State of West Virginia, and the State of West Virginia is the plaintiff in this case? Is that -- am I correct in that understanding?

THE DEFENDANT: It's close. It's close. If I can find

2 t 3 t 4 s 5 m 6 c 7 St

it here. In actuality, there is an open and pending case, the Supreme Court of Appeals against the plaintiff, in which they defaulted on the 11th of September of last year, and it stipulated and agreed many things. You'll have to forgive me, I have a hard time here with cuffs on. I have the exact code. And according to -- this is West Virginia Code, not State of West Virginia Code, but West Virginia Code 51, Section 1, dash, 4a, that it is -- that organizing, governing all attorneys practicing law, it's an administrative agency of the Supreme Court of Appeals of West Virginia, which is a subdivision of the State of West Virginia, it's known as the State Bar, and shall be a part of the judicial department of the state government.

So it's a part of the government that is a plaintiff in the case against me, and it's created strictly for enforcing such rules that they may prescribe without constitutional authority.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: And as such, I can't -- I can't see anything other than a conflict of interest being as they say quite clearly in the code that they are part of the judicial department of the state government, and that is who the alleged plaintiff is not only in this case, but in 15-0491, where they've defaulted and dishonored themselves as corporate entities.

THE COURT: Okay.

2

3

4

THE DEFENDANT: And I feel I'm -- I mean, I feel I can take care of myself at this point. I'm not looking for

counsel of any kind. And I mean there's --

5

THE COURT: So you wish to waive your right to be

represented by counsel?

7

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE DEFENDANT: Well, I wish to invoke the assistance of counsel as is my right under, what is it, Amendment VI, I believe, the United States Constitution for the United States of America, circa 1791. And at that time it was recognized that I could have persons assist me that were not licensed so that I could -- because I'm unlawfully confined I'm unable to do a lot of research and to file things, and so I need the assistance in that sense.

I spoke with him on that back at Magistrate Court. He didn't want to be what he called really a secretary, and that's actually what I need more than anything is someone. I'm going to guide what I'm doing. I don't want someone else guiding it.

THE COURT: Well, I just want to make sure you understand, and I'm certainly not trying to change your opinion or -- well, yeah, change your opinion or conclusion, but I want to make sure you understand the significance of what your position is.

Under the laws of this state, only a licensed attorney

can practice law and only a licensed attorney can represent
someone in a court of law. And whether it's someone who's
licensed in the State of West Virginia, or whether it's
someone who is licensed in another state who has requested to
practice what's called pro hac vice, which is someone from
out-of-state given the ability to appear in a particular
case, even though they may not be licensed in West Virginia.
Regardless of where that person comes from, in terms of
whether it's from West Virginia or another state, that person

still has to be either licensed in West Virginia, or come

under the authority of the licensing board of the state.

And so, you know, if you maintain that position, and, again, it's up to you, I was just trying to make sure you understand the significance of it, if you maintain that position, there's no way that an attorney can represent you. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, I don't want to be represented. I mean, I'm a living soul created in the image of my heavenly father. I don't wish to be brought in as a corporation fiction or an entity or a juristic person. I wish to stay in the capacity and standing that I am, which is a living soul.

THE COURT: And while attorneys are licensed and must comply with certain requirements under the law, just like a lot of professionals, like doctors and dentists, people like that, lawyers have an ethical obligation to represent their

clients, not to do what the State of West Virginia may want them to do. The State of West Virginia may license them, but the State does not dictate their conduct or how they perform their obligations. Lawyers, even though they may be licensed by the State, have the obligation to represent their clients, which would in this case be you or in any case would be -- you know, in criminal cases it would be the defendant, regardless of whether the State may pay them or the individual may pay them.

So while I understand your concern that these -- that lawyers may be licensed through the State, the State does not control how they do their job and represent someone. It is their client, which would be you in this case, who they must represent. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: No. No. Because I've seen some of the oaths, and they take an oath to the government, whether it be the government of the United States or the government of West Virginia. So I'm just going by the code and the oaths that I've seen. Their allegiance is not to me, the code specifically states they are strictly to enforce the rules of the Supreme Court of Appeals. It says nothing about representing me or maintaining my best interest. I can't find that anywhere.

THE COURT: Well, it's in the Standards of Professional Conduct for Lawyers is where it says that.

11-F-101 & 16-F-25 - Mot. to Revoke Home Confinement & Arraignment (1/26/16)

a lawyer may refer not only to the law, but to

25

other considerations, such as moral, economic, 1 2 social and political factors." 3 Rule 5.6 of the Rules of Professional Conduct indicate 4 that: 5 "A lawyer shall not permit a person who 6 recommends, employs or pays the lawyer to 7 render legal services for another to direct or 8 regulate the lawyer's professional judgment." 9 So someone else can't tell Mr. Oshoway how to represent 10 you. You will direct how he represents you, or make the 11 decisions, again, as to whether you testify, and, you know, 12 things like that. So even though someone else may pay him, 13 even though it may be, like I think in the other case, in 14 11-F-101 you had some person, I don't remember his name now, 15 out of the eastern panhandle, I mean, I don't know whether 16 you paid him or not, but he followed your directions --17 THE DEFENDANT: Not really. 18 THE COURT: -- regardless of who paid him. THE DEFENDANT: Not really. That's, you know --19 20 THE COURT: Well, that --21 THE DEFENDANT: -- that's another problem. 22 THE COURT: Okay. 23 THE DEFENDANT: No. You said it has the effect of law, 24 but it's not actually law, it hasn't been passed by the 25 Legislature. So I'm only going by the code that has been

passed. 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

THE COURT: It has not been passed by the Legislature.

THE DEFENDANT: Right.

THE COURT: But under the laws of this state, a rule passed by the Supreme Court has the same force and effect as legislation.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, we address that issue in the case with the Supreme Court of Appeals where they defaulted and dishonor themselves, along with the State of West Virginia, and they don't have the contractual authority to do a lot of what they're doing.

THE COURT: Well, so --

THE DEFENDANT: So I --

THE COURT: -- and the point -- the only reason I'm saying this now is because, you know, I need to try to decide whether you're going to be represented by counsel, whether you're going to have standby counsel, or whether you're going to be representing yourself, and that's the only reason I'm going into this.

THE DEFENDANT: Unless an oath in fealty is taken to me, I can't accept a bar attorney, I just can't do it.

THE COURT: So you want to waive your right to be represented by counsel?

THE DEFENDANT: Well, it's -- they're actually attorneys, I mean, "counsel" is a different term under the

11-F-101 & 16-F-25 - Mot. to Revoke Home Confinement & Arraignment (1/26/16)

24

23

25

original contract, the Constitution. Counsel would be someone that I would choose that would assist me, and he's not willing to assist in doing the clerical things that I need done. We had discussed that before.

THE COURT: Well, you seem to have somebody doing all the clerical things, because I've been served with a -- I mean, just this morning I was served with a forty-six page document, and there's been reams --

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.

THE COURT: -- of documents filed with the clerk's office. So it doesn't seem like you have any problem with having people do secretarial work for you.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, all they're doing is copying. Now I'm running into the problem that I don't have the actual law library needed to facilitate a further defense of any kind.

THE COURT: You can have anybody you want do that.

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, but they're not permitted to come to the jail and to give me the stuff that they have.

THE COURT: I don't know about that.

THE DEFENDANT: That's the problem I'm facing. But, I mean, I have the right, unhindered right to represent myself, and it should be unhindered in being able to defend myself, and so far it has been hindered. A lot of these things have been late in coming. I know that I haven't even -- there wasn't even subpoenas issued. I wasn't at a grand jury

hearing with documents were mailed in, certified mail, received, I believe, on the first of the year.

THE COURT: See, sir, that's where you're at a -- that's the point I'm trying to make. You don't understand the basic concepts of the grand jury. The defendant has no right to be at a grand jury. The defendant doesn't have the right to present evidence at a grand jury. And so if you have that basic misunderstanding, I'm having problems letting you represent yourself.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, no, there was private counsel for a person confined at a grand jury hearing. And that's just one of the issues that was sent in. We have a challenge of jurisdiction, venue and law form that's been unanswered. I mean, we've got -- I've got a whole stack of stuff here that's been unanswered by the State.

THE COURT: And do you why?

THE DEFENDANT: Well, I've asserted my right to represent myself since day one at the Magistrate's Court.

THE COURT: Do you know why those things haven't been answered?

THE DEFENDANT: Because they -- in the supposed rules of procedure there is no timeline for them to answer them.

THE COURT: No. It's because in reading through them it is difficult, if not impossible, to understand what you're saying.

with a crime in 16-F-25?

THE DEFENDANT: No. I understand that there's an entity charge that appears to be cestui que vie trust, I understand that, and I'm the administrator, the executor, or the custodian, the beneficiary thereof. I'm not the trustee, the surety, the acceptor, the debtor.

THE COURT: The law in this state, as I understand it, is that there needs to be an unequivocal waiver of right to counsel before a person can waive their right to counsel, and it has to be knowingly, intelligently and voluntarily done. I think that in this case it is certainly voluntarily done, and, I mean, I think it's knowingly done, in terms of I think the defendant understands the effect of it.

My concern is, and this concern is based upon the conversation that just occurred on-the-record, as well as the filings that have occurred in the two cases that are pending in front of me, as well as the filings that have occurred with the clerk's office. And I'm pretty sure that the clerk's office has been advised not to file those documents in a particular case, but I'm now directing the clerk's office not to destroy those files, because I read through those documents, and that's part of the reason why I'm saying that I think that this defendant will be -- will not be able to effectively represent himself because of the assertions that he is making in those documents, which are sometimes not

1

4

3

5

7

8

9

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2324

25

-- well, it doesn't -- it shows a lack of understanding as to how certain procedures are done, and it shows a lack -- well, not a lack, but some of those documents are difficult, if not impossible to understand, and, you know, you can't raise a defense if nobody understands the defense that's raised.

And so I just think that, and I would find, that this defendant cannot effectively represent himself, and therefore needs -- I'm going to have standby counsel. I'm going to put your position, Mr. Oshoway, as standby counsel, so that you can give him advice. Like if he wants to issue a subpoena, you can tell him how to issue a subpoena or issue that subpoena for him, things like that, so that -- you know, and if he wants to appear at certain hearings, you know, how he can make that request effectively. And what I'm thinking about is, while I don't think that there's a right for a defendant to appear before a grand jury, the defendant does, I think, have the right to request to appear before a grand jury. And I think the law is that the court that's presiding over the grand jury then makes the decision as to whether --I think that's what the law is. But I don't know whether he made the right request, because I don't know who that request was made to.

MR. OSHOWAY: Right. And, Judge, I don't know that either, because in the situation with -- as between Mr. Deegan and myself is, it is such that I am not -- I have not

been privy to all of the motions and filings that he has made.

The problem I have with acting as standby counsel is, for example, if we have a hearing today, as the hearing is proceeding, if I -- you know, if I, as counsel, perceive that an objection should be made or whatever is appropriate under the circumstances, do I just -- do I counsel Mr. Deegan to do that, or do I do that?

THE COURT: Mr. Deegan, do you want his assistance in terms of objections during the presentation of evidence?

THE DEFENDANT: Presentation of evidence when?

THE COURT: Today.

THE DEFENDANT: I haven't even seen -- I mean, we just -- I just got the packet today. I haven't even got to look through it.

THE COURT: Do you want his assistance during the presentation of evidence in terms of objections, yes or no?

THE DEFENDANT: I mean, I don't want any assistance from

THE COURT: Okay. So, Mr. Oshoway, you do not need to advise the defendant whether to object during the

anybody, I just want to be able to prepare.

presentation of evidence.

MR. OSHOWAY: The other problem I have, Judge, is, I have tried to walk the line between, you know, representation and acting as counsel, as apparently Mr. Deegan conceives of

c

it. You know, I have suggested actions to him in the past, which he has not taken. And for some of the reasons that the Court has already highlighted, you know, is -- when we've that discussed his rationale has escaped me, but, nonetheless, there are things that he could have done. For example, you know, he's never filed, to my knowledge, he's never filed a motion for reduction of bond, and I was not permitted to as I understood the relationship that I had with him. There are -- I mean, that's a very -- seems like a very tenuous position for an attorney as things develop.

And, again, as the Court has stated, there is much about Mr. Deegan's position on all of these defenses that he's raised and other legal issues that he's raised that simply I don't understand the rationale, or simply disagree with the interpretation that's presented of various statutory or constitutional matters.

THE COURT: Well, and, of course, it's my understanding of the law of standby counsel is that there's supposed to be a clear -- clearly spelled out what standby counsel's obligations are. And I think the reason for the law is exactly as you just pointed out, is that you don't want to get the attorney in trouble and you don't want to interfere with the defendant's representations of himself.

So as of now, your obligation is to monitor the case, so that if Mr. Deegan has legal questions for you, you can

answer those questions. You are to assist him in, I don't want to say technical aspects, but the filing --

MR. OSHOWAY: Procedural.

THE COURT: Yeah, procedural aspects, in terms of how to request a subpoena, how to file motions properly, different things like that. But, you know, as Mr. Deegan specifically said, he doesn't need your assistance in terms of making objections during the presentation of evidence. So you don't need to do any legal research, unless he specifically asks you to do that, or file any motions, unless he specifically asks you to do that.

So hopefully I have delineated your responsibilities. If there is some area that you're not sure of, then I will try my best to be more specific in that area.

MR. OSHOWAY: Well, there is an area that concerns me, and you just touched on it just now. For example, Mr. Deegan might, and this is just an example, it's not a real life instance, Mr. Deegan might ask me to research littering law in California. And, you know, I would say, of course, why would you want me to research that, and he has a rationale for that, which, you know, in my view as an attorney doesn't make any sense, you know, it doesn't have any effect or impact on his case as I see it. That's a little bit -- that's kind of an extreme example. But, I mean, based on discussions I've had with Mr. Deegan and some of the people

that he's associated with, I can easily foresee, you know, requests to research matters that in my view have little or nothing to do with his case or cases. Am I obligated to conduct that research?

THE COURT: I don't want to inhibit Mr. Deegan's ability to present any type of defense or any type of argument before the Court. So, yes, unless and until we start running into, you know, a lot of expenses.

MR. OSHOWAY: Okay.

THE COURT: And at that point, just like in any case, you know, if it's a murder case, and you've got issues and you're running into a lot of expenses, or, you know, some other type of a case, then at that point you need to come back before the Court and say, hey, you know, I'm running into these expenses, and I just want to make sure that it's okay if I, you know, exceed the statutory limits, and, you know, all that.

MR. OSHOWAY: Okay.

THE COURT: But, you know, I don't want to -- I don't want to limit Mr. Deegan's ability to, you know, make an argument as to -- well, as to anything.

MR. OSHOWAY: Okay. Now, one last area of concern.

Your Honor stated that I didn't have to file any motions,

unless I was specifically requested to file a motion. If I

perceive a motion or other legal filing to be dilatory, or

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: You'll have to look at Rule 11.

MR. OSHOWAY: Okay.

THE COURT: Your obligat --- your ethical obligations to

MR. OSHOWAY: Right. And that's where I can perceive an ongoing conflict.

THE COURT: Well, if you believe that it is -- I mean, just like with any client, if any client says they want you to file something that you perceive to violate Rule 11, I don't know what the procedure is, because -- I mean, you know, I'm assuming you have to protect yourself. You would have to document that somehow and communicate with your client, I don't believe that this is an appropriate motion.

Mr. Deegan can file the motion, I'm not saying he can't file motions --

MR. OSHOWAY: Right.

THE COURT: -- I'm just saying you are there to advise him as to how to do it properly.

MR. OSHOWAY: Okay.

THE COURT: Because I suspect that the reason he hasn't heard anything from the Supreme Court is because it wasn't properly done, I mean, I don't know, and so it's probably just sitting down there. I don't know.

THE DEFENDANT: Oh, we've had responses in the case.

```
1
          THE COURT: Oh, okay.
 2
          THE DEFENDANT: I understand the rules and everything.
 3
     I can read.
         THE COURT: Okay. All right.
 4
 5
         THE DEFENDANT: Okay.
 6
         THE COURT: We have to do an arraignment in 16-F-25.
 7
    Mr. Deegan, have you received a copy of this indictment?
 8
         THE DEFENDANT: About twenty minutes ago.
 9
         THE COURT: Okay. And have you read it?
10
         THE DEFENDANT: I've read it.
11
         THE COURT: Okay. And discussed it with Mr. Oshoway?
12
         THE DEFENDANT: No, I haven't discussed it.
13
         THE COURT: Are you prepared to plead to this indictment
14
    then?
15
         THE DEFENDANT: No.
16
         THE COURT: How much time will it take for you to be
17
    prepared to plead to this indictment?
18
         THE DEFENDANT: I wouldn't be pleading to it. I would
19
    just initially challenge in personam subject matter,
20
    political and territorial jurisdiction.
21
         THE COURT: All right. The Court would interpret that
22
    as a not guilty plea.
23
         Trial?
24
        MR. ROGERS: February 23<sup>rd</sup>.
25
         THE COURT: Mr. Oshoway?
```

MR. OSHOWAY: I have a divorce hearing in Calhoun County 1 set for that day, but I'm sure I can move it. 3 THE COURT: So is February the 23rd acceptable or not 4 acceptable, Mr. Oshoway? 5 (Mr. Oshoway confers with the defendant.) 6 THE DEFENDANT: Absolutely not. I mean, I don't have --7 I haven't had an answer to anything, so I don't know what --8 MR. OSHOWAY: I believe we would ask for some additional 9 time. 10 MR. ROGERS: In this term? 11 THE COURT: Yes, in this term. 12 MR. ROGERS: March 15th? 13 MR. OSHOWAY: That's fine with my schedule. 14 THE COURT: Mr. Deegan, March 15? 15 THE DEFENDANT: When would they have to make answers to what I've submitted by, so that I know --16 17 THE COURT: See, I don't know what you submitted, so I don't know. Is March 15th an acceptable trial date? 18 19 THE DEFENDANT: Well, I'm not sure. I'm not sure. 20 THE COURT: All right. Well, we'll set it for 3/15/2016, and if you need -- if it's not acceptable, you can 21 22 make a motion to continue. 23 Any and all motions are to be filed on or before 24 February 19, with a notice attached to the motion setting the matter down for a hearing. 25

All right. Are we ready to proceed on the motion to revoke home confinement?

MR. ROGERS: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. OSHOWAY: Judge, I would point out that I received discovery in the home confinement case on Thursday of last week. There were a couple of days where I could have picked it up a day or two earlier, but, in fact, I wasn't able to pick it up until Thursday, and was not able to provide Mr. Deegan with a copy of the discovery until this morning.

Included with the discovery is two CDs. One, I believe, is transcribed in this discovery, the other is not, and I don't believe I can give Mr. Deegan a compact disc to take with him. So there's discovery that he hasn't seen. So as a result -- well, I just want the Court to be aware of that.

(Mr. Oshoway confers with the defendant.)

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, I need -- I absolutely need more time. I was not -- I requested pursuant to Rule 32.1, I believe it was (c), that the evidence that was going to be used against me at the revocation hearing would be provided, and I just got it this morning. I mean, I haven't even got to read through it. So I did ask in a timely manner.

THE COURT: Why was it provided so late?

MR. ROGERS: Your Honor, if I could for the record, discovery was available, I believe it was on January $14^{\rm th}$ or $15^{\rm th}$, one of those two days, I don't have that specific day in

front of me. I did receive those, all the documents, and complied it. I received them early in January.

The reason that I didn't mail it out, there was -- there were, as Mr. Oshoway stated, two discs. I wanted Mr. Oshoway to get that discovery as soon as possible. I knew that if I mailed it, it would take a while. As Mr. Oshoway stated, there was some miscommunication, and it wasn't picked up until the 21st.

THE COURT: Mr. Deegan, how much time do you need?

THE DEFENDANT: Well, there's a CD that has not been transcribed from the best I can tell from just look -- I mean, I only had a few minutes to look through it, but it looks like one whole CD has not been transcribed, and I do not believe that I have the means at the jail to be able to hear it.

THE COURT: How much is on that CD?

MR. ROGERS: Your Honor, that disc actually contains phone calls from the jail. There are a lot of phone calls on that disc. What I can do is provide just the few phone calls that I'll be using for this hearing on disc, and provide the exact files. And then that way it would be limited to probably only a couple -- probably a couple hours.

Now, what I'll tell the Court is, I'm not going to use the entire phone calls, but I'll provide that -- those phone calls would be a couple hours. I'd only be using a couple

```
1
    minutes' worth of the phone calls for purposes of this
 2
    hearing.
 3
         THE COURT: So how long will it take to transcribe the
 4
    phone calls that you're wanting to use for this hearing?
 5
         MR. ROGERS: I apologize, Your Honor, I'm not sure how
 6
    long that takes. I would assume maybe a week or two. I'm
 7
    not sure how fast they can get those transcribed.
         THE COURT: When you say "they," who are you talking
 8
 9
    about?
10
         MR. ROGERS: Whoever my office has transcribe.
11
         (Pause.)
12
         THE COURT: How is Friday, February the 19th, at one
13
    o'aloak?
14
         MR. OSHOWAY: Judge, I am in an abuse and neglect
15
    proceeding in Calhoun County at eleven o'clock that morning.
16
         THE COURT: Will that start at 11:00?
17
         MR. OSHOWAY: It will start at 11:00, or close to it.
18
         THE COURT: Will you go until you get finished?
19
         MR. OSHOWAY: It'll be fairly brief. It'll be -- it's
20
    not a review, it's a request for visitation by grandparents.
    So it won't --
21
22
         THE COURT: Do you have anything else scheduled that
23
    afternoon?
24
        MR. OSHOWAY: No.
25
         THE COURT: What time could you be here?
      11-F-101 & 16-F-25 - Mot. to Revoke Home Confinement & Arraignment (1/26/16)
```

MR. OSHOWAY: I could be here at 1:30. 1 2 THE COURT: Okay. How about 1:30 on Friday, February the 19^{th} ? 3 4 MR. ROGERS: Your Honor, since I have my witnesses here, 5 can I check with them? 6 THE COURT: Okay. 7 (Mr. Rogers leaves room, and returns.) MR. ROGERS: Your Honor, one of my witnesses has a trial in Putnam County that morning. He thinks he'd be available, 10 but it probably -- he says 1:30 would be pushing it. I don't 11 have a problem leaving it at this time, as long as the 12 Court's aware, and if we even may have to take a brief recess 13 to wait on the trooper to arrive. 14 THE COURT: Okay. Or at least we can get something 15 done. All right. We'll reset it then until Friday, February the 19^{th} , at 1:30. 16 17 And the phone calls that you're going to use, they need to be transcribed and provided to the defendant no later than 18 19 Friday, February the 5th. 20 21

MR. OSHOWAY: And, Judge, if I may, does that mean provided to me to provide to Mr. Deegan, or does that mean provided to Mr. Deegan.

THE COURT: No, no. Mr. Deegan's representing himself. You are standby counsel.

MR. OSHOWAY: Okay.

22

23

24

25

1 THE COURT: And your obligations don't have anything to 2 do with discovery. So discovery and all that needs to be 3 provided directly to the defendant, not to Mr. Oshoway, because he's not -- his duties as standby counsel don't have 4 anything to do with receiving discovery. 5 6 MR. OSHOWAY: I would ask that the State provide me with 7 a copy of what they provide Mr. Deegan. 8 THE COURT: Well, that's up to Mr. Deegan as to whether he wants you to get a copy. He may -- I mean, you know --9 10 all right. Anything else? 11 MR. ROGERS: No, Your Honor. 12 THE DEFENDANT: Yeah. Can I get some clarification? 13 You said that some of my filings were ramblings, and I would 14 just like clarification as to which ones those were. 15 THE COURT: Well, I don't have a bunch of those in front 16 of me right now, so I --THE DEFENDANT: Because there were approximately twenty 17 18 or so that have been filed in both matters. THE COURT: Well, I don't know of any that have been 19 filed in 16-F-25. I haven't received anything. 20 21 THE DEFENDANT: Well, that's because that's the new case 22 number. The case number I had was 15-B-328. At the present 23 time they were filed that was the case number, so they've

24

25

changed it since then again.

THE COURT: Yeah. I guess -- and I don't know whether 11-F-101 & 16-F-25 - Mot. to Revoke Home Confinement & Arraignment (1/26/16)

it's even in here now. Just the title of some of these. says, "Declaration and Notice of Rebuttals of a Silent Presumptions of Law;" "Declaration and Notice of Commercial Default and Dishonor; " "Declaration and Notice of Demand for Production, Demand and Order of Cease and Desist;" "Second Final Notice, Opportunity to Cure;" "Second Final Notice, Refusal for Cause Without Dishonor." Those things are --that's language that's not used in criminal courts, and that's, you know, where we are.

You indicate in here, let's see, I'm trying to find it. Here it is:

"I am not in custody by/of custodians, and/or guardians. I am not a persons, corporations and/or fictitional entities property. Under no circumstances may I be detained in any way, shape or form at any time and/or any place, nor at any time past, present and future, ab initio, in perpetuity."

You also say -- and this is just of the forty-some pages that were filed today.

THE DEFENDANT: What I filed today was a cross-complaint and counterclaim.

THE COURT: Sir, you asked me if I could provide you with some examples of what I am saying when I said it was hard to understand, and that's what I'm trying to do. I'm

11-F-101 & 16-F-25 - Mot. to Revoke Home Confinement & Arraignment (1/26/16)

1 not here to debate you on it, I'm just trying to tell you 2 what I --THE DEFENDANT: I know what I filed today. I'm talking 3 about -- you were talking about the past filings, I thought. 4 5 They were incorporated into today's filing by reference. 6 (Pause.) 7 THE COURT: Well, I must have left the -- the one that I 8 was just quoting from was received on the 12th of January. So 9 I don't have the one that I received today evidently in here. 10 THE DEFENDANT: I have a copy of it right here. It is 11 entitled, "Cross-complaint, Counterclaim, Criminal Complaint, Bill of True Accounting of the Trust." 12 13 THE COURT: It's not in here, but it contains similar language. And you talk about being a "real man with arms and 14 15 legs." I mean, you know, I don't know how to respond to 16 things like that, so that's what I'm talking about. 17 THE DEFENDANT: Well, that's from a judicial notice, and 18 that document is created by the government. So I'm using 19 their language, not mine. THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you. 20 (Proceeding ended at 11:16 a.m.) 21 22 23 24 25

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA, COUNTY OF WOOD, to-wit:

I, Cynthia A. Sutphin, Certified Electronic Reporter and Transcriber for the Circuit Court of Wood County, West Virginia, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the proceedings held in the matter of STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA, Plaintiff vs. THOMAS DEEGAN, Defendant, Case Nos. 11-F-101 and 16-F-25, as recorded by me on the 26th day of January, 2016.

Given under my hand this 10th day of February 2016.

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
COUNTY OF WOOD, to-wit:

I, Cynthia A. Sutphin, Certified Electronic Reporter and Transcriber for the Circuit Court of Wood County, West Virginia, do hereby certify that the transcript within meets the requirements of the Code of the State of West Virginia, Chapter 51, Article 7, Section 4 and all rules pertaining thereto as promulgated by the Supreme Court of Appeals.

CYNTHIA A. SUTPHIN, CER, CET

DATED: 2/10/16