IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE SIXTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA, IN AND FOR PINELLAS COUNTY CASE NUMBER CRC23-03157CFANO

STATE OF FLORIDA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

THOMAS ISAIAH MOSLEY,

Defendant.

PROCEEDINGS: HUNTER HEARING

BEFORE: THE HONORABLE SUSAN ST. JOHN

Circuit Court Judge

DATE: April 18, 2023

PLACE: Courtroom 4

Pinellas County Justice Center

14250 - 49th Street North Clearwater, Florida 33762

REPORTER: Carla Jessal

Registered Professional Reporter

(Pages 1 to 25)

Administrative Office of the Courts Court Reporting Department Pinellas County Justice Center 14250 - 49th Street North Clearwater, Florida 33762 Telephone: (727) 453-7233

Fax: (727) 453-7488

APPEARANCES

APPEARING ON BEHALF OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA:

CHRISTIE ELLIS, ASSISTANT STATE ATTORNEY
COURTNEY A. SULLIVAN, ASSISTANT STATE ATTORNEY
Office of Bruce Bartlett, State Attorney
Sixth Judicial Circuit, Pinellas County
14250 - 49th Street North
Clearwater, Florida 33762

APPEARING ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANT THOMAS ISAIAH MOSLEY:

JESSICA MANUELE, ASSISTANT PUBLIC DEFENDER MARGARET S. RUSSELL, ASSISTANT PUBLIC DEFENDER Office of Sara Mollo, Public Defender Sixth Judicial Circuit, Pinellas County 14250 - 49th Street North Clearwater, Florida 33762

* * *

(PROCEEDINGS) 1 2 (UNRELATED CASES WERE HEARD BUT NOT TRANSCRIBED) 3 THE COURT: I'm going to try to handle two 4 quick issues. They may not be quick, but I'm going 5 to try. 6 Can we see if Ms. Fletcher is ready to come in 7 from the back, please? 8 MS. MANUELE: Can we approach real quick, 9 Judge? 10 THE COURT: We sure can. THE COURT REPORTER: Do you want this on the 11 12 record? 13 MS. MANUELE: No. 14 (A SIDEBAR CONFERENCE WAS HAD OFF THE RECORD) 15 16 (UNRELATED CASES WERE HEARD BUT NOT TRANSCRIBED) 17 THE COURT: Did you have a chance to talk 18 with -- Ms. Manuele, did you have a chance to talk 19 with Mr. Mosley about what he wanted to do this 20 afternoon? 21 MS. MANUELE: We did, your Honor. We are --2.2 we, again, would be willing to waive his presence. 23 We are not in a position where we feel comfortable 24 with him answering any questions under oath.

Okay.

THE COURT:

25

MS. MANUELE: So if the Court would not allow us to waive his presence without doing a colloquy with him, then we -- we'll have him brought in.

THE COURT: Okay. So Mr. Mosley, if we can have him in and have him seated at counsel table please.

We're here on case number 23-03157, State of Florida versus Thomas Mosley.

(DEFENDANT ENTERED THE COURTROOM)

THE BAILIFF: This way.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Mosley is present and seated in the courtroom with both of his lawyers and the state attorney is present.

It's my understanding we're here today because the State has sent a subpoena for some records from St. Anthony's Hospital -- Mr. Mosley's records from St. Anthony's hospital, and defense has filed an objection to that motion. So that's -- that's all we're discussing today, correct?

MS. SULLIVAN: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. What I'm not sure is what is the scope of what it is you're trying to get?

MS. SULLIVAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: If you can explain that to me.

MS. SULLIVAN: Courtney Sullivan for the State 1 2 with Christie Ellis. 3 I would like to approach first with the 4 subpoena request that we made so your Honor can see 5 specifically what we're requesting. 6 THE COURT: Okay. Have you seen the -- I 7 assume you've seen the subpoena? 8 MS. RUSSELL: Yes, your Honor. 9 THE COURT: All right. 10 MS. RUSSELL: We have it. 11 THE COURT: Thank you. 12 All right. So having reviewed the subpoena, 13 is there anything more specific that you want to talk to me about? 14 15 MS. SULLIVAN: Just my argument and the 16 evidence I'd like to put on the record. 17 THE COURT: Can I ask you some questions? 18 MS. SULLIVAN: Yes. 19 THE COURT: All right. So is Mr. Mosley 20 admitted to the hospital on March 29th of '23? 2.1 MS. SULLIVAN: Yes. 2.2 THE COURT: Okay. How long does he stay 23 there? 24 MS. SULLIVAN: He stays there until he is 25 booked into the Pinellas County Jail on March 31st.

2.2

THE COURT: And are you aware of what sort of treatment he received at St. Anthony's Hospital?

MS. SULLIVAN: Yes. Our understanding is that he was admitted with the lacerations to his hands and his arms. He ultimately had to have surgery for those lacerations. And that was the extent, I believe, of his treatments while he was there. And he also was placed under a Baker Act.

THE COURT: Are you looking to obtain any medical records related to the Baker Act?

MS. SULLIVAN: Not at this time.

THE COURT: So is the scope of your subpoena simply wanting to obtain any medical treatment related to lacerations on his hands and arms, any treatment related to those, any surgery related to those, and the names of the folks who treated him for those specific injuries?

MS. SULLIVAN: And the blood work, toxicology.

THE COURT: Okay. And for Defense, with that understanding of the scope of what it is the State is attempting to obtain, are you objecting to all of it, part of it?

MS. RUSSELL: We're objecting to all of it, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything the State

1 wants to present? 2 MS. SULLIVAN: Yes, your Honor. So I provided 3 your Honor case law yesterday afternoon regarding 4 the State relying on the PC affidavit as part of 5 the evidence. 6 THE COURT: Uh-huh. 7 MS. SULLIVAN: I have those two for each of 8 the first degree murders that Mr. Mosley's been 9 charged with. I ask the Court to take judicial 10 notice of them. If I can approach with the two 11 affidavits. 12 THE COURT: Yes. And I assume Defense has 13 seen both of these? 14 MS. RUSSELL: Yes, your Honor. 15 THE COURT: Do you want to see them again 16 before I look at them? 17 MS. RUSSELL: I have them. 18 THE COURT: Okay. 19 MS. RUSSELL: We're aware. 20 THE COURT: And Mr. Mosley went through 2.1 advisories and probable cause was found, correct? 2.2 MS. SULLIVAN: He did. Judge Moore advised 23 him the Saturday morning that he was booked into 24 the Pinellas County Jail and PC was found on both

25

counts.

THE COURT: All right. These affidavits were previously submitted, obviously, at the time of his booking into the Pinellas County Jail. Probable cause was found. I'm reading them now finding probable cause as well. They were offered by Detective Brian Bilbrey and sworn to under perjury -- penalty of perjury per the affidavit.

MS. SULLIVAN: We do have a body cam video regarding -- if the State (sic) wants to see it. I can represent to the Court in argument what that statement is, but we do have it. It's a statement regarding getting the toxicology records.

Anything else the State wants to submit?

THE COURT: A statement from who?

MS. SULLIVAN: Lakita Denson. It's the victim Pashun Jeffery's mother. She gives a statement to the police shortly after it's discovered that Ms. Jeffery is deceased in her apartment. And during that statement she indicates that she, along with other family members and including the defendant, were at Pashun Jeffery's apartment around 4:00 and 5:00 p.m. the date of the homicides, and during that time they were smoking marijuana. So that's her statement. And based on case law and showing the relevancy to the

toxicology records, specifically, the State would 1 2 need to provide some evidence, informed statements 3 or any other observations that there would be drug 4 or alcohol use. And that would be a statement made 5 that within hours of this homicide occurring that 6 there was some marijuana use. 7 THE COURT: Okay. So are you wanting to admit 8 that as evidence and have me watch it today? 9 MS. SULLIVAN: Yes, that was what I -- we put it on a disk so I can move it in evidence. 10 11 THE COURT: All right. Any objection? Have 12 you seen it? 13 MS. RUSSELL: Your Honor, we haven't seen the 14 CD. 15 THE COURT: Okay. Do you want to watch it now 16 before I see it? 17 MS. RUSSELL: Yes, we'd like to. 18 THE COURT: Okay. 19 MS. RUSSELL: And in fact, if it's lengthy, we 20 could recess --2.1 MS. SULLIVAN: It's not. 2.2 MS. RUSSELL: -- the hearing until another 23 time. 24 MS. SULLIVAN: It's one minute. 25 MS. RUSSELL: Okay.

THE COURT: Okay. So is there -- I assume 1 2 there's audio to it? MS. SULLIVAN: There is audio. And because 3 4 I'm having to do it on my own office laptop because 5 this laptop was not working, I may have to walk it 6 up to you when you do it. 7 THE COURT: Okay. Well, I want defense to 8 watch it first. So I can step out. You-all can 9 watch it. I'll take a couple minutes. I'll come 10 back in and you can let me know you've seen it and 11 we'll argue as to whether or not it's admissible or 12 not. Okay? 13 MS. RUSSELL: Excellent. 14 THE COURT: All right. I'll be back in a 15 minute. 16 THE BAILIFF: All rise. 17 (RECESS) 18 THE BAILIFF: All rise. Circuit court is back 19 in session. 20 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. You can 21 have a seat. 2.2 THE BAILIFF: Please be seated. 23 THE COURT: All right. Has Defense had an 24 opportunity to see the video? 25 MS. RUSSELL: Yes, we did, your Honor.

All right. And, Ms. Sullivan, do 1 THE COURT: 2 you have that marked? 3 MS. SULLIVAN: I can, but once I take it out 4 of here. 5 THE COURT: Oh. Well --6 MS. SULLIVAN: It's still in my --7 THE COURT: -- what are you going to call it, State's Exhibit 1? Any objection to State's 1? 8 9 MS. RUSSELL: Well, yes, your Honor. 10 know, we think that it's not relevant to the 11 subject of the subpoena. So we object to its being 12 admitted. 13 THE COURT: Okay. I don't know that I'm going to know that until we see it. 14 15 MS. RUSSELL: Right. 16 THE COURT: All right. So let's play it. 17 MS. SULLIVAN: Do you mind if I walk it up to 18 your Honor to --19 THE COURT: No, I don't mind. 20 So, madam clerk, we'll need a tag for State's 21 Exhibit 1, please. 2.2 THE CLERK: Yes, your Honor. 23 MS. SULLIVAN: The beginning part is silent 24 because the body cam audio hasn't kicked on. 25 sure it's loud enough for you.

(STATE'S EXHIBIT 1 WAS PUBLISHED TO THE COURT. 1 2 TO POOR QUALITY OF THE RECORDING, INABILITY TO DISTINGUISH 3 SPEAKERS, SPEED OF CONVERSATION AND/OR SIMULTANEOUS 4 SPEAKING, THE FOLLOWING TRANSCRIPTION IS NOT A VERBATIM 5 RECORD OF SAID VIDEO) 6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What's up? I just 7 heard (unintelligible) I just heard 8 (unintelligible) and the baby. Yesterday it 9 happened (unintelligible) birthday. Yesterday was 10 her baby's daddy birthday. Tom, it was his 11 birthday. 12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Do you know if they 13 were drinking or anything? 14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I just know they were 15 smoking. 16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Smoking weed? 17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes. 'Cause I -- I --18 I smoke with 'em --19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. 20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- yesterday. 21 while he's open up his gifts and, um, they was 2.2 sitting there on the couch. 23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. 24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And then she come. We 25 was eating ice cream and stuff. And I go, okay,

I'm fittin' to go (unintelligible). 1 2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You gotta be. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Go call your dad back 3 4 'cause he worry. I been had him on his -- on the 5 alert (unintelligible). 6 (PUBLISHING CONCLUDED) 7 THE COURT: All right. So I viewed State's 8 Exhibit 1, body cam video. Remind me who was that 9 was again, please. 10 MS. SULLIVAN: That was Lakita, L-A-K-I-T-A, That is the mother of victim 11 12 Pashun Jeffery. And that is body cam that was 13 taken on March 30th of 2023, the day that 14 Ms. Jeffery was discovered deceased in her 15 apartment. THE COURT: Okay. Anything else the State is 16 17 seeking to introduce? 18 MS. SULLIVAN: Not in terms of evidence, 19 your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Did you want to have these 2.1 affidavits marked? 2.2 MS. SULLIVAN: Yes. And I guess we can call those two and three. 23 24 THE COURT: Okay. Any objections to two and 25 three?

MS. RUSSELL: No, your Honor. 1 2 THE COURT: All right. 3 (STATE'S EXHIBIT NUMBERS 1, 2, AND 3 WERE RECEIVED IN 4 EVIDENCE) 5 THE COURT: And, obviously, the State has the 6 burden here, but did Defense wish to admit anything 7 into evidence? I don't know that you would in a 8 hearing like this, but I wanted to offer you that opportunity if there's something you wanted me to 9 view or review. 10 MS. RUSSELL: Thank you, your Honor. No, we 11 12 don't have anything except the cases that we 13 e-mailed earlier yesterday. 14 THE COURT: Yes, thank you. And I've read all 15 the cases you-all have sent me. 16 All right. So let's get to -- anything else 17 before we get to argument? 18 MS. SULLIVAN: Not from the State. 19 THE COURT: Anything else before we do argument? 20 2.1 MS. RUSSELL: No, your Honor. THE COURT: All right. Ms. Sullivan, are you 2.2 23 doing the argument? 24 MS. SULLIVAN: Yes. 25 THE COURT: Okay.

MS. SULLIVAN: So, your Honor, based on all the case law, it's pretty consistent across the board that the State's burden is to show a reasonable founded suspicion that the materials that we are seeking are relevant to an ongoing criminal investigation.

First, in terms of what we just watched on the body cam, the reason why the State provided that specific evidence of the statement by Lakita Denson is because in the Rodriguez v. State case that was provided by the defense to your Honor, it says that linking the relevance of toxicology records, it's important to have statements from witnesses who observed the person whose records are being sought close in time to the crime.

And that's what we have with Lakita Denson. She makes in her statement she was with the defendant just prior to both the homicides. And she makes reference that the defendant was smoking marijuana along with her and the victim. So that's why we provided that actual evidence of a statement because that Rodriguez case requires that when you're discussing toxicology records.

In terms of the rest of the records, the medical records and the treatment records regarding

his injuries, the State relies on the probable cause affidavits of both Taylen Mosley and Pashun Jeffery. What's important in that affidavit is it sets out the timeline of events that occurred that evening and that the defendant showed up to the hospital within hours of these homicides occurring with the deep laceration wounds to both of his hands that ultimately required surgery.

We know from the probable cause affidavit that your Honor is relying on that the victim,

Pashun Jeffery, was found deceased in her apartment stabbed many times by a knife. And then at 9:03 p.m. this defendant shows up at his parents' house with the severe lacerations and his brother Isaac drives him to St. Anthony's Hospital.

So based on the affidavit and how we know

Pashun Jeffery was killed that day, these medical

records are relevant because it will give the State

information in its investigation as to the

treatment, how severe these injuries were, how they

had to be treated, what the surgery entailed, all

of that information which is highly relevant to our

crimes of first degree murder.

In addition, the timeline being so close to when these homicides occurred, any statements made

to treating physicians about how these injuries occurred by the defendant are relevant. Statements made about why he was at the hospital with what appeared to be knife slippage wounds according to the PC affidavit that you're referring to.

We aren't asking for the records -- I want to make clear because case law discusses this -- in anticipation of any defenses. That's not why we're asking for these records. We're asking for them because they are very relevant to our investigation and our charges of first degree murder. And that's why I told your Honor we weren't at this point asking for anything regarding Baker Act records. These are purely medical treatment records by the physicians, the nurses that treated him, the statements that they obtained from him in diagnosing his injuries, what treatment he received, and his toxicology results.

That's all at this time, your Honor.

THE COURT: So if I'm understanding your argument correctly, you believe that his injuries that he was treated for at St. Anthony's Hospital were the result of slippage due to the stabbing?

MS. SULLIVAN: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Defense?

MS. RUSSELL: Your Honor, at this point we're talking about a probable cause that a murder -- or two murders occurred. There have been no formal charges filed in this case.

And the State has heavy burden. They have to show not only relevance, but actually a specific closely tailored nexus between the records and the elements of the crime that they are seeking to prove.

Now, in most of the cases cited by defense, they are DUI cases that have to deal with toxicology. You can see why there would be a close nexus in a case like that. Here we're talking about murder. And the two cases that I sent to the Court, Tyson, 114 So.3d 443, and Faber, 157 So.3d 429, are both murder cases where the State sought a broad subpoena for medical records. And in both of those cases the subpoena was quashed and found to be issued in error because people were indicted and charged with first degree murder, and no insanity defense or any affirmative defense had been noticed. And --

THE COURT: But in the *Tyson* case they requested medical records that were over 17 years old from various different entities. I think the

issue there was the broad scope and not narrowly tailored, right?

MS. RUSSELL: Exactly, broad scope, narrowly tailored, but they did -- they did request medical records over a long period of time, including ones that were supposedly tied to the murder.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. RUSSELL: Okay? And in Faber, same thing, insufficient nexus for the very broad scope.

When we're talking about toxicology, right, in this case it's very difficult for me to understand why the State would think that toxicology would have anything to do with the elements of a murder charge.

Moving forward, in the words of the subpoena itself, they are seeking all medical records of diagnosis and treatment of patient Thomas Isaiah Mosley. Treatment date commencing on or about 3/29, to include, but not limited to: Blood analysis, toxicology, the names of all treating physicians and nurses, and observations and all notes.

This is an exceptionally broad subpoena that is in no way narrowly tailored to give the State what it needs and balance Mr. Mosley's critical

privacy rights that are protected by the Florida and the United States constitutions.

I'd like to also reinforce the fact that many of the State's rationales for requesting these records are actually cumulative. The very probable cause affidavits that they have say that there have been stab wounds to his hands.

This is actually referenced in the affidavit where it says: At approximately 2103 hours, the defendant arrived sat his mother's house with severe lacerations to both of his hands and arms consistent with injuries caused by the slippage during knife attack.

So if they already have that fact by probable cause in the affidavit, these medical records are actually cumulative and there's no reason to violate Mr. Mosley's privacy rights by providing the State with additional cumulative evidence.

If Mr. Mosley's privacy rights are violated by this broad disclosure, it will cause irreparable harm. And all the appellate cases say there is no way to put the toothpaste back in the tube should you grant this overly broad subpoena.

I'd just like to add, your Honor, that we also believe that even if you're inclined to allow this

overly broad subpoena, that the subpoena would really be premature at this point because the State has not filed formal charges against Mr. Mosley and at this point we have no discovery and no understanding of whether there might have been issues relating toe custodial interrogation at the

Finally, if by any chance you are inclined to grant the subpoena, we would ask for an in-camera review of the hospital records so that you could determine whether or not the records are potentially relevant and narrowly tailored before they are actually turned over to the State.

That's all I have. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Anything else that you wanted to add,

Ms. Sullivan?

hospital.

MS. SULLIVAN: Yes, your Honor. I just want to put one case on the record in reference to what Ms. Russell just cited. It's on point with what she was just discussing, so I want to make a record. If I may approach with that because I didn't provide it to you before.

THE COURT: Sure.

MS. SULLIVAN: It's State v. Rivers. It's a

2.1

2.2

Second DCA case, 787 So.2d 952. And it's just a response to what Ms. Russell just argued that it's cumulative what the State is asking for.

This case specifically addresses that issue when in a DUI case the State already had legal blood but then was asking for medical blood. And it states that that does not preclude the State from getting that additional medical blood and it is not, in fact, a cumulative argument. It is not a good basis to deny our request for medical records.

THE COURT: Is it the State's position that

Mr. Mosley was under the influence of narcotics at
the time of the offense?

MS. SULLIVAN: We don't know. And the State's position is to either corroborate or refute the statement made by Lakita Denson regarding that.

Our position is that we've established -- our burden is to establish a relevancy to ask for those results based on the statements that he may or may not have been smoking do marijuana. Whether or not that leads to other things in the future, it is still part of our investigation.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. I'm going to prepare a written order. I'm not going to rule

So if you like, I can give you a status 1 today. 2 check in a week or so for that. Does the State have any sort of timeline on 3 4 when you expect to file? Do you have a timeline as 5 to when you expect to file? 6 MS. SULLIVAN: It will be within the next 30 7 days, your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Is there any day of the week that is better for you-all to come in? 9 10 MS. MANUELE: We're here always. 11 MS. RUSSELL: Yes. 12 MS. SULLIVAN: It just depends, your Honor, on 13 the week, but --14 THE COURT: Okay. Well, let me pick a day and 15 see what works for -- if it works for you-all. 16 May 5? 17 MS. SULLIVAN: That's fine, your Honor. 18 MS. RUSSELL: Yes, your Honor. That's fine 19 with me. 20 THE COURT: For both of --21 MS. RUSSELL: Yes, it's fine. 2.2 THE COURT: Okay. Great. May 5th, 8:45. 23 That will be a status check. I guess I can do 8:30 24 status check on order related to medical records 25 for Mr. Mosley.

All right. Anything else we need to discuss 1 2 for Mr. Mosley at this time? 3 MS. SULLIVAN: Not for the State, your Honor. 4 MS. MANUELE: No, your Honor. Can we waive 5 his appearance for the May 5th status check? 6 THE COURT: For the status check? 7 Mr. Mosley wants to affirmatively waive that on the record, he can do that. 8 My preference would be that he is here. If he 9 10 wants to waive it, he'd have to under oath tell me 11 he doesn't want to be here. This is a serious case 12 and I'm not willing to allow his appearance to be 13 waived without him indicating that's what he wants 14 to do. 15 MS. MANUELE: He is indicating that he is fine 16 not coming. 17 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Mosley, I need you 18 to stand up and raise your right hand for me. 19 MS. MANUELE: He'll -- he indicated he'll just 20 come, your Honor. 2.1 THE COURT: Okay. All right. See everyone 2.2 back here May 5th at 8:30. Thank you. 23 MS. SULLIVAN: Thank you. 24 (HEARING CONCLUDED) 25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

STATE OF FLORIDA)

COUNTY OF PINELLAS)

I, Carla Jessal, Registered Professional Reporter, certify that I was authorized to and did stenographically report the foregoing proceedings and that the transcript is a true record.

DATED this 12th day of April, 2023.

/S <u>Carla Jessal</u>
Carla Jessal
Registered Professional Reporter