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. VOLUME I

THOMAS MOSLEY,

Defendant.

PROCEEDINGS: COMPETENCY HEARING

BEFORE: THE HONORABLE SUSAN ST. JOHN

Circuit Court Judge

DATE: August 19, 2025

PLACE: Courtroom 2

Pinellas County Justice Center

14250 - 49th Street North Clearwater, Florida 33762

REPORTER: Linda K. Fritsch

Registered Merit Reporter

(Pages 1 to 65)

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

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 MOSLEY:

JULIA B. SEIFER-SMITH, ASSISTANT PUBLIC DEFENDER Office of Sara Mollo, Public Defender Sixth Judicial Circuit, Pinellas County 14250 - 49th Street North Clearwater, Florida 33762

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

\* \* \*

# INDEX TO PROCEEDINGS PAGE VOLUME I (AUGUST 19, 2025) STATE'S WITNESSES - CONT'D: BRIAN BILBREY Direct Examination by Ms. Sullivan 12 Cross-Examination by Ms. Seifer-Smith 15 OHIANA TORREALDAY Direct Examination by Ms. Ellis 19 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER 65

# INDEX OF EXHIBITS

STATE EXHIBITS	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
8	Flash drive - rap videos	15
9	Report and CV	21

### 

# 

### PROCEEDINGS

## **VOLUME I**

THE COURT: Good afternoon, everybody. We are here on Thomas Mosley, 23-03157.

Mr. Mosley is present with his lawyers, the state attorneys are present, and we are continuing our competency evidentiary hearing.

It's my understanding, from looking at the schedule you-all provided to me, that Dr. Torrealday is scheduled to testify today.

Is that correct?

MS. SULLIVAN: Yes, your Honor. And with the Court's permission, prior to that, I have added Detective Bilbrey, briefly, this morning, regarding some evidence the State would be requesting to move in. So, if possible, we can do that before we start Torrealday.

THE COURT: Okay. Before we get to that issue, let's just talk about scheduling for a moment. We are low on court reporters, so we're going to have a hard stop at noon, and then we're getting a new court reporter at 1:30.

MS. SULLIVAN: Okay.

THE COURT: So that's gonna be our schedule -- plus, everybody needs to eat lunch, including

1 Mr. Mosley, so that's how we're going to proceed. 2 Okay? 3 All right. Did you want to take Detective Bilbrey first? 4 5 MS. SULLIVAN: If that's okay with you. 6 THE COURT: Okay. 7 MS. SEIFER-SMITH: We have some objections 8 to --9 THE COURT: Okay. 10 MS. SEIFER-SMITH: -- Detective Bilbrey. 11 don't know if your Honor would like to do those 12 now? 13 THE COURT: If it's something we need to do 14 ahead of time, sure. 15 First, tell me what it is you're going to have 16 him testify to. 17 MS. SULLIVAN: He is testifying to his review 18 of two rap videos, that I will be seeking to move 19 into evidence --20 THE COURT: Okay. 21 MS. SULLIVAN: -- in which Mr. Mosley is part 22 of the rap videos, solely to authenticate that he's 23 viewed them, and they're accurate, what he viewed, 24 and that he is familiar with Mr. Mosley, through 25 this investigation, and can represent that that is,

1 in fact, Mr. Mosley in those videos. 2 THE COURT: Okay. 3 And the objection to that is what? 4 MS. SEIFER-SMITH: So, the videos were 5 provided to us on Friday. 6 THE COURT: Okay. 7 MS. SEIFER-SMITH: Detective Bilbrey was --8 "provided" is not the right word -- the State 9 indicated they were going to call Detective 10 Bilbrey, for this purpose, about an hour or so ago. 11 Detective Bilbrey has not been deposed. 12 concerned about what he's going to be testifying 13 to. 14 We are also going to object to these videos 15 coming in at all. They are not relevant. 16 believe they have been marked as an exhibit, but 17 your Honor would be able to see that these are 18 YouTube videos that were done well prior to 19 Mr. Mosley having been arrested. 20 As your Honor knows, competency is a 21 here-and-now determination, so looking at these 22 videos from many years ago is not relevant to the 2.3 particular question of what we're here to do today. 24 THE COURT: Okay.

Moreover, any kind of

MS. SEIFER-SMITH:

testimony from Detective Bilbrey, beyond an identification that a person on the video is in fact Mr. Mosley, would be completely inappropriate.

There should be absolutely nothing in terms of, you know, talking about the content, the capabilities, what was done, et cetera. There's nothing to indicate that Mr. Mosley was involved in the production of these videos.

Simply -- I mean, as his attorney, I can see that that is him, several years ago. He certainly looks younger. We can't tell if it's actually him speaking on the video. We know nothing about how the video was produced, whether or not he participated in the writing of any of this, the mixing of any of this, nothing whatsoever.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. SEIFER-SMITH: So our position would be, that this evidence is completely irrelevant and inappropriate in this particular context.

And we'd object to -- if your Honor is going to insist on viewing this, we're going to insist, too, that Detective Bilbrey be totally limited in his testimony, only to what Ms. Sullivan has indicated: Identify himself; that he was involved in the initial investigation; and because of that

familiarity with Mr. Mosley, having never met him before the investigation began, that he can look at the video, just like your Honor can, and say whether or not that person is, in fact, Mr. Mosley, having sat with Mr. Mosley at counsel table for an extended period of time.

THE COURT: Okay.

What's your response?

MS. SULLIVAN: First, just a fair representation of, factually, what occurred, regarding discovery, this witness, and the evidence.

When I located the videos on Friday, within an hour, I sent an Evidence.com download link to Defense, so they would have the two videos that I'm asking be moved into evidence. Within ten minutes of that, I did additional discovery, where I listed Detective Bilbrey as a witness, with the videos.

It was just prior to coming in here, I let them know, for scheduling purposes, that it may be easier just to put him on first. But, they've had notice. I don't want it to seem like I just sprung it on them, by calling Detective Bilbrey, this morning. I did not do that; I would not do that.

I also just had a conversation with

MS. SULLIVAN: That's okay.

Ms. Seifer-Smith about what I would be asking

Detective Bilbrey, which is exactly what I just

relayed to your Honor, that it's purely

authentication, to move it into evidence.

I figured they would want a witness here, to do that, instead of just doing it directly, since this is how this hearing has gone, and I respect that.

I have no -- I think they speak for themself. You can weigh it however you want, like all the other evidence in this hearing, and I simply am going to ask him if he's familiar with Mr. Mosley, and if that's Mr. Mosley on the videos, and that's the end of it. I'm not going to ask him to comment on the content of the videos.

THE COURT: Okay.

Anything else that you would like to put on the record, Ms. Seifer-Smith?

MS. SEIFER-SMITH: Your Honor, I apologize.

I'm just looking at the docket. I apologize. I

did not know that Detective Bilbrey was listed on

Friday; and, in fact, he was. I know we have been
having docketing issues, so I was not aware that he
was listed previously. I apologize.

THE COURT: There's been some complications,

I think, with the new programming everybody is

using. So --

MS. SEIFER-SMITH: That is very diplomatic, to say "complications."

THE COURT: I will allow Detective Bilbrey to testify, and it's hard for me to make a decision about relevancy, without actually seeing it.

This isn't a jury trial, so it's just me, so I've got to make evidentiary issues. And I can't unring the bell. I have to see it, to make a decision whether it's relevant or not, or germane to this case.

Having said that, the issue of intellectual disability has been raised, and, as just about every doctor has testified to, historical data is incredibly important in making that decision, which includes school records from the third grade, medical records, things he did as a child, and much earlier on. So it seems like this may or may not offer some assistance to the Court, in making that determination.

So, if you want to start with Detective Bilbrey, I'll allow that testimony now.

MS. SULLIVAN: Thank you.

1 The State would call Detective Brian Bilbrey. 2 THE BAILIFF: Right this way, sir. Stand 3 here. Raise your right hand and receive the oath, 4 please. 5 6 THEREUPON, 7 BRIAN BILBREY, 8 the witness herein, having been first duly sworn, was 9 examined and testified as follows: 10 11 THE BAILIFF: Right this way, sir. You may 12 Speak loud and clear into the have a seat. 13 microphone. 14 THE COURT: Ms. Sullivan, whenever you're 15 ready. 16 MS. SULLIVAN: Thank you. 17 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. SULLIVAN: 18 19 Good morning. Q. 20 Good morning. Α. 21 Can you please introduce yourself, and spell Q. 22 your last name for the Court Reporter. 23 My name is Brian Bilbrey, B-I-L-B-R-E-Y. Α. 24 And where are you employed? Q. 25 I'm currently employed with the City of Α.

St. Petersburg Police Department. 1 2 Q. In what capacity? I'm a detective in the Major Crimes Unit. 3 And how long have you been in Major Crimes? 4 0. 5 Α. Um, about nine years. 6 Q. All right. 7 Were you a part of a double homicide 8 investigation, that led to the arrest of a Thomas Mosley? 9 Α. I was. 10 In what capacity were you assigned to that case? Q. 11 I was the lead investigator. Α. 12 During that investigation, did you come into Q. 13 contact with Thomas Mosley? 14 I did. Α. 15 On how many occasions? Q. 16 At least two. Α. 17 All right. And where was that? Q. 18 One was in the hospital, right after surgery. Α. 19 Um, the second was, um, at the jail, when we were getting 20 a buccal swab, I believe. 21 Okay. Do you see Mr. Mosley in the courtroom, 0. 22 today? 23 I do. Α. 24 Can you please identify him for the record? Q. 25 He's wearing an orange jumpsuit with white Α.

sleeves, um, has long dreads, seated at the table there. 1 2 Q. All right. 3 Did you have an opportunity, at the end of last 4 week, to review two YouTube rap videos? 5 Α. I did. 6 Q. All right. And did you see anyone familiar to 7 you, in those videos? 8 Uh, Mr. Mosley. Α. 9 All right. Q. 10 MS. SULLIVAN: May I approach the Clerk? 11 THE COURT: Yes. 12 MS. SULLIVAN: May I approach the witness? 13 THE COURT: Yes. 14 BY MS. SULLIVAN: 15 Detective, I'm showing you what's been premarked Q. 16 as State's Exhibit 8. Can you take a look at this, the 17 contents inside, and tell me if you recognize it? 18 Yes. That's my signature, and that's the flash Α. 19 drive. 20 Have you reviewed this flash drive? Q. 21 I have. Α. 22 And do they accurately reflect the two YouTube Q. 23 rap videos, that you were asked to review? 24 They do. Α. 25 And are your initials and the date on this Q.

```
envelope?
 1
 2
          Α.
               They are.
               All right.
 3
          Q.
               MS. SULLIVAN: And at this time, the State
 4
 5
          would seek to move into evidence what's been
          premarked as State's 8, as State's 8.
 6
 7
               THE COURT: Any additional objections to
 8
          State's 8?
 9
               MS. SEIFER-SMITH: No. Same objection, as
10
          to relevance.
11
               THE COURT: It will be admitted.
12
          (STATE'S EXHIBIT NUMBER 8 WAS RECEIVED IN EVIDENCE)
13
               MS. SULLIVAN: No further questions.
14
          you, Detective.
15
               THE COURT:
                            Okay.
16
               Any cross-examination?
17
               MS. SEIFER-SMITH: If I could just beg a
18
          moment?
19
               THE COURT: Yes.
20
                          CROSS-EXAMINATION
21
     BY MS. SEIFER-SMITH:
22
               Good morning.
          Q.
23
               Good morning.
          Α.
24
               How are you?
          Q.
25
               I'm fine.
          Α.
```

1 Q. Good. 2 Were those videos located by yourself, or by somebody at the State Attorney's Office and sent to you? 3 4 Α. Um, I have memorialized them recently, in 5 Evidence.com. 6 Q. Okay. 7 I have known about the videos since the time of 8 the crime. 9 Okay. Did you do any further investigation Q. 10 regarding the videos themselves? 11 Just memorializing them recently. Α. 12 And when you say "memorializing," you mean like Q. 13 uploading them to Evidence.com? 14 Just copying them; making copies and putting 15 them into evidence. 16 Okay. So you didn't do any investigation to Ο. 17 determine, like, the other people, who were in the videos? 18 I did not. Α. 19 Okay. You didn't look into the production team Q. 20 that produced the videos? 21 Α. No. 22 Okay. You didn't seek the raw footage of the Q. 23 videos from the production team? 24 I did not. Α.

So the only thing that you can testify

25

Q.

Okay.

to, with regards to those videos, are that you viewed 2 them. Right? 3 Α. Correct. And that one of the people on those videos is 4 5 somebody who has become known to you as Thomas Mosley, 6 through your investigation. Is that right? 7 Correct. Α. 8 Okay. And obviously, those videos were made Q. 9 well in advance of Mr. Mosley's arrest in this case? 10 Um, it didn't have an exact date on the YouTube Α. 11 videos, when they were posted, so I know that they were 12 prior to the arrest, but I don't know how far in advance. 1.3 Q. Okay. 14 MS. SEIFER-SMITH: If I could just beg one 15 more moment of the Court's indulgence? 16 THE COURT: Sure. 17 MS. SEIFER-SMITH: Nothing else. Thank you. 18 THE COURT: Any redirect? 19 MS. SULLIVAN: No, your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Thank you, Detective. THE WITNESS: 21 Thank you. 22 MS. SULLIVAN: May I approach the Clerk? 2.3 Do you have a copy? THE COURT: 24 MS. SULLIVAN: Yes. 25 And that was State's 8? THE COURT:

1	MS. SULLIVAN: Yes.
2	THE COURT: Do I need anything in particular,
3	to view this?
4	MS. SULLIVAN: It plays online, in various
5	computers, so it should be okay.
6	THE COURT: Okay.
7	All right. Anything else before
8	Dr. Torrealday?
9	MS. SULLIVAN: Not from the State.
10	THE COURT: Anything else?
11	MS. SEIFER-SMITH: Not from Defense.
12	THE COURT: All right.
13	Dr. Torrealday, come on up.
14	THE BAILIFF: Right this way, ma'am. Please
15	stand here. Face the Clerk. Raise your right hand
16	and receive the oath, please.
17	
18	THEREUPON,
19	OHIANA TORREALDAY, PH.D.,
20	the witness herein, having been first duly sworn, was
21	examined and testified as follows:
22	
23	THE BAILIFF: Right this way, ma'am. Have a
24	seat. Speak clear and loud into the microphone,
25	please.

```
1
               THE WITNESS:
                             Thank you.
 2
               THE COURT: All right. Ms. Ellis, whenever
 3
          you're ready.
                         DIRECT EXAMINATION
 4
 5
     BY MS. ELLIS:
 6
          Q.
               Doctor, can you please introduce yourself to
 7
     the court?
 8
               Yes. My name is Ohiana Torrealday.
 9
               And can you spell your first and last name?
10
               Absolutely. It's O-H-I-A-N-A; last name is
11
     T-O-R-R-E-A-L-D-A-Y.
12
               And did you write a report in this case,
          Q.
13
     "Thomas Mosley," after doing several evaluations?
14
               I did write a report, yes.
15
               Okay.
          Q.
16
               MS. ELLIS:
                          May I approach the Clerk?
17
               THE COURT:
                          Yes.
18
               MS. ELLIS: And let the record reflect, I'm
19
          showing Defense what's been premarked as State's
20
          Exhibit 9 and --.
21
               THE COURT: Is there more than one report?
22
               MS. ELLIS:
                          There is one report and a CD.
23
               THE COURT:
                           Oh, okay. Are they both
24
          Exhibit 9?
25
                            I'm sorry?
               MS. ELLIS:
```

1 THE COURT: They're both Exhibit 9? 2 MS. ELLIS: They are. 3 May I approach the witness? 4 THE COURT: Yes. 5 BY MS. ELLIS: 6 Q. Doctor, if you can please look through that. 7 And does that fairly and accurately depict your 8 findings and your evaluation in the case? 9 Yes, it looks like my report. Α. 10 Okay. And in the back, what is that? Q. 11 C.V. Α. 12 Q. Okay. 13 MS. ELLIS: And, your Honor, I did find one 14 mark on this. I was going to make a complete clean 15 copy of this report. So I'm going to give -- it's 16 the same copy as this other, then. 17 Do you want to see this again, as well, to be 18 clear? 19 Did you write on it? THE COURT: 20 MS. ELLIS: It had, like, a check. That's it. 21 But I wanted it to be clean. 22 THE COURT: I appreciate that. BY MS. ELLIS: 23 24 Is that fairly and accurately, your report? Q. 25 Α. Yes, it is.

1 MS. ELLIS: At this time, the State would be 2 moving into evidence what's been premarked as State's Exhibit 9, as State's Exhibit 9? 3 4 THE COURT: Any objection to State's 9? 5 MS. SEIFER-SMITH: None. 6 THE COURT: It will be admitted as such. 7 (STATE'S EXHIBIT NUMBER 9 WAS RECEIVED IN EVIDENCE) 8 BY MS. ELLIS: 9 Doctor, can you please tell us about your 10 training and experience to become a clinical psychologist? 11 Sure. Following completion of an undergraduate Α. 12 degree in psychology, I attended graduate school and 13 obtained a master's and a doctorate in Clinical 14 Psychology, from Auburn University, um, and completed an 15 internship at the University of Tennessee Medical School; 16 and then did postdoctoral training, at Brown, in juvenile 17 forensics. 18 Okay. And when did you finish your psychology Ο. 19 doctorate? 20 In 2004. Α. 21 And you've been practicing as a psychologist, 22 since then? 23 Yes, ma'am. Α. 24 What type of psychology do you primarily 0.

25

practice?

1 Um, clinical and forensic. Α. 2 Q. And can you tell us what clinical psychology is? 3 Α. Sure. Evaluation also includes treatment, 4 although I am not providing direct treatment services 5 right now, but doing evaluation for diagnostic reasons. 6 Referrals can come from different sources. It could come 7 from the school or agencies. I'm looking to see if 8 there's any mental health treatment needs that need 9 diagnoses for an individual, and making a recommendation. 10 Okay. And what is forensic psychology? Ο. 11 Doing evaluations for those individuals that are 12 involved with the court system. 13 And in the past 20 years, do you have any number 14 of approximately how many evaluations you did, for both 15 clinical and forensic psychology? 16 A couple thousand. Um, there was a period of 17 time that I was doing more academic and administrative, 18 but I have done many evaluations for juveniles and adults. 19 MS. SEIFER-SMITH: Excuse me, I'm so sorry. 20 Your Honor, would you be able to let our 21 mitigation specialist in. She's in the waiting 2.2 room. 2.3 THE COURT: Yes.

MS. SEIFER-SMITH:

THE COURT:

Thank you very much.

Give me a second to turn Zoom on.

24

```
1
               MS. SEIFER-SMITH: I'm sorry to interrupt.
                           That's okay.
 2
               MS. ELLIS:
 3
               THE COURT:
                           All right. Zoom is on, and once I
 4
          see her in the waiting room, I'll let her in.
 5
               And, she's in.
 6
               MS. SEIFER-SMITH: Thank you.
 7
     BY MS. ELLIS:
 8
               Doctor, do you have any licenses or
          Q.
 9
     certifications --
10
               I do.
          Α.
11
               -- in clinical or forensic psychology?
          Q.
12
               I'm a licensed clinical psychologist.
          Α.
13
               And in what states?
          Q.
14
               In Florida and Texas, currently.
          Α.
15
               And are you a part of any commissions?
          Q.
16
                    I am part of the National Commission of
          Α.
17
     Correctional Healthcare.
18
               And what is that?
          Ο.
19
               It's a national organization, um, that looks at
20
     providing, um, best practices, mental and medical health
21
     treatment services in correctional settings.
22
               Okay. And are you appointed to that commission?
          Q.
23
               Um, I have become a member, but I am appointed
24
     to different subcommittees within the commission, yes.
25
          Q.
               As part of your education, did you work in the
```

correction system at all?

2.3

- A. Yes, I did.
- Q. And when was that?
- A. Um, I, most recently -- prior to going into private practice, and going to the jails to do evaluations -- I was involved with the correctional system in Texas; um, I was involved in the correctional system in Tennessee, um, and Alabama and Rhode Island.
- Q. And what sort of duties did you do, or evaluations did you do, for the correctional system?
- A. Sure. Um, in some settings, depending on if it was pretrial or post competency evaluations, general mental health evaluations, I also did, in some settings, waiver evaluations for juveniles, mental health evaluations for treatment needs, while they're in the prison setting.
  - Q. And let's talk about your current work. What do you do in your private practice?
  - A. I'm mostly an evaluator, um, and do diagnostic evaluations, and then do court-involved evaluations.
  - Q. And where are you, on the court-appointed list, currently?
    - A. In the Sixth Circuit, as well as the Thirteenth.
  - Q. How long have you been on both of those court-appointed lists?

1 A. For seven years.

- Q. Have you ever done any presentations on intellectual development disorders?
  - A. I have.
  - Q. And how many presentations, approximately?
- A. Um, a handful of them. Um, it's not been overwhelming, but I have, for purposes of staff, for example, who work with individuals that are in the correctional setting.
- Q. Okay. And besides being on the court-appointed list, are you ever hired by the defense, as an expert in any kind of competency hearing?
  - A. Yes.
    - Q. Do you know approximately how many times?
- A. Most of the cases are court-appointed, that come from the bench, but, um, more so from the defense, than the prosecutor, but I do do them, yes.
- Q. Okay. And you don't have an estimated number of times?
  - A. Um, a hundred, maybe; something like that.
- Q. And how many intellectual disability patients or -- should we call them "patients"? -- or defendants, in a forensic setting, would you estimate that you've done evaluations on, over your 20 years?
- A. Sure. And that is hard to gauge. I do do

- evaluations for APD, as well, so, um, I do see individuals
  under that. Um, the majority, I would say, are mental
  health-driven evaluations, with mental illness, but I do
  have some co-occurring intellectual disability. Um, a
  couple hundred, probably.
  - Q. Okay. Does that include your APD clients as well?
    - A. Yes.

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

20

- Q. How about autism? Have you ever done any kind of evaluations for autism?
- A. I do.
- Q. And, approximately, how many evals have you done over the past 20 years?
  - A. Sure. Those are fewer. Um, several dozen of them, for just looking at autism, in the corrections.
    - Q. Do you have experience with patients with language learning disabilities?
- A. I have interacted, and have evaluated. I don't specialize in that --
  - Q. Okay.
  - A. -- in evaluating for that.
- Q. Is there anything you do differently, if someone were to have a language learning disability?
- A. Um, yes. You would look at the instruments that you need to use for evaluation purposes.

Q. Okay. And we'll get to the instruments that you used, in a moment.

So, what -- as part of the APD evaluations -- what do you do for those type of evaluations? What type of clients do you evaluate?

- A. Sure. Um, those -- those are evaluations that are referred when questions of possible intellectual disability or autism has been raised, so looking for diagnosing of those disorders in the individual, and, if so, if they meet criteria, and then doing competency to proceed.
- Q. Okay. And how long have you been doing the APD evaluations?
- A. I actually started assisting with those slightly before I went into private practice, so about eight years.
- Q. Okay. And I'm gonna turn your attention to this particular case. How did you get involved in this particular case?
  - A. I was court-appointed.
  - Q. And when were you court-appointed?
  - A. Good question. It is March 4th.
- Q. Okay. And when you get court-appointed to a particular case, are there directions as to what type of evaluation the court would like you to perform?
  - A. Um, it's identified, typically, um, if it's

general competency, or if there are questions about intellectual disability or autism, that can be specified. Um, if it is APD, that's appointed, then that is autism and intellectual disability.

- Q. Okay. And what particular directions did you get in this case?
- A. Yes. And so, the court order for this one was not specified. The initial one, I believe, was an amended order, looking for intellectual disability.
  - Q. Okay. But it is a competency evaluation?
  - A. Correct, yes.

2.2

- Q. What do you do, when you first get appointed to a case, to determine competency?
  - A. Request records.
- Q. All right. And what records did you get in this particular case?
- A. Um, the court order, the charging document, um, and criminal report affidavit. And then, um, prior evaluations, that may be available, um, I request them. I don't know initially what is available, so those are sent to me, when they have been identified.
- Q. And did you detail in your report, that's been entered into evidence, what documentation you received prior to any evaluations in this case?
  - A. I did, yes.

- In addition to what's documented in your report, 1 2 did you ever receive anything in addition? Um, I received some additional test results. 3 4 Q. Okay. And that would have been the raw data 5 from other doctors? I received raw data from other doctors, as well 6 7 as scores on more recent intellectual testing done this 8 summer. 9 And can you specify what doctors you did receive 10 the raw data from? 11 Yes. I received raw data from Dr. Railey and 12 Dr. McClain, and then data was provided from South Florida 13 Evaluation and Treatment Center. 14 Q. Okay. 15 How about Dr. Railey's report? Did you get 16 provided that at a later time as well? 17 I did. Α. 18 And you were able to review that? Q. 19 Um, yes. I recently received it, so I was able Α. 20 to look at it. 21 Okay. Anything in addition, that I missed, that 22 you reviewed in coming to your opinion in this particular
  - A. I believe that -- and I requested the jail mental healths records.

2.3

24

25

case?

- I'm sorry? 1 Q. 2 The jail mental health records. 3 Q. Okay. So, once you review all of these records, that 4 5 you detailed in your report, what is your next step? 6 Um, yes. I go ahead to make plans to schedule 7 -- so I have the records that I need -- and scheduled an 8 evaluation. 9 Q. Okay. Did you schedule an evaluation in this 10 particular case? 11 I did, yes. Α. 12 And when was that? Q. 13 It was on the 8th of May. 14 All right. And who was present at that Q. 15 evaluation? 16 Um, yes. Part of the defense team and the 17 prosecution.
  - Q. All right. Where did that evaluation take place?

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. At the Pinellas County Jail, in his housing unit. It was in a conference room across from his housing unit, that was a little larger, so outside of his pod, but across the hall, in the same floor and building.
- Q. Okay. And what was your initial observations of the Defendant sitting there?

1 Um, yes. He came in, um, and sat. Sat down, 2 and, um, he presented as quite guarded and unwilling to 3 participate in the evaluation. And what does that mean, that he "presented as 4 5 quite guarded and unwilling"? 6 Um, very quiet. He was looking around. He, uh, 7 didn't want to answer questions, um, with all the parties 8 that were in the room. 9 Okay. And you said he didn't want to answer 10 questions with all the parties in the room. Can you 11 expand on that, and say why he didn't want to answer the 12 questions, or what he was verbalizing? 1.3 Α. Um, yes --14 MS. SEIFER-SMITH: Objection, as to 15 speculation. 16 THE COURT: Okay. 17 I can rephrase it. MS. ELLIS: 18 THE COURT: Rephrase your question. BY MS. ELLIS: 19 20 Doctor, was he telling you why he didn't want Q. 21 to answer questions? 2.2 Um, he consulted with defense counsel that was 23 there, too. He didn't want to speak with the prosecutors

So he recognized us as the prosecutors

24

25

present.

Q.

Okay.

1 in the case? MS. SEIFER-SMITH: Objection. Leading. 2 3 THE COURT: Overruled. BY MS. ELLIS: 4 5 Ο. So that's a yes? 6 Α. Yes. 7 And what did he say, to make you think that he Q. 8 recognized us as prosecutors in the case? 9 Um, he, um -- I think he made a statement -- he 10 didn't want to participate. The defense attorney talked 11 to him, to try to get him to cooperate, and he was 12 unwilling to talk. 1.3 Okay. Did he make any statements as to who we 14 were, or understanding what our role was, in this process? 15 Α. Let me see my notes. I can't recall 16 specifically. I don't think I made a note of any comments 17 that he had made. Did he make any comments at that time, about the 18 Q. 19 penalties that he was facing? 20 I did make note of that. I vaguely recall 21 something, but I didn't take specific notes of what he 22 said. 2.3 Okay. Do you recall him saying something along 24 the lines of: I'm not speaking with them, because they're

25

trying to kill me?

1	A. Along those lines, but I don't have a specific
2	quote for it.
3	Q. So, what happens after he made that statement,
4	and he was guarded and unwilling to participate in the
5	eval?
6	MS. SEIFER-SMITH: Objection. Counsel
7	testifying. Dr. Torrealday has not indicated that
8	any of these statements were made, that Counsel is
9	insisting that he made.
10	THE COURT: Rephrase your question. What was
11	your question?
12	MS. ELLIS: My question was, what happened
13	after he made the statemented that he was
14	unwilling, or he was guarded, which is what she
15	testified to, earlier.
16	THE COURT: That's not a direct quote, you're
17	summarizing, I suspect?
18	MS. ELLIS: I think her words were that he was
19	guarded and unwilling to participate in the eval,
20	is what I wrote down. But
21	THE COURT: All right.
22	MS. ELLIS: maybe I am summarizing.
23	THE COURT: All right. Answer the question,
24	if you can.
25	

BY MS. ELLIS:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

17

18

19

20

21

24

- Q. So, what happened next?
- A. Um, we tried to problem solve, and to see if there was a way to get it done. Um, a request was made, to see if we could get the evaluation done, with the prosecutors in the hallway, with the door open, um, but that didn't work, because it was difficult to hear.
  - Q. Okay. And then, what happened?
- A. And then arrangements were made, to meet with him, separately, without the prosecutors present, but have the interview recorded.
- Q. Okay. And did you continue to meet with the Defendant that day?
  - A. Later on, yes.
- Q. Okay. How long did you meet with the Defendant, at that time?
  - A. Um, I would approximate about an hour or so.
  - Q. Who was present during the rest of that evaluation on that day?
    - A. A member of the defense team.
    - Q. And where did that evaluation take place?
- A. Yes. So that happened in a meeting room, on his housing unit.
  - Q. And tell us about that evaluation. What did you gather, and how did you conduct that evaluation?

- He was cooperative. He sat calmly, and he was cooperative. Um, he answered questions, um, so we were able to complete that, um, and we did the interview portion at that time. Okay. So his demeanor went from guarded and
- unwilling, to being cooperative, once the prosecution was not there?
- MS. SEIFER-SMITH: Objection. Leading. THE COURT: Rephrase your question, please.
- 10 BY MS. ELLIS:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

- 11 Did his demeanor change, once the prosecution Q. left? 12
  - He answered questions.
- 14 Okay. And you said that you did his interview. Q. 15 What does that consist of?
  - Um, yes. So, background information, mental status exam, and then I did the competency portion of the evaluation.
  - Okay. Let's talk about his background information. What historical background information was he able to give you?
  - Um, sure. That he was born and raised in Α. St. Petersburg, with his parents and siblings, and was living with them prior to his arrest.
    - Um, he denied living outside of the home without

his parents, never living independently, and he has never married, and did not have children.

- Q. Okay. Was he able to give you any details, like the number of siblings he had, or any other details about his home life?
  - A. He had four siblings.
- Q. Okay. Did you cover any other topics with him, as far as background information that he was able to provide to you?
- A. Sure. That he attended Boca Ciega High School, and had started the 11th grade, is what he reported, and dropped out because he didn't want to be in school.

He did state he repeated the third grade; and he denied any history of special education services, when he was in school.

Um, when I asked, um, more about that, about special education, if he received any help, or any kinds of services, um, he did say he was pulled out of class, for help in reading and math, in the fourth and fifth grades.

Um, and then I asked him about his employment history, that he had worked as, like, an intern, for carpentry, for two years; and then in waste management, for a few months. And he denied receiving disability.

Q. Okay. I'm going to break that down a little

bit. So he was able to tell you that he went to Boca Ciega. Were you able to verify that in any of the records?

- A. He had IEP's, that were sent to me later, yes.
- Q. From Boca Ciega?
- A. I believe so.

2.2

2.3

Q. And how about when he said that he was -- he denied special education, but then told you that he was pulled out of the class, in fourth and fifth grade.

Was that also substantiated with the school records that you were provided?

- A. He actually had an IEP for a reading disability and language, and so he did receive services addressing that.
- Q. Okay. And he was pulled out of, like, regular classes, to get extra --
- A. He received assistance. I don't know the mechanisms of how it happened, but he was receiving extra help for reading.
- Q. Okay. And then, you said that -- when you asked him about his employment -- you said he was an intern carpenter. Did he use that -- or carpenter intern -- sorry -- did he use that term to you?
- A. He said he did carpentry, and interned. I didn't ask follow-up questions as to what that meant for

him; but, yes.

2.2

- Q. Okay. Did he give you any other background, as to employment that he has had in his life?
- A. Um, that he had worked for waste management for a few months.
- Q. Did you ask any details as to why he left, or, um, how he was doing at those particular jobs?
- A. Um, I asked him how -- you know -- how did he find that job. He said it was day labor. Um, he worked for -- he can't remember why he stopped, or why he left, he said.
- Q. How about the carpenter intern? Was he ever able to give you any details to that employment?
- A. He said about two years, and, um, he didn't really like it. It wasn't his thing; like, it wasn't a good fit for him.
- Q. All right. How about -- in the education records, were there any indications that he had special classes in middle school?
- A. Um, in my review of what I was provided, IEP's had assistance for reading, since early elementary school.
- Q. Okay. Was there a specific diagnosis for his learning disability?
- A. Um, a specific learning disability, and language impairment, in the school setting.

Q. Did you see, in any of the records -- and I believe we have them from second grade, all the way up to ninth grade -- several times, in ninth grade -- A. Uh-huh.

1.3

2.3

- Q. -- did you see anything in those records, that indicated that he was ever tested for intellectual disability?
  - A. I did not see any testing in the record.
- Q. Okay. Did you see any indication in any of those records, that a parent, or a teacher, or a provider ever suggested that he needed to be tested for intellectual disability?
- A. I don't recall seeing that. Just the reading difficulties and oral comprehension was identified in the records, repeatedly.
- Q. Okay. And the same question for autism. The records from second grade, all the way up to ninth grade, several times, is there any indication that he was ever tested for autism in all of those years?
  - A. I did not see anything for that, no.
- Q. Was there any indication that a parent, or a teacher, or any sort of provider ever suggested that he had needed to be tested for autism in any of those years?
- A. I did not see it raised in the records that I saw.

Was he able to tell you what medications that 1 2 he was on, during your evaluation? 3 Um, I believe so. Um, he -- in general, he did 4 talk about it, yes. 5 Okay. And wasn't he able to, at some point, 6 tell you the actual medications? 7 Um, he -- some of them, not all of them. He was Α. 8 taking multiple, but he did identify two of them. 9 Q. Two out of three? 10 Yes --Α. 11 Okay. And --Q. 12 -- for mental health. And that he is on a 13 thyroid med; he didn't label that one. 14 Okay. So the two medications that he did know Q. 15 he was on, was he able to name them? 16 Α. Yes. And what did he say? 17 Q. 18 Trazodone and melatonin. Okay. Was he able to say why he was on those 19 Q. 20 particular medications? 21 Anxiety and depression. 22 And what was the Defendant's demeanor like, when 0.

you were doing this first evaluation?

23

24

25

Um, he answered questions briefly. Um, so he

details, but he did answer question directly and coherently.

- Q. Okay. So the questions were coherent, and the appropriate answers?
  - A. Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

- Q. Although brief?
- A. Yes, they were brief.
- Q. How about his hygiene? What was his hygiene?
- A. Um, appeared appropriate. Um, he -- his uniform was not dirty. His grooming appeared appropriate. He wasn't malodorous. He presented adequately.
- Q. And you did receive all of the jail records.

  Was there any indication that he was getting any
  assistance, as to his daily living, in the Pinellas County
  Jail?
  - A. Daily living?
  - Q. Like showering and hygiene?
- A. I think there's a couple of times I saw him there, he didn't come out, he didn't want to shower; but it was not a continuous issue that I saw.
- Q. Okay. Was there anyone that had to assist him in showering, or getting dressed, or getting to breakfast?
- A. Not that I'm aware of, no.
- Q. And how was his affect, when he was talking to you?

1 A. Flat.

- Q. Was there any time, during your interview -- either your first or second interview -- that he did smile or joke or laugh?
  - A. Um, briefly, yes, there was a time.
  - Q. Okay. And tell us about that.
- A. Um, it was in response to, um, activity, um, that was behind me, that I could not see, that was in the dayroom, the other defendants that were back there -- or residents.
- Q. Okay. So the activity is going on behind you, so you don't know exactly what's going on there. That's fair to say?
- A. Correct.
- Q. All right. But he could see behind you, because he was facing you?
- A. Yes. It was within his line of sight, but I couldn't see it.
- Q. Okay. How do you know it was, like, his peers that were diverting his attention?
- A. They were all there, congregating near the TV, watching TV in the open space -- it's not a ton of space, but open space -- right outside the door.
- Q. Okay. And did he appear to be distracted at any point during your interview, because of that?

- A. Um, it was more so during the second day for testing, that he did that.
  - Q. Okay. And at that point in time is when he smiled or joked or?
- A. He chuckled -- um-hmm, he smiled and chuckled, yes.
  - Q. Did he ever ask any spontaneous questions to you?
    - A. He did. Not many, but he did.
  - Q. Okay. And what were they?
- 11 A. Um, if I had any children, and if I've been doing this for a long time.
  - Q. Did you ask him about any prior accidents that he may have been involved in?
    - A. Yes.

- Q. What was his response?
- A. Um, yes. I asked if experiencing any serious injuries, um, and he said he had suffered, um, lost consciousness, in a concussion. He ran into a pole, when he was in middle school.
- Q. Okay. Did you have any -- in your review of the records, did you substantiate and corroborate that with anything?
- A. I didn't have any medical records from that incident, no.

- 1 All right. How about mental health history? 2 Was he able to give you a mental health background? 3 Α. Yes, a brief one; but, yes. 4 Q. What did he say? 5 He had been Baker-Acted and voluntarily 6 hospitalized on two occasions, um, at Windmoor and 7 St. Anthony's. 8 And was he able to detail why he was Baker-Acted 9 on those two occasions? 10 For suicidal ideation and attempts. 11 All right. And did he elaborate on how he tried Q. 12 to commit suicide? 13 Um, he said cutting -- he tried to cut himself 14 -- and overdosed on medication. 15 All right. Were you able to corroborate that by Q. 16 any of the records that you were provided? 17 Um, he reported two Baker Acts to other mental 18 health staff, but I do not have records from the two 19 hospitals. 20 And as far as the medical records that Okay. 21 you did receive, did you review those records, and see any 2.2 kind of ID diagnosis in any of those medical records that
  - A. I don't recall seeing that, no.

2.3

24

25

you received?

Q. How about in the Pinellas County Jail records

1 that you received? 2 Α. No, ma'am. 3 Ο. The same question for autism. Did you see any 4 kind of diagnosis or suggestion, he should be tested, in 5 any of the medical records that you have received? 6 Α. The ones that I reviewed, that I received, no. 7 How about in the Pinellas County Jail records? Ο. 8 Α. No. 9 The only time that autism or intellectual Q. 10 disability is brought up, in your review of the records, 11 is through defense experts. Is that correct? 12 Well, the order is for intellectual disability 13 or autism, so that's how it was raised. 14 Okay. But, as far as a diagnosis goes, that Q. 15 would be purely in the past year, or the pendency of this 16 case, let's say, by the defense experts? 17 MS. SEIFER-SMITH: Objection. Leading. 18 THE COURT: Okay. Rephrase your question. 19 BY MS. ELLIS: 20 Do you recall if any of the other experts, Q. 21 besides defense experts, have ever said an intellectual 22 disability or autism? 2.3 Um, just defense evaluations was part of this

Was the Defendant able to tell you the date,

24

25

case.

Q.

time and year, when you asked him?

- A. Um, he was able to tell me the month and the year, but did not know the date.
- Q. Okay. And when he told you the month, how did he tell you?
  - A. May.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q. And was he able to give you a number associated with May?
  - A. Yes. Five.
- Q. Did you ask the Defendant about his reporting of voices?
- 12 A. Yes.
- Q. And tell us about that.
  - A. Um, yes. Um, he, um, when asked if there's ever been a time that he's heard voices or noises or things that others do not hear, he did say -- he endorsed hearing voices, telling him to kill himself.
  - Q. Okay. And did he tell you when he has heard those voices?
    - A. Um, he indicated they started around age 18.
  - Q. Okay. And then, how recently has he heard voices?
- A. He reported last hearing them the mornings of each of the days I saw him.
  - Q. Okay. So the mornings of the evaluations is

1 when he's hearing the voices?

- A. Most recently.
- Q. Did you ask him how he was feeling?
- A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q. And what was his response?
- A. Um, that he -- it was difficult to explain and put in words, not knowing very well how he felt; and then, not good; um, and he indicated that -- because he's in jail.
  - Q. Okay.
- A. And he did endorse feeling anxiety and depression on a regular basis.
- 13 Q. Okay.

Did I cover most of the background that you have? You did the interview with the Defendant, on that initial evaluation?

- A. He also endorsed visual hallucinations.
- Q. Okay. And tell us about what he said about visual hallucinations.
- A. Um, seeing blood in his eyes, and being blinded by that, when he sees that, for a couple of seconds. So, apparently, it's very brief for him.
- Q. Okay. Did you ever observe any internal stimuli

  -- of him reacting to any internal stimuli, in either of

  the two evaluations that you did?

A. No, I didn't.

2.2

- Q. Is there anything else about the history or background interview of the Defendant, that you feel is appropriate and necessary to bring out, that I have not brought out?
- A. Um, besides, you know, the history of some substance use, you've covered everything.
- Q. Okay. And that substance abuse was the cannabis disorder, that you listed in the --
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. -- diagnostics? All right.

And that was obviously controlled, because he's in the Pinellas County Jail at this point?

- A. Correct, yes.
- Q. So, what do you do next, once you gather the background information on the Defendant?
- A. Um, yes. I, um, then did, um -- because the testing would be separate, without counsel -- any counsel present, I did the competency portion of the evaluation.
- Q. All right. And what is encompassed in the competency portion of the evaluation?
- A. Um, reviewing of records of, you know, what was given to me, prior evaluations done for him, but assessing the different factors, um, of -- addressed by the statute.
  - Q. And how do you assess the different factors at

this point, without doing the testing?

A. Um, interview.

2.2

- Q. Okay. And talk to us about that interview.
- A. Um, yes. Um, I have the different -- so I ask questions for the different prongs that fall into the different factors.

I'm asking about -- um, do you want me to go into that? -- the charges, if you understand what the charges are, and allegations. And then, asking about, um, the different, uh, individuals involved in the court system, pleas, possible outcomes, um, and the adversarial nature of the court process; and then, um, behavior in court.

Q. Okay. Let's break those down. The first prong is the appreciation of the charge.

What was he able to tell you about the charges that he is facing?

- A. Um, yes. That he is facing two counts of first degree murder.
- Q. All right. And did you have any other follow-up, as to that, two counts of first degree murder?
- A. I asked if, um -- if there's -- if he understands what the allegations are, against him, if he knows what they are.
  - Q. Okay. And what is his response?

A. They say I killed two people.

- Q. All right. Was he able to elaborate, like, who he killed, or did he provide any other details?
- A. Um, no. The only thing is, I asked where it took place, in what city, and he said St. Pete; that, allegedly, it occurred there.
- Q. When you are asking the follow-up question, and he does not want to give further detail, what are his responses? What is he saying to you?
- A. Um, that he didn't know anything about that, um, that he's never known. Um -- and, um, I asked him if he's ever talked to his attorney, or asked his attorney about the allegations, and that he didn't really know anything.

Um, I asked if he's discussed that, and he said it was not a good time. And I asked, "What do you mean by that?" Um, that, when he's ready, that his mind needs to be ready to do so, to talk about it.

- Q. Okay. So he's saying that, when he's ready, he'll talk about it?
  - A. Those are the words, uh-huh.
- Q. All right. The next prong is appreciation of the range and nature of the possible penalties.

What questions do you ask the Defendant, to determine whether he has comprehension in that field?

A. Sure. Um, well, you know, if someone is

potentially found guilty of these charges, what -- what can happen, what are the possible punishments or consequences that can take place.

- Q. And what was his answer?
- A. Um, the death penalty, where you die, and in prison.
- Q. The third prong, which is understanding the adversarial nature of the case, what questions did you ask the Defendant, on that prong?
- A. Um, I asked about the different roles of the key court personnel, from the judge to the defense attorney and the prosecutor. Um, and I, um -- do you want me -- those are the three roles, that I ask about.
  - Q. Okay.

2.2

- A. And then, um, the pleas that are available, if he understands what those are, the plea bargaining process, and then in jail, to see if there's a basic understanding -- I mean -- sorry -- trial, not jail.
- Q. Did he understand the role, or did he -- was he able to identify his defense attorneys?
  - A. By first name.
  - Q. And how about the role of a prosecutor?
- A. Um, he, um -- he did not know the names of the prosecutors, but he demonstrated an understanding of the role, that they are people who listen to the case. And

I asked why they would do that: To see if I did it or not, and they try to send you to prison. And then, he indicated: They are on the other side.

- Q. Okay. How about the judge's role?
- A. Yes. He identified, the judge's role is to sentence an individual. Um, and when I asked whose side he's on, he said, "The State's side, the people trying to get you indicted and sent to prison, and found guilty."
- Q. And how about plea bargaining? Was he able to articulate what that was about?
- A. Um, yes. He described it as a deal between you and the State, that -- you know -- that involved a lighter sentence, compared to what one could face. Um, and I said, "Well, what do you mean, 'facing'?" "If sentenced, you could get more time."
- Q. Okay. Anything else with that particular prong, that he was asked and answered, that I have not covered?
- A. I asked basic questions about trial. Um, he said, "It's where someone is sentenced." And I said, "Well, who does the sentencing?" And he said, "The judge."

Um, I asked, "Why would some defendants choose to go to trial?" And he indicated, "They feel they can beat the case."

Um, and I asked, um, you know, a few other

questions, like, "How do you plead, to go to trial?" He answered that correctly. And he was able to identify, um, who are the main participants in the trial.

Q. Okay.

2.2

2.3

The third prong is capacity to disclose the facts. Talk to me about your conversation with the Defendant, in that particular prong.

A. Um, yes. So, um, he demonstrated an understanding of the charges, um, and, generally, demonstrated an understanding of the allegations, although he did not elaborate and did not discuss or provide any other information about that, um, so he didn't discuss the events surrounding it, what's been alleged. Um, and Defense did state that he hasn't really done that in-depth with them, either.

Um, and I noted he was quiet and guarded, um, but he was able to answer background questions, for example, briefly and coherently.

His thoughts were goal-directed and organized. I didn't see any evidence of a thought disorder. Um, and he appeared to have a basic capacity to be able to answer questions, you know, coherently, relevantly. Um, they were brief answers, so I don't know how -- to what extent he'll elaborate far more, but he was able to answer them, directly and coherently.

- Q. Was this the only subject matter that he seemed unwilling to even give you basic answers on?
- A. Um, he just provided the basic background questions, that we reviewed before.

2.2

2.3

- Q. Okay. But, as far as the content of what happened in the charge, or the allegations that are before him, was he unwilling to even give you the basic answers in those particular discussions?
- A. Um, he didn't provide more information, besides saying that he's, you know, accused of killing two people. And then, I found out, it's allegedly in St. Pete, and that was it.
- Q. Okay. How about his ability to manifest courtroom behavior?
- A. Um, he demonstrated an understanding, how one is supposed to behave, um, and knew -- was aware that one can speak -- it's appropriate to speak when told to, in court. He didn't demonstrate any difficulty in managing his behavior. He sat calmly. He was, you know, cooperative. He became cooperative, and answered questions.
- Q. Okay. And how long, total, did you meet with him, in both evaluations?
- A. Sure. Um, these are estimates. About an hour, um, a piece, probably, uh, for the interview, and then the

testing, the second part, uh-huh.

2.3

- Q. All right. And how about the capacity to testify relevantly?
- A. Um, yes. Um, I asked if he -- you know, "Do you know what testifying in court means?" "Telling what you know."

I did ask if he's required. He said, "I don't think I can," like, he's able to. He was aware that one must be honest, when testifying.

Um, I did note that, although he has been identified as having a language disorder, um, he answered questions briefly and coherently. Um, his thoughts were organized and goal-directed.

Um, he was aware of his charges, although he didn't elaborate on the allegations. Um, and then, he was quiet and guarded. Um, and my opinion was, he wasn't presenting with such significant impairments, or acute symptoms of mental illness, that he wouldn't be able to answer questions, um, you know, coherently and relevantly.

- Q. Okay. Did you do any other evaluations or interviewing of the Defendant on that first evaluation day?
- A. The background and the mental status, in the competency case.
  - Q. Okay. So, the mental status, have you

determined or assessed that?

2.2

2.3

A. Um, yes. And we touched on those, um, earlier, asking about, um, you know, my observations of his presentation, his orientation, if he's aware of the date, where the location is, how he's feeling; mood.

And I asked for experiencing symptoms of psychosis, you know, if I see anything, is he experiencing that, um, how he's feeling, um, how he's sleeping and eating. I do ask about history of trauma, as well as, um, any history of suicidal ideation or attempts, both past and then current.

- Q. Okay. And he was able to answer briefly and simplistically, but he answered those questions for you?
  - A. Yes, briefly, yes.
- Q. Did that conclude the first part of your evaluation on that first day?
- A. Yes.
- Q. All right. And why did you have to come back a second day?
- A. To do formal testing that is typically done without counsel present, because of the security of the test instruments.
- Q. Okay. So, tell us about that second evaluation.
  What date was that on?
  - A. That was on the 21st.

1 And where did that occur? Ο. 2 Α. On his housing unit, in the meeting room. 3 THE COURT: May 21st? 4 THE WITNESS: Yes, Ma'am. 5 THE COURT: Thank you. 6 BY MS. ELLIS: 7 And that's a different location than where that 8 first interview occurred? It's the same location where -- when I was able 9 10 to do the interview. 11 Q. Okay. 12 Not the big conference room, but the meeting 13 room within his unit. 14 Okay. So, when the prosecutors were there, we Q. 15 were in a separate room, but when you actually conducted 16 the interview, it was in his, like, pod area? 17 Yes, in a small meeting room within his housing. 18 Okay. And approximately how long was that 0. 19 evaluation? 20 The second? Α. 21 The second one. Q. 22 About an hour. Α. 23 All right. What tests did you perform on the 24 Defendant, on that particular date? 25 I, um, conducted a measure of intellectual Α. Yes.

1 | functioning, IQ testing.

2.2

2.3

- Q. And what was that test?
- A. The Comprehensive Test of Nonverbal Intelligence.
  - Q. And what's the acronym for that?
  - A. The CTONI-2, it's the second version.
- Q. Why did you administer the CTONI-2, versus the WAIS?
- A. Um, yes. The WAIS had been administered not too long before, at the state hospital, um, so to be able to choose a different instrument that would allow me to do the testing, so looking at what other comprehensive measures are available, um, that would be appropriate for that, and the CTONI is one of them.
- Q. Okay. And talk to us about the CTONI. What does that test look for, and what are you evaluating in that test?
  - A. Intellectual functioning.
  - Q. And how do you do that?
- A. Um, it's a nonverbal, so it can be used with individuals of different backgrounds, languages. Um, it doesn't require reading or, um, writing, um, but it is one where stimuli or items are presented, and they have to select, by pointing, the answer that best fits that subtest, what's being asked.

- 1 Q. And what grade level is that norm for?
- 2 A. It is ages six to 99.
  - Q. Okay. And how did the Defendant do on that test?
  - A. Um, poorly.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q. How so?
- A. Um, he obtained a pictorial scale of 55, a geometric scale of 61, and a full scale of 54.
- Q. And did that match what you were seeing, when you were having this conversation with him, in the initial interview?
- A. Um, I don't know if the score -- I wouldn't be able to say the scores exactly matched, but, you know, his conversations are brief, and it was somewhat simplistic, so I didn't expect very high scores.
  - Q. Okay. What was his total score, in the CTONI?
- A. Um, 54.
- Q. And what does that equate to?
- A. Intellectual disability. They score it in the very poor range, the language that the instrument uses, um, but that is on the -- the lower end of the mild, upper moderate.
- Q. Does that equate to the WAIS, like a 54, and the CTONI be a 54?
  - A. They can be compared.

- Q. Okay. And if you were to see a patient at 54, would they be able to do the daily tasks of, like, bathing, driving, um, living independently?
- A. I've seen, more often, needing some help in some of those capacities -- not driving, for example -- but being able to bathe, might need help with some aspects of showering, but they are able to do some things independently.
- Q. Okay. Did you have any concerns, to that point, that effort might have been an issue in this particular test?
- A. Um, he -- at one point, at least, um, there was some distractibility. That is where the chuckling and the giggling -- there was the activity in the background, going on, whatever that was, was during this testing.
- Q. Okay. Did you do any other additional tests, to test for effort or feigning or malingering?
  - A. Um, I did.

- Q. And tell us about those.
- A. The Inventory of Legal Knowledge, and then I did the dot-counting test.
  - Q. Okay. Let's talk about the Inventory of Legal Knowledge. What is that test?
  - A. Um, it's one looking at response style, with respect to questions about competency.

- Q. Okay. And is that norm for a particular population?
- A. It is, um, a reading level. It has a reading level, uh -- it's fifth grade and above, in being able to understand. It's provided orally, so you listen to it, you don't read anything; um, but it does say fifth grade.
- Q. And were you able to determine what reading level he had, through his school records?
- A. Um, it was low. I saw varying numbers, um, three -- upper elementary -- third grade to, I think, fourth or fifth --
  - Q. Okay.

1.3

2.2

2.3

- A. -- but low.
  - Q. And how did he do on the ILK?
  - A. Um, he scored, um, on the cusp -- so, like a scoring on the relatively low -- so questioning, um, his response style or effort.
    - Q. Okay. So, "relatively low" means what?
  - A. Meaning that he -- greater than chance. So, one can randomly guess answers, and get them correct.

    And then, where you miss more than you would, if it was just by chance, guessing.
  - Q. Okay. So he missed more than someone who was just, like, guessing, by chance?

A. Greater than chance.

- Q. And what does that indicate to you, as far as effort goes?
  - A. It questions. It raises concern for effort.
- Q. And did you perform any other tests on the Defendant, in regards to effort, at that time?
  - A. Yes, on the dot-counting test.
  - Q. And tell us about the dot-counting test.
- A. Um, it is a measure designed to assess effort.

  Um, it's fairly simplistic. It involves counting dots,

  um, and that's timed, and so you're looking at error and

  the amount of time it takes to do that.
- Q. Okay. And to be fair, there is no, like, arithmetic involved in this test, it's just literally counting dots?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. So you may have a card with one dot on it, but what is the maximum number of dots that would be on a card?
- A. I believe the max, I think, is 30.
- Q. All right. And how did the Defendant do on this particular test?
- A. So I looked at it, because different -- he presents with a host of areas, potentially, of difficulty.
  - I looked at, um, the scoring for those who

have a reported head injury. Um, I looked for those, 1 um, that have been identified with a learning disability. 2 3 And then, um, there's also scores for schizophrenia, for 4 those who have been diagnosed with that. 5 Okay. And you're getting the head injury from 6 when he ran into a pole, when he was seven? 7 He reported that. And then, later, um, when Α. 8 he was asked -- or reminded, asked -- he had been in a 9 car accident also. 10 Okay. And how did he do in comparison to the Q. 11 head injury group? 12 He scored within normal range. Α. 13 Okay. How about the schizophrenia? Ο. 14 The same. Α. 15 And how about the learning disability? Q. 16 Slightly above. Α. 17 And what does that mean? Ο. 18 Um, that, uh, it raises a question of effort. Α. 19 He scored above the norm -- norming group, done for 20 learning disabilities. 21 THE COURT: All right. It is two minutes 2.2 after twelve. Okay? 2.3 MS. ELLIS: Okay. 24 Doctor, we're going to stop here. THE COURT:

You're available to be here, this afternoon,

1	correct?
2	THE WITNESS: Yes.
3	THE COURT: Can you be back at 1:30?
4	THE WITNESS: I can.
5	THE COURT: All right. Let's stop, and I'll
6	see everyone back at 1:30.
7	Can you please see that Mr. Mosley has an
8	opportunity to eat lunch today.
9	THE BAILIFF: Yes, your Honor.
10	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
11	I will see everybody at 1:30.
12	THE BAILIFF: All rise. Court is in recess
13	until 1:30, by the courtroom clock.
14	(RECESS)
15	(VOLUME I CONCLUDED)
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

## CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

STATE OF FLORIDA )

COUNTY OF PINELLAS )

I, Linda K. Fritsch, Registered Merit Reporter, certify that I was authorized to and did stenographically report the foregoing proceedings and that the transcript is a true record.

DATED this 26th day of August, 2025.

/S Linda K. Fritsch

Linda K. Fritsch Registered Merit Reporter