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: Competency Hearing

BEFORE: The Honorable Susan St. John

Circuit Court Judge

DATE: August 21, 2025

PLACE: Courtroom 2

Pinellas County Justice Center

14250 - 49th Street North Clearwater, Florida 33762

REPORTER: Jennifer Fleischer

Registered Merit Reporter

(Pages 1 to 57)

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:

COURTNEY SULLIVAN, ASSISTANT STATE ATTORNEY CHRISTIE ELLIS, 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:

MARGARET RUSSELL, ASSISTANT PUBLIC DEFENDER
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

* * *

1	INDEX TO PROCEEDINGS	
2	(AUGUST 21, 2025)	
3	(1100001 21, 2023)	PAGE
4	CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE DEFENSE	6
5	CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE STATE	36
6	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER	57
7		
8		
9 10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24 25		
/ .)	46	

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

THE COURT: Okay. So we're here today for the final arguments on the competency evidentiary hearing set for Thomas Mosley, case number 23-003157. Mr. Mosley is present in court. State and defense counsel are present.

And anything we need to talk about before we get started?

MS. SULLIVAN: Not from the State.

THE COURT: Anything from the Defense?

MS. RUSSELL: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. The only thing I just wanted to bring up -- and I appreciate Ms. Russell, you brought it up a couple days ago when I was looking at my notes. I just thought it was worth talking before we got into final arguments. You had requested that I take judicial notice of Dr. Hall's prior testimony from the competency evidentiary hearing one. This is -- I guess some are referring to this one as the second one.

It would be my expectation to consider all of the evidence in both records when making a decision in this case. So I just wanted to make sure we had that conversation. So if there's anything you wanted to reference from the first hearing in your

arguments today, you're certainly welcome to do 1 2 that. Okay? 3 MS. RUSSELL: Your Honor, can I just make 4 clear that I think I also put on the record the 5 same with regard to Dr. McClain who had also 6 testified in the prior hearing. 7 Yes. And so, yeah, just to be THE COURT: 8 clear, I plan on taking, to the extent it's 9 necessary, anything that was evidence, essentially, 10 in evidentiary hearing number one, including the 11 ones you've asked me to take judicial notice of. 12 Okay? 13 So, with that, I'm ready for final arguments, 14 and so I'm ready to proceed. Who's going to go 15 I don't care. I mean, really there's 16 no -- it's not like either one of you filed a 17 It's -motion. 18 MS. RUSSELL: All right. I'm happy to start. 19 THE CLERK: Does the Defense actually need to 20 rest, or was it done on the record yesterday, or 21 no? 22

THE COURT: Are both -- can we all agree we've concluded with evidence in this case --

MS. RUSSELL: Yes.

23

24

25

THE COURT: -- at it relates to the competency

1 hearings?

MS. SULLIVAN: Yes.

THE COURT: So we'll just leave it at that.

THE CLERK: Okay. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. You're welcome.

All right. Ms. Russell, I'm ready whenever you are.

MS. RUSSELL: May it please the Court.

"I don't understand," these are the words that Thomas Mosley can sometimes express, but other times he sits quietly, afraid to ask for help.

Now, Thomas Mosley's case, over all of these days of testimony that you've heard, all of the experts, you know it's a complex case, one that's probably unprecedented in the history of this courtroom.

He has three disabilities: Intellectual disability; autism since birth; and schizophrenia, a psychotic break since late adolescence, mostly due to his inability to communicate.

And Dr. Fabian, whose testimony was essentially unimpeached in this case, explained that these three disorders are common comorbidities. So a diagnosis of one makes the other two much more likely. Why? Because, quite simply, if you have intellectual disability and

problems thinking and you have autism and you can't communicate, a human brain often copes with psychosis.

Now, we've had two lengthy rounds of competency hearings in this case, and there are some things that I don't understand. This is a death penalty case, and South Florida Evaluation and Treatment Center has made a mess of these competency restoration.

The Court found Thomas Mosley incompetent to proceed back in October of 2023. And in his first day at South Florida Evaluation and Treatment Center, he was miraculously restored from profound psychosis in only 28 days. Now, that was Dr. Ascherman-Jones. He got there and was found competent December 14th of 2023, and she found him competent on January 11th, after he had only attended four competency classes.

Now, we had many days of a competency hearing with my colleague Jessica Manuele and
Nichole Blaquiere, and we pled with the Court and
DCF, with phone calls and emails. We begged them
not to send Mr. Mosley back to the South Florida
Evaluation and Treatment Center, but they sent him
back a full year later, and in his second stay,

miraculously, in 78 days, right, December 12th through -- December 12th of '24 through February 28th of 25, Dr. Tenaglia found Thomas Mosley cured.

Now, maybe it wasn't that miraculous given that Dr. Tenaglia testified that South Florida had an unwritten policy that they have a 90-day target for release of all of their competency patients.

Now, let's see. That's 28 days plus 78 days, 106 days in total, after more that two years of repeated evaluations, hearings and arguments.

Another number that's important is zero, because there have been zero days of training by the APD to restore him in the case that he might have ID or autism. And, in fact, no one has even tried because although many suspected that Thomas Mosley had intellectual disability, it couldn't be diagnosed until his psychosis was treated.

I want to talk to you, your Honor, a little bit about competency standards. As everyone is aware, the criminal trial of an incompetent defendant violates due process, and the Dusky factors are the Dusky factors all across the nation, says the U.S. Supreme Court.

Thomas Mosley needs to be able to have a rational and factual understanding of all the proceedings against him. Now, Florida's six competency factors were developed in response to Dusky, and in Cooper v. Oklahoma -- that's 517 U.S. 348 -- there is a preponderance standard in competency determinations. And just for the record and as of note, that's different than the standard in Rule 3.203 for intellectual disability as a bar to the death penalty where the evidentiary standard is higher, clear and convincing.

Now, the risks of trying an incompetent defendant are dire. That's straight out of <u>Cooper</u>. And Thomas Mosley is wrapped in a presumption of incompetence until you find him competent again. And that's in <u>Dougherty v. State</u>, 149 So.3d, and <u>King v. State</u>, 387 So.2d 463.

So, your Honor, what you have to decide is, is
Thomas Mosley more likely competent than not
competent here, and what are you gonna base your
opinion on, after more than two years, only 106
days of treatment, Doctors Torrealday and Railey?
Where is the harm in giving Thomas Mosley adequate
competency training geared toward ID and autism,
something that we have only recently discovered

that he has?

As the Supreme Court said in <u>Cooper</u>, the risk of trial with an incompetent client are so dire.

Nobody -- I don't think the State, not your Honor, not the next of kin, no one has an interest in trying Thomas Mosley before he is competent and if he can't communicate with his lawyers or testify.

And just like at the South Florida Evaluation and Treatment Center, we now know that it's just much easier to get it right the first time.

So we had Dr. Fabian here for a day of testimony back in June, and Dr. Whitney who testified just yesterday what the best practices are in diagnosing ID and autism. We need the broadest possible foundation, records, collateral interviews, appropriate testing with appropriate norms. And Drs. Whitney, Hall and McClain all adhered to those standards.

Your Honor, I'm gonna refer you to the strongest evidence in this case, Exhibit 4, which includes all of Thomas' elementary school records. When he attended school, he tried hard and there was no possible secondary gain in elementary school.

I'm gonna talk to you about intellectual

disability. Again, Dr. Fabian was qualified as an expert. He testified on June 26th. He talked about the best practices in ID; again, gathering records, using updated assessment measures, collateral informant interviews, assessing behavior outside of the prison stetting during the developmental period. That is on his transcript at page 56 through 57, and 68 through 69.

And as the U.S. Supreme Court wrote in

Moore v. Texas, the seminal case on intellectual
disability and the death penalty, the defendant in
that case, Bobby Moore, mowed lawns and played pool
for money. The Supreme Court found that the lower
court in Texas erred in its intellectual disability
analysis twice. They kept finding that Moore was
not intellectually disabled, but what the lower
court did was made a big mistake of weighing
adaptive strengths against adaptive deficits and
coming up with some sort of equation, but that's
not how it works.

ID doesn't mean that you're deaf, dumb and blind in all respects. People with ID can have some adaptive strengths. They can speak on the phone with their family. They can wave their arms around in a rap video. They can maybe even write a

sentence that says they live in Florida or Floridia, because only deficits in one domain are required and that could be either conceptual, practical or social, and that's all that's needed.

Now, Moore v. Texas also pointed out that people with ID also have -- often have other impairments, ADHD, depressive disorders and autism, and these are all comorbidities, not alternative diagnosis for ID.

Now, Dr. Fabian also told us there are three diagnostic criteria: IQ, adaptive functioning, and age of onset. Let's talk about IQ. We had Dr. Railey who came in with a 55 on the WAIS.

Dr. Torrealday gave the CTONI of 54, Dr. Tenaglia a 46 on the WAIS-4. And not one of these doctors used the effort measures normed for people with ID, and none of them even knew that there are embedded measures of effort in the WAIS, a fact that's shown in the academic literature that we attached to the exhibits in this case.

Now, Dr. McClain got a 69. She gave two tests of effort, one including the embedded measures supported by the literature. That's in Exhibit 32, by the way. And she also give the Rey 15.

So even if you accept that the first three

tests are invalid, pick a reason -- practice effect, low effort, Thomas was not stabilized on his medications, maybe he had a bad day -- but there's nothing to suggest that Dr. McClain's score is not valid, and every expert who reviewed her score agrees.

Let's talk now about adaptive functioning.

Dr. Fabian told us that adaptive functioning is typical behavior, not maximal behavior in the community context. You can't really rely on the self-report of a person with ID because they may overrepresent their capabilities or not really understand what they're missing. For adaptive functioning, you have to look at what somebody can do alone and not with the help and support of other people. And Dr. Fabian also told us that we use accepted tests, such as the ABAS and the violent, not the WHODAS.

Now, back to Exhibit 4, you can read in Exhibit 4 that in the spring of Thomas' third grade year, he was absent only five times. He was tardy two times, and still in the ESE program. He was actually promoted to fourth grade based on the number of times he had been held back in third grade.

_

Now, Dr. Torrealday, Dr. Hall, Dr. McClain, and Dr. Whitney all agreed Thomas Mosley had adaptive deficits in elementary school. And, your Honor, this is the important part: All of that happened before he could even spell the word "secondary gain" or understand what that meant. He didn't learn to tie his shoos until he was 13. And Dr. McClain gave an appropriate adaptive behavior screening measure called the ABAS which also confirmed the deficits.

I'm sure that when the state attorneys get up here, they are gonna argue that so much of this collateral information came from

Elaine Mosley (sic) and that maybe she has an incentive not to tell the truth, but she lost her grandchild, and she took the stand in front of the press. She answered all our questions, and that was really hard for her. And I know everyone in this room could sense that she was both reluctant and nervous, but she was credible and thoughtful.

Bernard Currington also testified that Thomas always had trouble understanding. He never read independently. He was really, really flat on some of the video visits. We also have the documents and testimony by his elementary school teachers.

Jessica Daws (sic) came up, and she sat here and testified that if she knew back in 2013 what she knows now about autism and speech and language delays, that she would have referred Thomas for an autism or ID evaluation. Unfortunately, she was just a brand new teacher without a lot of experience.

We know that the pyramid was upside down at Lakewood Elementary and there were too many kids who needed too many services and that she was discouraged from referring students for further testing for ID and autism. What she knew when Thomas was at Lakewood was all confirmed by a Dr. Amy Fritz. That's in Exhibit 13.

I'd like to read something from Dr. Fritz's report at page 2. She said: Remarkably, despite the strong history of scholastic failure even when provided intensive academic and therapeutic interventions, Mr. Mosley was never evaluated to determine his cognitive level. This is especially shocking given the pervasive nature of Mr. Mosley's deficits during his formative years. However, this evaluator suspects that educational team decision-making may have been partially biased because Mr. Mosley was a black student.

Specifically, quote, significant proportionality, unquote, legislation designed to reduce the percentage of students of color identified with special needs was introduced in 2004. Enforcement of these policies varied by state and grew throughout Mr. Mosley's scholastic career. During the years that he was in school, focus both at the state and federal level was on early detection of learning needs and reducing patterns of overidentifying persons of color as being disabled.

Dr. Fritz also gave language and speech testing about Thomas' functioning on speech and language, completely consistent with the findings in elementary school. That's in Exhibit 13. On the PPVT, he scored a 59, which relates loosely to IQ, and on the CELF-5 she found that he had profoundly impaired language.

Your Honor, you need only look as far as

Exhibit 19, which is the driver's test.

Thomas Mosley didn't understand. All of the court records that we introduced show that Thomas had poor driving and even poorer money management. He wasn't functioning as an independent young adult.

He had support for living, finances, food shopping,

hygiene, and he had to consistently be hounded and controlled on all of his basic activities.

Finally, the third criteria, age of onset during the developmental period, I'm not sure is even in contention here.

Thomas Mosley suffers from intellectual disability.

Now, three experts did testing for autism.

They were the same three that suspected autism and the same three that used special means to communicate with Thomas, a person who doesn't understand words and language.

Now, Dr. Whitney is one of the nation's foremost experts on autism. He gave an interview, a collateral interview, and the ADAS. He also interpreted language testing from Dr. Amy Fritz to arrive at his diagnosis. Dr. McClain gave the GARS and did collateral interviews, and then Dr. Fritz did the speech and language testing we've talked about.

All of this testing is supported by the testimony of the special ed teachers back in third and fourth grade, Ms. Daw and Ms. Franklin, who said that the OWL and the TOLD scores in the third and fourth grade were consistent with autism, but

Thomas Mosley was never referred for a diagnosis.

Why would you discount this testimony when the alternative is to believe Dr. Tenaglia, Dr. Railey, and Dr. Torrealday, all forensic psychologists with no specialty in diagnosing autism? Those three did nothing more than pass their hands over Mr. Mosley and say he doesn't have it and he must be faking. They never asked him to get up and walk around to see the autistic gate that is so characteristic that Dr. Whitney described it. And Dr. Torrealday, Dr. Railey, and Dr. Tenaglia talked about a flat affect and a failure to engage. Those are the very symptoms of autism that they failed to diagnosis.

Now, Dr. Whitney, Dr. Fritz, and Dr. McClain were the only doctors who could break through to Thomas because they suspected autism as a diagnosis, and they used the specific communication techniques that they know for someone with profound speech and language disabilities and that's how they were able to communicate with Thomas. And that may be one of the reasons why Dr. McClain got a higher IQ score, because she was able to reach across the divide and understand his neurodivergence.

Dr. Tenaglia, Dr. Railey, and Dr. Torrealday

evaluated Thomas, but none of them understood at the time that they were evaluating someone with a profound speech and language disorder, someone with autism. Even Desiree Baker from Suncoast said he was so flat, it was like he didn't care.

Thomas Mosley didn't understand that Desiree Baker was there to help him and she was on his team.

Now, Dr. Tenaglia used none of the best practices for diagnosing autism, no testing, no collateral sources and, in her case, no school records. Well, actually, I think she testified that somebody at FSFTC requested the records, but they never showed up. And, of course, nobody at SFETC reached out to defense counsel to get school records which we would have happily provided. No one bothered in a death penalty case, which isn't surprising from Tenaglia's utter lack of knowledge about the procedures and seriousness of a death penalty case.

Now, Dr. Torrealday and Dr. Railey did no testing for autism, no collateral interviews, and they really have no expertise in autism. So there's no reason to give their missed diagnosis -- and I do think it was a missed diagnosis -- any credibility at all. Had they

known that Thomas Mosley had been diagnosed with autism, a fact none of us really knew until a few weeks ago, they might have come up with a different result.

I want to switch gears for a minute and talk about the South Florida Evaluation and Treatment Center. And we'd like to renew our motion to strike and motion to bar the testimony of Dr. Tenaglia. If you do choose to consider her testimony, your Honor, we'd ask that you give it no weight.

From the very outset, Dr. Tenaglia knew this case was headed for litigation. She circulated drafts of her reports to colleagues, which she only did in this case. She spoke numerous times to Dr. Jones to shore up her approach. She even read Dr. Jones' deposition. And then she shredded her notes, a violation of both Florida law and all of the ethical practices of the American Psychological Association.

Now, this shoddy work at South Florida

Evaluation and Treatment center over two visits had really infected the entirety of Thomas Mosley's competency proceedings, and that was from the outset.

Even we laypeople understand it's pretty basic that people whose sole diagnosis is malingering, which by the way is not actually a DSM-5 diagnosis, aren't prescribed both antidepressants and antipsychotics. Shredding your notes, that's pretty dishonest. Not listing your diagnosis which your team psychiatrist is prescribing medications for, that's really intellectually dishonest and pretty shameful when your job is to restore a person facing the death penalty to competency in 78 days or less.

Now, let's talk about some of those documents that Dr. Tenaglia used in her competency assessment. She did a CAT, a Competency Assessment Tool, on December 18th of '24, finding Thomas Mosley unacceptable on five criteria. And she suspected poor effort from Thomas's behavior from the outset, also which all was explained by both autism and intellectual disability that she could not detect.

She gave him a WAIS-4. He got a very low score, and then she diagnosed him with malingering based on invalid effort tests. She wasn't even skilled enough to know about the embedded measures for malingering that we have heard through all the

1 experts exist in the WAIS.

Let's talk about her psychology progress notes in Exhibit 30. On December 26th of 2024, she said she asked the patient the difference between a felony and a misdemeanor, and he stated, I don't want to answer that question. I asked him why, and he stated, I don't understand it.

The following week, her note, When asked how he's understanding the material, he stated, It's kind of hard. I don't understand some of the things.

January 10th of '25, the understanding really doesn't get any better. Tenaglia's note: He stated he, quote, doesn't really understand what's being taught in class. He then stated while in class, quote, I got a paper so I can try and understand from that, unquote.

Then on January 15th of '25, a note that

Mr. Mosley has been attending classes, when asked

if he's understanding the material taught in class,

he stated, quote, Some of it, end quote.

January 23rd of 2025, I asked him to tell me one thing he learned in class. He told me he learned about, quote, not guilty by reason of insanity, unquote. I asked him to tell me what it

means, and he stated, I forgot.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Then there was a competency assessment tool given on the 30th of January. He was found unacceptable on five of six criteria. when Dr. Tenaglia actually asked him the questions.

On the 6th of February of 2025, she said, I asked Mr. Mosley if he's understanding what's being taught in class, and he stated, Not really. asked him what was making it difficult, and he said Too much. It's so hard to understand.

The next week, Thomas' antipsychotic prescriptions were changed. And Dr. Tenaglia just Christmas treed the final CAT on February 25th, finding him acceptable on all the criteria because he's malingering. So he must know all the answers. We're not even sure she asked him the competency questions on her competency assessment tool.

I want to talk now about some of the State's experts, and I'm gonna start with Dr. Railey. like to renew our Daubert motion and rely on many of the arguments in our Daubert motion for brevity and ask that your Honor give his testimony no weight and his report no weight as well.

So Dr. Railey sat on that witness stand back in July and told us all with a straight face that

he began his training in psychology as a four-year-old. That's the transcript at page 24. He knows everything he needs to know about psychology because his dad was one of the biggest drug dealers in Palm Beach County.

And then there were things in Dr. Railey's memory that he testified to, he described as flashbulb moments, that were not on the videotape of his evaluation. That's on page 93 of the transcript. He used those things both in his evaluation and his completion of the WHODAS which he used for an adaptive functioning test.

Now, his memory of what happened during his interview was so different from what was reported on the video, that he couldn't actually tell me if he thought that I had tampered with the videotape. He also had two copies of his resume, one without dates of employment, one with dates of employment. I wonder why he left those dates of employment off the resume that he produced to the State, given some of his checkered work history.

Now, even though he had access to the video, what was actually taped during the evaluation, he put phrases in direct quotes that were actually, well, not direct quotes at all. You can see that

in his transcript at page 99. He passed his hands over Mr. Mosley, with no objective testing, and declared he didn't suffer from autism.

There were so many other problems with Dr. Railey's report. First he gave the WAIS-4 less than three months after a prior test at South Florida Evaluation and Treatment Center, invoking the well-documented practice effect. We had talked about that prior to his giving the test, and he said that he thought that it would be a valid test regardless.

Now, Dr. Fabian told us unequivocally that the same IQ test should never be given twice within a year's period. Dr. Railey was completely unaware of the practice effect or embedded measures of effort in the WAIS that he gave. And then he assessed adaptive functioning with the WHODAS, which is not intended for intellectual disability adaptive functioning assessment and also uses a 30-day window. So everything that Dr. Railey assessed was prison context outside of the developmental period.

And that test is supposed to be a self-report, but I gather Thomas couldn't understand the test.

So Dr. Railey input the data himself in less than

two minutes, something we didn't discover until we won a protracted fight with him to turn over his WHODAS scoresheets, which once he finally turned them over, he scored Mosley as zero disability on every single criteria. I don't think that was his best work. And it looks like Thomas Mosley is really not the only person who occasionally Christmas trees a test, because that's exactly what Dr. Railey did on the WHODAS.

Now, Dr. Fabian, again, was very clear that the WHODAS is not scientifically valid for assessing adaptive functioning for intellectual disability. That's the Fabian transcript at 78 through -- sorry, page 79 through 80.

And Dr. Railey, again, did not us best practices for diagnosing either ID or autism. Now, Dr. Railey told me he wanted to conduct collateral interviews with Renee and David Mosley. So he requested their phone numbers and asked me to set up a meeting for him. He never called them, leaving Renee and David Mosley sitting by the phone for four hours on a Sunday after church. Instead, he emailed them the WHODAS.

He did not administer it to Thomas Mosley's father, David Mosley, because he didn't have an

email address, and then he completely ignored

Renee Mosley's answer. He said, basically, that

her responses were not credible because they were

different from the responses that he got when he

Christmas treed his WHODAS scoresheet in less than

two minutes.

Dr. Railey didn't give a single test or screening for autism. Now, Dr. Railey did do a structured interview with Mosley. So many inaccuracies in his report. He said that Thomas Mosley was born in San Diego, California, when he was born and raised in St. Petersburg.

I think that you should give Dr. Railey's report very little weight, your Honor. He's thankfully no longer on the court appointed list here in Pinellas County, but I don't think that his report or his testimony are worthy of your confidence in such an important matter.

I would like to address Dr. Torrealday and just suggest that a report written under threat of criminal contempt while on a European vacation is probably not an ideal circumstance. Dr. Torrealday did everything but admit that she was wrong in failing to diagnose ID.

She admitted that she had no reason to doubt

the validity of Dr. McClain's IQ test. She admitted that Thomas Mosley had adaptive deficits prior to the age of onset, and those were contained in the educational records. Why didn't she diagnose intellectual disability? She admitted that all the diagnostic criteria were fulfilled. So I guess we can only assume that she didn't really look at those records very carefully before writing her report.

Can't help but wonder how things would have been different if, at the beginning of Dr. Torrealday's interview, Thomas had followed counsel's instructions to behave and cooperate. Would things have been different? Would Dr. Torrealday have seen the flat affect and lack of engagement as signs of autism?

Unfortunately, it's true that if you're a hammer, pretty much everything looks like a nail. And Dr. Torrealday is court appointed, and her expertise is mostly in mental health conditions. She didn't really suspect autism from the outset. So she don't look for it. She gave no tests that would screen for autism.

Now, the State may characterize this as no diagnosis of autism, but in both Dr. Torrealday and

Dr. Railey's case, this is a missed diagnosis of autism. Perhaps, if Dr. Torrealday had had Dr. Whitney's report at the time of her evaluation, things might have turned out a little differently, but Dr. Torrealday did not understand that she was evaluating and reporting on a person with profound speech and language deficits.

I want to talk about a few of the miscellaneous pieces of evidence and how you should weigh them, your Honor. The State introduced into evidence videos from YouTube that are rap videos.

I'm not exactly sure what they're for. I suspect that probably they're to be used in your determination of adaptive functioning and intellectual disability. We would ask, if they're for that purpose, that you give them no weight for these reasons:

Doctor Fabian's told us that intellectual disability is what you can do alone, in your typical performance, without assistance. Now, in those videos, and I'm not sure if you've watched them --

THE COURT: I have not seen the videos yet.

I've watched the video visits, and, obviously, we had some jail calls from the first competency

hearing, but I have not watched the videos yet. So you're welcome to either play them or describe them for me.

MS. RUSSELL: I'll just describe them.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. RUSSELL: Intellectual disability is what you can do alone, in your typical performance, without assistance. Now, in the videos, what you see is Thomas Mosley dancing around and mouthing a few words. And when you do look at those videos, look closely because in one of them there are two people singing, and I want you to look how Thomas Mosley compares in his activities in singing to the other rapper who seems much less impaired. Does he know the words?

Now, Thomas is moving around, holding a bottle, sitting in a car. He has no idea -- you know, we have no idea who's doing the voiceover, who wrote these raps, who directed, filmed and edited the videos, not even who actually physically posted the videos on YouTube.

We have no idea who or how Thomas was assisted in the video process, if at all, if he was even involved in the video process. So I feel -- we feel that they have zero evidentiary value except

2

3

45

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to demonstrate the autistic obsession that Dr. Whitney talked about. Likewise, you've seen the video calls. Thomas is completely lost when his mom is showing him that house renovation. He can't figure out where the door is to his childhood home where he has lived.

I'd also like to address that, throughout these proceedings, there's been an insinuation that the experts paid by the Defense are paid for their experience -- or paid for their opinions and not for their experience and expertise. Dr. Fabian, Dr. Whitney, and Dr. Fritz, Dr. Hall, these are all incredible national-caliber experts. routinely testify all over the country. They were bound by their ethical rules, and we tried to find the best people we could, to do the best and most thorough job we could, and some of those people live outside of Florida. They've done really thoughtful evaluations, and we all are very, very grateful for the work that they've done in this case and the light that they have been able to shed.

100, 93, 86, 79, 72, 65, it's not hard if you practice.

THE COURT: I haven't practiced.

MS. RUSSELL: But Thomas couldn't get it right even after doctors gave him the MMSE more than seven times. More often than not, he misspelled "world" backwards and forwards over and over. You only have to look at Exhibits 27-A and 27-B. He did the same test twice and couldn't spell, punctuate, or capitalize "Floridia" properly, even with practice. And look at the drawings. Those were all done within weeks of each other, and that is something he faired very poorly on.

So has the State met the burden? Have they offered you proof that Thomas Mosley has been restored to competency? Dr. Tenaglia said that she has no current opinion on competency. Well, there's Dr. Railey. I don't think I need to say more about his very unscientific methods or his credibility.

And Dr. Torrealday found Thomas Mosley competent, though he confused the roles of courtroom personnel, the seriousness of the crimes, he basically gave one-word answers in her evaluation. And Dr. Torrealday herself seemed to have very little understanding of how the criminal process is really different and infinitely more complex in a death case.

Thomas Mosley does not understand. He thinks his lawyer is collaborating with the State. Do you think an eight-year-old can face off against a seasoned state attorney on cross-examination? Can a second-grader assist counsel in interpreting hundreds of pages of police reports, depositions, transcripts and discovery?

Now, Dr. Amy Fritz did language testing. I'm just gonna refer you to her report, page 6, where she has the CELF-5 subtest scores. None of Thomas' age equivalents are over 12. Word classes, following directions, sentence assembly are all age seven and eight. Those are the skills that he would need if he were going to testify. On the pragmatics profile of the CELF, Thomas Mosley scored under age three in terms of his functionality.

Look at the school records. Look at the testimony and the testing of Amy Fritz.

Thomas Mosley is so low functioning, he cannot testify relevantly or consult with counsel with any degree of rational understanding as required by both the Florida and the U.S. Constitutions. Could he get there? Maybe he could learn to understand if he got restoration training through APD,

hopefully for more than 106 days over two sessions.

I've represented Thomas Mosley since the very beginning of this case. He does not understand, and we all thought it was because he suffered from schizophrenia. In this case we didn't understand that it was actually intellectual disability and autism.

Thomas Mosley was born with an extra finger, exactly like his illiterate father. He couldn't tie his shoos until he was 13 years old, and he continually failed at school, even elementary school, before he could read the word "secondary gain." Ms. Daws (sic), the inexperienced special ed teacher at Lakewood Elementary, gave him speech and language testing that she now recognizes are the harbingers of autism.

Renee and Bernard said he always struggled at home, never learned to read. His mother even took him to Sylvan Learning Center in elementary school to try to bolster his performance, but he couldn't learn. He failed the third grade at three different schools. He was intellectually disabled and autistic. So he didn't understand.

Now, ID and autism are present from birth, and the elementary school records are unimpeachable.

_

Things get a little muddier when you get to high school, as so many other factors can be at play as children age. But, your Honor, when you look at Exhibit 4, you have all the evidence you need of adaptive deficits in social, practical, and conceptual domains when he was a young child. He's had those IEPs since first grade, long before anyone could have anticipated his current charges. And all of the doctors agree that those deficits existed, except Dr. Railey.

Now, as Thomas grew older, his circumstances really never improved. His communication challenges made school next to impossible. He was gullible. He struggled with reading at an elementary school level even when he was in high school. He couldn't hold down employment, reliably make change, understand finances, even pass a simple test for his driver's license, something, like every young man, he was really motivated to do, because he didn't understand. For Thomas, it's not about the effort. It's about the ID and autism he was born with.

Now, Renee Mosley has been his mother for her entire life. She knows he doesn't understand. And why? Because she's his mother. No one knows him

better. And although she made sure he had a bible while he was in jail and prays with him after phone calls, reciting the 23rd Psalm that she's committed to heart, perhaps the saddest thing is that after 23 years Thomas can't understand her words of faith and comfort. So we'd like to ask the Court to please find Thomas Mosley more likely than not incompetent.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Russell.

State?

MS. SULLIVAN: Thank you, your Honor.

As Ms. Russell pointed out, the Court's job is to determine whether the defendant has the sufficient present ability to consult with counsel with a reasonable degree of rational understanding and whether the defendant has a rational as well as factual understanding of the pending proceedings.

We have Dr. Tenaglia, the State Hospital doctor; Dr. Railey, a court-appointed doctor, not a State doctor; and Dr. Torrealday, another court-appointed doctor, all saying that Thomas Mosley is competent to proceed in this case.

All three of them questioned the level of effort during the evaluations and the cognitive testing, which was then confirmed by the scores on

the effort tests. The effort tests used were appropriate based on their assessments. None of these doctors felt that his cognitive abilities were so significant as to not warrant the tests that they administered, and none of these three doctors observed symptoms of autism during their personal one-on-one observations with the defendant.

Going back a few weeks ago, we started with Dr. Fabian. After four hours of a PowerPoint presentation, going on a journey through the DSM-5, we found out that he had not done an evaluation of Thomas Mosley. He had not done any testing of Thomas Mosley. He had never met him. I'd ask the Court to give no weight to Dr. Fabian's testimony when considering whether or not Thomas Mosley is competent to proceed, because that's what we're here for.

We've also heard from Dr. Hall two times,
Dr. McClain two times, and Dr. Whitney, all saying
that Thomas Mosley is incompetent, all three being
hired by the Defense in this case.

Dr. Hall is unable to answer a straightforward question from the State, from me personally, without adding or qualifying whatever he wanted to

relay about the defendant. Oftentimes what he was trying to relay was not related to the question I was asking at all.

Dr. McClain never did testing on the defendant until mid July, just a few weeks ago, when all of a sudden she had found that he is now stable enough to do an IQ test. The test she did for malingering is a basic memory test, the Rey 15, which actually shows he's within normal limits, meaning healthy cognitive function, which she confirmed for me yesterday on cross-examination.

Dr. Whitney did not give any effort tests, despite reviewing all the records showing that effort had been questioned by the other doctors appointed in this case and the State Hospital. He administered Module 4 of the ADOS standardized autism test, which is for verbally fluent individuals. He did not review video visits to see the difference in how he communicates and how the defendant reacts to his family versus the doctors during evaluations.

His schizoaffective diagnosis is based on the self-reported hallucinations of the defendant that he's consistently repeated for two years now despite different kinds of antipsychotic

medications at different dosages, and no other doctor besides Dr. McClain has personally observed these hallucinations.

While even Defense doctors find the defendant acceptable in all criteria except four and six, Dr. Whitney found him only acceptable for criteria one. And then yesterday we found out during cross-examination that, in fact, the defendant himself told and showed Dr. Whitney his rap videos and where to access them on his YouTube page.

Dr. Fritz, a speech pathologist, I'd like to note that during the second day of the testing with Mr. Mosley, he abruptly discontinued the testing. Her example, I'd like to remind the Court of how slow she had to speak to Mr. Mosley is not at all consistent with how his family or other doctors have spoken to him, and he has understood and engaged in conversations just fine at the pace that his family and other doctors speak to him.

I would also like the Court to keep in mind that his scores on these language tests highly depend on his level of effort, which has been called into question by numerous other doctors, the State Hospital, and the court-appointed doctors, and then confirmed with effort and malingering

tests. Dr. Fritz also told the State that she did not take into consideration at all that he was currently incarcerated when reaching her opinion of the defendant.

1.3

2.2

2.3

In the area of psychosis, the State would argue that that's a nonissue at this point.

Anything related to psychosis is self-reported, and, again, only Dr. McClain is the one seeing any evidence of psychosis. However, then Dr. McClain, on the seventh time she's evaluated the defendant over the past two years, when she finally did some testing on the defendant, all of a sudden the internal stimuli that she has said has been present every other time she evaluated the defendant is gone; yet, on that seventh evaluation, he's still reporting the same hallucinations that he's been repeating every time to all the doctors for two years.

He even told Dr. Torrealday that he has these hallucinations on the mornings of an evaluation with a doctor. The consistency with which he reports the same hallucinations regarding seeing blood in his eyes or in the shower and hearing voices telling him to kill himself is relevant evidence of malingering those psychotic symptoms.

In the area of depression, again, I would argue that at this point it's a nonissue regarding his competency. At the State Hospital this time around, he was put on the highest doses of meds for depression and was still reporting the same symptoms despite that. His self-report of his depression is not reliable. None of the doctors that testified seemed concerned -- from both Defense doctors to the court-appointed doctors seemed concerned with his level of depression at this time.

And to be fair, one could be expected to have some level of depression given the circumstance that Mr. Mosley finds himself in. But if you contrast that with the evidence reported by the defendant himself that he's eating, he's sleeping well, he's watching TV and enjoying the TV shows that he's watching in the jail, he's laughing and joking on video visits with his family, he's making jokes about haircuts with his brother and his father, the level of the depression that the defendant may have is not the level where it is impairing the capacity to be competent.

The school records, we talked a lot about the school records. They were heavily relied upon by

the Defense doctors. No indications of intellectual disability or autism are existing in those records. And, yes, Ms. Russell talks about what the teachers say now versus what they did then, but the school psychologist that actually met with the defendant during his childhood, not just teachers, did not see any indication or raise any concerns for intellectual disability or autism.

What the school records do show, which is a continuing theme of the defendant's poor effort, bad behavior, unwillingness to do anything Mr. Mosley doesn't want to do. On numerous occasions as I went through with Dr. McClain the first time she testified, the school records, I noted his lack of effort and motivation. I argue his reading level should be taken with caution considering how fast he completed those STAR reading tests. And he even tried to tell the State Hospital at one point he could not read and then was observed reading while he was in competency training.

It's not really surprising that he failed at school when he failed to go to class, when he walked out of class, when he didn't participate in class, wouldn't turn on his computer at times. But

the records also show something else that

Ms. Russell didn't mention. He was capable of
getting decent grades at some point in time. Those
existed, those records that they put into evidence,
but then when you see the absences pick up, when he
is walking out of class, the grades fall.

His school records represent what happens when a student choose not to learn, not to participate, and, of course, his educational records suffered as a result as any person's would. What the records did not show is that the defendant's failure at school was a result of intellectual disability or autism. The records just do not support that when all of the records are taken into context.

What we've seen during this hearing and the hearing last year and in all the collateral and historical evidence involving Thomas Mosley is that, from the time he was young, if he didn't want to do something, he wasn't gonna do it. His mom even talked about this during her testimony. He has consistently shown bad behavior when it comes to school and listening to his parents, and it brings us to the present day when, even during this hearing, when he decided he didn't want to be in the courtroom, he tried to get up and walk out,

just like he got up and walked out of the evaluation the prosecutors tried to attend with Dr. Torrealday because he didn't want us there and he didn't want to talk with us being present.

Autism, Dr. Tenaglia, Dr. Railey,
Dr. Torrealday, in their assessment which they are
trained to do, during their evaluations, found no
symptoms of autism. The Defense doctors relied
heavily on what is being reported by family members
in coming to their conclusion related to autism.

Dr. Whitney is the only one that administered a standardized test directly to the defendant. His scores on that should be taken with caution, given all the other relevant evidence regarding effort.

And, again, Dr. Whitney did not do any effort test to confirm whether or not that standardized autism test was being accurate or not.

Dr. Hall, again, he did not do standardized autism tests with the defendant or his parents. He even testified he had to take the family members' information with a grain of salt, and he explained the reasons for that.

And, also, when Renee Mosley Dixon came and testified, Ms. Russell said that she was credible and she was upset. She also had to have me walk up

her sworn statement that she gave me right after these homicides occurred, because what she was saying under oath during this hearing was different than what she said under oath to myself and Ms. Ellis during a sworn statement.

Dr. McClain did not do standardized autism tests with the defendant, just his parents. It's been mentioned a few times that she did the GARS test, but she did that with his parents. McClain never did a standardized autism test with Mr. Mosley personally.

Dr. Whitney, again, he did do the standardized autism test, but he used that Module 4 when he had three other options and he chose the highest module.

His parents continually point out issues with socializing with peers. Again, Dr. Hall put it you take that with a grain of salt, but you also look at the school records, his time at the State Hospital, the video visitations, showing the opposite of having issues with socializing with peers.

Again, Mr. Mosley tends to do what he wants to do. He wants to talk to peers, whether he's in jail, whether it's during a talent show at the

State Hospital; or even during an evaluation, he would rather focus on what the inmates are doing in the day room and what they're watching on TV than talk to Dr. Torrealday.

An important thing in the State Hospital records show that when the defendant wanted a radio in his room, that meant he had to move up a level in his competency training, and it was only then that he then put forth the effort in training so that he could get that reward.

State Hospital records also show that he is not consistent in what he knows about the legal system from one training to the next, which is consistent with when he talks to different doctors at evaluations. It's showing further relevant evidence of feigning effort.

Intellectual disability, it's not reliable testing that has been conducted due to the defendant feigning and poor effort exhibited, and that's confirmed by the malingering and the effort testing. We essentially have four IQ scores throughout this hearing, 46, 55, another 55 from Dr. Torrealday on the CTONI, and then Dr. McClain's coming in at the end of July on the WAIS-5 at a 69.

I would urge the Court to take consideration

regarding his effort when considering the weight of these scores. The court-appointed doctors question if the test results accurately reflect his abilities, and they suspect effort is lacking when getting those scores.

And then the fact that Dr. McClain testified yesterday that she finds her score of 69 to be valid despite the wide spread in the scoring in a time period of about five months should be considered when evaluating any findings by Dr. McClain.

When it comes to adaptive functioning, it plays a big part in the intellectual disability diagnosis. It's not just about an IQ score. And those IQ scores should be strongly questioned regarding their validity at this point, all of them. But Dr. Hall, he did not do standardized testing or have family do standardized adaptive functioning tests.

He changed his diagnosis to intellectual disability just recently, an area he admittedly does not have an expertise in or practice in frequently, and he did that based on McClain's representation that her score is valid. So Dr. Hall changing his diagnosis I would argue

_

should be questioned when all -- it all depends on McClain's representation that that 69 is a valid score.

Dr. McClain did not do standardized adaptive functioning tests with the defendant, just his parents. And then Dr. Tenaglia, Dr. Railey, and Dr. Torrealday saw no issues with adaptive functioning. And Dr. Railey specifically found that the defendant's mother, Renee Dixon Mosley, on the WHODAS, the score was completely out of the range of what he observed when he evaluated the defendant.

Dr. Tenaglia reviewed the hospital records.

She spoke to those who observed the defendant from day to day. She reviewed the nursing progress notes. She talked to the competency trainers. And she learned that he did socialize with peers. He did participate in training when he wanted to, when there was a reward at stake. He was able to function appropriately with his daily living while at the State Hospital. He was able to feed himself, shower. Dr. Torrealday reviewed the Pinellas County Jail records and saw there were no issues with his daily functioning in the Pinellas County Jail.

Prior to his arrest, he was able to work until he made the choice that he either didn't like the job or want to do it anymore. He drove a car. And him taking many times to pass the test needs to be considered in the context that he never in his life has seemed motivated to study for something, and that driver's test is something you have to study for. And it goes in line with how he's conducted his life is that he wants it, he's gonna go try to do it, but you have to study to pass tests. You have to put forth effort to pass tests, and Mr. Mosley just decides he wants to be able to do something and drive a car, but he has not over his lifespan shown that he wants to do the effort required to make successful outcomes.

The way he talks and acts on video visits when it's something he wants to talk about, he wants to know about, when family members show up during the video visits, he wants to hear what they're doing, what they're up to, he's engaging with them. He's having conversations. He's smiling. It's a different Thomas Mosley than the one that we've heard about over the last two months that shows up to an evaluation seeing blood in his eyes and being sad.

And the rap videos, yes, we put those in for adaptive functioning purposes. I think it very much goes towards that. It shows him participating with others, socializing with others. It shows that he can memorize lyrics. He can rap lyrics. He can perform them. He can do that while driving a car. One of the videos put into evidence is just Mr. Mosley himself. It's a rap video just of him, on his own, no one else to compare it to. Just the real Thomas Mosley driving his car, rapping, rapping around boats, doing what he loves to do, what he had a dream to do.

That's not an autistic obsession. It's a genuine desire that Thomas Mosley had in his life, and he actually had some success at it. He was able to have a YouTube page with albums. These were produced. Not saying he was a rap star by any means or that he was awesome at it, but he had a goal, and to call that just an autistic obsession and toss it to the side, you have to give weight to that.

That's showing him in his society, in his community, what he knew. Dr. Whitney says that's not a normal societal community, but that's Dr. Whitney's opinion on that. This is

Thomas Mosley's friends, his peers, doing something he wanted to do, and when he wants to do something, he performs it well, and that's what you see in those rap videos, and that's what you see in those video visits. It's relevant evidence of his adaptive functioning, and it shows the difference between the man that walks into this courtroom and the man that's out there doing what he wants to do and the dream that he had.

Language impairment, that alone does not equal intellectual disability or incompetence.

Dr. Fritz's opinion regarding the significance of any language delay does not align with what can be seen in other evaluations with other doctors, what can be heard on the visits and the rap videos.

And, again, the reliability of her test results should be questioned considering all the other evidence of the defendant displaying poor effort and feigning.

There's a Supreme Court case that I referenced last year. It's <u>Peede</u>, P-E-E-D-E, <u>v. State</u>, and that's 955 So.2d 480. It was when a trial court found the defendant competent and it was sent up to the Florida Supreme Court. And on page 9 of the case -- and I have a copy for your Honor I can give

you -- the court states: The trial court subsequently found the defendant competent to proceed, concluding that the defendant could assist his attorneys, if he wanted to, but is instead choosing not to discuss the facts of this case. The court said it was clear that the defendant is not incompetent, simply uncooperative. The court stated that any difficulties in communicating with counsel were of the defendant's own choosing rather than due to any mental defects.

The court further pointed out that a trial Court's decision does not constitute an abuse of discretion unless no reasonable person would take the view adopted by the trial court, and that it is the duty of the trial court to determine what weight should be given to the conflicting testimony.

And when we were here last year, the State made the argument that it seemed the question really came down to whether the defendant was unable or unwilling to participate in his legal case, and this time around the court-appointed doctors, along with the State Hospital doctor, all conclude that, if the defendant chooses to put forth the effort and participate, he has the

capacity to do so. And those opinions are supported by the relevant evidence contained in the State Hospital records, the school records, the standardized testing, and the video visits.

There's not enough credible evidence that the defendant is at this present time suffering from a psychotic disorder, major depression that is impeding his ability to be competent, intellectual disability, or autism. What is clear and convincing is that the defendant is competent to proceed, and any illusion that he is not is due to his own malingering and his own feigned effort that is supported by the assessments of the court-appointed doctors and the supplemental testing they conducted on the defendant.

Thank you. And may I approach with this case law?

THE COURT: Yes, please.

MS. SULLIVAN: I gave a copy to Defense already.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Any rebuttal argument from Defense?

MS. RUSSELL: May I have a minute to confer?

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.

What page did you refer me to?

2.3

MS. SULLIVAN: Page 9, your Honor. 1 2 MS. RUSSELL: Your Honor, I don't believe we 3 have anything further. 4 THE COURT: Okay. 5 MS. RUSSELL: I also have copies of the cases 6 that I cited. 7 THE COURT: I would be happy to take those 8 from you. 9 MS. RUSSELL: Unfortunately, I don't have 10 copies for the State. So I'm just gonna show them. 11 MS. SULLIVAN: It's okay. Just go ahead and 12 give them to the judge. 13 MS. RUSSELL: Okay. 14 THE COURT: You already read the cites into 15 the record, I believe, correct? 16 MS. RUSSELL: I hope so. 17 THE COURT: I'll just do it again. 18 MS. RUSSELL: Okay. 19 THE COURT: All right. So you gave me Byron 20 Keith Cooper, 116 Supreme Court 1373. 21 517 U.S. 348, and that's a 1996 case; Dougherty v. 22 State, 146 So.3d 672, Florida Supreme Court case; 23 387 So.2d 463, King v. State, a First District 24 Court of Appeals case from 1980; Moore v. Texas, 25 586 U.S. 133, a 2019 U.S. Supreme Court case;

another Moore v. Texas, 581 U.S. 1, 2017 case, 1 2 U.S. Supreme Court. And I believe that's it. 3 Okay. All right. So the transcripts are 4 starting to come in. You cited some of them. 5 think we're all getting them at the same time. 6 There's still a few more outstanding, and obviously 7 I need this week's stuff transcribed. So my hope 8 of -- we previously discussed I was gonna try and 9 be done by today with my order. Obviously I can't 10 do that. 11 So any day of the week better for you-all to 12 come in? I'm just gonna set it pretrial/status 13 check on my order. That way I have a deadline, and 14 I can make sure you-all have received it. 15 MS. SULLIVAN: It really depends on the week 16 for us, our schedules. 17 THE COURT: September 15th is a Monday. 18 MS. RUSSELL: Yes, your Honor. 19 MS. SULLIVAN: The 15th works. 20 Is that okay, 8:30? Okay we'll do THE COURT: 21 status check pretrial for Mr. Mosley. He'll be a 22 mandatory bring for that day, and we'll go from 23 there. All right? Thank you, everybody.

MS. RUSSELL:

24

25

Thank you, your Honor.

1	(PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED)
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21 22	
23	
24	
25	

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

STATE OF FLORIDA)

COUNTY OF PINELLAS)

I, Jennifer Fleischer, Registered Merit Reporter,

certify that I was authorized to and did stenographically
report the foregoing proceedings and that the transcript

DATED this 26th day of August, 2025.

is a true record.

/S <u>Jennifer Fleischer</u> Jennifer Fleischer Registered Merit Reporter