

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF CENTRE COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA CIVIL ACTION - LAW



MICHAEL J. MCQUEARY

: NO. 2012-1804

VS

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS (ON THE RECORD DISCUSSION IN CHAMBERS PRIOR TO START OF TRIAL)

BEFORE:

THOMAS G. GAVIN, SENIOR JUDGE

SPECIALLY PRESIDING 15TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

DATE:

OCTOBER 17, 2016

PLACE:

CENTRE COUNTY COURTHOUSE ANNEX

ANNEX COURTROOM

108 SOUTH ALLEGHENY STREET

BELLEFONTE, PA 16823

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF: ELLIOTT STROKOFF, ESQUIRE WILLIAM T. FLEMING, ESOUIRE

FOR THE DEFENDANT: NANCY CONRAD, ESQUIRE GEORGE MORRISON, ESQUIRE



NOTES BY:

JENNIFER AMENTLER

OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

ROOM 101, CENTRE COUNTY COURTHOUSE BELLEFONTE, PA 16823

814 355-6734 or FAX 814 548-1158

CU

PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: I thought we would try and get a couple things squared away before openings so everyone knows what's going on. Let's address the whistleblower first. I take it, Ms. Conrad, you and Mr. Strokoff are in agreement that the Court decide the whistleblower.

MS. CONRAD: That is the law.

THE COURT: And the advisory verdict of the jury, we're not going to do that. The Court will decide without an advisory verdict. However, I think to keep everybody in the game, I'm not going to mention that they're not deciding the whistleblower claim. I think that way it will keep everything in context. And I can tell them at the conclusion of the case that as a matter of law the Court will decide that.

MS. CONRAD: Thank you.

THE COURT: Does anybody have any objection to that?

MR. STROKOFF: No, sir.

THE COURT: Now, as part of the opening instructions, we generally talk a little bit about the law. And I have learned that sometimes when I'm talking about the elements of the law, I'm saying

that the view of the parties is this, that, or the other thing, only to learn out that's not really the view of the parties at all. So, it seems to me that what would make sense here is to give all of the opening instructions with the exception of any comment of the law until you've both had a chance to open. And then once I know what your positions are, then I can briefly talk about the law. And I don't intend to talk about it to any great extent because I think doing so really isn't going to be helpful.

I think, off the top of my head, on the defamation, there's no question something got sent, there's no question people read it, and the issue is whether the person who read it took it in a manner that was defamatory to Mr. McQueary or whether they did not and whether it was a statement of fact or statement of opinion.

And the same thing with regard to the misrepresentation, that seems the easiest thing to say is that, and I'm assuming you're going to say it, the contention is I went and I told him X, Y, and Z and they said they'd do A, B, and C and I relied on it and they didn't. And the flip side is going to be -- well, I don't know what the flip side is going to be, that's why I want to be careful and

wait until I hear what the flip side is. So once I 1 2 hear that, maybe what we'll do is we'll just take a 3 sidebar conference and I'll tell you generically 4 what I would explain them the law to be. And then 5 that way I'm not sticking my foot in where it 6 doesn't belong, in the opening anyhow. So we can do that.

> MS. CONRAD: Judge, will you reference the whistleblower so it's --

> > THE COURT: I am going to -- yeah.

MS. CONRAD: Thank you.

And I'm simply going to say to THE COURT: them that, you know, again, his contention is because he came forward he was dismissed, your contention is he wasn't selected and his contract was up.

> MS. CONRAD: Thank you.

I don't think we need to say a THE COURT: lot more than that. I'm assuming you're both going to wax eloquent about that.

Okav. McQueary is a public figure. You both have to commend you have wonderful secretaries who would be in on Sunday to be working as diligently as the lawyers on Sunday were working. I can tell you that my wife was unhappy when I kept looking at my

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

cell phone during her dinner, but that's another matter.

So I'll hear you on the whistleblower. I've read both positions and if you want to any further discussion, I'll hear it.

MR. STROKOFF: The whistleblower or the public?

THE COURT: I'm sorry. On the public figure. Public figure.

MS. CONRAD: And Your Honor, we certainly can brief this issue. I don't know that this is an issue that has to be decided at this stage if Your Honor wanted to hear more of the evidence.

THE COURT: Well, I think I'm giving credit to whoever bringing up the idea that he set the passing record and was so famous 15 years ago. But I think the issue really is, was he a public figure on the day the email went out? And while there's no question that Mr. Paterno was a public figure, the guy's walking up and down the sideline. And unless you were devoted as some of the prospective jurors were to Penn State football, you'd have no idea who that person was and could care less. And so, I mean, I'll give you a chance to brief it further, but I do not see any way that Mr. McQueary was a

public figure at the operative time. Clearly he's one now, but that's not what's controlling the issue.

MS. CONRAD: And we would request the opportunity to further brief that he was a limited public figure, purpose public figure at the time --

THE COURT: And again, limited -- a citizen who comes forward and does their duty by reporting something, and again, I'm just saying that's the contention, is hardly a willing participant. No person in their right mind willingly gets involved in any kind of litigation, civil or criminal. So, you know, to assert that by stepping forward he somehow injected himself and became a willing participant, I don't see it. But I'll give you the chance to brief it.

MS. CONRAD: Thank you, sir.

THE COURT: I'm not going to make any comment in my openings about the adverse inferences, Fifth Amendment issues, any of that. We can wait until all of that arises. And I will tell the jury as regarding the law, and I will be instructing them on various other matters. Did we resolve the motion in limine about the characterization of the file? I believe we did, but_--

Confidential. 1 MR. STROKOFF: 2 MS. CONRAD: And I believe we agreed no reference to the victim settlements. 3 MR. STROKOFF: Like I said, I never imagined 4 5 it. MS. CONRAD: Thank you. 6 7 THE COURT: Okav. So I think that sort of covers what was on my checklist. If you folks have 8 9 something on your checklists, let's get to it. MR. STROKOFF: Okay. With respect to the 10 adverse interest, I tendered a proposed stipulation 11 12 on how to deal with the Curley and Shultz to Ms. 13 Conrad, so I would hope some time within the next 14 day or so we can --15 THE COURT: Did I get a copy of that? 16 MR. STROKOFF: No, because I wanted her to 17 weigh in before we bothered Your Honor. 18 MS. CONRAD: And when did you send that? 19 MR. STROKOFF: Friday. 20 MS. CONRAD: I have not been in the office. 21 MR. STROKOFF: George, you got it, right? 22 MR. MORRISON: I did see the email, yes. MR. STROKOFF: I have copies of it somewhere, 23 24 Your Honor. MS. CONRAD: We will make that a priority to 25

review.

MR. STROKOFF: Then the other thing has to do with the depositions. We have three depositions, Coach Bradley, Coach Wilson, and David Joyner. And my original intent was to have Tim be the deponent, but Nancy objected to that. What I frankly was expecting is that with all the witnesses that we have coming in and Murphy's Law being what it is, these depositions could very well, if we're ready to go with them, slide in so there's no down time. So the question is, if it's not going to be Tim, then we really have to have somebody standing by. But sometimes, Your Honor, I just play both parts.

MS. CONRAD: We have readers available and can be here tomorrow if -- now we just received the two depositions transcripts of Bradley and Joyner last night.

MR. STROKOFF: You need the designations.

MS. CONRAD: The designations last night. We have not had an opportunity to produce our designations to Elliot.

THE COURT: So are we that concerned that Mr. Fleming is going to read like Shakespeare and hit all the appropriate points that he wants dramatically and then go flat on everything else?

1	MS. CONRAD: Your Honor, these are former
2	employees of Penn State. And to have Plaintiff's
3	counsel rise from his seat next to Plaintiff and go
4	up to the witness stand and read as a Penn State
5	witness is just too confusing to the jury and sends
6	a wrong message.
7	MR. STROKOFF: Well, if the readers are going
8	to be available on demand, then
9	MS. CONRAD: I will have readers here
10	tomorrow morning.
11	MR. STROKOFF: Well, I don't think I need
12	them in the morning. Perhaps the afternoon.
13	MS. CONRAD: The afternoon? Okay.
14	THE COURT: So they're not going to be from
15	the theater department and read as you worry about
16	Mr. Fleming, right?
17	MS. CONRAD: I hadn't thought about the
18	theater department.
19	THE COURT: Well, there you go.
20	MS. CONRAD: Thank you, sir.
21	MR. STROKOFF: Just so you know, Meryl Streep
22	was not available.
23	THE COURT: Okay. What else?
24	MR. STROKOFF: On the adverse interest issue,
25	we've received, that is Nancy and I have received,

communications from the lawyers from Curley and Schultz. And I don't know if Your Honor wants a copy, but they seem to be agreeable to even reading the depositions. But hopefully, we could come up with a stipulation.

MS. CONRAD: As I've already indicated, there's no reason to read the deposition because all the deposition is the assertion of the Fifth Amendment. The stipulation that we would propose is that were Mr. Curley, Schultz, and I believe there's a third witness, were to appear here today, they would assert their Fifth Amendment rights and refuse to answer any questions that relate to the claims and the defenses in this matter.

THE COURT: Okay. And then from that, your position is but there's no adverse interest because they're not parties and we don't control them, notwithstanding that Penn State is paying their legal fees. And I need to be certain in my own mind, what is the exact status? I thought one of these gentlemen were still somehow on the University faculty or something. They're completely gone?

MS. CONRAD: Mr. Schultz and Mr. Curley have no relationship with the University except as former employees.

THE COURT: And except that the University is paying their legal defense.

MS. CONRAD: Per -- yes, they are.

THE COURT: Okay. So that might suggest that you have some leverage over them since their legal expenses are about to begin to get even bigger since I understand the Attorney General withdrew the perjury count.

MS. CONRAD: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Well, I won't comment about that on the record, we can discuss that off the record later. But they're in for the failure to report issue. Okay. And of course, that's the inference that he wants drawn that Mr. McQueary told them and they were supposed to do something and they didn't do it, and they're invoking of the Fifth Amendment would probably meet the adverse inference rule for a witness.

MS. CONRAD: And Your Honor, if that trial were over, one would assume that Mr. Curley and Mr. Schultz would be here testifying. They have not been convicted. We have not had access to their testimony. They have not testified in their proceedings.

THE COURT: Yeah, I understand that. And

that's why we're here today because if they go the same way the Sandusky proceedings did, it will be another four years before we're even close to getting a resolution. All right. You can brief it further as you want, but I think you know where I'm

MR. STROKOFF: Does Your Honor have a reference with respect to openings about leaving counsel table or standing at a podium?

aligned at the moment.

any place you want to question as long as you're not blocking the other counsel's view of the jury, et cetera. You don't have to ask my permission to approach a witness, although with the high tech courtroom, that's probably out. We don't have to do that anymore. But no, you can stand wherever you want. I am a stickler, if you address me you stand. And, you know, if you object, I just want to hear the legal basis, I don't want to hear your argument until I ask you for it. And other than that, you've both done this enough times.

MS. CONRAD: Elliot, do you have anything else?

MR. STROKOFF: Not on my list.

MS. CONRAD: Your Honor, many of the

witnesses have personal counsel. And their personal counsel appeared at the depositions, asserted objections on behalf of their witnesses. The question is, where are they to sit? And they need

MR. STROKOFF: These are personal counsel I believe, Your Honor, paid for by Penn State.

to confirm procedures in your courtroom.

THE COURT: Well, we won't worry about who's paying for them at the moment. But the question becomes, if none of these witnesses have previously invoked the Fifth Amendment, what right do they have to counsel to advise them as to -- or to have counsel object on their behalf?

MS. CONRAD: These witnesses have, in some cases, appeared before the grand jury and are under certain instructions from that proceeding. These witnesses will be appearing in the upcoming criminal proceedings.

MR. STROKOFF: Your Honor, unless there's an --

THE COURT: Then we're going to have to talk to them since I happen to sit as supervising judge of the eastern state grand jury. I don't know what instructions you could possibly give to a witness that would preclude the witness from revealing

2 | 3 | 4

11.

but I think to avoid any problems, when we have such a witness, we'll have to take a break and sit down in a room and say this is the general gist of where we're going, why do you think you have a dog in the fight where you get to say something?

MS. CONRAD: And I don't know that they have

anything the witness wants to reveal. So -- and the

Attorney General has no objection about that.

a dog in the fight, I'm only saying that they appeared at depositions, and you'll agree with me.

MR. STROKOFF: Yes.

MS. CONRAD: They asserted objections on behalf of their clients.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. CONRAD: Your Honor, with the electronics, it is our practice to, when we're introducing an exhibit with the witness, it will appear on the screen in front of her. We will then have the witness authenticate it. And at that time, move it into admission and ask for it to be displayed to the jury. Is that acceptable?

THE COURT: Works for me.

MS. CONRAD: Thank you. And then finally, following up on Elliot's questions with respect to openings, we do have a demonstrative that we intend

to use during opening, which is nothing more than a timeline that tracks the events as identified in the complaint. THE COURT: Okay. MS. CONRAD: Thank you. END OF PROCEEDINGS

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately in the notes taken by me upon the hearing of the within matter and that this copy is a correct transcript of the same.

Date

Jennifer E. Amentler

official Reporter

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that a copy of this transcript was made available counsel of record for the parties, advising they had until October 24, 2016, in which to file any objections or exceptions to the same. That time period having elapsed without recording of objections or exceptions, the transcript is therefore lodged with the Court for further action.

13 Date

Jennifer E. Amentler

Official Reporter

ACCEPTANCE BY COURT Upon counsel's opportunity to review and to offer objections to the record, the foregoing record of proceedings is hereby accepted and directed to be filed. 11-2-16 Date Thomas G. Gavin Senior Judge Specially Presiding 15th Judicial District