| 1 | STATE OF WISCONSIN CIRCUIT COURT MILWAUKEE COUNTY BRANCH 3 |
|----------|---|
| 2 | * |
| 3 | STATE OF WISCONSIN, |
| 4 | STATE OF WISCONSIN, |
| 5 | Plaintiff, |
| 6 | vs. Case No. 2013-CF-003474 |
| O | JIMMIE JOHNSON, |
| 7 | Defendant. |
| 8 | |
| 9 | * |
| 10 | ORAL RULING |
| | * |
| 11 | Charge: Possession of Heroin, With Intent to |
| 12 | Deliver |
| 13 | Date: March 24, 2014 |
| 14 | Time: 9:53 a.m 10:17 a.m. |
| 15 16 | Before the Honorable Clare L. Fiorenza, Circuit Judge, Branch 3, Presiding |
| | |
| 17 | * |
| 18 | APPEARANCES: |
| 19 | ANTONELLA ALEMAN appeared on behalf of the Plaintiff. |
| 20 | |
| 21 | CRAIG POWELL appeared on behalf of the Defendant. |
| 22 | * |
| | Jennifer L. Carter, RPR, RMR, Official Reporter |
| 23 | * |
| 24 | |
| 25 | Please see final page for information on obtaining official, certified copies of this transcript. |

| | 2 |
|----|--|
| 1 | TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS |
| 2 | THE CLERK: State of Wisconsin versus |
| 3 | Jimmie Johnson; Case No. 13-CF-3474, possess |
| 4 | with intent to deliver heroin. |
| 5 | Appearances, please? |
| 6 | ATTORNEY ALEMAN: Antonella Aleman on |
| 7 | behalf of the State of Wisconsin. |
| 8 | ATTORNEY POWELL: Jimmie Johnson |
| 9 | appears in person with Attorney Craig Powell. |
| 10 | Good morning, Your Honor. |
| 11 | THE COURT: Good morning. |
| 12 | Mr. Johnson has two cases of to be called |
| 13 | this morning. I'll just have them called |
| 14 | separately, I think. Makes more sense. |
| 15 | Separate cases. Separate decision. They're |
| 16 | not going to be tried together; so I thought |
| 17 | we'd call them one at a time, if there's no |
| 18 | objection to proceeding in that matter. |
| 19 | ATTORNEY ALEMAN: Not from the State, |
| 20 | Your Honor. |
| 21 | ATTORNEY POWELL: No. |
| 22 | THE COURT: Okay. This case before |
| 23 | the Court is for a decision on the defendant's |
| 24 | motion to suppress that was filed back on |
| 25 | November 11th of last year. |
| 1 | |

| | <u> </u> |
|----|---|
| 1 | An evidentiary hearing took place on |
| 2 | March 13th. At that time, there was one |
| 3 | witness, Detective Nick Stachula, |
| 4 | S-T-A-C-H-U-L-A. The motion filed by Defense |
| 5 | challenged both the stop of the defendant and |
| 6 | the reliability of the dog of the drug |
| 7 | detection dog. Excuse me. |
| 8 | After the hearing began, I was |
| 9 | advised that the sole issue was concerning the |
| 10 | stop of the defendant, specifically, whether |
| 11 | there was probable cause to arrest the |
| 12 | defendant at the time he was stopped by police. |
| 13 | Mr. Powell, is that an accurate |
| 14 | statement of the sole issue? |
| 15 | ATTORNEY POWELL: Yes. |
| 16 | THE COURT: Ms. Aleman? |
| 17 | ATTORNEY ALEMAN: Yes, Your Honor. |
| 18 | THE COURT: Based upon the |
| 19 | uncontested testimony from the evidentiary |
| 20 | hearing, I make the following findings of fact: |
| 21 | Detective Nick Stachula, an officer |
| 22 | with the West Allis Police Department for |
| 23 | approximately fourteen years, presently |
| 24 | assigned to the Special Investigations Unit, |
| 25 | was assigned to investigate a matter concerning |
| | |

a report of a citizen finding some suspected controlled substances in the Chuck E. Cheese parking lot on Highway 100 in West Allis.

On June 13th of last year, he was advised that Jennifer Trudeau, T-R-U-D-E-A-U, came to the West Allis Police Department with a bag of suspected controlled substance she reported finding in a nearby business parking lot, and she spoke to the front desk officer about what she had found.

Detective Stachula ran a report written by Officer Tillman, T-I-L-L-M-A-N, that day, and then called Jennifer Trudeau and spoke with her. She told him that she's a social worker and was coordinating a visit with some children with a client of hers at Chuck E. Cheese.

She went to exit her vehicle and walked over -- she went to exit her vehicle and to walk over to Chuck E. Cheese and located a purple Crown Royal satchel directly adjacent to a car parked next to hers, which she described as by the driver's door -- side door, below the driver's door, as if it fell out of a car, it appeared to her, as whoever exited the door --

that the bag fell out on the concrete parking
lot.

The satchel was picked up and opened, and she saw a plastic baggie with a bunch of aluminum foil folds, which she suspected was some type of narcotic.

She took out her cell phone, took a picture of the license plate and the back end of the vehicle, which the bag she found by the driver's door, proceeded to go into Chuck E. Cheese with the visit she was coordinating, and maintained by the window -- and remained by the window -- excuse me -- to actually look into the parking lot to see if anyone came out into the vehicle.

She noticed an individual come walking from the north, which was a business directly north, which was the Pet World, and that individual walked from that general direction of Pet World, then made it to the driver's door and accessed the vehicle.

It drove directly west towards

Highway 100 exit, made an abrupt stop, turned

back in the parking lot, and then started

circling around the lot, which she described as

1 appeared to be looking for something.

Eventually, the vehicle stopped

again, and the driver, the sole occupant, got

out and walked around, looking on the ground,

like -- like he lost something, and then

eventually went back in the vehicle and left

the area.

Ms. Trudeau provided a description of the individual as follows: Black male, roughly five-eight to five-nine-ish, light to medium complexion, 200 pounds, and in the twenties area. He was wearing a black T shirt and black shorts. She brought in with her the Royal Crown purple cloth bag with a plastic bag containing sixty-nine individually-wrapped tin foil bindles.

Detective Stachula tested the substance, and it was heroin. There is no challenge to the drug testing for this motion.

Detective Stachula contacted Pet
World that day and requested a copy of
surveillance footage or the surveillance
footage in the entry area and the front door of
that business from 1:00 to 2:00 p.m. because
the report Ms. Trudeau -- sorry -- because in

the report Ms. Trudeau estimated that it was somewhere in the area of 1:45 when this occurred.

The next day, on June 14th, he picked up the video. He viewed the video, and at 1:13 p.m., he observed a party matching the description that Ms. Trudeau had provided, black male, twenties, five-eight-ish, wearing a black T shirt and black shorts, come walking in the front door of the business. The video was quite clear for surveillance footage, he testified, and he could clearly see, on the right forearm, a tattoo.

He observed the person walk through the front door, pass through the checkout area, and walk back to the fish tank display area.

The person looked around the garbage area and underneath it and then walked out of the store without stopping to purchase anything.

Detective Stachula -- Am I pronouncing it correctly?

ATTORNEY ALEMAN: Stachula.

THE COURT: Stachula. Did not show the video to Ms. Trudeau. The video also showed a person in a blue T shirt look in that

1 same area.

Ms. Trudeau also provided a photograph of the license plate and trunk area to Detective Stachula via e-mail, which was received into evidence as Exhibit 14, which he reviewed, and it was consistent with the information Ms. Trudeau had verbally provided It was a Chevy Tahoe with a Wisconsin to him. registration tag of 190UNY.

He ran that information through a database and acquired an address and name of the registered owner. I believe it was D-A-Y-A-Y-A, Shurrell, S-H-U-R-R-E-L-L, Anderson, A-N-D-E-R-S-O-N, at 3360 North 48th Street. That's Exhibit 15 that was received into evidence. Detective Stachula drove by the house several times and was not able to locate the vehicle at that location.

Detective Stachula sent an e-mail out on an investigative website asking other jurisdiction investigators if they had made contact with that plate or vehicle and received -- and he received an e-mail response from Detective Zimmerman from the Milwaukee Police Department that that vehicle had

recently received a Milwaukee parking ticket at an address of 4460 North 20 -- North -- sorry -- 59th Street.

Exhibit 16 is a spreadsheet for the City of Milwaukee night parking violations and showed that on June 7th, 2013, a Chevy SUV bearing the plate 190UNY received a citation at -- one minute, please. I think I have the wrong address in here. A 4650 North 52nd Street, which matched the plate provided by Ms. Trudeau.

After getting an address, surveillance was done on that address in an attempt to locate the vehicle, and on June 19th, 2013, Detective Stachula and Corporal Jeffrey Zientek, Z-I-E-N-T-E-K, driving in separate vehicles, were doing surveillance at 5650 North 52nd Street and saw that vehicle, which was empty.

Eventually, a black male exited the residence and -- and entered the front driver's seat of the vehicle and proceeded northbound on 52nd Street. From the distance he was,

Detective Stachula, with binoculars, was unable to confirm 100 percent that it was the person

in the Pet World video.

Detective Stachula and Corporal

Zientek followed the -- the vehicle to the area

of, I believe it was, 30th and Villard or 35th

and Villard -- 35th and Villard, where the

vehicle parked, and the driver exited the

vehicle and started to walk towards the

business.

As the driver was exiting, Detective Stachula pulled up and got within a car length of the individual and was close enough to get an unobstructed visual on the tattoo on the right forearm and was able to identify him as the male who he previously viewed exiting Pet World on the day Ms. Trudeau filed the complaint, which was the defendant, Jimmie Johnson.

Detective Stachula drove past the defendant and then turned around, and in the minute or two it took him to come back to the area where the defendant was walking towards, the vehicle was gone. They were not able -- Detective Stachula and Corporal Zientek -- were not able to locate the vehicle in the general area, and then they went back to the house

where they had previously seen the vehicle.

2.4

I believe it was his testimony about five minutes had passed from the time he saw the vehicle on, I think it was, 35th Street and -- 35th and Villard and return to the house, and then he observed Mr. Johnson walking into the residence. Detective Stachula testified that he had seen this type of short transaction hundreds of times in the past when conducting drug investigations.

They stayed at the location, trying to get a marked squad to assist, and they may have actually been trying to get a marked squad earlier, but it was June 19th, and they had a difficult time getting a marked squad from the City of Milwaukee on that day.

About five to ten minutes after the defendant entered the residence, he exited the residence, got into the same vehicle, and proceeded north on 52nd Street. A traffic stop was done by a marked squad at around, like, 51st and Hampton. Detective Stachula went to that location, and the -- the person stopped was the defendant, the same person Detective Stachula saw at the -- in the Pet World video

and the same person he saw on 35th and Villard.

A canine sniff was done on the vehicle Mr. Johnson was driving, and the dog indicated that narcotics were present inside the vehicle. I find this undisputed testimony of Detective Stachula credible. The defendant asserts that there was not probable cause to arrest the defendant at the time that he was stopped.

Probable cause to arrest exists when the totality of the circumstances within that officer's knowledge, at the time of the arrest, would lead a reasonable police officer to believe that the defendant probably committed a crime.

The objective facts before the police officer need only lead to a conclusion that guilt is more than a possibility. There must be more than a possible -- a possibility or a suspicion that the defendant committed the offense, but the evidence need not reach the level of proof beyond a reasonable doubt or even that guilt is more likely than not.

With this standard in mind, at the time that the defendant was stopped at the

direction of Detective Stachula, he had the
following information. I'm just reviewing the
testimony, the credible testimony, from
Detective Stachula.

There was a citizen, a social worker, who had come to the West Allis Police

Department on June 13th with a bag of sixty-nine foil bindles of heroin and reported that they were found on the ground outside the driver's door of the vehicle, and she provided a photo of a license plate on the back end of that vehicle.

She described how she saw the individual walk from the north, which was the direction of the Pet World, get into the car, drove west towards Highway 100, the -- the exit there, make an abrupt stop, turned back into the parking lot, and started circling around the parking lot, which she thought appeared to be like the individual was looking for something, and stopped the vehicle again.

And then the driver of -- the -- the sole occupant, which was the defendant, got out and -- and walked around, looked on the ground, again like he lost something, and then

eventually went back to the vehicle and -- and left the area.

Ms. Trudeau had provided a description of this individual as a black male, roughly five-eight to five-nine-ish, light to medium complexion, 200 pounds, and in their twenties. The individual was wearing a black T shirt and black shorts.

Detective Stachula reviewed surveillance video from Pet World, and there was a person that matched that description of the person provided by Ms. Trudeau, a black male, matched in age, height, weight, and exactly what the person was wearing, a black T shirt and black shorts.

And Detective Stachula could also see him -- When, I guess, the video was slowed down, he could see clearly a tattoo that was on the forearm -- the right forearm -- of the individual that went into the Pet World and exited without purchasing anything. Police ran the plates, go to that address, did not see the vehicle.

Detective Stachula sent out an e-mail on an investigative website asking other

jurisdictions and investigators if they'd made contact with that plate and vehicle and received an e-mail response from Milwaukee Police Department that the vehicle had received a citation.

2.2

The officers -- The citation, I believe, was on June 7th; so the same month as this incident occurred they went to that area to get some surveillance, found a vehicle that matched the description that Ms. Trudeau had provided, the plate and the description of the vehicle.

And the officers do surveillance and they see an individual get out, come out a residence, go into that vehicle. Officer Stachula gets close up. They follow. That vehicle gets close up, within a car length, sees the individual, believes it's the same person that was on the video from the 17th of -- I'm sorry -- from the 13th of June, saw the tattoo that they saw on the person from the Pet World video.

And the defendant then returns to the residence after a short period of time, which was consistent with what Detective Stachula

| | 16 |
|----|---|
| 1 | testified was he'd seen in his years of |
| 2 | experience with dealing with drug transactions. |
| 3 | Did anybody believe I misstated any |
| 4 | fact from the hearing? |
| 5 | ATTORNEY ALEMAN: No. I think they |
| 6 | were stated accurately, Your Honor. |
| 7 | ATTORNEY POWELL: Well, according to |
| 8 | the last thing you said, I think you needed to |
| 9 | make this specific finding because he said what |
| 10 | they observed about this short-term |
| 11 | transaction. |
| 12 | I think what the Court is referring |
| 13 | to is he saw Mr. Johnson get out of his car, |
| 14 | walk towards the business. Detective Stachula |
| 15 | and Corporal Zientek drove past, did not see |
| 16 | what happened after that, and returned. And he |
| 17 | was gone. |
| 18 | THE COURT: And then went back to the |
| 19 | residence. About five minutes passed from |
| 20 | returning to the residence and finding the van |
| 21 | there. That's what I meant by the "short |
| 22 | term." They did not see a hand-to-hand. |
| 23 | Clearly, they did not, Mr. Powell. I wasn't |
| 24 | trying to insinuate that. |
| 25 | I believe Detective Stachula said he |

had seen many short transactions, people go
somewhere, come back, deliver -- that's what I
inferred from his testimony, and that's what's
consistent with what he's seen in other
investigations regarding drug matters.

ATTORNEY POWELL: I believe he also testified it was consistent with thousands of other innocent explanations as well. That was his testimony, just to --

THE COURT: It could be -- it could be many things. Correct.

Based upon this record, I do find that there was probable cause to arrest Mr. Johnson at the time that he was stopped. You know, probable cause does not mean guilt beyond any type of reasonable doubt. It's more than a suspicion, more than a possibility, but it is not guilt beyond a reasonable doubt or a reason that guilt is more likely than not. I clearly believe, on this record, there was probable cause to arrest the defendant for the drug transaction.

And I do know that the defendant has not been charged with the bag of heroin that was found in the parking lot. The State

| | 18 |
|--|--|
| 1 | advised me, as the case proceeds, they would be |
| 2 | intending on charging that, or it would be a |
| 3 | read-in, I believe, for sentencing if the |
| 4 | defendant resolved resolved the case. So I |
| 5 | respectfully deny the motion to suppress. |
| 6 | With respect to this case, as I said, |
| 7 | we have two cases before the Court for |
| 8 | Mr. Johnson. That one is This one is set |
| 9 | for a jury trial a week from today, and I |
| 10 | believe at the last court date, you asked for a |
| 11 | brief time to talk with your client after the |
| 12 | ruling? |
| 13 | ATTORNEY POWELL: Yes. |
| | |
| 14 | THE COURT: Okay. We can put this |
| 14 | THE COURT: Okay. We can put this case on for Wednesday. |
| | |
| 15 | case on for Wednesday. |
| 15 | case on for Wednesday. ATTORNEY ALEMAN: Your Honor, it's my |
| 15 16 17 | case on for Wednesday. ATTORNEY ALEMAN: Your Honor, it's my charging week. |
| 15 16 17 18 | case on for Wednesday. ATTORNEY ALEMAN: Your Honor, it's my charging week. THE COURT: Okay. I don't know when |
| 15 16 17 18 19 | case on for Wednesday. ATTORNEY ALEMAN: Your Honor, it's my charging week. THE COURT: Okay. I don't know when you want to do it. The trial's on Monday. |
| 15 16 17 18 19 20 | case on for Wednesday. ATTORNEY ALEMAN: Your Honor, it's my charging week. THE COURT: Okay. I don't know when you want to do it. The trial's on Monday. ATTORNEY ALEMAN: That said, Your |
| 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | case on for Wednesday. ATTORNEY ALEMAN: Your Honor, it's my charging week. THE COURT: Okay. I don't know when you want to do it. The trial's on Monday. ATTORNEY ALEMAN: That said, Your Honor, with this trial on Monday, I was |
| 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | case on for Wednesday. ATTORNEY ALEMAN: Your Honor, it's my charging week. THE COURT: Okay. I don't know when you want to do it. The trial's on Monday. ATTORNEY ALEMAN: That said, Your Honor, with this trial on Monday, I was notified by one of my officers, Corporal |
| 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | case on for Wednesday. ATTORNEY ALEMAN: Your Honor, it's my charging week. THE COURT: Okay. I don't know when you want to do it. The trial's on Monday. ATTORNEY ALEMAN: That said, Your Honor, with this trial on Monday, I was notified by one of my officers, Corporal Zientek is on vacation and would not be |

| | 19 |
|----|---|
| 1 | proceed on the 31st. |
| 2 | THE COURT: What are you asking me to |
| 3 | do? Are you asking me to put I understand |
| 4 | you're in charging. Are you asking me not to |
| 5 | do the final pretrial? |
| 6 | ATTORNEY ALEMAN: No. We can do the |
| 7 | final pretrial, but if we do, the State will be |
| 8 | filing a motion to adjourn, seeing as I |
| 9 | wouldn't have one of my primary officers for |
| 10 | Monday's trial. |
| 11 | THE COURT: Okay. |
| 12 | ATTORNEY POWELL: Does the Court |
| 13 | have some time on Thursday afternoon? |
| 14 | ATTORNEY ALEMAN: I cannot do it |
| 15 | Thursday afternoon. |
| 16 | ATTORNEY POWELL: In the morning? |
| 17 | THE COURT: See, the I understand |
| 18 | this is Ms. Aleman's charging week. |
| 19 | ATTORNEY ALEMAN: Right. |
| 20 | THE COURT: And generally, I'm |
| 21 | supposed to, like, not bother the DAs during |
| 22 | their charging week. She I kind of twisted |
| 23 | her arm to have her come up here today because |
| 24 | the jury trial's on Monday. |
| 25 | You can't make it on Wednesday? |

| | 20 |
|----|--|
| 1 | ATTORNEY POWELL: Is the afternoon |
| 2 | available at all? I could be here in the |
| 3 | morning, but it would probably be closer to |
| 4 | 9:00 o'clock before I get here, and I have |
| 5 | another appearance at 10:00 in a civil matter. |
| 6 | THE COURT: Ms. Aleman, can you do it |
| 7 | on Wednesday afternoon? |
| 8 | ATTORNEY ALEMAN: Wednesday afternoon |
| 9 | I can. Just Thursday afternoon I cannot. |
| 10 | THE COURT: Okay. We'll adjourn |
| 11 | the we'll adjourn the final pretrial to |
| 12 | Wednesday afternoon with respect to Case |
| 13 | 13-CF-3474 at 1:30 on the 26th. |
| 14 | (The proceedings concluded at 10:17 |
| 15 | a.m.) |
| 16 | * * * |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| I. | |