

Synopsis of alterations done on the court records

RE: Transcript and audio court records of
Christy Diamond # 11-1-06177-5

This case must be *vacated* and dismissed. There is/was no unaltered record of this trial in existence prior to the bid to the Court of Appeals.

Diamond's constitutional right to appeal was denied because court records of her trial were egregiously altered and tampered with.

The transcripts no longer exist that are a true record of the events as what occurred at trial. What is referenced as "transcripts" are at best a work of fiction.

Alterations of court records are a Class B Felony.

There should be an investigation.



I. Record alterations - Background

- 1) There was no official court audio produced of this trial. However private audio was recorded.
- 2) It was transcribed live by three different court reporters during trial.
- 3) The private audio demonstrate clearly that all transcriptions have been altered most spectacularly during portions of the trial where there was an obvious intent to change the trial event due to perjuries, illegal legal proceedings, concealing exhibits, concealing State witnesses identities through the misspelling of their name (concealing from a word search), concealing exculpatory evidence and more.
- 4) The alterations are so egregious that correcting all transcriptions in whole is onerous.
- 5) The ability to correct in whole to the private audio is impossible because there was one section where the audio malfunctioned and was left unrecorded.
- 6) In the remaining, negatives were changed to positives. Words were added and/or omitted. Entire sentences were added that did not occur with the appearance to cover-up perjuries.
- 7) Entire sections were left un-transcribed.
- 8) There are and average of 1.12588 "edits" per line in the 42- page sample provided.
- 9) It is certain the alterations were done after the trial.

- 10) The alterations had to have been performed by someone with familiarity with the trial and the legal issues germane to the case.
- 11) Note that there were two individuals used who were terminated and designated as “Brady Officers” who testified during Diemond’s trial, RASKC Jenee Westberg and KCSO Det. Robin Cleary. Since trial, Veterinarian Hannah Mueller aka Evergreen has been discovered embezzling from the county using a plethora of these suspected cases as a vehicle to repeatedly bill for the same services including this one.

Discussion - Once altered, there is no way to determine how much or what is missing so there is no bona fide record of the trial depriving the defendants of their constitutional right to appeal.

All the transcripts were altered - some more than others. However, intent is present in all. Included are excerpt samples. Providing them in a clear cogent fashion is onerous. As reviewing the same would be onerous. At some point in attempting to capture the errors enough is enough and certain sections were chosen for presentation for demonstration purposes.

There are two samples from Diemond’s trial included. These are from two separate trial days and two different transcriptionists. There are:

- A. 42 - page excerpt sample of Oct. 2, 2012 demonstrating the types of edits.
- B. 17- page excerpt sample of Oct. 9, 2012 that includes the missing 2:30 minutes of the trial transcription.

It is clear that whoever it was who did the edits did so with the freedom of believing there would be no audio to compare it with.

The portions of the transcripts that have been corrected have been corrected to the private audio.

- **Transcription sample from [Oct. 2, 2012 – 3RP](#) are pages 1 – 43. The transcript has been corrected from Page 1 -43. This is the [section of the audio linked](#).**

Background to this example - This is - in part - the perjured testimony of King County Sheriff SGT Bonnie Soule who is the primary suspect in the wither mutilation/scalping wound found on “Brandy” the morning Soule showed up un-announced on Diemond’s property. Soule claimed she was referred by Jenny Edwards, director of another service provider “rescue” “Hope for Horses.” (H4H).

Edwards posted on her H4H’s Facebook page that she had possession of Diemond’s horses 36 hours prior to Diemond’s release to King County for adoption. Several people from Diemond’s mother’s church responded.

A printout of the Facebook page was included in the KCPA discovery package.

Jenny Edwards clearly anticipated getting the billing hours on Diemond's horses.

It was apparently during Diemond's case that Hope for Horses (and Jenny Edwards) fell out of favor with King County.

The horse rescue service provider that ended up caring for "Bud" and "Brandy" is called "Save a Forgotten Equine" (SAFE) run by then director Jamie Taft and now director Bonnie Hammond. They were the third source of tampered photos in the Diemond case.

It was discovered through public records that SAFE billed for the same care at the same time as the veterinarian Hannah Mueller aka Evergreen. Mueller had a nefarious history

Despite this she was employed by the State as the expert witness in Diemond's trial as well as Markley and Thomas's trial. During that time, Mueller was employed as the State's expert in some 19 other cases. Because Mueller enjoyed the billing hours from the county, she has a succinct conflict of interest in each case, the custody of evidence was compromised. It would be discovered Mueller – in addition to a plethora of other illegal practices - was embezzling from the county at the time.

According to Ms. Mueller's invoicing provided in the discovery package, both horses were being administered normal care as opposed to care on might give animals that were unhealthy and starved.

Also in the PA discovery package, the blood work (CBC) taken on both horses on Diemond's property was normal while blood work (CBC) taken on "Bud" three weeks later under Mueller and/or SAFE's care, indicating starvation anemia.

Through public records, it was discovered there was a third embezzlement attempt to bill for 8 months of care at SAFE for Bud and Brandy (plus Markley and Thomas's "Alex" and Dunham's two mini horses and a goat) in the Shannon Dunham care through a restitution demand prepared by KCDPA Gretchen Holmgren. (SAFE changed the names of Dunham's mini horses and currently uses them for promotional purposes). This billing included the same duplicate billing above.

On Oct.2, 2012, SCRAP DA Dave Roberson, KCDPA Maggie Nave, Tony Wisen and Judge Jim Rogers assigned the live transcription for the day to a transcriptionist who "volunteers" for SAFE.

Diemond vigorously objected though Roberson attempted to force the issue during side bar disclosure of the transcriptionist's conflict of interest. None of them seemed to think this conflict would be a problem yet they attempted to disclose it and get Diemond into agreement with it.

It was only because it appeared that Diemond was getting too vocal that Mr. Stach was called to replace the original transcriptionist. The result of this can be heard at the beginning of this transcript.

In 42 pages of 25-line pleading paper (1,033 lines), there are 1,256 "edits." Or an average of 1.12588 "edits" per line = 122% altered which qualifies as a complete "re-write" of the actual events at trial.

Of those there are over 122 edits of significance.

They are as follows:

List of alterations on Oct. 2, 2012 King County Sheriff Deputy Bonnie Soule's testimony Pages 1 -42. These are marked on the transcript.

- 1) Page 2 – 1st misspelling of Soule as "Sole" on witness index and subsequently 9 more times completely concealing Soule from a word search.
- 2) Page 4 – Line 11 – Omitted "S-A-F-E" to obscure the name of the "rescue" original reporter was volunteering for that everyone agreed with had no conflict of interest (Roberson, Nave, Wisen and Judge Rogers) except Diemond.
- 3) Page 4 – Line 21 – misspelled Soule as Sole 2nd time.
- 4) Page 4 – Line 23 – omitted Soule
- 5) Page 4 – Line 24 – misspelled Soule as Sole.
- 6) Page 5 – Line 7 - There is a deliberate and consistent misspell or omission of Soule's name. This is very clear on the audio when Soule spells out her name. This occurred in Jenee Westberg's transcript as well. It avoids a word search during Public Document Request searches.
- 7) Page 5 – Line 13 - Omitted reference to Soule and omitted actual position.
- 8) Page 5 – Line 17 – Omitted reference to Soule by name.
- 9) Page 5 – Line 22 – Omitted "any" making question more absolute.
- 10) Page 6 - Line 7 – Omitted "do you believe you've owned" to "horses have you owned"
- 11) Page 6 – Line 11 - Changed the description of the type of from "some training" omitting the word "some" to sound more substantial.

- 12) Page 6 –Line 11 – Omitted “through 4H” making it sound like she has had other training besides her only training as a child in 4H.
- 13) Page 6 – Line 19 - Changed whole meaning of sentence omitting “a lot as a kid” to adding “with a lot of the kids.”
- 14) Page 6 – Line 24 – Changed “it was” to “not only” making it sound like there was more training than 4H in high school.
- 15) Page 6 – Line 25 – Change “combined” to “how many” making it sound like there was more training.
- 16) Page 7 – Line 1 - Changed whole meaning of sentence omitting “by the time you are out of high school” to adding “are in”
- 17) Page 7 – Line 4 - Changed singular to plural omitting “Since then I have owned my own horse” to adding “Since then I have owned my own horses” making it sound like she had more experience.
- 18) Page 7 – Line 9– Omitted comment about teeth. This started a whole series of alterations and omission regarding teeth including perjury. This topic is something Dave Roberson defense counsel was attempting to villainize his own client with but Diamond debated his stupidity on the subject to the point that he realized his own incompetence on the topic (this series of edits suggests Roberson as party to the “editing” of the transcripts).
Another common “script” from case to case is the use of taking a 90 degree parallel discussion about a related topic in a “what could happen” kind of discussion while this “what could happen” is not part of the allegations at any point. It just sounds terrible and the target gets blamed for something that doesn’t exist in the process. This series of discussion about teeth is an example of that technique. Diamond had also noticed in Public Documents that Mueller charges for teeth on virtually every invoice. Impossible to prove. It is very unlikely every horse has dental issues.
- 19) Page 7 – Line 17 – Again omitted discussion on teeth.
- 20) Page 8 – Line 4 – Again omitted entire sentence discussion on teeth.
- 21) Page 9 –Line 14 – Omitted court direction.
- 22) Page 9 – Line 15 – Changed comment completely - “I would like to talk about this case” to “I would like to talk about the date.”
- 23) Page 10 – Line 4 – Omitted defendant’s name “Christy Diamond” to introduce a “son” later.
- 24) Page 10 – Line 7 - Added a whole series of a son Diamond doesn’t have - added “had you ever come in contact with her son before?” Instead of “had you ever come in contact with – contact with Ms. Diamond before?”

25) Page 10 – Line 12 – Misspells Jenny Edwards as “Jennie” director of “rescue” Hope for Horses – (avoids word search). Jenny Edwards was showcased in the 2006 marketing documentary advocating horse sex called “Zoo” regarding the Enumclaw man who died from a perforated colon having sex with a horse at a well-known (not to me) animal brothel while bilking Pierce County of around \$30,000. This “bestiality” has been coined by those who practice it, “Zoophilla.”

Jenny Edwards is currently a prime suspect in running an animal sex brothel in Snohomish of her own. She now claims on the internet that she is an “expert” in “zoophilla.”

Hannah Evergreen aka Mueller (the KCDPA expert vet) was also involved in promoting this movie about a secret nocturnal animal sex ring. Bill O’Reilly, Rush Limbaugh and WA State Senator Pam Roach rallied around this as animal abuse and passed the bestiality law for Washington State. This law is being used as a vehicle for the false prosecutions through the quiet backroom add of section “2” - “starvation and dehydration” that no one talked about. This has nothing to do with “bestiality.”

We now have an epidemic of falsified prosecutions under [RCW 16.52.205\(2\)](#) on the “starvation and dehydration” portion. In comparison, there is only one known prosecution on “bestiality” since 2006 in the entire state.

Jenny Edwards was exposed in 2008 overbilling Pierce County by \$30,000 for horse care in front of the Pierce County Council ([video still online](#)). Jenny was never held accountable for it by Pat McCarthy and Julie Anderson who were having a change of the guard from the auditor’s office to executive at the time.

Pierce County Prosecutor Mark Lindquist is currently in a heated defense of questionable use of his position in Pierce County for malicious prosecution and has at least 6 cases of phony animal cruelty there.

It was Jenny Edwards (H4H) who brought Soule to Diamond’s home that Saturday morning. The release, [Exhibit 18](#) was missing for awhile from the exhibit room but shows the date of release.

26) Page 10 – Line 11 – Discussion about how Soule, at Jenny Edward’s behest is stalking Diamond’s property in her marked patrol car, in uniform and out of her jurisdiction.

27) Page 10 – Line 16 – another reference to a “son” that Diamond doesn’t have.

28) Page 11- Line 1 - 25 - Soule is admitting to trespassing on Diamond’s property before 8AM, under the color of authority, in her uniform, marked patrol car and out of her jurisdiction. PDR’s show she did not document the 8 AM visit. She documented the 11AM visit 3 hours later. She is the prime suspect for the scalping of Brandy’s withers.

29) Page 12 – Line 1 – 3 – This was an odd comment. The KCSO records shows no calls before Soule’s notation that she was at Diamond’s property at 11AM but she was on duty all of that time.

- 30) Page 12 – Line 9 – There was no discussion about the color of Soule’s uniform. This was added in the transcript as if there were some concern that Soule was seen scalping Brandy early in the morning. KCSO uniforms are tan and Green. Seattle Police are blue.
- 31) Page 12 – Line16 – Omitted “phone” and substituted “radio.” Makes it sound more like official police business when she was likely a party to the scalping of Brandy to blame on Diamond later.
- 32) Page 13-Line14 – Matching to page 12 where the word “phone” was changed to “radio” making it sound like Soule was on official police business when she wasn’t.
- 33) Page 12- Line 9 – There was no reference to Bonnie Soule’s uniform as being blue on the audio. It is believed she was seen by someone in the neighborhood at the time and this has something to do with that misrepresentation. KCS uniforms are green and tan. This whole section was rewritten.
- 34) Page 13 – Line 4-6 – Rewriting script. Changed “decision” to “observation.”
- 35) Page 13 – Line 11 – Soule changed her testimony from pretrial where she said she got out of her car and breached the property.
- 36) Page 13- Line 15 – This is the “radio” that caused the earlier change on Page 13 –Line 24 change from “phone” to “radio.
- 37) Page 14 – Line 3 – 14 - A rewrite of what was really said misdirecting the fact that there was a large pasture the horses were grazing in and eating.
- 38) Page 15-Line 21 – Rewrite and omissions of parts like “I don’t recall” leaving in the rest of the sentence to make it sound like an affirmative answer.
- 39) Page 16 – Was a whole discussion redressing the blankets that the “rescues” took with them that would tend to exonerate Diamond in their blanket negligence allegations.
- 40) Page 16 – Line 5 - The transcription was altered to make Soule sound more articulate than she is and - to conceal her stress likely covering for her botched attempt to get Brandy’s blanket back on like it was before. (The buckles were threaded. One was notched two holed out instead of on the last one and the other was threaded but not notched. IE Brandy could not have done this on her own.)
- 41) Page 16 – Line 8 – Attempt to edit so that it appears that oversized blankets are a result of loss of weight when they were big to begin with giving them more material.
- 42) Page 17 – Line 6 - Changed “that’s what I primarily look for” to “primarily is what I looked for.” Changing tense so that is doesn’t sound like she does this all the time.
- 43) Page 17 – Line 7 – Changed “Looking for hay” to “regarding the hay.”

- 44) Page 17 – Line 8 – Soule states she did not see hay when she was 10 feet from the alfalfa visible from where she was standing and was in an exhibit she identified as the shed where Diemond kept the hay that is pictured in another exhibit. Later she talks about the alfalfa hay in the shed that is not one of Diemond’s four sheds.
- 45) Page 17 – Line 14 – Along with an immense amount of perjury there is another misspell of Soule’s name.
- 46) Page 18 – Line 21 Omitted Soule’s name.
- 47) *Page 19 – Completely re-wrote to conceal the perjury taking place around an “airbrushed” version of a photo not included (the photo’s digital version shows the perjury) and misrepresenting the amounts of feed. Soule is describing “Ext 9” (it is the only exhibit that it could be) while Nave is introducing “Exh. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5” which have been missing from the Exhibit Room since trial.*
- 48) Page 19 – Line – 1-6 - Soule points to an over colorized print and says, “I don’t know if the jury can see this but the bark is eaten off. (The digital photos finally turned over 8 months after trial **shows the bark intact** as does the video Dave Roberson suppressed from both the jury and defense expert Paul Mabry). Soule then concludes they ate it because they were probably hungry. The exhibit Soule is describing is never identified but because of her description, it can only be “Exh. 9” while a completely different exhibit number is being identified in the transcript.
- 49) Page 19 – “Exh. 2, 3, 4” are 3 of 7 were photos that were missing from the exhibit room after trial. Exhibits 5, 6, 7 have mysteriously materialized at the COA.
- 50) Page 19 – Line 12 – Omitted “Bud or Brandy” instead added “one of the horses.” Makes Soule sound more confident.
- 51) Page 19 – Line 22 – It appears some of the exhibits are missing from the exhibit room but sound like they are from Westberg’s CD provided 8 months after trial suggesting the PA tried to conceal the lack of providing the digital photos before trial. Westberg took a photo of a shed that they all testified to was Diemond’s shed Exhibit 11 that the digital version clearly shows is next to a 30” DOT cement noise barrier that doesn’t exist on Diemond’s property – Not Diemond’s shed. In addition, Westberg’s GPS shows Westberg was NOT on Diemond’s property at the time in the metadata when she took the shed picture in Exhibit 11.
- 52) Page 20 – Transcription has significantly cleaned up the perjury regarding the intact bark on Diemond trees they claimed was eaten off. Again referring to “Exh. 9” not referencing it by name where the digital shot shows bark intact. “Exhibit 9” was not listed during this testimony however “Exh. 9” is the only photo that fits the description given. This whole discussion about the bark eaten from the trees was a fabrication as demonstrated by both the digital versions of the photos not used at trial and the video taken at the time. Roberson attempted to conceal these exhibits from Diemond during the exhibit inventory which is part of why it was never transcribed into the transcript. They were doing a shell game with the pictures.

Note – the “script” that “*all the bark was eaten off the trees*” is apparent in virtually all the 17 cases of falsified prosecutions we have reviewed thus far even in one case where the property had no trees.

53) Page 20 – Line 7 – Soule blows Westberg’s attempt to tilt the camera to make it look like there was a steep incline that didn’t exist in the photo Exhibits 2 and 3.

54) Page 21 – Line 3 – Omitted court direction and changed reply.

55) Page 21 – Line 6 – Omitted “4-H and added “forest training” instead.

Note – Childhood 4-H training is not considered formal training. It is a club usually run by parents.

56) Page 21 – Line 13 - Omitted “fencing” as part of things hungry horses will eat. Roberson sent out his investigator to take photos of Diamond’s “eaten” fence only to find it wasn’t eaten. This edit suggests again that it was Dave Roberson, Diamond’s defense counsel who was party to the edits.

57) Page 22 – line 19 - Another omission of Soule’s name.

58) Page 23 – Line 1-4 - Is rife with perjury while the transcription tightens it up and omits whole sentences of perjury. The transcription omits any mention of the “white spot” which was most likely snow “sort of in the center of the photograph...” that is identified as chewing instead.

59) Page 23 – Line 21 - Diamond’s son seems to have disappeared. (Page 10).

60) Page 24 – Line 4 - Soule perjures herself saying the complaint was anonymous when earlier and at pretrial when she said it was Jenny Edwards from Hope for Horses here (who anticipated getting the billing hours from the county) and that she was there for a “Well horse visit.” She also told Diamond that it was Ms. Edwards at the time. She never mentioned any complaint.

61) Page 25 – Line 17 – Soule never mentions that Diamond was in the middle of bath rooming her elderly mother when Soule demanded she stop and talk with her while working with the PA to depict Diamond as just rolling out of bed at 11AM.

62) Page 27 – Line – 9 – Changed whole sentence from a verb to a noun - “to facilitate that happening” to “when that that happened?”

63) Page 27 - Line 10 – Now Soule admits there is hay when on Page 17 line 8 she didn’t see any.

64) Page 27 - Line 11 – The word “partial” Is added when what was actually said is a “partially open” bale of hay.

65) Page 27 – Line 16 – Series of Substitutions of words “hay” for “feed.” Appears to be a series of a word search to omit and change the meaning of “feed.”

- 66) Page 28 – Line – 2 - Omitted “help her feed the horses” to substituting “tell her to feed the horses?” Changes the entire meaning of the sentence.
- 67) Page 28 - Line – 14 - The color of the black buckets is not blue. The alterations on the hard copy prints was so severe, they looked blue.
- 68) Page 28 – Line 15 - Changes “two buckets” to “one bucket” (there were actually three buckets) changing the amounts of food to the negative.
- 69) Page 28 – Line 19 - Changes plural to singular when referencing how many fingers of feed changing amounts of food.
- 70) Page 28 – Line 21 - Changed “a few” to “two” inches minimizing the amounts of food. And it was perjury as well. There was five times that amount of feed.
- 71) Page 29 – Line 1 – Added “water” where it was not uttered and changed sentence.
- 72) Page 29 – Line 10- 16 - Completely changed sentence to something that wasn’t said - “dealing with horses for the last – since you were 15 years.” to “for horses that are 30 years old.” (This attempts to drive home the impression that the horses were younger than they really were – they were very elderly at 35 and 39).
- 73) Page 29 -Line 16 - Changed 2nd person to 3rd person changing the sentence to Soule servicing the horses “you put water into the feed” rather than a comment that Diamond stated “she needed to put water into the feed.”
- 74) Page 29 – Line 18 - Changed reference to Soule’s raising one old horse to many by changing singular to plural omitting “especially based on you raising an old horse” changing it to “upon you raising old horses” making Soule sound like an expert about old horses and changing entire meaning.
- 75) Page 29 – Line 25 - Again changes the age of the horses when it was not discussed. Changes “She’s got horses since she was 16 years old” to “The horse was 17 years old making it appear the horses are even younger than half their ages when that was not the topic.
- 76) Page 30 – 1 – Changes Court direction from an order to a passive direction.
- 77) Page 30 – Line 5 - At this point the editing is so onerous it is clear whoever is doing it feels they are at their leisure to make whatever changes they want. Omitted the reference to learning about horses “and also just through going to the feed store.” Making her knowledge level seem more authoritative.
- 78) Page 30 –Line 6 – Changes “about how much a horse eat” to “how much horses eat.”
- 79) Page 30 – Line 16 – Changes “pelleted feed or your oats or things like that” to “pellet feed.”

- 80) Page 30 – Line 18 – Changes size of “scoop can” to “soup can” which is two thirds less the size of the actual scoop.
- 81) Page 30 – Line 20 - Changes “the” to “each” changing the whole meaning of the sentence reducing the feed amount again.
- 82) Page 30 – Line 24 – Added changes to make it say a specific amount when Soule was not definitive. The entire sentence says something else.
- 83) Page 31 – Line 3-10 – Omitted most of objection and court ruling when it was about the validity of Soule’s actual training and knowledge about horses.
- 84) Page 31 - Line 15-29 – Soule covers for RASKC ACO Mike Cronin who was the person who told Diamond this.
- 85) Page 31 – Line 23 – Completely re-wrote dialogue around feed amounts.
- 86) Page 31 – Line 25 – Omitted “In” for “For” minimizing the feed amounts.
- 87) Page 32 – Line 6 – Diamond never said this. Perjury.
- 88) Page 32 – Line 9 - 11 - Omitted “when you’re talking about the feed?” Omitting information correcting Soule’s non-responsive answer.
- 89) Page 32 – Line 18 – Perjury. Were not “small” buckets. As per Soule’s description Page33Line16 that they were 5 gallon buckets. Horses have a stomach capacity of 4.5 – 5 gallons.
- 90) Page 32 – Line 20 – Changed “tree” singular to “trees” plural to accommodate the rest of the inconsistent and erroneous testimony where Soule says the buckets were hung on two different trees. (The buckets were hung on one tree there is video of this).
- 91) Page 32 – Line 25 – Omitted identification again of Soule as “Sergeant.”
- 92) Page 33 – Line 6 – Changed plural “buckets” to singular “bucket.” Reduces the feed amount.
- 93) Page 33 – Line 7 - The word “feed” has been omitted.
- 94) Page 33 – line 12 – Changed the word “describe” being similar “define” but “define” demands more classification.
- 95) Page 33 – line 13 – Added the word “bucket” singular and omitted the plural “buckets.” Reducing the feed amount.
- 96) Page 33 – Line 13 - The word “feed” has been omitted 2 more times suggesting a word search to alter it. Omitted the horses were getting fed.

- 97) Page 33 – Line 16 – Soule states the buckets are five gallon buckets. This is hardly “small” as she testified several other times.
- 98) Page 33 – Line 17 - She states the buckets are “blue” because the “air-brushed” altered prints are “blue” but the actual color of the buckets is black.
- 99) Page 33 – Line 25 - The word buckets are “blue” again.
- 100) Page 33 – Line 17-25 – Soule has a whole perjury conversation describing left over feed. Instead of stating it was left over feed – indicating that the horses were routinely fed, she makes it sound dirty. This “material” is not foreign matter. Soule has horses and she knows this.
- 101) Page 33 – Line 25 – The buckets are NOT blue. Soule relies on the altered photo that has been so color altered that the bucket is blue in the photo. The digital photos that were concealed from Diamond show the true color of “black.
- 102) Page 34 – Line 3 – States again that the buckets are 5 gallons as per Page33Line16.
- 103) Page 34 – Line 9 - Added “exhibit number 5” when what was said was “five number five.” The photo of the altered print of the bucket was Exhibit 6.
- 104) Page 34 – Line 17 – Playing a shell game with Exhibits omitted exhibit number so as not to track it.
- 105) Page 34-35 Lines 23 – Line 6 – Omitted most of objection regarding whether or not Soule would know if the horses were hungry. (Horses are foragers. They are always hungry especially when they are offered “sweet feed” as what was in the buckets).
- 106) Page 35 - Line 3-4 – Omitted most of court ruling “*at least lay foundations for the witnesses as to what she observed to begin with.*”
- 107) Page 35 - Line 6 – Omitted most of court ruling.
- 108) Page 35 – Line 15 – Omitted I “*quite honestly didn’t*” pay a whole lot of attention to that.
- 109) Page 36 – Line 11 – Omitted “*Okay and is a gelding a male horse?*” Substituted “*And the gelding, Bud, was the male horse?*” Concealing Nave’s ignorance of horses.
- 110) Page 36 – Line 13 - Omitted “*eating*” and added “*feeding*” - Another word search on the word “*feed*” changing “*eating*” to “*feeding.*” Omitting any reference to the fact the horses were “*eating.*”
- 111) Page 36 – Line 14 - Omitted “*to do a little bit closer examination*” adding “*getting a little closer to them.*” Completely different meanings.
- 112) Page 36 – Line 25 – Omitted “*I was interested to know how-how*” he felt. Substituted “*I just wanted*” to know *how* he felt.”

- 113) Page 37 – Line 3 – Omitted “*when you were doing that?*” Replaced it with fabricated “*blanket.*”
- 114) Page 37 – Line 5 – Changed “*did you run an-uh your hand just*” to “*you describe that you moved your hands.*”
- 115) Page 37 – Line 18 – Answer to what was Diemond doing? Diemond was right there marveling at Soule’s incompetency. In fact, Diemond was thinking that Soule was not exactly cogent.
- 116) Page 38 – Line 13 - Soule makes a reference to *Brandy in the past tense (because Brandy is dead) this was completely omitted in the transcript.* In fact, Soule corrects herself in the audio from present tense to past tense.
This was changed in the transcript so the fact that the horses were dead could not be argued later based on the transcript regarding KCPA Maggie Nave’s mistrial that wasn’t cured by Judge Jim Rogers nor at the COA. Again whoever did this, was counting on the fact there was no audio.
- 117) Page 38 – Line 13-Transcript also changes the color of the horse. It would be discovered later that this is a method of confusing billing. Color is part of the identification of a horse. To confuse it is to confuse the identification so that other horses could be billed for.
- 118) Page 38 – Line 14 – Transcript changes the color of Brandy’s mane and tail from flaxen to black by omitting an entire sentence. This would make Brandy a completely different DNA pool. (This confusing of color description is common in these cases. It appears to be a device to confuse billing so the vet, rescues and restitutions can bill multiple times for several horses under the same horse case number and the same services (demonstrated by PRA productions).
- 119) Page 38 – Line 16 – Changed “*boney*” (an adjective) to “*bone*” (a noun). Changes entire meaning of sentence.
- 120) Page 38 - Line 20 – Omitted an entire sentence by the Nave.
- 121) Page 38 - Line 21 – Omitted “*putting blankets on*” changing question entirely from her “*experience with putting blankets on*” to her “*experience.*” Changes entire meaning of sentence. “*Your experience with putting blankets on horses*” with “*your experience with horses.*” Complete change of what was actually said.
- 122) Page 38 - Line 25 – This is the answer to Soule’s experience with blankets but because the former change it becomes responsive to all her training.

NOTE – *This discussion is an effort to draw attention away from the (later) allegation that it was Soule who mutilated Brandy’s wither at 8AM Feb. 26, 2011 and could not get the blanket back on the way it was originally placed (likely because Brandy felt it and spooked. Diemond had alleged that “someone” scalped Brandy at this point but did not imagine that it could be Soule until it was revealed Soule had been on the property at 8AM at pretrial without permission. There are a lot of changes in this transcript that serves to protect Soule. Because there is even a discussion here – prior to records that draws one’s line of sight to Soule (after many public records reviews post trial) – this line of questioning wholly implicates Soule in*

the effort to cover-up her involvement with Brandy's scalping/mutilation, IE, if she were not the guilty party, there would be no need for this line of questioning – or the changes made.

- 123) Page 39- line 11 – *“and the straps that go around the back legs.” This is incorrect. The straps go between the hind legs.*

This conversation is a deliberate misdirection because Diamond had noticed the rear straps were not in-between the hind legs as they are supposed to be. (If Soule thinks the straps go on the outside, she is really incompetent).

Diamond had also noticed that there was tampering with the two chest buckets. One was threaded and notched two holes out from the last hole where it was originally. The second was threaded but not notched at all.

Brandy could not have accomplished this without the help of human thumbs.

The fact Brandy's straps were no longer between her hind legs was a component of why Diamond knew the blanket had been tampered with along with no mud, no tears, no split seams, one buckle notched two holes out and one bucket threaded and not notched.

This was when Soule was trying to convince Diamond the wither wound was from the blanket *“entanglement”* that they later changed to a blanket *“rub”* wound with a scab that didn't exist while they took both completely intact blankets with them intact fleece on the neck where the wither is and all.

Of course, Diamond (naively) immediately reported this to Soule, Westberg and Mueller all of which, failed to investigate while attempting to convince Diamond it was a blanket entanglement injury (that they changed to a blanket *“rub”* later when they could not convince Diamond of the former).

- 124) Page 39 – Line 20 – Omitted again a comment referencing the true color of Brandy's mane.

- 125) Page 39 – Line 25 – Omitted words *“neck”* and *“withers.”*

- 126) Page 40 – Line 10 – Omitted *“at her withers?”* Again concealing attention to withers.

- 127) Page 40 – Line 12-15 – The transcript was completely re-written here with result to conceal comments and photos regarding the wither scalp/mutilation.

- 128) Page 40 – Line 15-25 – The transcript answer was again re-written to conceal the importance of the fleece.

- 129) Page 40 – Line 24 – Omitted completely *“Now you say there is extra fleece on the blanket because”* again to keep the reader from wondering how a *“rub”* could occur if there was intact fleece there. Line 24 omits the fact there was fleece lining on the blanket that is on the withers to prevent a rub wound and that the blanket's fleece was completely intact.

- 130) Page 41- Line 5 - Changes *“you noticed that this looked like a rub spot”* to *“You noticed a rub spot.”*

Note – Concluding that it was a *“rub spot”* when there was no evidence provided to prove that the injury was a *“rub”* versus a *“scalp/mutilation”* done earlier in the morning by Soule who could not get the blanket back on in its original position.

- 131) Page 41 – Line 9 – Transcript changes “gunky” to “bumpy”
- 132) Page 41 - Line 9-10 – Omitted Nave and Soule response.
- 133) Page 41 - Line 14 – Omitted “take the pressure.”
- 134) Page 41 - Line 22 – Changed “did you actually” to “did you have to”
- 135) Page 41 – Line – 25 - The word “oozing”(verb) is substituted for “oozy” (adjective) These are two different words with two different meanings.
- 136) Page 42 – Line 1 – Omitted “lifted” and substituted “moved.” Two different things.
- 137) Page 42 – Line 1 – Change “tried to kinda” to “so I could.”
- 138) Page 42 – Line 5 - Substituted “oozing” (verb) for “oozy” (adjective) again.
- 139) Page 42 – Line 8 – Substituted “a little bit” for “kinda.”

[END of corrections to audio.]

- **Transcription for [Oct. 9, 2012 - 6RP](#) starts at page 83 - 100. The transcript has been corrected from Page 83 - 100 also. This is the [section of the audio linked](#) . Significant alterations are:**

- 1) It is interesting to note that fro 1.75 pages, the transcription is perfect compared to the onerous “edits” on the Oct. 2, 2011 sample. Having said that, the alterations are clear. It is clear where it starts. It is clear why. It is clear what as long as one had the audio to compare it with.
- 2) KCPDA Maggie Nave commits mistrial 6RP 89, L14 that Judge Rogers fails to correct. (The bell cannot be un-rung).
- 3) Exhibit inventory of 2:30 minutes is then completely omitted at 6RP 94 between L10 and L11. Because 2:30 minutes are omitted it appears on the transcript that the objection is immediately dealt with when there was long period before the objection was actually handled.
- 4) At the time there was a rush to inventory the exhibits first to get them to the jury in-between.
- 5) Mr. Roberson rushed to get exhibit 1 in before Diemond had time to see it.

Later it would appear this was intentional as the already tampered air-brushed exhibits used at trial were exchanged again while in the custody of the exhibit room and while checked out by the KCPAO multiple times.

Note - *The altered prints that appeared at the COA were not the same altered prints that were in trial. (Yes there were two sets of altered prints). The prints for the COA were visibly lighter than those used at trial. This is documented.*

- 6) The entire 2:30 minute audio exhibit inventory was omitted from the transcript.
- 7) When the transcript is resumed, it appears the discussion about the mistrial committed by Maggie Nave was a continual conversation and addressed immediately when it was not.
- 8) There are notations of other perjuries/misrepresentations in the margins that have since been documented as false.
- 9) 6RP 84 L18 – Transcript is changes from “*the science*” to “*at face value.*” This is obvious. The agenda is to keep attention away from the fact that the blood work (science) was normal and the embezzling, perjurer - Hannah Mueller is telling the truth so she can get the bilking hours.
- 10) 6RP 85 L3–L15 – Ms. Nave never introduced any evidence that Mueller discounts as she represents. Later public records would reveal that Mueller does just the opposite. PDRs show that Mueller discounts on paper then bills the county multiple times for the same services in concert with SAFE.
Bud and Brandy were billed for at least 3X for the same services on the same date.
Then the KCDPA attempted to bill 8 months worth of care for Bud and Brandy and Alex from the Markley case, then bill it to yet another falsified prosecution, Shannon Dunham - in addition to Dunham's 2 mini horses and a goat.
It would appear Mueller is making a lot of money and doing it illegally.
- 11) 6RP 86 L3 – The teeth issue was left out because Mueller could not substantiate it. In review of her many invoices of King County as well as Pierce County, Mueller diagnoses dental issues on every invoice – something very unlikely.
- 12) 6RP 86 L15-22 – Nave does not identify exhibit. The photos of them emaciated were taken 3 months after release. The blood work shows they were being systematically starved by Mueller during that time. The metadata shows the photos were taken 3 months later after they had time to starve them. Who is guilty of animal abuse? It is not Diamond.
- 13) 6RP 86 L9 – Mueller has been an (illegally) licensed veterinarian since 2004, 7 years. Mabry has been a legally licensed veterinarian for 20 years. Which has more credibility?
- 14) 6RP 87 L10 –L12 Mueller has been documented making this same claim regarding electric wire over water in multiple cases (another “script” used in the many falsified animal cruelty prosecution Mueller is involved with)

15) 6RP 89 L8 –L13 Hard copy prints used at trial have been “airbrushed” then reprinted/airbrushed” with a second set for COA.

16) 6RP 89 L14 –L19 Mistrial committed by KCPDA Nave. Nave states: “That horse has long since gained weight and is healthy now.” WHEN THE HORSES WERE DEAD AT THE TIME.

Note – In this excerpt the areas of transcript altering center around the mistrial, concealing the 2:40 minutes left out for the exhibit inventory so that it appears that the objection was addressed post haste when in fact a good 5 minutes passed and the jury had left the room before it was addressed at all.

With the exception of the obvious intent of covering up the areas of misconduct, compared to the Oct. 2, 2011 transcript, there are swaths of the transcript that were exquisitely verbatim to the audio.

17) 6RP 89 L19 – Judge Jim Rogers fails to correct the error.

18) 6RP 89 L19 – Defense Counsel Dave Roberson fails to object in front of the jury and holds it back until after Nave has finished her close, the jury has left the room and Rogers, Roberson and Nave all take inventory of the “air-brushed” exhibits.

19) 6RP 91 L11 - Changed the amounts of feed from singular when it was plural again reducing the appearance of feed.

20) 6RP 91 L11 – Nave fails to mention that Diemond was using the same “Senior Equine” she attributes to Mueller’s “correct” recipe as well so that it would appear Diemond was derelict when she wasn’t.

Note – Mixing up the measuring units again clouds the amounts of feed. “Cups” is not a unit. Pounds are meaningless without the accompanying caloric content. When calories are calculated, Diemond was feeding twice the calories as what an average horse needs per day. This was never introduced and intentionally kept obscured and confusing during the trial.

21) 6RP 91 L19 – Mueller NEVER saw Diemond feed the horses and it was not four cups. It was 6 scoops of the 4 cup scoop.

The actual amount fed works out to almost twice the caloric needs of an average horse.

These are gross misrepresentation of the facts. Nave fails to mention the additional alfalfa fed nor does she mention the fact the horses were grazing on pasture 24/7.

The grazing alone represents 12,600 calories a day when the average calories needed per day is 12,400 – 15,000 a day.

Mr. Roberson fails to defend as he did for the entire trial.

22) 6RP 92 L14 – Financial hardship was never introduced nor was it defended. The court allowed this.

MISSING 2:30 mins OF TRANSCRIPTION SHOULD BE HERE -----

23) 6RP 94 L10–L11 is where the missing approx. 2:30 minutes of audio should have been transcribed. It consisted of the exhibit inventory. This is significant because all the photo evidence has been documented as tampered with and phony.

In the audio, Mr. Roberson hurries up to the bench leaving his client behind where later it would be discovered that he was attempting to conceal Exhibit 1 from Diemond which was discovered as missing for some time from the exhibit room after trial. This can be heard as the volume come up when Diemond tries to catch up to her defense counsel.

During trial, Exhibit 1 was left unidentified (in the transcript) during trial while Exhibit 9 was substituted for the jury (3RP-L18-20). This is easy to determine because of the content of each photo that was described by KCS Sgt Bonnie Soule while she was busy committing mass perjury. When the transcription begins again at 6RP 94 Line 11 it appears as though the objection was seamless and occurred immediately when it did not happen that way.

24) 6RP 96 L11 – Judge Rogers states: “Even now I can bring in the jury and instruct them that Ms. Nave stated that the horse are doing fine now and I could strike that argument. But on page 98 L 1 – 10, Rogers fails to do so.

25) 6RP 97 L14 – Court is in error saying the fact that the horses current state of deceased was not in the record of the trial. The horses were introduced in past tense by KCSO Bonnie Soule Oct 2 3RP 38 L13 - that was altered out of the transcripts also. It remains in the audio.

26) 6RP 98 L1- 10 – Judge Rogers did not do what he promised in front of the jury earlier on page 96, L11.

[End of excerpt].