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# DECLARATION OF JAMES DIAZ IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGEMENT 

I, James M. Diaz, declare as follows:

1. I am a citizen of the United States. I am over 18 years of age and fully competent to make this declaration. I knowingly and voluntarily make this declaration in support of Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment.
2. I am an attorney with the Foundation for Individual Rights and Expression and counsel for Plaintiff in this action. I am admitted to the bar of the States of Vermont.
3. A true and correct copy of the transcript of Plaintiff Gregory Bombard's November 13, 2023 deposition is attached as Exhibit 1.
4. A true and correct copy of the transcript of Defendant Jay Riggen's February 21, 2018 Affidavit is attached as Exhibit 2.
5. A true and correct copy of the transcript of Defendant Jay Riggen's October 5, 2023 deposition is attached as Exhibit 3.
6. A true and correct copy of excerpts of the transcript of Lieutenant Tara Thomas's August 30, 2023 deposition is attached as Exhibit 4.
7. A true and correct copy of excerpts of the transcript of Chief Maurice Lamothe Jr.'s August 30, 2023 deposition is attached as Exhibit 5.
8. A true and correct copy of the Vermont State Police's Investigative Motor Vehicle Stop Directive [VSP-DIR-403] is attached as Exhibit 6.
9. A true and correct copy of Defendant Jay Riggen's February 9, 2018 Police Cruiser video recording is attached as Exhibit 7.
10. A true and correct copy of the February 9, 2018 St. Albans barracks video recording is attached as Exhibit 8.
11. A true and correct copy of the February 9, 2018 Email from Defendant Jay Riggen to VSPMedia is attached as Exhibit 9.
12. A true and correct copy of the Information in State v. Bombard, Docket No. 241-2-18 (Vt. Sup. Ct. Feb. 28, 2018) is attached as Exhibit 10.
13. A true and correct copy of the Decision on Defendant's Suppress and Dismiss at 3-4, Docket No. 241-2-18 (Vt. Sup. Ct. Aug. 31, 2018) is attached as Exhibit 11.
14. A true and correct copy of the Amended Information in State $v$. Bombard, Docket No. 241-2-18 (Vt. Sup. Ct. Nov. 21, 2018) is attached as Exhibit 12.
15. A true and correct copy of the Ruling on Motion to Dismiss Count Two, Docket No. 241-2-18 (Vt. Sup. Ct. Dec. 18, 2016) is attached as Exhibit 13.
16. A true and correct copy of the Docket sheet of 241-2-18 (Vt. Sup. Ct. Dec. 18, 2016) is attached as Exhibit 14.

I declare that the above statement is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief. I understand that if the above statement is false, I will be subject to the penalty of perjury, or other sanctions in the discretion of the court.

Executed on December 15, 2023.
/s/ James M. Diaz
JAMES M. DIAZ
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CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.

## STIP U L A T I O N S

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and between counsel as follows:

1. That the requirements of notice of the taking of the deposition have been complied with;
2. That the proof of the qualifications of the Notary Public be waived;
3. That all objections except as to the form of the question shall be reserved to the time of trial.
(10:08 a.m.)
GREGORY BOMBARD
Having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

EXAMINATION
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. Would you state your name for the record, please.
A. Gregory Bombard.
Q. Have you ever been deposed before?
A. No.
Q. What would you like to be called for purposes of your deposition?
A. Greg.
Q. Okay. Greg, I introduced myself a short while ago. My name is Susan Flynn. I'm an attorney representing Trooper Riggens [sic].

There are some guidelines I'm going to go over that will make the process go more smoothly for all of us, I think. One is that you'll have to use words for your responses. If you were to just nod your head or if you were to gesture or say a a-hum, that could be difficult for our court reporter, as good as she is, to get down accurately. Does that work?
A. Yes.
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Q. Okay. It's also important that you wait until I finish my question entirely before you start responding so that we are not talking at the same time. Again, that will make our court reporter's job a lot easier. Does that work?
A. Yes.
Q. And then finally, if any of my questions are confusing or unclear, it's important that you stop me and have me restate the question until you're comfortable you know what I'm asking. Okay?
A. Okay.
Q. If you don't do that and you just answer a question, I'm going to assume you knew what I was asking. Does that seem reasonable?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So let me get some background information on you. Although first I will ask you this. What did you do to prepare for your deposition? And Greg, I don't want any conversations with counsel. What I'm really focused on is did you look at any materials, review any records, videos, recordings, anything like that?
A. Yes.
Q. What did you do?
A. Looked at the video. I looked at the video.
Q. Okay. So the dashcam video --
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A. A-hum.
Q. The trooper's video?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Did you do anything else?
A. I looked at some reports.
Q. Okay. What kind of reports did you look at?
A. Some past police reports or something. Yes.
Q. Okay. And the past police reports, did they relate to this incident or other incidents?
A. It did not relate to this incident.
Q. Okay. So what did they relate to?
A. They -- a Facebook comment that I posted.
Q. Okay. So you looked at past police reports that related to a Facebook comment that you posted; is that correct?
A. Say that again.
Q. You looked at past police reports that related to a Facebook post or Facebook comment that you posted; is that correct?
A. And I see you looking over at your attorney.
Q. Yeah. So just so that we are on the same page, as you know, he can't help you answer questions.
A. Yeah.
Q. At the conclusion of a question, in other words, once you provide a response, if you want to take a
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break for any reason, including to talk to your attorney, you can do that.
A. Yeah.
Q. All right?
A. Okay. So can you repeat the question?
Q. I'm going to ask Kim to repeat it because I can't -- I'm good for like two, and then I won't be able to remember it.
(The record was read as requested)
THE WITNESS: Yes. Yup.
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. Okay. And so describe the police reports for me.
A. The police report was past. It was in the past. One was from 1995.
Q. Okay.
A. And I believe that's it. Yeah.
Q. Okay. So while you testified as to past police reports, you looked at one past police report relating to this Facebook post of yours?
A. No. No.
Q. You looked at more than one?

MR. DIAZ: Objection. Counsel, I'm
going to object just -- I think it's vague. But I
think to facilitate this a little bit, the question
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of what a report is might be, you know, what his understanding of report might be might move this forward.

MS. FLYNN: Yeah. So I appreciate that, Jay. One of the things I worry about in all depositions, and I'm not suggesting that you were attempting to do this, but sometimes a speaking objection can actually signal to the witness how to craft or answer a question. And so I'm pretty much "objection to form." That's fine.

If you want to take me aside because you think I'm, you know, frustratingly lost in a question, which happens --

MR. DIAZ: Sure.
MS. FLYNN: -- we can do that out of earshot of the witness. And then we don't risk running afoul of that very important rule.

MR. DIAZ: Sure thing. Let me chat with my client just one second.

MS. FLYNN: Okay. So now we are pending a question. What $I$ was contemplating --

MR. DIAZ: You want him to answer that.
MS. FLYNN: Yes. If you want to talk to me to tell me why I'm missing it, I'm happy for you and I to talk. Then we don't have to worry about
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the witness hearing what's going on in a way that might influence his response.

MR. DIAZ: That's fine. Let's finish
the question, and then we can -- I can advise my client.

MS. FLYNN: Okay. Can you find the
last question, Kim?
(The record was read as requested)
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. So you can answer that, and then you can meet with your attorney
A. I looked at a police report from 1995. Where -- do you want the description?
Q. Sure.
A. Where someone said I was tailgating her or something on Interstate 89. And then from 1996 where a friend, or former friend, said I called her a name on the phone or said something to her on the phone derogatory. MS. FLYNN: Okay. Do you want to meet?

I think -- I mean, I think, look, I don't know if he knows what we are talking about. I'm going to get more information if that's helpful to you. So it's up to you.

BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. All right. Greg, so I'm going to ask you some
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more questions about these -- what you described as past police reports. One from '95 and one from '96. Okay?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you describe -- you said something about a police report from 1995 and something about you tailgating someone. Did I get that right?
A. Yes. Or getting close to her car.
Q. Okay. Can you tell me about that?

MR. DIAZ: Objection. Objection. I'm
going to object to further questions about police
reports from 1995 and older because it's unnecessary, harassing, and oppressive to the witness.

MS. FLYNN: Okay. So are you
instructing him not to answer? Because only really two grounds to do that. One, is that it's not -there is no good faith basis for it. And the other is that it's a privileged communication.

MR. DIAZ: That's not what I agree
with. I'm saying it's oppressive under rule, I
think, $30(d) 3$. And so I'm going to instruct him to not answer further questions about police reports dating back to 1995.

MS. FLYNN: Okay. So --
MR. DIAZ: Not anywhere close to the scope of the relevance of this case.
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MS. FLYNN: It has become relevant because he looked at it in order to prepare for this deposition. In other words, his eyes were on that document because it was going to somehow inform him for purposes of this deposition; therefore, making it quite relevant.

MR. DIAZ: I'm also going to object in addition as to work product because these documents were provided by counsel. And therefore, talking more about these documents will relate to the mental impressions of counsel in determining what documents were provided to the client during advice.

MS. FLYNN: Right. Which is one
hundred percent always the case. Counsel provides documents for a witness to review. The witness reviews those documents in order to remind them, inform them, provide some assistance in the course of a deposition. Those documents then become relevant because of that.

MR. DIAZ: Yeah. My objection stands on both counts -- both grounds. I'm instructing my client not to answer further questions about any police reports related back -- dating back to 1995.

MS. FLYNN: Okay. Just so that I'm clear, you provided him with police reports from '95

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. info@capitolcourtreporters.com
and '96. You provided them in order for him to prepare for his deposition. And now you claim that I'm not entitled to ask him about those documents because they are work product. Is that what you're saying?

MR. DIAZ: That, and because they are, under rule $30(d) 3$ to ask questions about these things which have no relationship to this deposition and no possible relevance whatsoever, are oppressive under 30 (d) 3 .

MS. FLYNN: You do appreciate that when you state that they have no possible relevance whatsoever, it begs the question why Mr. Bombard was looking at them in order to prepare for his deposition. You do appreciate the weak foundational basis for that.

MR. DIAZ: Well that's a question you're asking of me. He has no idea why they were provided and why he reviewed them. That is a question I answered because I am his attorney and that I decided to do.

MS. FLYNN: So as I go forward with this deposition, I will have absolutely no understanding how, if at all, those documents are informing his testimony. And you believe that that's
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a fair basis for objection.
MR. DIAZ: Yes. And because there are
no actual -- there is no -- those documents are not informing the basis of his testimony whatsoever.

MS. FLYNN: Well I've yet to explore that. That's the point. You gave them to him. He looked at them. He says he did it for purposes of his deposition, so I get to explore that with him. That's the way it works.

MR. DIAZ: Not under rule $30(\mathrm{~d}) 3$, whereas I see them as strongly oppressive and totally unnecessary and unrelated to this deposition. Therefore, to ask about it as of 1995 I'm going to instruct the client not to answer.

MS. FLYNN: So you get to offer them to him for his review, and then you get to prevent me from figuring out why he reviewed them and how they may have informed his testimony. That's the way you think it goes.

MR. DIAZ: You can ask him how they might inform his testimony, but you can't ask him about those documents.

MS. FLYNN: I can't do one without the other, Jay. That's the problem. That's why in my experience always you show documents to a witness at
risk that those documents will become something that he has -- the witness has to discuss at a deposition. If you don't want the witness to do that, then you don't show him the documents.

MR. DIAZ: What I'm saying is to ask it -- the documents were shown because of reasons his counsel decided to, thereby protecting -- those mental impressions are protected under work product as well as attorney-client privilege.

In addition, asking about documents from 1995 that have no relationship to the case at hand, which took place in 2018, we are going to object and instruct the client not to answer going forward about the substance of those documents.

MS. FLYNN: All right. Well then we will have to seek the court's advice on this. And it will be at your cost. At least that's what I'll be requesting. Because, frankly, it seems wholly indefensible to me that you can ask a witness to review documents in order to prepare them for their deposition but then you deprive the questioning attorney from asking about those documents, and therefore, understanding how they may have informed the witness.

And I would be very interested in some
precedent on this. Because, you know, I have been doing this for awhile.

MR. DIAZ: Well again, the objections, just to be clear, are under rule $30(d) 3$ that asking about these types of police reports from 1985 will have no possible relevance here is oppressive to the witness. And, in addition, the reasons that he was shown those are protected work product.

MS. FLYNN: Sure.
MR. DIAZ: But that's just to be clear on the record what the objection is.

MS. FLYNN: No. No. The stated basis is clear. The rationale for the stated basis is far from clear.

BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. So you looked at a police report from 1995; you looked at a police report from 1996. What else did you look at, Greg, to prepare for your deposition this morning?
A. I don't believe anything. I don't remember.
Q. When did you prepare for your deposition?
A. Last Wednesday. Whatever the date was.
Q. Okay. So today's Monday. So we are talking about four or five days?
A. Yes.
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Q. Okay. So you looked at -- how many records do you think you looked at?
A. Two maybe. Three.
Q. Three pieces of paper?
A. I saw two police reports on a laptop. So whether it was a piece of paper on there, yes.
Q. Okay. How many pages would you say you looked at?
A. One each.
Q. So one page for 1995 police report, and one page for a 1996 police report?
A. Actually I didn't see the 1996 police report. Jay --

MR. DIAZ: I'm going to stop you right
there. You don't talk about what was discussed.
Attorney-client privilege.
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. You looked at a 1995 police report, one page.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And although I don't want to know the contents of any conversations with your attorney, you did not look at a police report from 1996?
A. No.
Q. Okay. So to prepare for your deposition, which occurred last Wednesday, you looked at one piece of
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paper or one page of a document on a computer and it was a police report from 1995?
A. Yes.
Q. And as you sit here today, do you believe that police report from 1995 refreshed your memory as to any events at issue in this lawsuit?
A. Can you repeat that, please?
Q. Do you believe that that one page of a police report from 1995 refreshed your memory as to any matters at issue in this lawsuit?
A. No.
Q. So where were you born?
A. St. Albans, Vermont.
Q. What year were you born?
A. 1966 .
Q. Where did you go to school? Did you go to BFA?
A. Yeah. BFA St. Albans. Yeah.
Q. When did you graduate?
A. 1984.
Q. Where do you live currently?
A. St. Albans, Vermont.
Q. What's your address?
A. 7 Ashton Drive. St. Albans.
Q. $\quad \mathrm{A}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{T}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{N}$ ?
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A. Yes.
Q. How long have you lived at 7 Ashton Drive, St. Albans?
A. 25 years.
Q. Do you live there alone, or do you live there with others?
A. I live there with one other person.
Q. Who's the other person you live there with?
A. My mother.
Q. What is her name?
A. Anna Bombard.
Q. Are you related to Mike Bombard?
A. Yes.
Q. Project Soar? S-O-A-R.
A. Yes.
Q. What's his relation to you?
A. He's my brother.
Q. Before living on Ashton Street in St. Albans, where did you live?
A. I lived in Tennessee. Moved back.
Q. So after you graduated from BFA, Greg, did you go on to have more education?
A. Yes.
Q. What did you do?
A. I went to Champlain College for one semester
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and quit.
Q. Okay. I'm sorry. What did you study at Champlain College?
A. Business.
Q. And then you quit Champlain College after a year, and what did you do after that?
A. I took a year off and then went to Community College of Vermont and gained an associate's degree.
Q. Okay. What was your associate's degree in?
A. Liberal studies. Yeah.
Q. What year, more or less, did you graduate from Community College of Vermont?
A. 1990 .
Q. So between -- I'm going to guess you graduated from BFA in the mid 80 s?
A. Yes. 1984.
Q. Okay. So before that, and before you graduated from Community College of Vermont, what did you do?
A. I worked for my father.
Q. And what did your father do at that time?
A. He owned a bakery/deli.
Q. In St. Albans?
A. Yes.
Q. What did you do for him?
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A. Assisted him.
Q. And then after you did that, what did you do?
A. After I did what?
Q. After you assisted your father at the bakery/deli, what did you do? Did you stay in St. Albans?
A. No. I went to a travel academy and travel school.
Q. And where is the travel school?
A. It was in Williston, Vermont.
Q. And what was your intention going to travel school in Williston, Vermont?
A. To become a travel agent, travel consultant.
Q. Before they -- while they were still a thing to be, huh?
A. Yeah, yeah, yeah.
Q. Did you become a travel agent?
A. Yes.
Q. And when did you become a travel agent?
A. $\quad 1993$.
Q. And where did you work as a travel agent?
A. I worked in St. Albans; Tennessee; and South Burlington, Vermont.
Q. What was the name of the business app or the business that you worked for as a travel agent in St. Albans?
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A. It had two names. Rail City Travel/Rail Travel Center Tours.
Q. Okay. And how long did you work there?
A. Two and-a-half years.
Q. What did you do after working there for two and-a-half years?
A. I went to Costco Wholesale.
Q. Okay. In Colchester?
A. Yes.
Q. What did you do there?
A. I'm still there. And I have been a clerk.
Q. Let me ask you something, Greg. Are you on any medications right now?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Are you on any medication, to your knowledge, that have the side effect of impacting your ability to remember things?
A. No.
Q. Are you on any medications for conditions that can affect or impair your memory such as depression or anxiety?
A. No.
Q. What medications are you on?

MR. SARACHAN: Objection.
MR. DIAZ: Objection.
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MS. FLYNN: I think the -- I think you mean objection, but he can answer.

MR. DIAZ: Objection to the -- no. I'm going to object for privacy purposes because you asked if any medications are going to affect his memory. He doesn't have to tell you what other medications he might be on that would reveal other private health conditions.

MS. FLYNN: So you're going to object on the -- you're instructing him not to answer; is that right?

MR. DIAZ: That's correct.
MS. FLYNN: I mean relevance obviously is not the basis to prevent someone from answering during a deposition.

MR. DIAZ: I didn't say relevance. Again, rule $30(d) 3$ it's, you know, I'm happy for you to ask him about whether any medications might affect his ability to testify today. But he said no. Therefore, that wouldn't affect his ability. He doesn't have any conditions that would affect that ability to testify truthfully, and so to ask him what medications he's on after that, you know, is private, protected health information, and again, oppressive, embarrassing for his own privacy purposes. So I'm
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going to instruct him not to answer that question.
MS. FLYNN: So you do understand that he may provide me answers that I don't necessarily know to be accurate. And that that ought to entitle me to ask questions that will elicit sufficient information so that $I$ can agree or disagree with Mr. Bombard's characterization.

MR. DIAZ: Well none of us are doctors here, so I don't know if -- how we could evaluate by knowing what medications he is on whether they impact his memory or ability to testify truthfully.

I'm going to instruct him not answer this question because it's unnecessary and impacts his private health information.

MS. FLYNN: So do you know yourself whether or not any of the medications that Mr. Bombard is on --

MR. DIAZ: That's not an appropriate question.

MS. FLYNN: Sure it is.
MR. DIAZ: I'm not going to answer that question.

MS. FLYNN: Let's say he's on a medication that has a primary side effect of memory impairment.

MR. DIAZ: You already asked him that. He said no. What else do you need?

MS. FLYNN: You understand the whole purpose of the deposition is not just hear what Mr . Bombard has to say, but to get information that could allow me independently to corroborate or not the assertions that he makes during the deposition. Right?

I don't have -- if he says, you know, did you hit Mr. Riggen, he says no, that's the end of it. You don't ask more questions. He's already provided that answer. That's the whole purpose of the deposition. I get to explore. And if it's sensitive and such that it should never come into trial, then you file a motion for protective order.

MR. DIAZ: That's what we will do.
MS. FLYNN: That's fine. But you
haven't done that. So I get to have the information so that I can figure out whether Mr. Bombard's thinking about it is accurate or inaccurate.

MR. DIAZ: We can either adjourn now and we can file for a protective order, or you can continue subject to us filing a protective order later without us waiving any rights to file that protective order as relates to the medications that
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Mr. Bombard is on.
There is no relevance and no --
MS. FLYNN: But don't even know that yourself. You don't even know that yourself.

MR. DIAZ: The objection stands, and I'm instructing my client not to answer the question.

MS. FLYNN: Why don't you file a motion for protective order then.

MR. DIAZ: We will. Do you want to continue today's deposition?

MS. FLYNN: Do you want to try to reach the court?

MR. DIAZ: We can.
MS. FLYNN: Go ahead.
MR. DIAZ: Where is the phone?
(Noise in the room)
MS. FLYNN: You know what? It's a difficult enough deposition without comments from someone who is not involved in the process. It is.

MR. SARACHAN: I'm involved in the process.

MS. FLYNN: Well I would just --
MR. SARACHAN: I'm very involved in the process, so don't condescend me, please. I appreciate it. I know that you're very experienced.
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You've told us that. But you don't have to condescend me. Please. Don't. Let's not.

MS. FLYNN: You're at the table.
MR. SARACHAN: Please stop, stop, stop.
MS. FLYNN: You're not taking or
defending the deposition. So comments, size, it's not helpful. You're making comments under your breath.

MR. SARACHAN: I actually made one comment, and it was -- it was Byzantine. I apologize.

MS. FLYNN: Was that helpful?
MR. DIAZ: The choice before us right now, Susan --

MR. SARACHAN: Is this helpful?
MR. DIAZ: Hang on. The choice before us now is do you want to continue? Or would you like to adjourn so we can file for a protective order?

MS. FLYNN: You can try. We can try to get the Washington Superior Court on the telephone.

MR. DIAZ: Okay.
MS. FLYNN: Is there a telephone here?
Do you have a cell phone?
MR. DIAZ: You're the one challenging our objection here, so if you would like to call
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court, you're welcome to.
MS. FLYNN: Don't you have to move for a protective order? Wouldn't that be --

MR. DIAZ: I don't need to move right now. I'm instructing my client not to answer the question. Whether you want to try to compel him to answer this question at this moment is your decision.

MS. FLYNN: I'm going to take a break of 5 minutes, and I'll get back to you on that.
(Recess was taken.)
MS. FLYNN: Can you read back the last question please, Kim?
(The record was read as requested)
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. And I understand you're not going to tell me.
A. No.
Q. Are you -- is there anything -- any reason why we should think that your testimony here this morning is not accurate or reliable?
A. No.
Q. Why did you go to Tennessee?
A. Because I was young and there was some friends down there, and I just wanted to go and get away.
Q. How long did you live down there?
A. Less than a year.
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Q. Other states that you've lived in other than Vermont and Tennessee?
A. Colorado.
Q. When did you live in Colorado?
A. $\quad 95$.
Q. Just for the year? Less than a year?
A. About 30 to 40 days and came home.
Q. Other than Tennessee, Colorado and Vermont have you lived in any other states?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever been convicted of a crime?

MR. DIAZ: Objection. Instruct the witness not to answer pursuant to the privilege under 13 V.S.A. 7606.

MS. FLYNN: Well please -- I'm not
familiar what privilege would exist there.
MR. DIAZ: It's Vermont's expungement
of criminal records statute.
MS. FLYNN: Okay.
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. So have you ever been convicted of a crime that has not apparently been expunged under Vermont's expungement of a criminal record statute?

MS. FLYNN: Kim, can you repeat that
please?
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(The record was read as requested)
MR. DIAZ: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: No.
MR. DIAZ: You can answer.
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. Not in Tennessee? Not in Colorado?
A. No.
Q. Have you been involved in any other lawsuits?
A. No.
Q. So other than Mike, you have other siblings?
A. Yes.
Q. Who?
A. I have a sister.
Q. What's her name?
A. Bonnie.
Q. Where does she live?
A. St. Albans.
Q. So just the three of you? You, Mike and Bonnie?
A. Yes.
Q. And are you close?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you get together regularly?
A. Yes.
Q. How frequently would you say you get together
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```
with Bonnie?
```

A. Once a week.
Q. How about Mike?
A. Once a week.
Q. Do you have close friends?
A. Yes.
Q. Who would you count among your closest of
friends if you had to pick three?
A. My friend Sarah. And Kelly.
Q. Okay. Sarah's last name is what?
A. Maginn. M-A-G-I-N-N.
Q. Does she live locally St. Albans, Franklin

County?
A. Yes.
Q. And Sarah -- that was Sarah; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. The other one you mentioned?
A. Her name is Kelly.
Q. Kelly. What's her last name?
A. Greeno. G-R-E-E-N-O.
Q. Does she live in Franklin County?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see them regularly?
A. No.
Q. Do you see your family more?

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. info@capitolcourtreporters.com
A. Yes.
Q. What do you do for a living currently?
A. I work at Costco Wholesale.
Q. What do you do for them?
A. A clerk.
Q. What does a clerk do for Costco Wholesale?
A. Well there is different types of clerk. I'm a member service clerk. A membership clerk.
Q. How long have you been a membership clerk for Costco Wholesale?
A. I have been there for 23 and-a-half years, but about 12 years as a membership clerk.
Q. Is it a full-time position for you?
A. No.
Q. It's a part-time position?
A. Currently.
Q. How long has it been a part-time position?
A. I've never been officially full time there. I have had full-time hours, but I'm part time.
Q. Okay. Is there a reason, Greg, that you've never been -- even though you're working full-time hours you've never been officially full time?
A. Yes.
Q. What's the reason for that?
A. I don't want it. I don't want to work full
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time there.
Q. Okay.
A. I have worked full time many, many hours there. But --
Q. Okay. So it's a more flexible schedule for you?
A. Yes.
Q. And what do you do when you're not working at Costco Wholesale given that you don't want the full-time hours and commitment?
A. Recently go to Planet Fitness. Go shopping. I mean -- help my mother out. Yeah.
Q. Do you have any particular hobbies or past time, pastimes that you engage in?
A. No.
Q. Are you a hunter?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever been a hunter?
A. No.
Q. So other than spending time with your friends, you help out with your mother. Does your mother have any particular challenges?
A. She is 88.
Q. So just help her because as she gets older she needs more support?
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A. Yeah. Running errands for her. Things like that.
Q. So other than the events that give rise to this lawsuit, Greg, have you had any direct encounters with the police?
A. Repeat that, please.
Q. Other than the events that give rise to this lawsuit, have you had any other encounters with the police?

MR. DIAZ: Objection. I'm going to advise my client to the extent that you can provide information that is not protected by 13 V.S.A. 7606, you can answer. But other than that, you should not answer.

MS. FLYNN: Isn't there going to be some waiver of any privilege associated with that information insofar as it relates to this lawsuit? Generally, you know, you can't protect information that might be useful or relevant given some -- the claims of a lawsuit. Right?

MR. DIAZ: Which is -- I have instructed my client to the extent that information is protected, he should not respond with any information that is protected. Otherwise, he can respond.
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MS. FLYNN: Right. But if it proves to be relevant to this lawsuit; right? I mean we could agree to keep it confidential, we have never -- as far as I can tell nobody's had a conversation about whether there should be a confidentiality agreement with regard to any information that's part of the lawsuit. Right? That's always an option; a reasonable option. So that information that might be relevant to the lawsuit, but otherwise confidential or sensitive, is limited to the people involved in the lawsuit and destroyed after the culmination of the lawsuit.

MR. DIAZ: I think we are happy to stipulate to whatever information is available about the -- the subject matter of this lawsuit which is a police stop and arrest on February 9, 2018. That's, of course, fair game.

MS. FLYNN: Right. But --
MR. DIAZ: And not within -- not within the privilege as far as I'm concerned.

MS. FLYNN: But would you agree that privileged information can be relevant in a different context, like this type of lawsuit? And if it is, then it's not appropriate to withhold the privileged information.
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The better approach would be to agree to some kind of confidentiality agreement so that any sensitive information doesn't leave, effectively, this room. But it's not --

MR. DIAZ: I can agree that all types of information is relevant, but if it is privileged, it is privileged and is not to be -- not a part of this lawsuit.

MS. FLYNN: Right. But you do, by bringing this type of lawsuit, waive your privilege as to certain matters. I would suggest that if you're --

MR. DIAZ: I'm not aware of any such privilege as it relates to -- any such waiver of privilege under 13 V.S.A. 7606.

MS. FLYNN: Yeah. So he could have encounters with police that can look very similar to this or might have influenced the way he responded here or even affected his experience of this event and, therefore, be relevant to his damages. But I don't get to ask him about that. That's your position.

MR. DIAZ: My objection -- and as I advised my client -- is to the question that was asked which I believe was have you ever had any -- I
can't remember the exact question.
My instruction to my client was to the extent it would reveal privileged information under 13 V.S.A. 7606, do not provide that information. You can answer outside of that.

BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. All right. I disagree with that. In this context. Can you answer the question?
A. Repeat the question, please.
Q. Well I think it's my question, but you might as well take it from your attorney because he's got qualifications that $I$ have not imposed. So go ahead. You're the last one asking.

MR. DIAZ: I don't have the -- I don't
remember what the question was. There's a question
pending. I can give my instruction after the question is read.
(The record was read as requested)
MS. FLYNN: Respectfully, I'm assuming
-- So clearly the question's pending.
MR. DIAZ: Okay.
MS. FLYNN: And you're talking to him before he responds to it. I assume it's in good faith, Jay, because you seem like a decent person.

MR. DIAZ: Yes.
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MS. FLYNN: But don't --
(The record was read as requested)
MR. DIAZ: Objection. To the extent
that you can provide information -- the privilege is 13 V.S.A. Section 7606. To the extent you can provide information outside of that privilege, you can answer. Anything inside that privilege you cannot or should not.

THE WITNESS: I don't understand.
MR. DIAZ: You don't understand the question or you don't understand my instruction?

THE WITNESS: I don't understand yours.
MR. DIAZ: Okay.
THE WITNESS: So the answer to the question is no.

MS. FLYNN: Okay.
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. Would you say that you harbor any particular feelings or attitudes towards police officers generally, Greg?
A. No.
Q. Okay. So on the subject of police officers and law enforcement you would say that your attitude is neutral?
A. Yes. Yeah.
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Q. And you haven't had any negative experiences with police officers?
A. No.
Q. And any close family members have not, to your knowledge, had any negative experience with police officers?
A. No.
Q. So what damages are you claiming that you sustained because of the interaction with Trooper Riggens? MR. DIAZ: Objection to form. You can answer. THE WITNESS: Damages? I don't
understand the question.
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. Well you filed a lawsuit; right? You're nodding your head yes. You'll have to say yes so that Kim can get that down.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And do you know you're seeking certain relief in the lawsuit; right?
A. Yes.
Q. And part of the relief that you're seeking is compensation for harms that have occurred to you. Does that make sense?
A. Yes.
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Q. What compensation -- what harms are you alleging, Greg, occurred to you for which you believe you are entitled to compensation?
A. Harms, like my constitutional rights were violated. Certain constitutional rights were violated.
Q. Okay. Anything else?
A. I don't know how you want me to answer this. Basically that the damages are my constitutional rights were violated by a law enforcement officer. And I was interrogated on the side of the road and pulled over for no reason. So degraded, humiliated.
Q. Okay. So are you alleging that the experience caused you to feel humiliated or other psychological distress?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you seeking compensation for that?

MR. DIAZ: Objection. Mischaracterizes
previous testimony.
MS. FLYNN: I don't -- can we talk for
a second outside of this?
MR. DIAZ: Happy to.
MS. FLYNN: Okay.
(A discussion was held off the record.)
MS. FLYNN: Okay. So just on the
record, it is concerning to me when an objection is
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made followed by a statement which could have the effect, whether it's intended to or not, of informing the witness or educating the witness about how to answer a question, and that's what I had hoped to have a conversation with Attorney Diaz about. You wanted to say something?

MR. DIAZ: I don't have -- I don't know that there is a need to respond, but I would guess I would just say that $I$ did not, of course, in any way do anything improper. I did not provide a speaking objection. I'm not sure what the problem is with saying an objection and stating the basis for that objection in a very short, simple phrase which is very common.

MS. FLYNN: I thought you wanted to be on the record. I thought you had said we should be on the record, which is why I came back.

MR. DIAZ: No. I said if you wanted to continue, you know, the conversation we had outside because it was going in circles, then we should put it on the record. Otherwise, we can just continue.

MS. FLYNN: Can you read back the question please, Kim.
(The record was read as requested)
THE WITNESS: Yes.
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BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. And would you describe what it is that you experienced for which you're seeking compensation?
A. I experienced a violation of my constitutional rights. Other than that, embarrassment, humiliation, anger. Just felt violated.
Q. So have you sought any kind of treatment for those conditions? Your embarrassment, humiliation, anger or the feeling that you were violated?
A. No.
Q. Do you intend to seek any treatment for those conditions?
A. No.
Q. Have those conditions affected the way that you go about your job?
A. No.
Q. Have those conditions affected the way in which you interact with Kelly or Sarah?
A. No.
Q. Have they affected the way you interact with your family members?
A. No.
Q. Have they affected the way that you present yourself in the community?
A. Yes.
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Q. How so?
A. I live in a small town. And I don't like to be seen as much because of the embarrassment and humiliation because of the articles that were written about me in newspapers and a police vlog, blog.
Q. Blog with a B, I think you mean?
A. From the VSP website. Their -- their Facebook page where they post arrests and other things.
Q. Has anyone raised the -- has anyone brought it to your attention, Greg, that they are aware of any of the information in the Vermont State Police blog or from any other source that reflects the events that we are here to talk about today? Has anyone said, for example, hey Greg, I heard you were pulled over by Trooper Riggen. I heard you were cited. Anything like that?
A. Yes.
Q. Who has told you that?
A. Many people.
Q. Who are the many people who have told you that?
A. Co-workers. Even strangers.
Q. Okay.
A. Strangers. Friends. Co-workers.
Q. So I had asked you -- anybody else or any category of person you want to add to co-workers, friends
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or strangers?
A. A category?
Q. Yeah. I'm going to ask you in more detail about specific people. But you sort of shared that co-workers, friends, and strangers are aware of these incidents.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Who are the co-workers who have shared with you that they are aware of them?
A. I don't remember.
Q. Not one person?
A. Yeah. Yeah. I can remember one. Yeah. Her name is Jessica. A co-worker. Yeah.
Q. Can you remember what the interaction was?
A. Yes.
Q. What was the interaction?
A. I was stretching my hands at work because I use a keyboard, and she cracked a joke and said: Don't do that. You might get arrested for it.
Q. Okay. So did you have reason to think that Jessica felt differently about you because she was aware of it? In other words, she treated you different from the way she would have otherwise?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Any other co-workers you can think of?
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A. No. Not at this time.
Q. Friends?
A. Yes.
Q. What friends have shared with you that they were aware of the events that gives rise to the lawsuit?
A. The ones I previously mentioned.
Q. Sarah and Kelly? You'll just have to say yes if that's what you --
A. Yes.
Q. You said a moment ago that Sarah and Kelly -it didn't affect the way you interacted with them. Is that true?
A. Yes. It didn't affect the way I interact with them.
Q. Okay. So do you have reason to think that Sarah or Kelly think about you differently having become aware of these events than they otherwise did?
A. Yes.
Q. And why do you say that?
A. Because it was a strange event. Unusual event that happened to me.
Q. But it hasn't affected your friendship?
A. No.
Q. What about strangers? Strangers you said have -- you're -- you believe that strangers are aware of these
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events?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you give me some examples of how you've learned that strangers were aware of these events and --
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.
A. I work at a very busy place. And I had an interaction with a member: Aren't you the one that was on TV that was the arrested for -- saying something derogatory to a police officer? Yeah.
Q. Okay. So can you recall other instances, other than the one with a member who said aren't you the one who was on TV?
A. No.
Q. And do you believe that the interaction with this member was tainted or negatively affected by the member apparently having that information?
A. Yes.
Q. How so?
A. It was embarrassing and humiliating at work. It was at work.
Q. To you?
A. Yes. Yes. To me. Is that what your question was?
Q. Well what I was focused on is whether the
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interaction with this customer seemed to be affected by this information. In other words, you felt humiliated because the customer was aware of it; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. But do you have reason to think that it somehow affected the way that you and the customer interacted? In other words, was the customer angry towards you? Was the customer dismissive towards you? Was the customer somehow not treating you the way you thought the customer would otherwise treat you?

MR. DIAZ: Objection to form. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: No. The customer was
nice.
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. Any other examples of strangers -interactions with strangers that demonstrated to you that they were aware of the events at issue?
A. No.
Q. You described yourself perhaps in the present tense as someone who, other than work, takes care of your mother and spends time with friends. Is that --
A. Yes.
Q. -- generally what you do?
A. Yes.
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Q. Have you ever been involved in the community? Have you ever been on any committees or the City Council, or $I$ don't know, any activities? You're in St. Albans town?
A. Yes.
Q. For the Town of St. Albans?
A. No.
Q. It seems, Greg, and you can tell me if I'm wrong, it seems like you're someone who is, no criticism, not particularly active in your community. Is that a fair statement?
A. No. I'm not.
Q. You're not?
A. No.
Q. And in terms of like many people you like to hang out with the people that you're close to. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. You don't do a lot of activities with groups of people whom you don't know.
A. True. Yes.
Q. How would you describe your general demeanor? Are you a laid-back guy? Are you kind of intense? Are you quick to anger? How would you describe your --
A. I'm a laid-back person.
Q. All the time?
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A. Yeah. Yes.
Q. Any particular things that you can think of over the years that really set you off or trigger you?
A. Well I work in customer service. It's just you keep it in your -- you don't express yourself. You keep it to yourself.
Q. Okay. So there are things -- I think what you're saying is that there are things that sometimes tick you off or trigger you, but because you're in customer service you just have to stay even keeled?
A. Yes. Yeah.
Q. Do you think that your friends Sarah, Kelly, would describe you as someone who flies off the handle or is quick to anger?

MR. DIAZ: Objection to form. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: Would they describe me as
that? No. No.
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. Okay. So you can't recall if you think back to the last, $I$ don't know, 5 or 10 years, an incident where you really lost it getting angry or yelling or --
A. No.
Q. -- loud?
A. No.
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Q. Do you have reason to believe that the troopers in the St. Albans' barracks somehow knew you personally or knew of your reputation?

MR. DIAZ: Objection to form. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: I don't know.
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. You don't know one way or the other?
A. No. No.
Q. So February 9, 2018. This incident sort of unfolded more or less around midday?
A. Yeah. Around 11:30 a.m. to noonish. Around there.
Q. Do you have a memory as to what you had been doing that morning?
A. Yes.
Q. What had you been doing?
A. I had just returned from Dunkin Donuts. I got an iced coffee, and $I$ was on my way to the St. Albans post office to collect my mail at my P.O. Box.
Q. Okay. Do you remember what day of the week it was?
A. Friday? I'm not sure. I think it was a Friday.
Q. I will represent to you that it was a Friday.
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And it was a Friday -- around that time, 2018, did you have a set schedule at Costco?
A. Yes.
Q. What was your schedule?
A. Oh, no. I didn't. No. You never get a set schedule at Costco.
Q. What does that mean? Every couple of weeks you have to --
A. It's different -- your days off are different. I happened to have Friday off that day which the next week I might have not had Friday off.
Q. Okay. So do you remember what you had done the night before?
A. Yes.
Q. What had you done the night before?
A. I drove for Uber for about three or four hours.
Q. Okay. Is that something that you continue to do?
A. No.
Q. Drive for Uber?
A. No.
Q. But you did back in 2018?
A. Yes.
Q. And any particular reason you did that?
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A. Yes.
Q. What was that?
A. To be out of credit card.
Q. So do you remember if you had worked late the night before?
A. Yes.
Q. When did you work until?
A. About 11 p.m.
Q. Okay. And then was that something you would do that if you didn't have to work the next day you might work for Uber at night or is it --
A. Yes. Yeah.
Q. All right. So on that particular morning you had left your home on Ashton Drive. You had gone to Dunkin Donuts. And you had gotten an iced coffee?
A. Yes.
Q. And then you were headed to the post office?
A. Yes.
Q. And you were headed -- you were headed south; is that right? On Main Street?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall when -- where Trooper Riggens was in the roadway when your attention was first drawn to him?
A. No.
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Q. What do you first recall in terms of seeing a police cruiser? Do you --
A. Yes, I do recall.
Q. Yeah. What do you remember? What drew your attention to a police cruiser?
A. He was in back of my vehicle with his blue lights on.
Q. Okay. So the first time that you were sort of drawn to the presence of Trooper Riggens on North Main Street in St. Albans on February 9, 2018, was when he was behind you with his blue lights on?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you remember what you were thinking as you noticed him behind you with his blue lights on?
A. Yes.
Q. What were you thinking?
A. To pull over so he can carry on and go somewhere.
Q. Okay.
A. Because it's the law to pull over when there is a police officer with the lights on.
Q. Okay. So when you first were drawn to the presence of this officer behind you, you had in mind he must want you to pull over. It didn't occur to you that his being behind you had anything to do with anything you
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did; is that right?
A. Correct. I thought he was going to some other call.
Q. Okay. And so when you first saw the police officer behind you, you pulled over?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you remember your state of mind at the time he pulled you over?
A. Yes.
Q. How would you describe that?
A. Confusing. Confused. To wonder; wonder.
Q. Okay. So from what you said, you tell me if I have this right, Greg, you don't have any particular feelings about police officers. You said earlier that you're neutral as it comes to your attitude towards police officers?
A. Yes.
Q. So you've got this neutral attitude towards police officers. And then a police officer is behind you pulling you over, and you don't think anything of it; is that right? Except confusion because you don't think it has to do with you?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. And you appreciate that Trooper Riggens at some point seemed to think that you gave him the finger;
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is that right?
A. I appreciate -- can you repeat that?
Q. Yeah. Did you not believe that Trooper

Riggens at some point believed you gave him the finger?
MR. DIAZ: Objection to form. You can
answer.
THE WITNESS: Do I not believe that --
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. Why do you think Trooper Riggens, in fact, pulled you over?
A. He assumed I gave him the bird. The finger.
Q. Okay. So at some point it became clear to you that he assumed you gave him the bird or the finger?
A. At some point. Yes.
Q. Okay.
A. After a minute or so, or a few seconds after he came to my window. Yes.
Q. Okay. And just so that we are clear, you have no idea yourself as to Trooper Riggens' path of travel before you saw him behind you headed south on North Main Street, is that true?
A. No. I did not know he was -- I never saw a police officer or a State Police cruiser until the blue lights were on me.
Q. And he was behind you?
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A. Yes.
Q. Right. So you have no idea how it was he came to first see you or your vehicle?
A. Correct. I have no idea.
Q. All right. So at some point, I think you said after a minute, you came to learn that Trooper Riggens assumed you gave him the bird or the finger?
A. He told me.
Q. And you deny that you ever did that; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you think you might have made some motion or movement which could have been detected by a passing vehicle?

MR. DIAZ: Objection to form. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: Perhaps. Yes.
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. What do you think might have been detected by a passing vehicle? What movement or gesture or -- let me put it this way.

You believe that Trooper Riggens was confused about having seen you give him the finger or the bird?
A. I don't believe anything. I don't know what he thought.

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.
Q. Okay. But do you think you might have moved your hand or otherwise gestured or motioned within your vehicle in a way that could have drawn the attention of somebody who was, say, passing you?
A. I don't know why -- I don't know if someone would have seen what I was doing. I was stretching my fingers on the top of my steering wheel. I also smoke. So I don't know what he assumed or what anybody else could assume $I$ was doing in my car.
Q. Okay. So when you say you were stretching your fingers, how did you come to think about that? Is that something you decided that in hindsight perhaps could have led him to think that you were gesturing to him?
A. I don't know what he was thinking. I was stretching my fingers on my steering wheel. I don't know what he was thinking or what he thought or what other people in other cars are thinking.
Q. Okay. So your testimony is that at some point prior to your noticing Trooper Riggens behind you, you were stretching your fingers on your steering wheel?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And --
A. My hands. My -- yes.
Q. How were you doing that?
A. I was doing this. Just like this.
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(Indicating).
Q. So you're motioning with your hands. Presumably they stayed on the steering wheel, or would you release the steering wheel when you were stretching your fingers?
A. No. They were just -- one was here and one was here. And I was just moving my hands a couple times.
Q. Sort of like 10 and 2 on the steering wheel?
A. $\quad 10$ and 2?

MR. DIAZ: Objection to form. You can
answer.
THE WITNESS: Yes. Yeah.
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. All right. You know what I mean when I say 10 and 2 on the steering wheel?
A. Yes.
Q. You remember that from driver's ed?
A. Yes.
Q. So in other words, your hands weren't directly across from each other on the wheel. One was, if you imagine the sort of centerline or 12:00, one was a bit to the right and one was a bit to the left?
A. Yes.
Q. And you have a memory of stretching your
fingers -- holding on to the wheel at that 10 and 2
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position and stretching your fingers maybe one hand and then the other, and then one hand and then the other?
A. Yes. Yeah.
Q. How many times do you think you stretched the fingers on each hand?
A. Two or three times.
Q. Okay. So two or three times each hand.
A. No. I did it together. At the same time.
Q. Okay. So two or three times you stretched the fingers together?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Do you -- putting aside what happened in this particular instance, do you think you have a -- do you have a habit or practice of giving people the finger or the bird, as you say?
A. No.
Q. Is that something you would say you rarely do?
A. Yes.
Q. So if we, for example, talked to Kelly and Sarah, who are your friends, they wouldn't say: Oh, that Greg. He's always giving us the finger?
A. They wouldn't say that.
Q. Nor your family members?
A. No.
Q. It's not something you do often, true?
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A. At all. I don't do it at all.
Q. Never done it?
A. Maybe as a teenager I did. Or in my early 20 s as a young adult.
Q. Okay.
A. I don't recall though. But I could have.
Q. Okay. So you think that probably since your early 20s you've not given anyone the finger, period, as best you recall?
A. Yes. Yeah.
Q. Because that's just not the kind of thing you do?
A. No.
Q. Not since you were young and less -- I don't know what we are when we are young.
A. I don't remember actually ever giving the finger.
Q. You don't have a memory of that?
A. No.
Q. Ever?
A. No.
Q. All right. By the way, so this is happening you say around 11:30. Complaint says it happened around 12:15. Middle of the day. North Main Street, St. Albans.
A. Yes. I can't remember exactly what time.
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11:30 to 12, 12:15 around there. Yeah. I just don't remember the exact time.
Q. Sure. North Main Street during the lunch hour tends to get busy in St. Albans. Fair statement?

MR. DIAZ: Objection to form. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: Yes. Yeah.
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. I don't know where people come from, but they seem to all be kind of going maybe to run errands during their lunch break or go to restaurants. I don't know. But people seem to come out of the woodwork midday. MR. DIAZ: Objection to form. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: Perhaps. I guess. Yeah.
Whatever they have got to do. Yeah. BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. All right. And so suffice it to say that on this particular Friday around midday there were other cars around you?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you say it was a typical kind of busy lunch hour traffic situation?
A. I'd say it was typical. Not busy.
Q. Okay. So you would say that a typical lunch
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hour on North Main Street at this particular area in St. Albans is not busy?
A. It's steady.
Q. Steady.
A. Yeah. It's not quite busy-busy, but steady.
Q. So those are your words, and I don't have any problem with them. But $I$ do want you to say what you mean when you say busy versus steady. Okay?
A. There was normal traffic. Typical, normal traffic.
Q. For lunch hour normal or for 3 in the afternoon normal?
A. It was normal traffic. I'm not really identifying lunch hour. St. Albans Main Street can be busy, typical busy.
Q. Maybe I'm mistaken. I thought you said a short while ago that you thought that lunch hour on North Main Street in St. Albans can get busier than traffic at other times of the day.

Did I misunderstand that?
A. Yes. It can. Just like any other town.
Q. Sure. Sure. So I mean traffic North Main Street -- when it comes to St. Albans thoroughfares, North Main Street's probably the busiest or one of them?

MR. DIAZ: Objection to form. You can
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answer.
THE WITNESS: There is North and South
Main Street in St. Albans. They are busy. Yeah. BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. Yeah. So they are busy streets. North and South Main Street. And around lunchtime they get busier. Fair statement?
A. Yes. Yeah. Like any other town.
Q. Sure. Okay. You had said a moment ago that you wouldn't describe the traffic around the time of this incident as busy. You would describe it as steady.

Do you remember saying that?
A. Yes.
Q. I just want to make sure I understand the distinction you're making. How would you describe a busy traffic situation on North Main Street in St. Albans compared to what you're describing as a steady traffic situation?
A. How would I compare --
Q. Yeah.
A. I think that St. Albans Main Street is more busy between, like, 4, 5 and 6 p.m. I grew up there. I don't think it was actually busy. I think it was a normal noonish time of day there. Like just normal traffic.
Q. Okay. All right. What would you describe as

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. info@capitolcourtreporters.com
normal traffic for noonish time of day there?
A. Vehicles -- vehicles on the road.
Q. So vehicles heading in both directions?
A. Yes. Yeah.
Q. And a steady flow of vehicles headed in both directions?
A. Yes. Yeah.
Q. How are you doing?

MR. DIAZ: I don't know when you want
to take a break. Maybe the next 10, 15.
MS. FLYNN: I have no idea what time it
is. Are you looking at a clock behind me?
MR. DIAZ: It's almost 11:30. Just
saying I don't know if you need a break or you want to take a break. But maybe in the next 10 or 15 we could.

MS. FLYNN: That's fine. I can always take a break. How are you doing, Greg?

THE WITNESS: We can go on for another 10 or 15. However you like.

MS. FLYNN: How about we take a break right now. Once someone raises that question, you know what I'm thinking. You don't want to know what I'm thinking.

MR. DIAZ: Everybody wants a break.
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MS. FLYNN: So 10 or 15. So that means we will be back at 20 of.
(Recess was taken.)
(The record was read as requested)
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. Are you ready, Greg?
A. Yes.
Q. In your complaint, Greg, there is a statement that reads: Riggen confronted Bombard in an angry manner. I'm going to ask you do you agree with that statement?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you describe for me what led you to conclude that he was confronting you in an angry manner? And understand that I'm focused on when you first saw him behind you and you first encountered Officer Riggens, not the sort of what might be called the second time you engaged. Are you with me there?
A. Yes.
Q. There was an incident, there was an exchange, he walked back towards his car. Something happened. He approached you again. In general.
A. Yes.
Q. So we are talking about the sort of phase one.
A. Yes.
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Q. Do you agree that he confronted you that first time in an angry manner?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was it that you observed that led you to conclude that he was angry? Or his interaction with you was angry?
A. His voice.
Q. Okay. You think his voice was what? How would you describe his voice?
A. Angry and unprofessional.
Q. Okay. So I'm going to suggest that those are characterizations. And I'm hoping you can help me understand the observations you made that led you to say to yourself this guy's angry and unprofessional. Let's talk about the angry.
A. Okay.
Q. What said to you he was angry? You said his voice?
A. He had pulled me over. I pulled over. Normal traffic stop is you usually wait a minute or so. They run your plate. And it's about a minute or two.

He immediately got out of his police cruiser and walked abruptly to my vehicle and he said something to the point: Do you need some help? You got a problem? So I figured that was not normal procedure.
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Q. Okay. But is it the words he used that said to you, Greg, he was angry?
A. Yes.
Q. So it wasn't the -- it wasn't the volume of his voice or the tone of his voice. It was the words that he said that said to you he is angry?
A. It was both.
Q. Okay. What was it about the volume or tone of his voice?
A. It didn't seem friendly. It didn't seem friendly. It didn't seem professional.
Q. Okay. So we will get to the professional observation in a moment. Would you say it didn't seem friendly because it sounded serious?
A. No. It sounded rude.
Q. Okay. It sounded rude. What was it that made it sound rude to you?
A. His demeanor. His voice. The way he approached.
Q. Okay. So we have talked about the volume of his voice; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you believe his volume was higher than somebody who was approaching you in a non angry professional way; is that right?
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A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And you believe that the volume of his voice suggested that he was rude, or was it something else that suggested to you that he was rude?
A. It was the words and the volume.
Q. Okay. And the words and the volume said to you he's being rude; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you've seen the videotape?
A. Yes.
Q. And you believe that that displays a rude, unprofessional encounter?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Is there anything else you can tell me other than the words he used and the volume of his voice that signal to you that he was angry and unprofessional?
A. Because he abruptly got out of his cruiser. I didn't even have time to get my window down. Usually when you get pulled over they run your plates. It's a minute or two. It was very quick.
Q. How many times have you gotten pulled over?
A. In my life?
Q. Yeah.
A. Probably five or six speeding tickets. Yeah.
Q. And that would be the sum total of your having

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. info@capitolcourtreporters.com
been pulled over by police officers except for this incident?
A. Say that again please.
Q. Yeah. You said you got five or six speeding tickets. Now I don't know if you might have been pulled over for other things, like going through a stop sign or failing to yield, or other things?
A. Others. There are others. Yeah.
Q. So about how many times, total, would you say you have been pulled over for some kind of traffic related --
A. $\quad 10$ to 12.
Q. $\quad 10$ to 12. If you think of this event in 2018 when would the last one have been prior to this event?
A. July 2021. Oh, before this event of 2018. July 2021.
Q. So this happened in 2018?
A. Yes. Oh, prior.
Q. Yes.
A. Prior, I don't remember.
Q. Okay. Had it been years, or was it some recent thing?
A. I would say years.
Q. And would you have in those 10 to 12 stops ever on another occasion included -- concluded that you
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were approached in an unprofessional way?
A. No.
Q. Those other stops had all been professional?
A. Yes.
Q. This, to you, was different?
A. Yes.
Q. Because you believed that Officer Riggen was acting in a way that was rude and unprofessional?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. At some point earlier you said that after about a minute you came to note that he assumed you had given him the finger; right?
A. No.
Q. You don't remember saying that at the beginning of your deposition?
A. He told me that he assumed that -- he told me that I gave him the finger. In passing.
Q. Okay. All right. And then you expressed confusion about that; right?
A. Yes.
Q. Because you hadn't given him the finger?
A. No.
Q. In fact, it's not something you do?
A. No.
Q. Okay. And then you told him that you would
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file a complaint against him; do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was his response to that?
A. Go ahead. Okay. You know.
Q. He said something like "You're more than
welcome to;" do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. And how would you describe his demeanor when he said that to you?
A. Normal.
Q. Okay. He also told you he wouldn't be taking up any more of your time?
A. Yes.
Q. And he wasn't going to cause you any more delay. Do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And he said that, and then he left. True?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So would you say that after your initial exchange with him, which you describe as rude and unprofessional, that he seemed to become more professional?
A. Yes.
Q. So when he left you he seemed to be
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professional, telling you, you know, if -- you're more than welcome to file a complaint, don't want to take up more of your time. Those were words to you that seemed like he was calmer and more professional?
A. He seemed more pleasant.
Q. At the end --
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. At the end of that first phase of the encounter?
A. Yes.
Q. And then he turned and he walked towards his cruiser. Is that true?
A. Yes.
Q. And then what did you say to him then?
A. "I can't believe you just pulled me over for this. Fuck you, Asshole."
Q. Okay. So what made you say "I can't believe you just pulled me over. Fuck you, Asshole"? After the tail end of the encounter as we have been talking about seemed to be on better terms?
A. What made me say that?
Q. Yeah.
A. Because I wanted to say that. I wanted -that's the way I expressed my -- that's the way I wanted to express myself. I was angry. I was upset. I was
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confused. And that's the way -- that's what I did.
Q. Okay. So we can agree that when you're angry, upset or confused, you use the word asshole?

MR. DIAZ: Objection to form.
MS. FLYNN: Right?
MR. DIAZ: You can answer.
THE WITNESS: No. No.
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. Just in this instance you did?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's unusual for you?
A. Yes.
Q. And we can agree that when you said "Fuck you," that's a term that you use when you're angry and upset?

MR. DIAZ: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: No. I don't use that
very much at all, that word.
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. I'm sorry?
A. No. I don't. I don't use that word very much at all. Is that what you're asking?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes. No. No, I don't use that word.
Q. Okay. You do recall you're sworn to tell the
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truth. Right?
A. Okay. So I'm confused. Can you repeat the question?
Q. Sure.
(The record was read as requested) THE WITNESS: No. No.

BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. Okay. And you do appreciate you're sworn to tell the truth?
A. Yes.
Q. So your using the word "asshole" and your using the term "fuck you" were things that you don't do generally when you're angry and upset. You just did in this particular instance?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. What would it be about the circumstances of this particular instance that caused you to feel angry and upset when ordinarily you wouldn't use these kinds of words and phrases?
A. Well I had only been up about an hour and 15 minutes. My father wasn't doing very well. He was very sick. I wasn't in the mood to be interrogated on the side of a road -- of the road.

I didn't know why I was being pulled over in the first place. He approached me rudely. He was
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basically interrogating me and telling me something that I did that $I$ didn't do. I was confused and angry; upset.
Q. So can we agree this isn't the first time in your life, Greg, in your adult life, you are 57; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Can we agree this is not the first time in your adult life that you have been angry and upset?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. But on other instances where you were angry and upset you weren't prompted to call somebody an asshole or to say fuck you. That's not what you would do?
A. No.
Q. You did do that here, however.
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And you did it here because, among other things, you hadn't been up very long. Right? You said you were only up for about an hour and 15 minutes?
A. Yes.
Q. Yes?
A. Yes.
Q. And your father wasn't doing well?
A. Yes.
Q. And I'm sorry to hear that.

It's important for me to understand what your
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emotional state was at the time you made these utterances. So I'm just going to ask you was your father -- was he dying? Was he that --
A. No. No.
Q. He was sick with -- what was he sick with?
A. Parkinson's disease. Dementia. Yeah.
Q. Okay. And how long had he had that as of February of 2018?
A. Three years.
Q. Okay. Was there anything particular going on with him given that condition at this time in February of '18?
A. No.
Q. But yet you cited it as a contributing factor to your decision in this instance to use these -- this word and phrase that are not commonplace for you?

MR. DIAZ: Objection to form. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: I said that because when you've got emotions going on in your life, and then you're being pulled over and interrogated on the side of the road and you don't know -- and you've got other things on your mind that you're dealing with, this -- I wasn't happy. I wasn't amused. I wasn't in the mood for that.
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BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. I understand. So part of the reason you expressed your anger and upsetness with Trooper Riggen was because you had other life stuff going on in your life. Your father, for example, that had you upset?
A. No. No.
Q. Isn't that what you just told me, Greg?
A. No. No. I had other things going on in my life. But that was not because of -- the reason I did that to Trooper Riggen was not that. But it didn't have anything to do with that.
Q. Well you will acknowledge that you just testified under oath a very short while ago that those were factors in your decision --
A. Well yes, factors, but it wasn't a sole decision. A sole decision.
Q. Factors.
A. Yeah. Yeah. Yes.
Q. A factor that contributed to your decision to call Trooper Riggens an asshole and to say fuck you to him, were these other life things or this particular life thing; you hadn't been up very long that day, and then you had stuff going on with your dad, factors?

MR. DIAZ: Objection to form.
THE WITNESS: Being up an hour had
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nothing to do with it. No.
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. You just testified a moment ago that it did though.
A. Well it didn't contribute solely to what he did.
Q. That's why I'm using the term factor. I am using the term factor because that was how you described it. These were factors; right?
A. Yes, they were. Yeah.
Q. I'm not saying they are the only factors. I understand other factors where you believe -- your belief that Trooper Riggens had no right to pull you over in the first instance; right?
A. Yes.
Q. But you also respond to him in a way that was, according to your testimony anyway, uncharacteristic. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. It was uncharacteristic because you used words that you almost never use; right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you used them in this particular reason -for a particular -- or particular instance for a particular reason; right?
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A. Yes.
Q. And among the reasons that you've or -- yeah. Among the reasons that you used the words in this particular instance are you hadn't been up very long; dad was sick, and you were dealing with that; and you didn't believe that Trooper Riggen had a right to pull you over?
A. Correct. Yes.
Q. Anything else that prompted you to respond the way you did?
A. No.
Q. But you will agree that you were angry when those words left your mouth?
A. Yeah, I was upset. Yeah. Confused.
Q. Do you consider yourself -- do you consider those words "fuck you" and "asshole" to be aggressive terms?
A. No.
Q. You don't think they are aggressive?
A. No.

MR. DIAZ: Objection.
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. You don't think they are intended to provoke?

MR. DIAZ: Objection. Form. You can
answer.
THE WITNESS: No. No. I don't.
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BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. So you're someone who has rarely used these words in your entire life. You chose them -- you chose to use them at this particular instance, and you don't believe they were meant to provoke; correct?

MR. DIAZ: Objection. You can answer. THE WITNESS: No. I don't.

BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. And you don't believe that they would have been a display of aggression?

MR. DIAZ: Objection. Asked and
answered. You can answer the question.
THE WITNESS: No.
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. And you do believe that they reflect the fact that you were angry?
A. Yes. Yeah.
Q. Do you think you came across as agitated?
A. Yes. Yeah.
Q. So you were angry and agitated when you uttered this word and phrase?
A. Yes.
Q. What exactly were you trying to communicate, if anything, to the trooper?
A. Communicate?
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MR. SARACHAN: I'm just -- I apologize.
No. I tweaked my back, so this is when I stretch.
It's got nothing to do with anything.
THE WITNESS: My communication to him?
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. What did you want him to know?
A. That I was upset. I wasn't -- I was angry. I was confused.
Q. Okay. And what was your voice like? Was it soft? Was it elevated? Was it loud?
A. More soft.
Q. It was soft?
A. Yeah. Normal. More normal voice, I think.
Q. So when you called him an asshole you were using a normal voice?
A. Yeah. Yes.
Q. And when you said "fuck you" you were using a normal voice?
A. Yeah. Yes. I didn't yell anything.
Q. Well you were angry and agitated, but the words you used were not yelled? They were soft, softly spoken, normal?
A. They were soft.

MR. DIAZ: Objection to form. You can
answer the question.
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BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. They were normal?
A. They were normal. Maybe a little elevated. Yeah.
Q. Okay. And where were you when you yelled these words? Were you sitting in your vehicle?
A. I was in my vehicle.
Q. Was the window down?
A. Yes.
Q. And can we assume that traffic around you was steady?
A. Yes.
Q. So if you had given it some thought, you may not have, but if you had given it some thought you would appreciate that other people could hear these words if they were passing by?

MR. DIAZ: Objection to form. You can
answer.
THE WITNESS: I didn't give any
thought.
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. You wouldn't know one way or the other. You weren't -- I think what $I$ was trying to say, Greg, is that you might not have been thinking about it at the time. But any reason to think that people steady -- the steady
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traffic around you couldn't hear what you were saying?
A. I believe they could not hear what I was saying.
Q. And why do you say that?
A. Because it was winter and cold, and people's windows were up. And I didn't see anybody out on the sidewalks or walking.
Q. Okay. So this is North Main Street. What are the businesses that are around that area?
A. Where I was pulled over there aren't any businesses.
Q. Nothing right near there?
A. No. No.
Q. And there are sidewalks, however?
A. Yes.
Q. And you're saying this is about midday?
A. Yes.
Q. And not one person on the sidewalk?
A. I didn't see anybody.
Q. Did you look before you uttered those words?
A. No.
Q. That wasn't something you were thinking about?
A. No.
Q. And after you uttered those words, what
happened?
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A. I put my car in drive. Signaled. And got onto the roadway.
Q. And then what happened?
A. I continued to drive. And I looked in my rear-view mirror and saw Trooper Riggen following me with his blue lights on. And I think I heard a siren, like a short one. Not a continuous one, but a short one, I believe.
Q. Okay. And what did you do in response to that?
A. I drove. Turned left on to a street called Brainerd Street. And pulled over.
Q. And was Trooper Riggen behind you?
A. Yes.
Q. And then what happened?
A. He got out of his police cruiser and approached me. To my window.
Q. And you in your complaint described him as haranguing you. Is that an accurate description?
A. What is the word?
Q. Harangue?
A. Haranguing me? I don't know what that means.
Q. Okay. How would you describe his interaction with you now, the second time?
A. Very rude. Very aggressive.
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Q. It was rude and unprofessional the first time; right?
A. Yes.
Q. Was this different?
A. Yes. It was a different encounter.
Q. Was his demeanor towards you different during this different encounter?
A. No.
Q. It was the same as?
A. I think it was about the same.
Q. Okay. All right. And do you remember telling Trooper Riggen that it was your plan to contact the American Civil Liberties Union?
A. Yes.
Q. And had you done that before?

MR. DIAZ: Objection to form. You can
answer.
THE WITNESS: I don't remember.
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. You may have? You're not sure?
A. I'm not sure. Yeah. I don't remember. No.

I don't think I've ever contacted the American Civil Liberties Union.
Q. And you did contact them at some point?
A. I did. Yes.
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Q. Did you contact -- you were represented by Nick Hadden; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you contact them before or after you talked to Mr. Hadden?
A. After.
Q. After you contacted Mr. Hadden?
A. No. It was after my criminal case was dropped.
Q. Okay. So you had no communications with the American Civil Liberties Union before your criminal case was dropped?
A. No. My lawyer might have. My criminal lawyer.
Q. Okay. But you did not.
A. No.
Q. Okay. Who is Amy Cross?
A. A friend.
Q. And what do you believe -- what facts do you believe she possesses that are relevant to your lawsuit?

MR. DIAZ: Objection to form. You can
answer.
THE WITNESS: What facts does she
believe --
BY MS. FLYNN:
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Q. What facts do you believe she possesses that are relevant to your lawsuit?
A. Oh. What I've discussed with her. Yeah.
Q. Okay. What have you discussed with her?
A. Exactly what happened to me.
Q. Okay. So I want you to tell me, in as much detail as you can, what communications you have had with Amy Cross about the events we have been talking about. Let's start with how many times do you think you talked to Amy Cross?
A. About this event?
Q. Yeah.
A. Two or three times.
Q. Did I ask you what your sister's last name was?
A. No.
Q. What's your sister's last name?
A. Day. D-A-Y. She hyphenates it Bombard-Day.
Q. And her first name is Bonnie?
A. Bonnie.
Q. Okay. All right. So Amy Cross is a friend?
A. Yeah. Very good friend.
Q. So you mentioned Kelly as a friend, and we were talking just about your friends generally.
A. Yeah.
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Q. We weren't talking about communications with this --
A. Yeah.
Q. So there is Kelly. And you mentioned Sarah?
A. Yes.
Q. But Amy is also a close friend?
A. Very good friend. Yeah.
Q. And you had conversations with Amy about matters that are at issue in this lawsuit; is that right? MR. DIAZ: Objection to form. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: Yes. I told her what
happened to me.
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. Okay. What did you tell her?
A. I told her everything that happened to me.
Q. Okay. Did you tell her that you were stretching your fingers on your steering wheel?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you tell her that Trooper Riggen, when he first pulled you over, was acting in an unprofessional and rude manner?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you tell her that he then said he wasn't going to take up any more of your time or further cause
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you delay, and left on -- I think what you described as a better -- I'm totally paraphrasing now, better terms after that first initial stop?
A. Yes. I told her.
Q. You told her that he kind of left in a nicer way?
A. No. I didn't tell her it was nicer.
Q. What did you tell her?
A. I just said he left.
Q. Well did you say that he had started in a way that appeared to you to be unprofessional, but then he left and he seemed somehow improved?
A. No. I didn't tell her that.
Q. Okay. Did you suggest to her that he was, after that initial interaction, continuing to be difficult or rude or unprofessional?
A. Yes.
Q. You did?
A. Yes.
Q. After that initial encounter?
A. The first encounter. Yes, I did.
Q. Okay. So you told her that he was rude and unprofessional initially. And that he was rude and unprofessional when he left you that initial time?
A. No. I didn't tell her that. That when he
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left, I didn't tell her that. I said he just left.
Q. And did you tell her what you said to him? Did you tell her that you called him an asshole?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you tell her that you said fuck you?
A. Yes.
Q. How did she respond to that?
A. I don't remember.
Q. So you can't recall whether that was anything she thought was positive or negative? You don't remember one way or the other?
A. No.
Q. Do you have any reason to think she would -let me strike that.

Do you have any impression, Greg, as to her impression of you using those terms with the police officer?

MR. DIAZ: Objection to form. You can
answer.
THE WITNESS: No. No.
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. She didn't seem to react one way or the other?
A. She did. Yeah.
Q. Well how did she react?
A. She was surprised. And I told her what
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happened.
Q. She was surprised by what?
A. Me getting arrested, held in a cell for 50 minutes. Handcuffed. And the story I told her what happened -- just happened to me.

She was surprised. She was shocked. You know, like, you know, what happened. And I told her.
Q. Right. And anything else you can remember that you said to Amy Cross?
A. No. No.
Q. Anything that you remember that she said to you during this -- well let me ask you. How many times did you talk to Amy about this incident?
A. Two or three times.
Q. Okay. And do you remember any words that she used with you those two or three times?
A. No.
Q. And then you talked to Kelly Greeno about it?
A. Yes.
Q. How many times?
A. Once or twice.
Q. And do you remember the words that you used with her?
A. Yes.
Q. What words did you use with her?
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A. I used -- I described what happened to me.
Q. How did you describe it?
A. I told her what happened. That I got pulled over. A state trooper accused me of giving him the finger in passing. And then so on. The whole story.
Q. Did you tell her that you stretched your fingers on the steering wheel?
A. Yes. Yeah.
Q. And did you tell her that you called him an asshole?
A. Yes.
Q. And did you tell them that you said "fuck you" to him?
A. Yes.
Q. And did she seem surprised by that?

MR. DIAZ: Objection to form. You can
answer.
THE WITNESS: Yes. Yes.
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. She was surprised that you would use those words with the officer or the trooper?
A. Yes. Yeah.
Q. Because that's not something you typically do?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you have a conversation about that, about
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what prompted you to respond in that particular way?
A. Yes.
Q. And tell me about that part of the conversation.
A. I told her I responded that way because I wasn't happy. I was angry. Confused. I didn't know why I was being pulled over.
Q. All right. And how did she respond to that?
A. She said, "Oh, my God. Seriously. That's what happened to you? Wow." You know. And I continued on in a conversation.
Q. All right. And then Mike Bombard, how many times did you talk to him about it?
A. Two or three times. Yeah.
Q. Same thing? You told him what happened?
A. Yes.
Q. You told him the words that you used with the trooper?
A. Yes.
Q. And did he respond to that at all?
A. Yes.
Q. And how did he respond to that?
A. He said "Well if he was an asshole, then maybe he was. He was an asshole."
Q. Okay. So Mike said what? He said if he was
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an asshole, then maybe?
A. Then maybe you had the right to call him that.
Q. Okay. So you remember him saying --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- to you -- just so -- just a reminder you are under oath. So if you have a memory of Mike saying that, that's what I'm interested in.
A. Yes. He said that.
Q. Okay. He said if he was an asshole, then maybe it was okay to call him that?
A. Yeah. And he said -- he said he sounded like an asshole from what your description of the event, he sounded like an asshole.
Q. Okay. And so did he suggest that it was okay to call him that?
A. No.
Q. I thought you had said that just a moment ago.
A. Oh, yes. He said if he was, then yes. He said "If he was an asshole, then he was an asshole. You called him that. Good for you."
Q. Those are the words that you remember him saying?
A. Yeah. Yeah.
Q. All right. And did he express surprise that you had used that term since it's so unusual for you?
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A. No.
Q. Did Kelly or Amy?
A. No.

MR. DIAZ: Objection to the form.
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. Did you talk to any of them about your dad or the fact that you had not been up very long?
A. No.
Q. And then Bonnie is your sister?
A. Yes.
Q. And how many times did you talk to her?
A. Two or three times.
Q. And same thing. What did she -- how did she respond to you?
A. She is more neutral, my sister.
Q. More neutral than whom? Your brother?
A. Brother. Yeah.
Q. Does that mean to say that your brother was more supportive of you, and your sister was more neutral about your decisions?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. Okay. And how did she display to you her neutrality?
A. I don't -- I don't remember. I don't remember what she said exactly.
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Q. Okay. If -- and she did not say, "Wow, if you used those words, something really must have been troubling you," or something to that effect?

MR. DIAZ: Objection to form. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: I don't remember. She wasn't as supportive as my brother.

BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. Your brother was supportive because he said if he acted like that, he must have been -- sounds like he was an asshole, so that's fine.
A. Yes.
Q. And your sister wasn't as supportive because she said what?
A. She didn't like -- I think she was embarrassed that her brother was arrested, and his name was in the paper, and on a police social media vlog or blog. I'm not sure what you call it.

MS. FLYNN: Can you read back my question and the answer, Kim.
(The record was read as requested)
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. Okay. So your sister when she is interacting with you she seems concerned about the embarrassment of you being sort of out there in the public with this;
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right?
A. Yes. Yeah.
Q. Did she say anything about the way you interacted with the officer or the trooper or the way he interacted with you?

MR. DIAZ: Objection to form. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: No. I don't remember anything Bonnie said.

BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. So you described yourself as being handcuffed and in a cell for 50 minutes; is that right?
A. $\quad 35$ to 50 minutes. Maybe an hour.
Q. And describe that for me. Were you by yourself? Were you with a bunch of people?
A. No. I was by myself.
Q. Okay. Had you ever been in a cell before? A. Yes.

MR. DIAZ: Objection to form. But objection. Want to remind you and instruct you not to answer any questions that are protected by the privilege 13 V.S.A. 7606. Instruct the witness not to answer to that extent.

MS. FLYNN: So are you making any claim for his distress or discomfort because he was in a
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cell?
MR. DIAZ: I would have to look back at the complaint again, but $I$ don't believe there is any claim related to distress.

MS. FLYNN: I just, you know, I'm going to say it again, that if that's part of the claim, it doesn't seem to me that there is any way I can be prevented from asking him about that. If it's not part of the claim, that's a different analysis.

MR. DIAZ: What I would say is that the privilege under 13 V.S.A. 7606 says -- and we can get exact language -- but something to the effect of when a record is expunged, it's to be treated as if the underlying events never happened. So the -- not underlying events. Any evidence or record of the -any criminal record or anything related to it never happened.

So I can get the exact language if you want. But to the extent that your answers would reveal privileged information within the privilege under 7606, I instruct you not to answer.

MS. FLYNN: And you're not here waiving any claim of emotional distress, discomfort or hardship, anything related to his time in the cell?

MR. DIAZ: Not waiving any claim or
damage -- claim damage that is in the complaint. Correct.

MS. FLYNN: So you're going to continue to bring that claim, but $I$ can't find out information that might inform me as to the effect that this had on him, seeing that it wasn't his first time in a cell.

MR. DIAZ: I don't think we have said that he had any time in the cell. I'm instructing my client not to answer to the extent it would reveal information protected by 13 V.S.A. 7606 .

Outside of that, he can answer.
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. So you were by yourself in a cell.
A. Yes.
Q. And then somebody came to get you out?
A. Yes.
Q. Who was that?
A. I don't know names. It was a -- a trooper.

It wasn't Riggen.
Q. Did somebody have to post bail?
A. No.
Q. So were you met by any family members?
A. No.
Q. Are you a member of any groups or
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organizations that have positions with regard to police officers?
A. No.
Q. You're not a member of any social clubs, are you?
A. No.
Q. You're not a member of any Facebook groups, are you?
A. No.
Q. You're not a member of any kind of exclusive club or organization or group to your knowledge, is that true?
A. Regarding to police officers and law enforcement?
Q. No. Anything.
A. A club, no. Can $I$ be more specific with you or -- do you want me just to answer?
Q. You can be more specific with me.
A. I like things on Facebook. Like I like, like I belong and follow something.
Q. Okay. I was thinking of a group of people who are not, you know, that are exclusive in some way. Right? Not accessed by the public.

MR. DIAZ: Objection to form. You can
answer.
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THE WITNESS: No. I don't belong to any. No.
(A document was marked Exhibit A for identification.)

MS. FLYNN: I'm sorry. It should be 6 pages.

MR. DIAZ: 6 pages total?
MS. FLYNN: Yeah. I guess it's
Facebook stuff.
MR. DIAZ: Okay.
MS. FLYNN: I don't know why the, you know, I apologize, but interspersed with the Facebook stuff is a bill to Nick Hadden and then the docket.

MR. DIAZ: Yes.
MS. FLYNN: I'm just going to mark as Exhibit A the Facebook stuff.
(A discussion was held off the record.)
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. Why don't you take a look at Exhibit A there.

MR. DIAZ: Take your time and read
through.
THE WITNESS: Is Exhibit A just this or
the entire packet?
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. Just read through the entire thing, Greg.
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A. Oh.
Q. Because Exhibit $A$ is the entire thing.
A. Okay. Okay.
(A document was marked Exhibit $B$ for identification.)

BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. Have you looked at it?
A. Yeah. Yes.
Q. Are you ready to talk about it?
A. Sure.
Q. I'll represent to you, Greg, that these

Facebook messages were produced in response to our -- or someone asking about documents relevant to the allegations of the complaint. So can you describe for me how you -and I don't want your attorney's impressions -- how you view these as connected to the allegations of the complaint.
A. They are not connected. I don't think they are connected.
Q. Okay. So you don't know, yourself, independent, I don't want you to share with me any communications you had with your attorneys, you don't know why they were produced in response to questions that were asked to you in the course of this lawsuit?
A. No. I don't know why.
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Q. Okay. The first page of Exhibit A which is stamped -- it's called Bate stamped -- at the top it says Bombard 0001 . Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. The first page there has a statement that you made about checkpoints on roadways as being unconstitutional and unAmerican. Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do. Yeah.
Q. Okay. Do you yourself think that that statement -- and by the way, I'm not on Facebook. So I don't know -- preceding that statement is a Vermont State Police statement that says something about troops conducting a traffic enforcement detail. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And are you on -- does this indicate, Exhibit A, that you are on the Vermont State Police's Facebook page and posting a comment yourself?
A. Yes. Yeah.
Q. Okay. So you -- do you frequent the Vermont State Police Facebook page?
A. No.
Q. Are there other organizations that have Facebook pages which you visit?

MR. DIAZ: Objection to form. You can answer.
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THE WITNESS: Yes. Yeah.
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. Tell me about other ones.
A. Other what?
Q. Other organizations that have Facebook pages that you visit.
A. I like the St. Albans PD. Vermont State Police. South Burlington Mazda. Many other things. Yeah.
Q. Okay. So you visit the St. Albans Police Department Facebook page?
A. I don't visit it.
Q. I thought you said you did visit it?
A. It shows up on your feed on Facebook. I don't particular -- I don't make a point to go to the St. Albans PD, Police Department, Facebook page and check it out.
Q. Okay. Then perhaps my question was a poor one. Because what $I$ was interested in, we are looking at Exhibit A. Exhibit A is an example of you going to the Vermont State Police Facebook page and posting a comment?
A. I did. I did do that. Yes.
Q. True. So I'm just asking what other Facebook pages you visit. And I think you said the St. Albans Police Department, and South Burlington Mazza -- Mazda?
A. Many others that I just don't remember. Yeah.
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Q. Just do your best for me.
A. Would you like me to pull out my phone and look?
Q. No. I just want you to, as best as you can remember, share with me the Facebook pages that you have visited over the years.

MR. DIAZ: Objection to the form. You
can answer.
THE WITNESS: Many. Costco Wholesale.
South Burlington Mazda. Mazda USA. Toyota USA.
VSP. St. Albans PD. Vermont Trans. Vermont DOT.
Vermont Roadways Conditions. St. Albans, Vermont
home page. Social page. Many others. Yeah.
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. Okay. So you understand what it means then to visit a Facebook page?
A. Yes. Yeah.
Q. So one of the Facebook pages that you visited, one of the organizations whose Facebook page you visited, was the St. Albans Police Department. True?
A. Yes. Yeah.
Q. And are there particular reasons you visit
that Facebook page?
A. Yes.
Q. What are the reasons?
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A. Because it's my community. It's the police department in my community.
Q. Okay. All right. And do you look for information there?
A. No. I don't specifically go hunting for information. No.
Q. Okay. As someone who is not on Facebook, help me understand why you would go to the St. Albans Police Department Facebook page. What would be the purpose of a visit?
A. It's hard to explain. The St. Albans PD, a post would show up on your feed, and it's there. And you read it.
Q. Okay.
A. I'm not particularly going to it. It shows up there in front of me.
Q. I see. Somehow you're connected to it so it shows up on your -- on Facebook?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you ever comment or have you ever commented on the St. Albans Police Department Facebook page?
A. No. I can't remember. Not the St. Albans PD. I can't remember.
Q. Other police departments?
A. Yes.
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Q. The Vermont State Police?
A. Yes.
Q. Anyone other than St. Albans and Vermont State Police?

MR. DIAZ: Objection to form.
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. Any other police department whose Facebook page you commented -- left a comment on, other than St. Albans?
A. I don't remember.
Q. Any reason you would be seeing in your feed police departments other than St. Albans and the Vermont State Police?
A. Any reason?
Q. Yeah.
A. That I would see --
Q. Like have you ever seen the Burlington Police Department show up in your feed?
A. No.
Q. I can't imagine -- but again, I don't use Facebook. I can't imagine there would be reasons why you, as a St. Albans' town resident, would have Facebook feeds from police departments other than St. Albans or the Vermont State Police. Does that seem right to you?
A. No.
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Q. You would have others?
A. Yes. Yeah. You like to know what's going on in your state.
Q. I see. I see. So there might be other police departments that you get feeds from?
A. Yes.
Q. But you can't, as you sit here today, tell me which departments they are?
A. I can if you would let me look at my phone.
Q. I see.
A. I don't go hunt down the information on police department Facebook feeds.
Q. But there has to be some connection; right? You have to somehow connect yourself to a police department in order to get its messaging on your Facebook page?
A. Yes.
Q. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you've connected yourself in some way, shape or form to St. Albans?
A. Yes.
Q. And you've connected yourself to the Vermont State Police?
A. Yes.
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Q. Have you connected yourself to any other police department?
A. Yes.
Q. Which police departments?
A. I think Franklin County Sheriff. Maybe Swanton PD.
Q. Okay.
A. Colchester PD. I work in Colchester.
Q. Okay.
A. And others, I don't remember.
Q. Do you remember leaving a message for any police department other than the Vermont State Police department and the message we are looking at in Exhibit A?
A. No. I don't remember.
Q. Okay. But as far as you're concerned Exhibit A doesn't really have anything to do with this lawsuit.
A. No.
Q. Okay. Then the second page which is -although it's hard to read -- it seems to be what we would call Bombard 2. Do you see that?
A. Yes. I do.
Q. And then it says something about end of months' quotas for their bonuses. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. What did you mean by that?
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MR. DIAZ: Objection to form. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: Six years ago. I guess I
meant that they get bonuses for the amount of people they pull over, I guess.

BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. Okay. And is that information you shared on the Vermont State Police website?
A. I'm not sure which one this is here.
Q. Okay. Go to the next page, Bombard 3.
A. Yes. Yeah. I did. Yes.
Q. What's your thinking, Greg, when the Vermont State Police posts something about traffic, about people being killed on the roads and their efforts to prevent crashes, what's your thinking when you post on their website something about end of month quotas for bonuses? Do you mean to provoke?
A. No.

MR. DIAZ: Objection.
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. Do you mean to antagonize? MR. DIAZ: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: No.

BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. Why do you do it then?
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MR. DIAZ: You can answer the question. THE WITNESS: I did it because I wanted to. It's freedom of speech. Expression. BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. Sure. Just because you could?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. And then on page -- it's very small -but it's so small that I'm not sure $I$ can read it.

Bombard 6. Do you see that?
A. 6 .
Q. It's very small. There is a photograph.
A. Yeah. It's all the same. They are bigger and then there is smaller. Okay. I see it.
Q. So that looked different to me from Bombard 1 of Exhibit A. It looked like a different post. Is it a different post? Because the first one on the first page talks about checkpoints on the roadways are unconstitutional and unAmerican. This -- and this says checkpoints are unconstitutional and unAmerican.

Doesn't have the word roadways. And then you talk about the Supreme Court's strict policies and guidelines about how police can conduct themselves. Do you see that?
A. Yes.

MR. DIAZ: Objection to form.
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BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. So you testified a short while ago -- well let me strike that. What's your thinking in that Facebook post on the Vermont State Police website? In other words, you wanted the Vermont state Police to understand your position on that issue. True?
A. No.
Q. Why would you post it on their website if it weren't true?
A. Because other people go to it and see. And other people express their opinions.
Q. So you wanted other people who go to the Vermont State Police website to see your opinion?
A. Yes.
Q. A short while ago, well it may not feel like a short while ago, but when we started this deposition, Greg, you testified under oath that your attitude towards police was neutral; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. We have looked at several statements that you've put on the Vermont State Police website which seems to be sending a message with regard to some of the decision making of the State Police.

Would you agree with me there?
MR. DIAZ: Objection to form.
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Mischaracterizes testimony and statement in the document.

MS. FLYNN: Can you read that question back?
(The record was read as requested) THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. DIAZ: Just to restate my
objection. Same objection. You can answer.
THE WITNESS: Yes. Yeah.
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. So you don't think that you have an issue or concern with the Vermont State Police? You believe that you're neutral with regard to your attitude towards them?
A. Yes. Yeah.
Q. And that would be true with St. Albans police too?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. But you do want to make a statement about your view of the legality of traffic stops, true?
A. Yes.
Q. And yet you're completely neutral with regard to your attitude towards them?
A. Yes. I'm not bashing any police officers in this statement. I'm expressing my opinion on a constitutional law.
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Q. Okay. Are there other examples, other websites, where you -- or Facebook pages where you express your opinions on various laws?
A. I don't remember. I don't recall.
Q. And do you drink alcohol?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you not drink it at all?
A. I don't really drink. Once a year. Twice a year. Yeah.
Q. And do you take street drugs?

MR. DIAZ: Objection. I'm going to
instruct the witness not to answer.
MS. FLYNN: Is he asserting a fifth
amendment privilege?
MR. DIAZ: Yes. To the extent it's
required. I mean also the question is, I mean, where are we going here? This is like -- that has nothing to do with the stop on February 9, 2018. This is -we are getting into the realm of, like, again, $30(d) 3$. I'm just wondering where is this going?

MS. FLYNN: So let me ask you this.
Let's say he's drunk at the time of the stop. Is that not relevant?
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MR. DIAZ: There is no -- Trooper Riggen said at the deposition there was no even thought that my client was inebriated in any way. So we already -- there is no fact in evidence, nothing related to this whatsoever.

MS. FLYNN: Yeah. But it doesn't have to be a fact in evidence. That's the purpose of a deposition.

MR. DIAZ: He just told you he drinks at holidays.

MS. FLYNN: Right. So that's -- I don't think you can use the objection to this deposition so as to prevent me from trying to corroborate something that could be relevant.

MR. DIAZ: Corroborate what?
MS. FLYNN: Whether it ultimately proves to be relevant is something else.

MR. DIAZ: The question pending, I believe, is: Have you ever done drugs or something to that effect. If you want to ask about --

MS. FLYNN: Do you use street drugs?
MR. DIAZ: -- ask about the incident and whether that had -- any of that had any effect, then that's fine. But I think you're going into territory that, again, I would say is oppressive and
designed to annoy or embarrass the witness.
And I would instruct him not to answer
that question.
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. Were you using any street drugs within 24
hours of this event?
A. On February 8 -- 09, 2018?

MR. DIAZ: Objection to form. You can
answer.
THE WITNESS: No. No.
MR. DIAZ: Susan, just for -- I don't
want to stop going through the documents, but just to see if we can take a break. It's quarter of 1. At some point in the next little bit.

MS. FLYNN: I'm almost done.
MR. DIAZ: Do you know how long you're going to go today?

MS. FLYNN: Well I will suspend because of the issue about the prior arrest.

MR. DIAZ: Just today I mean.
MS. FLYNN: I'm almost done.
MR. DIAZ: Okay. Great.
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. Would you take a look at what's been marked as Exhibit B.
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MR. DIAZ: Do you have a copy for me? MS. FLYNN: I'm sorry. I do. MR. DIAZ: Thank you. (Handing document)

BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. Do you recognize Exhibit B, Greg?
A. Yes.
Q. And is that your bill from Nick Hadden?
A. Yes.
Q. And have you paid that bill?
A. No.
Q. Do you have an agreement with -- do you
believe that you have an obligation currently to pay the bill?
A. Yes.
Q. And is that all -- does that reflect in its entirety the amount that you allegedly owe Attorney Hadden? In other words, are there other charges that aren't reflected in Exhibit B?

MR. DIAZ: Objection to form. You can
answer.
THE WITNESS: I believe this is it
here.
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. $\$ 5,812.50$. That's the amount that you owe
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Attorney Hadden for the work that he did for you?
A. Yes.
Q. You'll have to say yes.
A. Yes.
Q. You also claim that there is a fee, a parking fee, that you had to pay because you were taken from the scene?
A. A towing fee.
Q. A towing fee. And what was that fee?
A. I believe $\$ 150$.
Q. Okay. So are there any other out-of-pocket expenses that you incurred that you allege are damages to which you're entitled in this lawsuit?
A. Out of pocket?
Q. Well theoretically, are there other monies owed or are there other monies you have paid to anyone else that you believe are related to your claims in this lawsuit?
A. No. I've only paid Nick Hadden a \$1,200 retainer. I paid him -- you said other monies. And that's -- before this, I have paid him $\$ 1,200$.
Q. Okay. So is it your understanding that you owe him this amount on top of that 1,200?
A. Yes.
Q. Or --
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A. Yes. This on top.
Q. Okay. So the monies that you have had to pay or owe Hadden because of this incident is what we are looking at in Exhibit B plus another 1,200?
A. I believe it was 1,000 actually. 1,000.
Q. Okay.
A. Yes.
Q. You have somewhere documentation that reflects that?
A. Yes. I think it was 1,000.
Q. Okay. So if I ask you for documentation that reflects that, can you try to get that and give it to your attorney?
A. Yes. Yeah.
Q. And so if you include the retainer that you believe you paid Attorney Hadden, if you include this bill that we are looking at, Exhibit B, and you include the parking, the towing fee, I think you specified what the towing fee was. But you don't remember it right now?
A. I believe it was 150. And I don't know if I have the receipt for that.
Q. Okay. Any other amounts that you have had to pay or you owe connected with this incident?
A. No. Just this and the retainer.
Q. And you've adequately described for me the --
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what you said was the embarrassment and humiliation that you've suffered as a result of this incident. Is that true?
A. Yes.
Q. You've not left out any meaningful details?
A. Like what?
Q. I don't know. It's your claim. You've talked to me about the impact it had with the person at work, the what do you call them, client or --
A. Members.
Q. Members. You talked about the impact it had on your relationship with Sarah and/or Kelly I think; is that right?
A. There was no impact with my friends.
Q. Right.
A. The impact was having -- being arrested on the side of the road. Okay? For something that really isn't illegal. Having my name -- having an article written about me in two papers in Franklin County, and being on a Vermont State Police website, website that shows their arrests for the week or day or the last few days. That impacted me quite a bit. Horribly.
Q. Okay. So it impacted you quite a bit. It impacted you horribly. Tell me about that. What -- did it affect you physically?
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A. No.
Q. It affect you -- it affected you psychologically?
A. Yes.
Q. And how did that psychological affect manifest in your day-to-day life, if it did?
A. It affected me so bad that I wanted to go to a manager at work and take a leave of absence.
Q. Okay.
A. But I did not.
Q. Did you?
A. No.
Q. And what was your thinking?
A. My thinking?
Q. Your thinking. Yeah.

MR. DIAZ: Objection to form. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: My thinking was I was
very embarrassed. I was very angry. I was confused.
I was upset.
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. Your thinking was that you were so upset, angry, embarrassed, confused that you wanted to request a leave of absence from a manager?
A. Yes.
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Q. But you did not?
A. No.
Q. Why did you not?
A. Because $I$ handled it myself in my -- myself. I didn't need to take the time.
Q. Okay. So that might have been an option available to you, but it was not necessary. You figured it out on your own?
A. Yes.
Q. And I think you said you didn't seek any kind of counseling?
A. No.
Q. You didn't need any kind of anti-anxiety or anti-depression medication?
A. No.
Q. You didn't talk about it -- you talked about it to your friends to some degree; right?
A. Yes.
Q. But the people you cared about didn't seem to have a negative impression of it.

MR. DIAZ: Objection to form.
Mischaracterizes the testimony.
THE WITNESS: No. No.
MR. DIAZ: You can answer.
THE WITNESS: I don't know what they
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were thinking.
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. Okay. The one stranger who brought it to your attention, that you could remember anyway, didn't seem to think less of you for it. True?
A. I don't remember.
Q. All right. Is it your contention, Greg, that these feelings or emotions you have with this event continue to bother you, or were they more of an issue before and have more or less gone away?
A. No. They haven't gone away. They continue to bother me.
Q. And have you thought -- and you're still not seeing anybody for it?
A. No. No.
Q. And it's been now five years plus?
A. Yeah.
Q. And can you give me any examples of the way in which these events bother you such that they affect your day-to-day activities?
A. How they affect my day-to-day activities, I think of it every day about the humiliation and the embarrassment is basically what it is. There is a feeling in me.
Q. Okay.
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A. It's a psychological feeling, you know.
Q. Does it affect what you do every day?
A. Physically?
Q. Does it -- do you change your activities because of it?
A. No.
Q. Does it affect who you engage with on a daily basis?
A. No.
Q. Does it affect how you choose to spend your time?
A. Yes.
Q. How so?
A. I choose not to be in lots of groups. And a be -- and go places too much.
Q. So tell me -- give me an example of a group or place you would go before February of '18 that you no longer engage with.
A. A private party. A personal party. A personal event.
Q. So before this you would go to private parties?
A. Yeah. Yeah. Yes.
Q. And after this you don't go to private parties?
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A. No. Not really. No.
Q. Okay. Have you been invited to private parties that you've turned down because of it?
A. Yes.
Q. Give me an example.
A. A going away party perhaps.
Q. Okay.
A. And I just refused. I don't want to be around anybody. I don't want to answer questions, because people bring this event up because it was on the news. It was in news outlets.
Q. Okay. Who brings it up? That's what I'm trying to get at as clearly as possible.
A. Who brings it up?
Q. Right. Give me examples of people that bring it up.
A. Co-workers that bring it up. A friend. An acquaintance could bring it up.
Q. So I tried to -- at the risk of beating a dead horse, $I$ tried to identify early on in your deposition who has brought to your attention the fact that they are aware of this event. Right? You told me about -- you told me about the co-worker who laughed about it when you did something with your hands. And then you talked -- you told me about the member who raised an issue.
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A. Yes.
Q. Right? And am I missing other people that have brought this to your attention?
A. It was on the news. It was on media. Many people know about it. So I don't know how to answer your question. Perhaps thousands of people know about it. This is little Vermont.
Q. Yeah.
A. Okay. It was in two news outlets in Franklin County and State Police blog. And many people know about it. So I don't know who knows about it, and I can't recall who I talked to everybody about.
Q. Yeah. Well that's why I tried to narrow the focus of the question to who do you know knows about it because obviously --
A. Many people know about it.
Q. If you don't know -- right. That's why I tried to ask you about who were the people that you were aware of, Greg, who brought it to your attention that they knew about it.
A. Yes, you did.
Q. That's what we talked about earlier. Have I missed anybody there?
A. I don't remember. I don't remember. I don't know.
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Q. Right. As best as you can recall you have shared with me all the people who have brought it to your attention that they know about this event; right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So I want you to tell me a party you went to before this event. Give me -- just give me an example.
A. I don't remember.
Q. All right. And then give me an example of an -- I think you said a going away party that you didn't go to after this event.
A. That was an example. Yes.
Q. Sure. Tell me whose party it was and when was it and -- tell me about that.
A. That was an example you said. Right?
Q. Yeah. Oh, you mean that was just a theoretical example?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. Is there an example of a party that you did not go to after this event because you had concerns about what the public knew?
A. Yes. Yeah.
Q. Okay. Please provide.
A. I just don't remember. I have refused to go places.
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Q. So all I'm asking is, since you are testifying under oath that you have refused to go places since this event, all I'm asking of you is to tell me where you wanted to go and where you didn't go?
A. My friend Kelly had a summer event party. I didn't want to go.
Q. Okay. So have you been to any event parties that Kelly has had since this event?
A. No.
Q. Any other examples?
A. Not that I recall.
Q. Did you share with Kelly why you weren't going?
A. No.
Q. Did she ask you why you weren't going?
A. No.
Q. Did she think it odd as far as you could tell?
A. No. No.
Q. All right. Anything else that we haven't touched upon in terms of how this has affected you on an emotional or psychological level?
A. No.
Q. All right. Well I am going to suspend the deposition, Greg, which means that we might have to come back together to talk about things. Maybe we won't. I
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don't know for sure. But I do appreciate your time here this morning. Thank you.
A. Okay.

MR. DIAZ: I have a few questions. But maybe we should take 5 minutes to take a breather. MS. FLYNN: 5 after? MR. DIAZ: Yeah. Sounds good. (Recess was taken.)

EXAMINATION
BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. All set?
A. Yeah.
Q. Mr. Bombard, Attorney Flynn and you spoke about the initial traffic stop of Riggen February 9 of 2018; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you said that when -- that he abruptly left his cruiser and came over to your car; right?
A. Yes.
Q. And I believe you said at the start he asked you if you had a problem. Something to that effect. Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And how did you respond to that?
A. I said no.
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Q. And he responded something to the effect of, like, you flipped me off; right?
A. Yes.

MS. FLYNN: I'm just going to object.
BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. And you said earlier that after -- after you explained to him you said -- after you said no, as you said to Ms. Flynn earlier, you said -- or he said you flipped him off or something like that; right?
A. Repeat that please.
Q. Why don't you just take me through the interaction of what happened on February 9, 2018, after Trooper Riggen was out of the car.
A. He abruptly came to my car. And I believe I heard a knock because my window was halfway down, or one quarter, one fourth down. I heard a knock. I looked and I was startled. And I believe he said something "Do you have a problem? Do you need some help?"

I said "No."
Q. And what did he say next?
A. I believe he said "You gave me the finger back there."
Q. And what did you say to that?
A. I said, if I remember correctly, "No, I didn't. I'm sorry you think that."
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Q. And how long was that conversation at your window?
A. The entire conversation?
Q. Yes.
A. $\quad 5$ to 6; 7 minutes.
Q. And after you explained to Trooper Riggen that you didn't give him the finger, how did he react?
A. He told me he knew what he saw. He had been a state trooper for 12 or 13 years, and he knew what he saw back there.
Q. And how did he -- you said earlier in your testimony that he was angry. Right?
A. He seemed angry.
Q. And you said earlier that -- how else would you describe his -- as the conversation continued, how would you describe his demeanor when it got to the point of you said, "No," you didn't give him the finger.
A. Rude, controlling and arrogant.
Q. And how long did he continue to be rude, controlling and arrogant?
A. A few minutes.
Q. And do you remember what else he said to you during that time?
A. Some things. Yeah.
Q. What did he say?
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A. That I should show more respect. And he knew what he saw, that $I$ gave him the finger in passing.
Q. And at some point in the conversation did you ever ask him any questions?
A. Yes.
Q. What did you ask him?
A. I believe I asked him if I did do that, what are the consequences. What are the -- am I going to get a fine? Am I going to -- be arrested? Am I going to be -I don't know. I don't understand, you know, what -- if I did do this, what's going to happen to me.
Q. And how --
A. Something to that extent. I don't remember everything.
Q. And do you remember how he responded?
A. No.
Q. Do you remember what he said next?
A. No.
Q. Did you all have -- was there a -- was that the end of the conversation, or was there a back and forth?
A. There was back and forth. Yeah.
Q. What was that like?
A. Questions being -- I was asking him questions.
Q. And how was he responding?
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A. With answers. Some answers. Yeah.
Q. And how would you characterize his demeanor while he was responding?
A. Rude, arrogant. Very controlling.
Q. And how did the conversation end?
A. He told me he wasn't going to, I believe, take up any more of my time. And he just walked away.
Q. So he just left?
A. He said he wasn't going to either delay me or take any more of my time up. And he just walked away.
Q. Were you -- did you consider the conversation over at that point?
A. Yes.
Q. Let me rephrase it. Were you still talking at that time, or had you finished talking?
A. I was finished, because he walked away. There was no one to talk to.
Q. Before he walked away were you still in conversation with him?
A. Yes.
Q. And then did he -- I'm just trying to understand. Did he depart mid conversation or -- was it over?

MS. FLYNN: Objection.
MR. DIAZ: You can answer.

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. info@capitolcourtreporters.com

THE WITNESS: Oh, he ended the
conversation. He seemed like he was in control. And he told me I'm either not going to delay you any more or take up any more time, and he walked away. BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. Okay. When he walked away, what was his demeanor?
A. Arrogance, arrogant. It was arrogant, kind of rude, just walked away.
Q. When he said the last -- his last statement to you during that time, something to the effect of I'm not going to take up any more of your time, how would you characterize his demeanor when he said that?
A. Rude. I thought he was rude. And unprofessional.
Q. When he pulled you over the second time, took you out of the car, tell me what happened after he took you out of the car?
A. I think I was protesting a little bit. When he took me -- I actually got out of the car myself. And I told him $I$ can't believe what's -- this is happening to me, something to that extent.
Q. And what did he do after that?
A. He said that I was being -- he said that he thought that he had reason to believe that I did give him
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the finger, the first initial passing. And that $I$ did it in front of hundreds of people. I think he literally said hundreds, I think, or dozens. I'm not sure. I can't recall exactly.
Q. Did you see hundreds of people?
A. No. No.
Q. Did you see dozens of people?
A. No.
Q. Did you see 10 people?
A. No.
Q. On the streets did you see anybody?
A. No.
Q. And by street $I$ say on the -- did you see any pedestrians on the sidewalks?
A. No.
Q. Were there any pedestrians in the street?
A. No.
Q. Did you see anyone in their cars look at you as you were pulling away from the first stop?
A. I don't remember.
Q. After Riggen -- going back to the second stop now after Sergeant Riggen -- after you got out of the car, just walk us -- can you walk me through what happened next?
A. The second time he pulled me over, and he
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told me to get out of the car. He was going to arrest me for disorderly conduct, even said this was disorderly conduct 101. And that he had reason to believe that $I$ did give him the finger in passing the first time. And that he said that $I$ had done that in front of hundreds or dozens of people.
Q. Now as you exited the car, what happened?
A. I stood out beside my car.
Q. And then what?
A. We continued to talk about something. Like, you know, I can't believe that you're doing this. To that extent. And --
Q. Where were you during that conversation?
A. Outside of my car on the side of the road.
Q. And you know at some point you ended up back at the barracks; right?
A. Yes.
Q. Trooper Riggen took you to the barracks?
A. Yes.
Q. So between, you know, getting out of the car and going to the barracks, just tell me your experience of what happened.
A. I got out of the car, and I think I was saying things in protest, like, I can't believe you're doing this to me. Why? I didn't give you the finger.
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That lasted a couple minutes. Another state cruiser pulled up and a male officer got out of the car. He, Trooper Riggen, said something to this male officer. I can't remember what it was. And I believe there was a little bit of other conversation.

And then he told me to walk up to the hood of his cruiser, and he cuffed me.
Q. And after -- where were you handcuffed?
A. The back. My hands put in the back. Yeah.
Q. And then what did Trooper Riggen do next?
A. He escorted me to the cruiser.
Q. He put you in the back of the cruiser?
A. Yes.
Q. How did it feel to be put in the back of the police cruiser?
A. Horrible. So embarrassed. Humiliated. It was crushing. I felt crushed. Like just horrible, embarrassed.
Q. Since this all happened have you had other interactions with the police?
A. Yes.
Q. Were those -- what were those interactions?
A. I had a speeding ticket in July of 2021. On the way to work.
Q. How did it feel when you saw an officer behind
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you in 2021?
A. I was uneasy. You know, I felt very uneased.
Q. Why was that?
A. Because of what happened, what happened to me in 2018. It affected me the way I look at them. I still respect them. But it's just -- it's not the same, you know.
Q. So after the incident with Riggen in 2018, you're saying you still respect police officers, but it affected how you look at them now?
A. Yeah. Yes.
Q. How so?
A. I feel like they -- I would never express the way I feel again, ever again, like I did in 2018. I would never do that. I feel like I would never do that because it would cause an arrest -- it would cause an arrest for me to say how I feel or show how I feel.
Q. So you're worried about showing or speaking -you're worried about speaking; you're worried about showing how you feel through words to police officers. Is that what you're saying?
A. Yes.

MS. FLYNN: Objection.
BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. Is that what you're saying? You can answer.
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A. Yes.
Q. Since that event is there any time -- are you still on Facebook?
A. Yes.
Q. We went over some Facebook posts that you had made back from 2017, I think. And -- is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And when you -- since 2018, since the event in 2018, have you posted anything on the Vermont State Police Facebook page?
A. No.
Q. Have you posted anything about police on your Facebook page?
A. No.
Q. Have you commented anywhere on social media about police?
A. No.
Q. Have you -- strike that.

And before you -- 2018 before the stop, you
did post on Facebook?
A. Yes.
Q. On the Vermont State Police Facebook page?
A. Yes.
Q. And you were somewhat critical of Vermont State Police strategy, let's say around checkpoints; is
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that right?
A. Yes. Yeah.
Q. Nothing further.

EXAMINATION
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. So were you critical of the Vermont State Police -- I'm sorry. That's -- yeah. Were you critical about the Vermont State Police on other occasions other than the ones we looked at in Exhibit A?
A. I don't remember.
Q. Did you post anything on their Facebook page other than what we looked at in Exhibit A, if you know?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Or if you recall?
A. I don't remember.
Q. You said that -- well you were asked whether you saw dozens or hundreds of vehicles in the area of that second stop. Do you remember that?
A. I wasn't asked that. No. MR. DIAZ: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Wasn't asked that. I was
told that. I was told by him.
BY MS. FLYNN:
Q. Right. I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Yeah. You were told, but then you were asked by your attorney
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whether in fact there were dozens or hundreds of people in the vicinity. Do you remember just being asked that question?
A. Yes.
Q. And are you saying that you stopped and looked around and made observations about how many cars were passing or how many people were in the area?
A. I could see the traffic. And I could see around me. And there were no pedestrians or people walking.
Q. But there was traffic?
A. Yes. Yeah.
Q. When Trooper Riggen said something to you to the effect that he wasn't going to take up any more of your time, did it appear to you from his subsequent actions that he was not going to take up any more of your time?
A. Yes. Because he walked away.
Q. Okay. That's all I have. MR. DIAZ: Nothing. MR. SARACHAN: I object. MR. DIAZ: We will object to the
leaving this deposition open. Just for the record. MS. FLYNN: Yeah. So it is -- we are suspending. Yeah.
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| $117: 16,117: 19$ | Philadelphia - 1 | $\begin{aligned} & 104: 20,105: 1, \\ & 105: 8,105: 21, \end{aligned}$ | prior [5] 56:19, | $40: 10,126: 23$ | rarely [2] 58:17, |
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| 118:18 | physically [2] | 107:11, 107:14, | $22: 23,23: 14$ | provoke [3] |  |
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|  |  |  | , | 48:4, 48:10 | SOKOL - 1:20 |
|  |  |  | 30:1 |  | sole [2] 76:15, |
| 2:5, 140:23 |  | r |  | - | s |
| recordings - 5:21 | RE | RI | $-1: 22$ | shall - 3:1 | somebody [5] |
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| regard [5] 3 | r | 14 | 6 | 40:13, 61:17, | 22, 79:2 |
|  |  |  |  | 76:13, 83:7, | 101:13, 105: |
| 112:13, 112:21 |  |  | 82:16, 93:3, |  | somewhat - |
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| 6:10, 6:11, | 37:2 | 56:19, 64:1 |  | 5:8 | 72:20, 74:24, |
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| ated [11] 6:14, | 95: | righ | $59: 23,97: 11$ | 105:15, 105:18, | $129: 25,139:$ |
| 6:17, 11:23 |  | 24:24, 39:4 |  | 119:20 | 139:24, 139:24 |
| 18:12, $68: 1$ | requr | 39:5, 39:8, 41 | 108:22, 110:18 | siblings-29: | sort [8] 43:4, |
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| $\begin{aligned} & 51: 19,54: 20, \\ & 62: 2,62: 6, \end{aligned}$ | 139:8 | 143:6 | ta | $99: 21,109: 1$ | treating-46:9 |
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## EXHIBIT 2

## AFFIDAVIT <br> Case\# 18A200787 <br> STATE OF VERMONT <br> FRANKLIN COUNTY, ss.

NOW COMES Trooper Jay Riggen, affiant(s), being duly sworn and on oath, deposes and says he has probable cause to believe that Gregory Bombard (DOB: 10/26/1966) has committed the offense(s) of Disorderly Conduct, a violation of Title 13, Vermont Statutes Annotated Section 1026. The undersigned being duly sworn, deposes and says that $I$, Trooper Jay Riggen am now and have been for the past twelve years and two months, a full time employee of the Vermont State Police, being presently assigned to the St. Albans Barracks as a Trooper

1) On 02/09/2018 at approximately 1215 hours I was driving north on North Main Street in St. Albans, VT. I was operating a fully-marked State Police cruiser. While I was driving north I observed a 2016 Mazda CX5 (with VT REG: 62941) traveling south toward me. While I observed this vehicle, I watched as the operator looked at me, lifted his fist, and then extended and displayed his left middle finger over his steering wheel.
2) I recognized the signal as generally understood to be a negative gesture as I continued driving north past him. After I observed it I considered that the behavior was supremely unusual. I referenced thousands of previous motor vehicle and public interactions in my twelve years of State Police service and I could not immediately recall a time where I had seen someone signal to me in that way. Although a negative gesture, I was concerned that the driver was seeking and needing my attention. I was unsure if this was a mental health crisis or other need but I decided that a brief motor vehicle stop to ascertain the well-being of the operator and any passengers was not only prudent but necessary:
3) I subsequently turned around and caught up to the vehicle as the operator sat in heavy traffic at the traffic signal regulating southbound North Main Street traffic at the North Main Street / Lower Newton Road intersection. The operator did not yield until he traveled

Subscribed and sworn to before me on

through the aforementioned intersection. (I did not find this action improper due to the relevant traffic conditions.) After the ultimate yield, I exited my cruiser and approached the driver's side window to speak with the operator.
4) I asked the operator, "Do you need something?" twice. I identified to him that I observed him look at me and then I saw him "flicking me off" (slang for a middle finger gesture). I spoke with him about my specific observations to which the operator responded with denial. The operator claimed that he had been wiggling and stretching his fingers over his steering. wheel and had not signaled to me with his middle finger alone. The operator stated something to the effect that "you and other law enforcement are really sensitive, aren't you?" I explained to the operator that I was not overly "sensitive;" rather, his behavior was unusual and I could not recall a previous time I had seen that occur. Ultimately, I explained to the operator that due to the very uncommon action I wanted to be sure that he was "OK." (Although I did not articulate it to the operator, by "OK" I was referring to him experiencing a mental health crisis, experiencing an escalating despondency, or other need that a brief, non-adversarial law enforcement encounter could identify and/or resolve.)
5) I spoke with the operator about the nature of his gesture. I asked him if he understood my perception that if someone was looking for (or needing) the attention of a Trooper, the way to get that attention, although unusual, would be to display that negative symbol. The operator responded something to the effect that he could not agree to that supposition because he didn't understand that type of public mindset.
6) I addressed with the operator that perhaps he had not gestured to me in that way. I explained to the operator that I wouldn't be able to understand the mindset of the gesturer or affirm that the gesture had occurred as observed until I had the chance to speak with him/her. At that time, I understood that the operator was not in crisis or other need and I intended to end the interaction; however, the operator continued to ask me questions. The operator asked me what the citation or crime would be if someone did that. The operator then laughed as I attempted to explain the following: If someone gestures in that way, I Subscribed and sworn to before me on

don't know if they are gesturing because they need my assistance, my attention, or because they need my attention as the gesture itself is not "normal" behavior.
7) I then told the operator that I would not take up "any more of his time." (Note: At this point in the interaction, approximately three minutes had elapsed from first contact. During that time, I had not asked the operator for identification or conducted any other intervention besides ascertaining the presence of any need.)
8) The operator told me that he was going to file a complaint against me. I advised him that he was "more than welcome to" and provided him with my name and my assigned station. At that time, the interaction became cyclical with the same information exchange taking place. I again tried to explain the unusual nature of the gesture demands intervention to determine well-being but the operator again laughed. I told the operator that I didn't wish to "delay him" any more than had been necessary. I concluded that the operator did not want the interaction to end as he continuously asked me the same pattern of questions and responses ("What if I did?", and "If I did...") that he had engaged me in during the previous three minutes. Therefore, to end the interaction I wished him a "good day" and returned to my cruiser. This concluded my encounter with the operator.
9) As I arrived back at my cruiser I heard the operator yell "asshole!" I turned around and I could see him looking at me in his sideview mirror. His window was still lowered all the way down and I could clearly see his face as he stated loudly "Fuck you!" two times. I could clearly see his face as he loudly exclaimed the obscenities. I was aware at that moment that a school bus had slowed down and stopped behind traffic at the Lower Newton Road / North Main Street intersection. I was also aware that there were multiple vehicles that were traveling both north and south on Main Street passed the operator and I who were in plain view of his tumultuous declarations. I observed that several vehicles had stopped behind this traffic and were watching my cruiser and the operator's car. While I could see the operator from behind and in his side view mirror, l observed that there were members of the public who were directly across from him and in close proximity who were certainly at risk of Subscribed and sworn to before me on

observing his tumultuous profanity and behavior much more directly than I was. These members of the public included any students who may have been sitting at the rear of the aforementioned school bus.
10) As I continued to watch the operator, he attempted to merge into southbound traffic but was so fixated on me that he did not appear to notice an oncoming southbound vehicle. Therefore, he needed to stop short so he didn't cause a crash. I watched as the operator extended his hand outside of his window and, again, extended his middle finger as he entered successfully into southbound traffic and began driving south. The operator extended his middle finger outside of his window for no less than five seconds and as he drove for no less than 15 yards. The operator displayed this signal in the presence of a northbound car, a southbound truck (that he needed to stop short to avoid striking) a northbound truck, and a northbound car.
11) Based on the yelling vulgarities through an open window (tumultuous, obscene, and vulgar) in close proximity traffic and in the presence of a school bus and multiple other vehicles in moderate-volume traffic (public place) in combination with the exaggerated and continuous display of his middle finger through his open window (obscene and vulgar), while being so fixated on his behavior toward me that he didn't recognize approaching southbound traffic for which he needed to stop short to avoid a side-swipe crash, I recognized this as the criminal offense of Disorderly Conduct pursuant to Title 13 VSA 1026(a)(1)(3).
12) I subsequently affected a second motor vehicle stop on the operator as he turned from North Main Street onto Brainerd Street in St. Albans. I exited my cruiser and approached the driver's side window. I advised the operator that he needed to exit the vehicle as he was under arrest for Disorderly Conduct. The operator did not comply as he asked me why his behavior had been "disorderly conduct." I explained to the operator that using his initial negative gesture was not a problem (once his well-being has been established). However, when he used loud profanity in concert with his obscene gesture and in front of numerous members of the public, I advised the operator that he had committed the crime of Subscribed and sworn to before me on

disorderly conduct. The operator did not deny the presence of the public or using the loud profanity or exaggeratedly displaying his obscene gesture.
13) After numerous verbal orders for the operator to exit his vehicle, he ultimately obliged. The operator (identified upon return to the St. Albans Barracks) was identified as Gregory Bombard (DOB: 10/26/1966) via his valid VT Driver's License. Bombard was placed under arrest pursuant to the above charge. I placed him into handcuffs which were double-locked and checked for tightness. Bombard was placed into the rear seat of my cruiser for transport. Bombard told me that the handcuffs were too tight. Upon hearing this, I immediately checked for capillary refill (which was present in both hands) and made an adjustment to his right handcuff per his request. I asked Bombard if he wanted me to adjust his left handcuff as well. Bombard told me that he did not want that handcuff adjusted.
14) I observed that Bombard's vehicle had been stopped directly in front of a street sign indicating that the side of the road he was on was not a legal parking area. Therefore, without any other valid operator present, I informed Bombard that I needed to contact a tow truck to remove the vehicle. Bombard did not have a presence so I contacted the next tow truck on the VSP wrecker rotation.
15) Bombard was subsequently transported to the St. Albans Barracks for processing. Upon arrival at the Barracks, Bombard was initially secured in a processing room holding cell. I advised him that the process may take approximately 30 minutes. Based on Bombard's public actions and not wanting him to engage in any further cognitive dissonance, 1 ultimately deferred processing to Detective Sergeant Desany who conducted the remainder of the process.
16) At the conclusion of the processing, Bombard was released with a citation to appear in Franklin County District Court on 03/05/2018 at 1:00pm to answer the charge of Disorderly Conduct.

Subscribed and sworn to before me on
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MR. MESSINA: Before we get started, just on the record, usual stips?

MR. DIAZ: I'll get to the stipulations in just a minute. So we can get to that. JAY RIGGEN,
having been first duly sworn to state the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

## EXAMINATION

BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. Mr. Riggen, my name is Jay Diaz. This is Gary Sarachan. This is Hillary Rich. We work with Mr. Bombard. We help him with this lawsuit.

Would you please state your name for the record?
A. Jay Riggen.
Q. And have you been deposed before?
A. Yes.
Q. How many times?
A. Estimating, 15.
Q. Okay. And have you testified at trial before?
A. Yes.
Q. How many times?
A. Estimating, 20.
Q. So you're familiar with the general rules of the road for testifying?

Yes?
A. Yes.
Q. So, you know, you know you have to give truthful answers to the questions I ask?
A. Yes.
Q. And you know that you're under oath, just as you would be in court?
A. Yes.
Q. So today you're here, while there isn't a judge you still are under oath and have to provide those truthful answers under penalty of perjury, understood?
A. Understood.
Q. I'm going to just set a few ground rules just in case -- just to remind you basically.

When we're -- when I'm asking the
question, let me finish the question before you answer. Most of all it will help the court reporter get an accurate transcript.

You can also wait one minute -- or not a minute, but you can also wait a few, make sure you
give your attorney a chance to offer an objection if he wants to do that. Is that fair?
A. That's fair.
Q. It's important that you answer in words, of course, because the transcript is not going to catch head nods and "Uh-Huhs" and things like that. Make sense?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. And most importantly, if I ask a question and you don't understand the question, will you tell me?
A. I will.
Q. Because I want to make sure that you are understanding what I'm asking for. Is that understood?
A. Understood.
Q. We'll take a break for lunch at some point, probably eat around noon, but if at any time you need to take a break for any reason, just let me know. I'm happy to do that.

The only thing $I$ ask is while -- if a question is pending, that you answer the question before we take that break. Is that fair?
A. That's fair.
Q. And is there any -- before we get going
is there any other questions you have about the ground rules I've just laid out?
A. No.
Q. So I want to just check in. You know, I have to ask a couple of questions. It may seem a little bit strange, but it's really just to make sure that you are able to give true and accurate testimony today. How are you feeling?
A. Good.
Q. Do you feel like you can answer all the questions truthfully?
A. Yes.
Q. And will you answer truthfully?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you consumed any alcohol in the last 24 hours?
A. No.
Q. Are you on any particular medications that might affect your memory?
A. No.
Q. Any that might affect your perception?
A. No.
Q. Any that might cause forgetfulness?
A. No.
Q. And you feel, again, like you'll be able
to answer all questions fully and truthfully today? A. Yes.

MR. DIAZ: So as to stipulations, this deposition as far as I'm concerned will be conducted according to the Vermont Rules of Civil Procedure. We will -- and all objections to form, as I think you did before, except for privilege.

I assume we want to read and sign the deposition transcript?

MR. MESSINA: Yeah, I'd like him to have the opportunity for the errata sheet so, yeah. MR. DIAZ: Great.

BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. So, Mr. Riggen, could you tell me, what is your current occupation?
A. State trooper.
Q. And how long have you been a state trooper?
A. About 17 years.
Q. What's your rank?

You're a state trooper in the Vermont State Police, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. What's your rank in the Vermont State

Police?
A. I'm a sergeant.
Q. How long have you been a sergeant?
A. Since 2019.
Q. And where do you work?
A. I'm assigned to headquarters.
Q. And that's where?
A. In Waterbury.
Q. And before you were a sergeant in

Waterbury where were you based?
A. I was a trooper in St. Albans.
Q. In the St. Albans barracks?
A. Correct.
Q. Did you become a sergeant while you were in the St. Albans barracks?
A. Yes.
Q. And then you moved over to Waterbury; is that right?
A. The promotion took me to Waterbury.
Q. And so you became a sergeant? Becoming a sergeant was a promotion?
A. Yes.
Q. And so in your role that you have now as a sergeant in headquarters what are your day-to-day job duties?
A. I am the sergeant of special operations with the focus on traffic safety, with a focus -- a particular focus in impaired driving.
Q. And so you said that you are -- I'm sorry, can you say your role again?
A. So I'm a sergeant in the Special Operations Unit. The focus is traffic safety with a specific focus in impaired driving.
Q. And what is the Special Operations Unit?
A. It's a group of subject matter experts who are troopers in the Vermont State Police. And so where I do traffic safety, there are crash reconstructionists, canine coordinators, search and rescue experts.
Q. And what is your expertise?
A. Traffic safety, impaired driving.
Q. When you say "traffic safety" what does that mean?
A. It's keeping an eye on Vermont's highway safety, taking a look at crash trends and seeing what Vermont State Police can do to be proactive in avoiding tragedy.
Q. And you also said you're an expert in impaired driving?
A. Yes.
Q. Does that mean you're a drug recognition expert?
A. Yes.
Q. You've been certified as a drug recognition expert?
A. Yes.
Q. And who does that certification?
A. It's State certified.
Q. In your role within the Special Operations Unit what are your day-to-day tasks?
A. Reviewing the work of other DREs, making sure that DUI arrests that are made proactively by troopers are done per standard, making sure that the highway safety grants are -- the books are balanced, people working the time are being productive.
Q. Let's talk about reviewing the work of DREs. What does that look like?
A. DRE performs a narrative. Well, performs an evaluation, prepares a report based on that evaluation, and I make sure that the reports are done to standard.
Q. When you're reviewing the reports you're checking to make sure that they are according to what standards?

MR. MESSINA: Objection.

THE WITNESS: The standards of the international drug evaluation classification programs, the standards set forth by the Vermont drug classification program, and make sure that the interpretation is sound.

BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. Would you say that you're checking the work of the DREs?
A. Yes.
Q. And you're making sure that their evaluations that they do in the field are appropriate?
A. Yes.
Q. Before you were with the Special

Operations Unit you said you were in the St. Albans barracks; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And there you became a sergeant. When was that?
A. $\quad 2019$.
Q. And before that you were a -- what was your rank?
A. I was a trooper.
Q. And how long were you in the St. Albans barracks as a trooper?
A. Since 2006.
Q. When did you join the Vermont State Police?
A. I was hired in January of 2006.
Q. You went through the Academy before that, I assume?
A. Yes.
Q. How long was the Academy then?
A. Start to finish, January, '06 to May, 2006.
Q. So we talked a little bit about you have done depositions before. You've -- and you've done trial testimony before. When we talk -- when you talk about depositions what was the -- what were these; criminal cases or civil cases?
A. Criminal.
Q. Exclusively criminal?
A. If there was anything civil I don't recall.
Q. There might have been a deposition in a civil matter, or there might not have been?
A. My -- my instinct would be there have not been. If there is, I don't remember.
Q. Have you ever been party to a lawsuit before?
A. Yes.
Q. When?
A. I don't remember the year.
Q. Ballpark?
A. 2010 maybe.
Q. What was the law -- what was the lawsuit about?

MR. MESSINA: Objection.
BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. You can answer.
A. It was alleged that I had used excessive force.
Q. So in 2010 there was a lawsuit alleging that you used excessive force in your role as a Vermont state trooper?
A. Yes.
Q. Were you the defendant in that case?
A. My recollection is it was the State of Vermont, and I may have been a co-defendant there. I don't recall.
Q. What was the outcome of that case?
A. It was dropped by the plaintiffs.
Q. Was there a settlement?
A. No.

MR. MESSINA: Objection.
THE WITNESS: Excuse me. No, there
wasn't.
BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. Have you been a party to any other lawsuit other than the one in 2010?
A. Yes.
Q. And what other ones have you been a party to a lawsuit in?
A. There was -- I don't recall what the purpose for it was, but $I$ was a party to one.
Q. When was this?
A. I don't remember. Maybe it was around that same time, but I don't remember.
Q. Was it -- do you remember what the subject matter of the lawsuit was?
A. It was a passenger during a DUI stop where I was the arresting trooper. He had sued in small claims court. I don't remember what he alleged.
Q. Do you remember the name of the plaintiff in that case?

MR. MESSINA: Objection.
MR. DIAZ: What's the objection?
MR. MESSINA: Relevance, but he can answer.

THE WITNESS: I don't remember.
MR. DIAZ: Just to be clear, under the

Vermont State Rules of Civil Procedure, relevance is preserved. All relevance objections are reserved.

BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. So there were these two lawsuits that you were a party to?
A. Yes.
Q. Were there any others?
A. Not that I remember.
Q. Have you ever been a plaintiff in a lawsuit?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever been a party to any type of regulatory proceeding?
A. For example?
Q. Let me rephrase.

Have you ever had any cases before the
Labor Board?
A. No.
Q. So you've been a Vermont state trooper for almost 20 years now, right?
A. $\quad 18$.
Q. Have any of your stops -- or let me rephrase.

In your role as a Vermont state trooper
have you had any of your actions reviewed by criminal court?
A. Could you be more specific?
Q. Sure. You stop people. So let's go back. When you were a trooper you would -- you were on the street, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You were patrolling?
A. Yes.
Q. And you did that on a daily basis?
A. Yes.
Q. And you would, I assume, do traffic enforcement?
A. Yes.
Q. And you would respond to civilian calls?
A. Yes.
Q. And were you doing -- were you on patrol for that whole time; 2006 to 2019?
A. No.
Q. When were you not on patrol during that time?
A. There was a nine-month period around 2009 where I was assigned to the Governor Security Unit. It's called the Executive Protection Unit now, but it was the Governor's Security Unit then.

MR. MESSINA: May we go off the record for just a moment?
(A discussion was held off the record.)
BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. In your role as a trooper you've conducted traffic stops?
A. Yes.
Q. In your role as a trooper you've arrested people?
A. Yes.
Q. How many traffic stops do you think you conducted in your role as a trooper?
A. Estimating, 1500 .
Q. And of the arrests, how many arrests do you think you've performed as a trooper?

Ballpark. I'm not going to hold you to it.
A. Yeah. 800, maybe.
Q. So of the traffic stops you conducted, were any challenged in criminal court?
A. And you're referring to the basis for the stop; is that correct?
Q. Correct.
A. Yes.
Q. How many?
A. I presume the number is the same as hearings I've testified at, so 20, 30. I'm not sure. I'm estimating.
Q. So your estimate is between 20 and 30 of your traffic stops have been challenged in criminal court?
A. I'm estimating, yeah.
Q. And of the arrests you've conducted, how many have been challenged?
A. I will say it's difficult for me to answer that question because I don't know to the extent that I would know if they were challenged or not.
Q. Have any of your traffic stops been challenged up to the Vermont Supreme Court?
A. Yes.
Q. How many?
A. One that I'm aware of.
Q. Is that State v. Button?
A. It is.
Q. There's no others that you're aware of?
A. Not that I'm aware of.
Q. Mr. Riggen, you use personal e-mail,
right?
A. Yes.
Q. And which personal e-mail services do you use?
A. G-mail.
Q. Any others?
A. No.
Q. How often do you use it?
A. A few times a week.
Q. Do you use it for work?
A. $\quad$ No.
Q. Never used it for work?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever used it to discuss this
lawsuit?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever used it to discuss

Mr. Bombard?
A. No.
Q. And, Mr. Riggen, do you use any social media networks?
A. No.
Q. Don't have a Facebook account or Twitter account?
A. No.
Q. Do you have a personal cellphone?
A. Yes.
Q. And you have a work cellphone, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have any other cellphones?
A. No.
Q. Do you ever use your personal cellphone for work purposes?
A. Define a work purpose.
Q. Communicating with co-workers.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you ever use your personal cellphone for communicating -- or do you ever use your personal cellphone while you're patrol?
A. Yes.
Q. And when you're using it, your personal cellphone on patrol, are you using it for work purposes?
A. And define "work purposes".
Q. Well, what does "work purposes" mean to you?
A. I mean, it's such a broad term. It would be hard for me to define it because it's so broad.
Q. Well, give me an example of what you think.
A. Talking to a dispatcher would be a work purpose, and I would use it for that.
Q. Why would you use your personal cellphone for that instead of your work cellphone?
A. Just sometimes feels easier. It's --
Q. Why does it feel easier?
A. Because that's the phone that I've always used, so I'm just comfortable with it.
Q. So what do you use your work cellphone for?
A. Almost nothing.
Q. When you say "almost nothing" what do you use it for?
A. On some occasions people will call me on that number that's always for work. I'll get a text message on that number. I'll take -- yeah, I think most recently I tried to -- I think I'll use it to listen to music on it.
Q. So are the only times you use your work cellphone when people are -- other than listening to music on it are when people are contacting you?
A. No. I'll make phone calls on it, but it's intermittent.
Q. Which phone do you use more for work, your personal cellphone or your work cellphone?
A. Maybe it's split. I'm not really sure. I never thought about -- I never thought about
quantifying the use, so I'm note sure. Split maybe.
Q. When you say "split" do you mean that it's even, 50/50?
A. Sure, 50/50.
Q. So you use your work -- your personal cellphone for work purposes 50 percent of the time; you use your work cellphone for work 50 percent of the time?
A. Estimating, yes.
Q. And I believe you said that you use both phones for -- I can't remember if you said this, but do you use both phones for phone calls and texts?
A. Yes.
Q. And have you texted on your personal cellphone about this lawsuit?
A. I don't believe I have, no.
Q. Have you talked to people on your personal cellphone about this lawsuit?
A. Yes.
Q. Who did you talk to?
A. I talked to -- at the time he was Captain Peterson. He called to notify me of the lawsuit.
Q. He's a lieutenant now, right?
A. He's a major.
Q. Major. Who else did you talk to about
this lawsuit on your personal cellphone?
A. I don't recall if we connected on it, but Ryan Wood had reached out to me wondering what was going on, and I ignored him.
Q. Anybody else?
A. I don't recall anybody else.
Q. You might have talked to somebody else, or you might not have?
A. I would say that I may have, but I couldn't give you specifics.
Q. And you say you may have, do you think you may have talked to somebody within the Vermont State Police about the lawsuit on your personal cellphone?
A. It's possible.
Q. And you conducted a search of your personal cellphone as a result of the document requests that were sent as a part of this lawsuit, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you remember what search terms you used?
A. I don't remember.
Q. Did you come up with those search terms?
A. No.
Q. And in terms of cellphones, are you familiar with programs or text messaging programs in particular that allow you to -- let me rephrase.

Are you familiar with text messaging programs that will delete texts shortly after they're sent?
A. So I know that these exists, but I couldn't tell you what programs do that and what don't.
Q. Do you use any of those programs?
A. I don't think so. You'd have to give me some examples. I don't know what these are.
Q. So for this deposition can you tell me what you did to prepare for today?
A. I re-watched the car stop video and read my affidavit.
Q. What else did you do?
A. That was it.
Q. You didn't speak with your attorney?
A. I did speak to my attorney. Thank you.
Q. Other than -- and when you say you watched the car stop video, you're referring to the February 9, 2018 stop of Mr . Bombard?
A. February 9, 2018, yes.
Q. And was that the full video?
A. Yes.
Q. So from the initial stop through

Mr. Bombard being placed in a holding cell at the St. Albans barracks?
A. That's right.
Q. How many times did you watch it?
A. Once.
Q. When did you watch it?
A. This morning.
Q. And when you -- other than the cruiser cam video and your affidavit, did you look at any other documents?

MR. MESSINA: Objection; asked and answered, but go ahead.

THE WITNESS: No, but since you mentioned talking to the attorney, that becomes --

MR. MESSINA: I object as to privilege.
MR. DIAZ: Let me rephrase the question to make sure that we avoid that.

MR. MESSINA: Yes.
BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. Other than any communications with your attorney, did you review any other documents besides the affidavit and the cruiser cam video?
A. So I'm familiar with the filings that
have gone back and forth.
Q. When you say "filings" what do you mean?
A. Communications between counsel, motions.
Q. Did you review the complaint?
A. Yes.
Q. And have you read the -- I think you said you've read motions in the case?
A. Yes.
Q. Which motions are you referring to?
A. Generally speaking it's conversations -well, excuse me, motions regarding discovery requests, the motions to dismiss, then e-mail communicating.
Q. Anything else?
A. I think that's it.
Q. Okay. And did you -- so have you reviewed the decision on the motion to dismiss?
A. I -- I probably did, yes.
Q. When did you review the filings in the case?
A. I don't remember. They were sent -- they trickled in over time and then they came in as a big batch and -- but I couldn't tell you the date. I'm not sure.
Q. Was it within the last week?
A. No.
Q. Was it within the last month?
A. No.
Q. Was it within the last six months?
A. Probably.
Q. And when you -- you said you also read your affidavit from Mr. Bombard's arrest, right?
A. Yes.
Q. When did you read that?
A. This morning.
Q. Did you -- other than communications with your attorney, did you review any other documents this morning?
A. No.
Q. Are there any other documents that you reviewed as a part of this lawsuit?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Did you review any deposition
transcripts?
A. No.
Q. And you said you spoke to your attorney in preparation for this deposition?
A. Yes.
Q. How many times?

MR. MESSINA: Objection.
BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. You can answer.
A. Once or twice, counting this morning.
Q. And other than Mr. Messina who else was present?
A. The first meeting was Rosemary Gretkowski.
Q. And who is she?
A. She is the lawyer for the Department of Public Safety.
Q. Is this on the phone or personal meetings?
A. Virtual.
Q. So Zoom?
A. Zoom.
Q. How many did the meeting last?
A. 60 minutes.
Q. And on your communications with your attorneys was anyone else copied who is not a -- not an attorney?
A. In past e-mails was Edmond; Edmond Staff, Attorney General's Office.
Q. Anyone else outside of the Attorney General's Office?
A. Not that I'm aware of.
Q. Have you provided your counsel with all
documents related to this case?
A. Yes.
Q. So I want to just go through a few of the individuals other than you who are involved in this case and make sure that you know who they are.

You know a Sergeant Bruzzi, right?
A. Yes.
Q. How do you know him?
A. I worked with him in the St. Albans barracks.
Q. And he was -- he came to the scene of the -- of Mr. Bombard's arrest, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know, I believe you said Ryan Wood earlier, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. You know him?
A. Yes.
Q. You all worked together at the St. Albans barracks?
A. No.
Q. How do you know him?
A. Working for the same agency.
Q. Working for the Vermont State Police?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that how you met him?
A. Yes.
Q. And you know Richard Desany?
A. Desany, yes.
Q. Desany. Because he also worked at the St. Albans barracks?
A. Yes.
Q. You know Jim Hughes?
A. Yes.
Q. He was the State Attorney's in Franklin County?
A. Yes.
Q. You worked with him in that capacity?
A. Yes.
Q. And you know John Lavoie?
A. Yes.
Q. He also worked at the Franklin County State's Attorney's Office?
A. Yes.
Q. And you worked with him in that capacity?
A. That's right.
Q. You know Maurice Lamothe?
A. Yes.
Q. He was the station commander in

St. Albans when you were stationed there, right?
A. That's right.
Q. And do you know Eric Patno?
A. Yes.
Q. How do you know him?
A. I worked with him at the St. Albans barracks.
Q. He was a trooper, also?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you know Tara Thomas?
A. Yes.
Q. How do you know Tara Thomas?
A. I worked with her at the State Police.
Q. Where did you work with her?
A. She supervised me in the Special

Operations Unit.
Q. Does she still supervise you in the Special Ops Unit?
A. No.
Q. Where is -- do you know where Tara Thomas works now?
A. Yes.
Q. Where?
A. She is the commander of the Internal Affairs Unit.
Q. So you were on the road for -- are you
still on the road as a -- are you still patrolling the roads?
A. That's not my primary function.
Q. Do you still do it as a part of your role within the Vermont State Police?
A. Yes.
Q. How often?
A. A couple, few times a month.
Q. Is there a specific reason that you do it just a couple times a month?
A. My primary job duties are, as I described earlier, and I don't always have the time.
Q. Are you assigned to do -- to go on patrol a couple times a month, or can you just explain that a little bit more?
A. Generally not assigned. There may be intermittent shift coverages, in which case that would then require patrol.
Q. And that's the -- is that the reason that you go on patrol is to cover shifts that -- where it's needed?
A. Sometimes.
Q. What are the other reasons that you would go on patrol?
A. I would go on patrol on overtime for
highway safety in grants to do extra patrol work.
Q. So over the last four years or so you've been on patrol on average a couple times a month?
A. On average.
Q. For how long -- when you're on patrol how long are you on patrol for?
A. It varies.
Q. Is it, you know, one hour?
A. It could be one hour, and if it's a shift it's longer but indeterminate.
Q. How long is a shift?
A. Nine hours.
Q. And sometimes it's much longer, right?
A. That's right.
Q. What's the longest shift you've ever done?
A. I couldn't say but probably 24 hours, yeah.
Q. And when you were in the St. Albans barracks you were on patrol five days a week?
A. Average, yes.
Q. And how long were your shifts at the St. Albans barracks?
A. Generally nine hours.
Q. Sometimes longer, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you would be on for overtime?
A. Yes.
Q. When you're on patrol is there anything more important than protecting the rights and safety of Vermonters?
A. That's probably the overarching goal.
Q. And when I say Vermonters' rights, you understand that that's -- what does that mean to you?
A. I think it's the life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness.
Q. Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights, right?
A. That's right.
Q. Are you familiar -- and, you know, and that goes for when you're conducting traffic stops, too, right?
A. That's right.
Q. And when you're making arrests?
A. Yes. And I'm going to clarify what I said before. I think people visiting Vermont also have those same rights, so it's not just Vermonters. Q. Absolutely. When I talk about the First Amendment, what does that mean to you?
A. It's a freedom of expression, freedom to gather and assemble.
Q. And when I talk about -- you've been doing this for a long time. You know about the Fourth Amendment, right?
A. I do.
Q. What does the Fourth Amendment cover?
A. It's a protection against seizure.
(Plaintiff's Exhibit 8 was previously
marked for identification, attached at the end of the original transcript.)

BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. I'm going to show you what's been marked as Exhibit 8 in a previous deposition.

What is Exhibit 8?
A. It is VSP Directive 419.
Q. And what's the line under?
A. Crowd Control and Management.
Q. And do you see Part 2.3?
A. Yes.
Q. And what does it say?
A. It's a paragraph describing First Amendment activities.
Q. And it says, First Amendment activities include all forms of speech and expressive conduct
used to convey ideas and/or information, express grievances or otherwise communicate with others and include both verbal and non-verbal expression.

Did I read that right?
A. You did.
Q. Does that align with your view of First Amendment activities?
A. Yes.
Q. Let's go back to one part here.

MR. MESSINA: Of Exhibit 8?
MR. DIAZ: Just give me a minute.
BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. So going back to Exhibit 8, can you find Section 4.4 for me? I believe it's on Page 3.

I should ask, have you seen this policy before?
A. Yes, probably.
Q. Do you remember when you saw it?
A. No.
Q. Do you know -- why do you think you would have seen it before?
A. We're required to review policies as they get pushed out.
Q. Have you ever been on the crowd control team?
A. No.
Q. So going to 4.4, do you see where it says "D" there?
A. Yes.
Q. And it says, Vermont State Police members shall avoid negative verbal engagement with members of the crowd. Verbal abuse against officers shall not constitute a reason for arrest or for any use of force against such individuals.

Did I read that correctly?
A. Yes, you did.
Q. So the Vermont State Police policy is that verbal abuse against officers shall not constitute a reason for an arrest; is that right?
A. That's right.
Q. And you abide by the Vermont State Police policy, right?
A. Yes.
Q. I want to talk a little bit about traffic stops. You said you've done over a thousand traffic stops in your career, right?
A. Yes.
Q. What's your procedure for doing -- for conducting a traffic stop?
A. Can you be more specific or define
"procedure"? I'm not sure.
Q. Do you have a standard procedure that you follow when conducting a traffic stop?
A. Are you talking mechanically, administratively?

I don't understand what you're looking for.
Q. Well, when you see a traffic violation, for instance, walk me through what you do.
A. I see a traffic violation. I decide that I'm going to have a contact with the operator about that traffic violation, and so I initiate the traffic stop.
Q. And after you initiate the stop what do you do?
A. I speak with the operator about what I observed, ask them questions regarding -- often regarding where they're going, where they're coming from. Ask for their driver's license, their proof of registration, their proof of insurance.

I validate or ensure that those things are all -- are all legitimate and current, and then I decide what type of action will be taken, whether it will be a form of a warning or a ticket or an arrest.

And depending on what that decision was,
the stop either concludes or continues.
Q. When you walk up to a car what's the first thing you do?
A. I address the operator.
Q. What do you say?
A. It varies. It's -- sometimes I introduce myself, and sometimes it's a casual "Hey", followed with, "Do you know why I stopped you" generally.
Q. And after the person, you know, responds to your initial introduction or question about why you stopped them, what's the next step?
A. I guess I don't fully understand -- I'm not sure where you want me to fill in the gaps of what I may have missed.
Q. Well, you said the first thing you do is you walk up to the car, you introduce yourself or you say, Do you know why I stopped you, right?

That's what you said?
A. Yes.
Q. What do you say to them next?
A. Do you know why I stopped you? They answer that question in the affirmative or something else. I then usually direct them to driver's license, registration, proof of insurance. Like I said, perhaps questions about where you're going, where
you're coming from. Perhaps I might discuss about the violation itself, and then it's a return to my cruiser to verify the driver's license, registration.
Q. And you'd say this is your standard operating procedure?
A. I would say that it's evolved over time, but that was generally how I conducted myself.
Q. Is it still how you conduct yourself today?
A. No.
Q. How do you do it today?
A. Try to make it more of an education conversation to draw out more with the operator about the nature of why I stopped them and why their behavior may be dangerous and what the purpose of these interactions are. More educative. It's education over reinforcement, I call it.
Q. And that's because you're an educator now, right?
A. I see it as -- I see the mandate as education.
Q. And part of what you do now is you teach and train officers on how to do this correctly, right?
A. One of my job duties, yes.
Q. Do you advise other officers to try to
educate people that they stop?
A. Yes.
Q. What were you -- just going back to your general, the general -- I guess when did you start doing the more educative type of interaction on motor vehicle stops?
A. The last couple years probably.
Q. In your role as -- at the Special Operations Unit --
A. Yes.
Q. -- how were you trained to conduct motor vehicle stops?
A. Most of the training, in my recollection, is about the physically conducting the stop. There's not so much a training about how to converse during the stop.
Q. I assume when you conduct motor vehicle stops that you're courteous?
A. Yes.
Q. You're honest?
A. Yes.
Q. You don't exaggerate facts?
A. No.
Q. I also assume you've done motor vehicle stops where people have argued with you about the
reason -- about why you stopped them?
A. Yes.
Q. They've probably argued with you about when you gave them a ticket, right?
A. Sometimes.
Q. Some people get unhappy about it?
A. Yes.
Q. What's the basis, or do you know the required basis for conducting a motor vehicle stop?
A. The legal basis, you're talking about?
Q. Well, I guess I'm just asking, what do you think you need in order to justify a motor vehicle stop?
A. There's three different things that -one of them needs to exist in order to conduct a motor vehicle stop.
Q. And what are those three things?
A. Reasonable suspicion that a traffic violation has occurred or that there's a criminal violation occurring or for a community caretaking purpose.
Q. So the first is reasonable suspicion of a traffic violation?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. The second is reasonable suspicion that a
crime is occurring. The third is under your community caretaking role?
A. That's right.
(Plaintiff's Exhibit 3 was previously marked for identification, attached at the end of the original transcript.)

BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. Okay. I'm just going to show you what's been marked as Exhibit 3 in a previous deposition. What is Exhibit 3?
A. It's VSP Directive 403, Investigative Motor Vehicle Stop.
Q. Have you seen this policy before?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you familiar with it?
A. Yes.
Q. Looking at Section 2.0 where it says Policy, do you see that?
A. Uh-huh (affirmative).
Q. It says 2.1?
A. Yes.
Q. It says, All motor vehicle stops shall be based upon probable cause that a statutory motor vehicle violation has occurred or upon a reasonable suspicion to believe that a crime has been or is being
committed or upon a community caretaking function. Is that right?
A. That's right.
Q. Have I read that correctly?
A. Yes, you did.
Q. And this basically comports with your definition of what you said are the allowable reasons to make a motor vehicle stop, right?
A. Yes.
Q. So I want to talk about the community caretaking function. What does that mean to you?
A. I think that the -- community caretaking to me means that police are guardians of society, and it's not only about enforcement of laws but also make sure the people are okay, which is to say not needing any assistance. So that can be health and welfare, whether that's their physical health or mental health or in general distress.

I think the police can be used as a tool for access to services or intervene before something more nefarious occurs.
Q. And in terms of what a motor vehicle stop had to be based on, the policy says, you know, probable cause of a violation, a reasonable suspicion of a crime or upon a community caretaking function.

In terms of motor vehicle stops what does "community caretaking function" mean?
A. I think one may -- an operator may present in a way that is not in violation of any law but requiring some intervention. I should say a community caretaking interaction which would be an intervention to make sure they're not needing any assistance.
Q. So part of the community caretaking function, I believe you said, was protecting people's mental health, right?
A. Yes, right.
Q. You've done mental health calls --
A. Yes.
Q. -- in your role as a trooper, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's part of the community caretaking function?
A. Yes.
Q. What other types of calls are -- would you say are part of the community caretaking function?
A. I think medical emergencies would be community caretaking.
Q. Anything else?
A. I think, like I said, medical
emergencies, and I think the other -- the other prong would be like mental health emergencies.

So I think -- I am hesitant to put them under two pillars because people could need assistance that don't fall into either of those but could really benefit from a police, public interaction to perhaps -- to perhaps afford them the opportunity for extra services.
Q. Can you give me some examples?
A. I think an example could be a parent dispute with a child. Not a violation of law, doesn't involve medical emergency or mental health, but perhaps there could be some referral for Department of Children and Families or some other type of social work for that family that they didn't earlier have access to because they were kind of existing in their own -- in their own space.
Q. And you'd respond to that because there's a concern about the child's safety?
A. It's -- I see it as not necessarily only child safety, but I think about family health and facilitating their ascent through Mansell's hierarchy.
Q. And you would be -- I mean, this is something you would be called to, correct?

You're not; is that right?
A. I'd say that's -- if we're still talking about community caretaking, not necessarily.
Q. How else would you interact with people other than when you're called to do so?
A. Being on patrol or just being present in the moment to observe departures from norm to say -to recognize people who may be in distress and to check in on them and see if they are and to validate that. If not, move along. And if they are, to see what other types of services may be necessary.
Q. When you say "distress" what does that mean?
A. I think distress can take many forms, but distress is psychological distress, it's physical distress.

I think psychological distress probably falls in the mental health pillar, and physical health falls in the medical emergency pillar.

And I think that distress is the physical manifestation that we can see or hear or observe that is physical manifestation of internal stress. And I think some of that stress is toxic stress, and I think that police can help through conversation or access to other services.
Q. And how do you determine if someone is in
in distress?
A. I think recognizing departures from what I've come to know as normal human behavior versus departure from that norm. I may use that as recognizing that this doesn't appear normal so, therefore, I would like to have a conversation and to see if that's validated.

And if it is, can $I$ be of service. And if not, then it's over.
Q. So are you saying that your definition of distress is anything that's not normal?
A. To me that appears not normal. My definition of distress is the physical manifestation of what is probably internal distress. Distress in the form of medical emergency or mental health. The things that stress may manifest itself in things that are not so-called normal.
Q. And so how you determine whether someone is in distress is by -- how did you put it?
A. Departures from the norm.
Q. So a lot of things can be departures from the norm, right?
A. Yes.
Q. They don't all mean that a person is in distress, right?
A. That's right.
Q. If you saw a person dancing on the corner, that would be a departure from norm, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you assume that that person is in distress?
A. No.
Q. Would you have a conversation with that person?
A. Not necessarily.
Q. What are the other ways you determine whether someone is in distress?
A. Someone -- I don't make an observation that appears to be departure from the norm. And, of course, context matters.

It would be -- someone may say, I'm in distress, I need your help. It doesn't always happen like that.
Q. So we can agree that departures from the norm are not always signs of distress?
A. We can agree on that.
Q. When you see someone who -- who departs from the norm in the way that you think they might be in distress, what do you do next?
A. I consider the context of that departure,
and in the event that I think that based on context that I'm going to speak to that person, I'll attempt to -- I'll attempt to speak to them to ascertain if they are, in fact, in distress or not.
Q. And is this -- were you trained on community care interactions?
A. Yes.
Q. How were you trained on them?
A. At the Academy level there's conversations about patrol procedures, and one of those patrol procedure mindsets is the community caretaking mindset.
Q. And what were you trained to do in these interactions?
A. I've kind of already said it.

To revisit it, it's recognize people who may be in distress and have a non-adversarial conversation with them to determine if that is, in fact, the case.

And if it is, offer them services. And if they would like access to those services, facilitate referral.

If they care not to and there's no violation occurring and no other concerns to continue that interaction, then be on your way.
Q. And how were you trained -- in your training were you trained on how to recognize distress?
A. We're trained to recognize distress, yes.
Q. And how were you trained to recognize distress?
A. The way people look, the way they may be behaving.
Q. Were you told the types of ways people can look or behave?

Let's start with the way people look. What were you told are -- about the ways people look that might be signs of distress?
A. It would be tough for me to talk about my training from 2006 because $I$ really would be guessing about what I remember I was taught, so I'd rather not do that. I can talk about where my experience has taken me, but it would be hard for me to say who told me what in 2006. That would be disingenuous.
Q. Do you remember anything of the training in terms of what you were told people looked like when they were in distress?
A. There's -- there's macro ideas here about the use of profanity, being loud, being aggressive, taking aggressive postures, throwing things, just
generally, not necessarily arriving to a disorderly level but people that look like they are, probably categorized something informally like having a bad day and so, therefore, your judgment based on context if that requires a police intervention or not.
Q. And in addition to how people look, you talked about behaviors. Other than what you just mentioned, are there particular behaviors you were trained are the types of behaviors that would show signs of distress?
A. I think people having an argument, for example. That doesn't necessarily mean I'm going to talk to them about their argument, but based on context, I'm seeing body language/behavior that it looks like it may be escalating by way of posture, then that would be context that I would want to intervene.
Q. And when you say "escalating", escalating to what?
A. Escalating to where a crime could occur.
Q. In terms of community care motor vehicle stops, would you say it's necessary for people to be in distress to justify that stop?

MR. MESSINA: Objection; form.
THE WITNESS: Could you ask the question
a different way, just to make sure I understand it?

BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. Making a community care stop, what is required for you to make that stop?
A. Right, so I -- based on what I've -- go ahead.
Q. Let me rephrase.
A. Yes.
Q. What level of distress is required for you to make that stop?
A. I think it's the -- if we're talking about a motor vehicle stop, it's about driver behavior and, also, the context of the behavior.
Q. We can agree that there are many types of -- we can agree that people experience stress on a daily basis, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Most people get stressed from various things, yes?
A. Yes.
Q. And you've on the road, I'm sure, witnessed people get stressed out by driving alone, right?
A. Yes.
Q. When people -- but being stressed does not -- seeing someone who's stressed out, that wouldn't be enough to conduct a community care stop, right?
A. No.

I mean, my eyeballs are about to float out of my head. Can I go to the bathroom? Can we just take literally three minutes? Is that okay?
(A recess was taken from 10:06 a.m. to 10:10 a.m.)

BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. Mr. Riggen, when I say "stress" what do you think I mean?

When I -- rephrase that.
When I say "stress" what does stress mean to you?
A. When I hear "stress" I think about cortisole release in the body leading to perhaps increased blood pressure and its spinoff health effects and things that maybe cloud judgment and create -- create conflict in the form of not receiving language clearly or processing language clearly, and distress is in response to environmental stimuli and has physical manifestations.
Q. And how does that differ from distress?
A. I think in the way that $I$ think of them, I think that distress is the physical manifestation of it. So someone who is in distress, that stress has reached a toxic level where it starts to blow over and have observable effects.
Q. So it would have to -- so it's stress that reaches a level that it becomes so toxic the person is exhibiting physical signs of that stress, is that what you're saying?
A. That's how I -- that's how I would use those terms, yes.
Q. And to get to a toxic level the stress would have to be extreme?
A. No, not necessarily.
Q. Are you familiar with the definition, the common definition of distress?
A. No.
Q. I'm going to show you the Cambridge English dictionary of distress.
(The witness was shown something on Attorney Diaz's cellphone.)
Q. Do you see the definition there?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you read it for me, please?
A. A feeling of extreme worry, sadness, or
pain.
Q. Do you agree with that definition?
A. I'm not in a position to disagree with it, no.
Q. You don't disagree with it?
A. No.
Q. And when you see someone exhibiting a feeling of extreme worry, sadness, or pain how do you approach them?
A. I may not approach them.
Q. If you do, how do you approach them?
A. If it's able to be done via a non-adversarial, noncustodial action, it's usually, Hey, are you okay?
Q. And you've said you've done mental health calls, right?
A. Yes.
Q. How many, would you say?
A. It would be tough for me to quantify.
Q. Is it ten? Is it more than 20?
A. It's -- it would be hard for me to quantify because it would be impossible to know what volume of calls have roots in mental illness.
Q. Well, not mental illness, but you said --
A. Mental health, excuse me, but I wouldn't
be able to know, you know.
Q. Well, you said you have been on mental health calls?
A. Yes.
Q. Right?

So when you've been on the calls you're thinking of, how have you responded to those people generally?
A. Those are -- those are conducted a little bit differently. We're talking about a reactive call for service, so I introduce myself, let them know the reason for the interaction, and it usually involves an offer of referral.
Q. And when you first approach the person what is your -- what does your first interaction look like?
A. It's usually it's an introduction and an explanation of why we're interacting with each other.
Q. And have you ever responded to someone who you believed was in mental health crisis?
A. Yes.
Q. And would you say you've done that many times?
A. Yes.
Q. And when you're responding to someone in
a mental health crisis how do you first interact with them?
A. Like I said, I introduce myself and tell them the reason for the conversation.
Q. And what are you trained to do when you first interact with someone in a mental health crisis?
A. I think it's just that. It's make sure that they are -- make sure that they are safe, make sure that we're safe and responding professionals are safe, and then a determination if a referral is necessary, if they're safe to be left by themselves, or if a -- if a non or involuntary -- involuntary continuation of custody is necessary.

All these determinations are made, and then depending on what level we're at we go down that road, and otherwise the interaction ends once everything is deemed to be stable.
Q. And if you approached someone in a mental health crisis and they are escalated, what do you -how do you respond to that?
A. If they're escalated it's a sign to me that they are not -- that they are under stress or exhibiting those signs that has those negative -negative nervous system impacts by way of judgment and memory and processing, so my goal is to deescalate
them, try to get them to return to more of a -- more of a calm state.
Q. And that's what you're trained to do, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you ever conducted -- other than for Mr. Bombard have you ever conducted -- or rephrase that.

Have you conducted motor vehicle stops based upon your community care function?
A. Yes.
Q. When?
A. I couldn't tell you specifically.
Q. How many times have you done that?
A. Estimating? I'll say more than ten times, but I couldn't tell you how many.
Q. So it's more than ten, yes?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it less than 20?
A. I would estimate it's probably more than 20 but, like I said, we get to a certain number here, I would be guessing.
Q. And can you give me some examples of the motor vehicle stops you did based upon your community care function?
A. A car pulled off alongside the road, the passenger door opened, and someone appeared to be getting sick.
Q. What do you mean, getting sick?
A. Vomiting.
Q. Out of the car?
A. Yes.
Q. What's another example?
A. Another example is observing an argument taking place and asking -- you know, essentially I'm trying to ascertain if this is -- if this is okay or not. I should say if criminal or not.
Q. You saw an argument in a vehicle?
A. An argument, yes.
Q. So you saw two people arguing inside a vehicle?
A. Right, so pulling up next to somebody at a light and looking over and seeing them arguing and then saying, well, okay, that's not a crime, but I'm concerned that it could escalate to a crime so I'm going to check in real quick.
Q. Why were you concerned it could escalate to a crime?
A. Because people when they are engaged in an argument don't always escalate to violence, but I
don't know them. I don't know if they're capable of that. I think anyone could be, I suppose, and so it was simply a non-adversarial check to make sure it's not heading in that direction. I think it's a police mandate.
Q. Do you have other examples of when you've stopped, conducted motor vehicle stops based upon your community care function?
A. There have been examples of vehicles that were slow moving or stopped along a roadway but not arising to say a slow-moving vehicle statute or stopped along a roadway, not in the aforementioned medical situation where $I$ may pull up alongside them and just talk to them.

I had one two days ago. Car was stopped, signaled, signaled to be over. And I pulled up alongside, and I asked if she was okay. She said, Yeah, I was just looking at my phone for directions, and that was the end of the encounter. Examples like that.
Q. That last one, where was that?
A. In Milton.
Q. Was it on a main road?
A. Define "main road".
Q. Where was it in Milton?
A. It was on a -- on Cobble Hill Road.
Q. And other than Mr. Bombard have you ever conducted a community care motor vehicle stop because someone signaled to you?
A. Yes.
Q. And can you tell me about those -- how many times would you say that was?
A. I know that it's happened, but I couldn't quantify.
Q. And so explain those stops to me.
A. Hey -- hey, I need to talk to you. Like that would be the way that would go.
Q. So somebody --
A. Basically they pull me over.
Q. So somebody spoke to you?
A. Yes.
Q. They asked you for helped?
A. Or signaled, waved to me.
Q. They waved to you?
A. Waved to me, like come over, yes.
Q. Any other times someone has gestured to you and you conducted a community care stop?
A. Not -- nothing that would be different than those examples that I can recall.
Q. Do Vermont state troopers enforce parking
violations?
A. I would say generally not. I don't -- I presume there have been calls where cars were parked along the road and may be creating a traffic hazard so a trooper may have responded to see if that's true, but that's not -- that's not generally what we do.
Q. So I think you just gave me one example of a potential parking violation that a trooper would enforce if there was a call that a roadway was being blocked by a car, right?
A. Right.
Q. Are there any other examples you can think of?
A. None that would be common, no.
Q. Is there a policy in the Vermont State Police about enforcing parking regulations?
A. I'm not sure.
Q. You're not aware of one?
A. Yeah, I'm not saying there isn't one, but I wouldn't be able to cite it here.
Q. Did you ever receive any training on enforcing parking regulations?
A. Probably not. I say probably not. I don't remember receiving it.
Q. Do you think you probably didn't?
A. I think I probably did not.
Q. And have you enforced parking regulations before?
A. Yes.
Q. When?
A. I'm thinking.

I wouldn't be able to put a date on it, but the kinds of parking regulations that I would have a conversation with somebody would be like parking in a handicapped spot.
Q. And why does that one stand out to you?
A. Because when I hear you say "parking regulations" what I'm thinking about, somebody whose meter has expired, so that's what $I$ think of. And so I separate that from a vehicle that is -- a disabled vehicle on the interstate, for example. I don't think of that as a parking regulation.

I think of a handicapped -- handicapped parking issue as not a parking meter issue. I feel like that's an access issue for people who may need it.
Q. And so I want to -- I appreciate you letting me know how we're thinking about parking regulations here. I guess what I'm thinking about is a car stopped in any way that is unlawful. You know,
a vehicle, empty or not, stopped in any way that is not lawful or potentially unsafe.

Is that fair?
A. Yes, so you and I have a different definition of a parking regulation. What you're describing is unlawful stopping or standing. That may have an encounter with me, yes.
Q. Okay. And so taking your definition, unlawful stopping or standing, you have enforced that before?
A. Yes, probably.
Q. Enforced those regulations before?
A. Yes.
Q. And what are the types of situations where you would enforce that law?
A. A disabled vehicle on the interstate. I guess that is technically not allowed. You can't stop on the interstate barring certain reasons.

I think of the aforementioned handicapped thing. I've had conversations with people about that.

There may be times where, like I said, a vehicle is stopped along a roadway, it's running, there's nobody around it. I might look into that and see what -- why and what and how and so forth. I can't give you an example necessarily, but these are
again ideas that -- general concepts that I would be involved in.
Q. And have you personally witnessed these types of violations?
A. Yes.
Q. And how did you respond to them?
A. Sometimes they were non-custodially, and sometimes they were with blue lights.
Q. And people were in these cars, is what you're saying?
A. Sometimes they were.
Q. And sometimes you -- when you say "non-custodially" what does that mean?
A. Rolling, driving alongside the driver's window and looking over at them and having a conversation, kind of across our two cars would be a noncustodial encounter.

Or a car stopped along the road idling or just parked but doesn't seem to belong there for whatever the context of the environment is. I may or may not have my blue lights on, and in which case making a seizure or not a seizure, I understand that, and just looking around, investigating, ascertaining if there's something wrong or otherwise nefarious.
Q. And what do you -- assuming there's
nothing else nefarious going on what do you tell the people in the car?
A. I tell them why I've interacted with them, what the concern was, and it usually ends the encounter.
Q. Do you tell them to move?
A. It depends what their reason is for being there.
Q. When you find vehicles that are empty -or let me back up.

Have you found -- have you found violations of these kind of parking, standing, stopping violations where the car is empty?
A. Yes.
Q. Meaning there's no driver?
A. Uh-huh (affirmative). Yes.
Q. And no passengers?
A. Yes.
Q. In those situations what do you do?
A. If the car is not posing a traffic hazard or -- or a -- if a -- it's not on a land or private driveway or something or somebody has asked us to remove it, just let it stay there.
Q. For how long?
A. I would say indefinitely. I might put it
on my to-do list to check on it later, and then I don't always check on it later. I get busy or something, but it didn't pose a hazard. That's why it was allowed to stay.
Q. I want to talk a little bit about arrests. You said earlier you've conducted, I think it was 800 arrests; is that right?
A. Estimated, right.
Q. Ballpark. I won't hold you to --
A. Thank you.
Q. -- being under penalty of perjury for that one; don't worry.

And you've -- so when I say "arrests" does that include custodial arrests and noncustodial arrests?
A. That includes any time $I$ issue somebody a citation for court.
Q. So it includes the times when you bring them to the station, and it includes the times that you've cited them to court?
A. Right.
Q. Is there a distinction between how you -between when you arrest someone, meaning bringing them to the station at least, versus when you cite them to court?
A. My -- my general patrol procedure there is to -- if it's a Rule 3 exception, I'll generally continue custody. And if it's not, then it will be cited and released.
Q. So if there's an exception to Rule 3 exception, you'll continue custody to bring the person to the barracks, is that what you're saying?
A. Yes.
Q. And if there's not, you will generally just give the person a citation and let them go on their way?
A. Yes.
Q. Outside of -- and so let's make this easy on ourselves here. A moment ago you said generally you would -- generally if a person -- if a violation does not meet an exception to Rule 3, you would cite the person to court and not bring them into custody; is that right?
A. That's right.
Q. And I want to just explore the word "generally" a little bit.

So are there times when -- so how would you decide whether you would -- outside the Rule 3 exceptions, whether you would cite them to court or bring them into custody?
A. So you're talking about times when I could legally continue custody but chose to do that or not do that and what would be the reason?
Q. Correct.
A. I would say the operational mindset that I have in a situation where $I$ am allowed to continue custody, do I do that; does this person continue or may they pose a continued harm or threat or continued behavior.
Q. Are there any other criteria you use?
A. If it's outside just the legal can or can't, if there's discretion in there it's that. It's does this -- do I need to continue custody for this behavior to stop?
Q. And that's the only criteria you use?
A. I would say that's the -- for me I presume there are other variables there, right, but that would be my primary question $I$ would ask myself.
Q. And I want to talk a little bit about affidavits. You did an affidavit of probable cause in this case, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you've done -- how many affidavits of probable cause do you think you've written in your career?
A. Probably as many arrests and then -- and then some, sure.
Q. Before you prepare an affidavit what do you do?
A. Can you be more specific?
Q. Sure. And so you arrest someone or you cite them to court, and you're required to prepare an affidavit of probable cause, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And that gets sent to the State's Attorney's Office, right?
A. Yes.
Q. So -- and, you know, an affidavit of probable cause can be lengthy if they write everything that happened basically, right?
A. Yes.
Q. So to determine what you're going to write what's the process you go through?
A. So it's a review of the evidence that I have, and that evidence often -- often or may often include cruiser video. So I'll review the video to see if it -- to make sure that my recollection of the events are as I believe that they are.

And if it's not, then I would want to make a correction as necessary to -- before the
affidavit were actually to be filed or to make sure that I thought was going on was actually going on vis-a-vis the available evidence review.
Q. And is there anything -- would you do anything different if it was a car stop arrest versus some other kind of arrest?
A. Different? How?
Q. In what you would do to prepare your affidavit of probable cause?
A. No.
Q. And is there any difference between -- in your process for preparing an affidavit of probable cause between when you arrest someone and put them into custody versus when you cite them to court?
A. No.
Q. Other than reviewing the evidence is there else you do before you prepare the affidavit of probable cause?
A. No, not that I can think of.
Q. Do you talk to colleagues?
A. Well, that would be -- that goes into reviewing the evidence. Like if there were other people present, making sure that they saw what I saw or if we disagree, what did you see, and then we'll figure out what -- what -- you know, what the outcome
is.
Q. And do you talk to the -- do you ever talk to the State's Attorney's Office or anyone in the State's Attorney's Office before you prepare the affidavit of probable cause?
A. Sometimes.
Q. When would you talk to them?
A. So I -- if I had probable cause for an arrest and that arrest was effected, and prior to citation in some situations I would make sure that the State's Attorney supported the charge before I issued the citation so I wouldn't inconvenience the suspect.
Q. You say "inconvenience the suspect", what do you mean by that?
A. I mean issuing a citation that the State's Attorney wouldn't support the charge.
Q. If you believed you had probable cause, why would you call the State's Attorney to see if they would support the charge?
A. Because sometimes -- so decisions may be made because probable cause exists, and the facts and the contents of the encounter required me to act in a certain way and so, therefore, the decision to arrest was made based on what I believe was going on at the time.

And then once the situation was
stabilized I may, in atypical situations, reach out to the State's Attorney and say, Here's what happened, would you like me to cite this person, or would you want me to send it down for review or do you want me to disregard it altogether?
Q. Is that because the State's Attorney might say -- so the State's Attorney might say, We're not going to pursue that case?
A. That's right.
Q. And you want to call and check with them to see if they want to pursue it or not?
A. Yes.
Q. When you're checking with them do you talk about the affidavit of probable cause?
A. I talk about elements that would be in the affidavit of probable cause, but it hasn't necessarily been written yet.
Q. Has anyone in the Franklin County State's Attorney's Office ever advised you on what to include in an affidavit of probable cause?
A. Not that I recall.
Q. You said sometimes you review the cruiser cam footage; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Before completing your affidavit of probable cause?
A. Yes.
Q. Are there times when you would not do that?
A. No.
Q. So you always review the cruiser cam footage before writing your affidavit of probable cause?
A. Yes.
Q. And so you did that in this case for the affidavit of probable cause you wrote about the stop and arrest of Mr. Bombard?
A. Yes.

MR. DIAZ: All right. Can we take ten
minutes?
MR. MESSINA: Sure.
(A recess was taken from 10:39 a.m. to
10:50 a.m.)
BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. Mr. Riggen, you said that to determine when you are going to arrest someone as opposed to cite them, that the only distinction is -- or, I'm sorry, let me back up.

Outside of the Rule 3 context and the

Rule 3 exceptions, you said that when you have discretion to either arrest someone or cite them to court, the only criteria you look at is whether they pose a continuing harm; is that right?
A. There may be other weights that I put on the decision, but at the top of the list is, is this going to be continued or not, yes.
Q. And how do you define -- like how do you determine whether something that's continuing or going?
A. I think the variable that led us to the moment of the arrest matter, the context of the arrest itself, as in compliant or otherwise, and then the presence or absence of any other victims or make sure that they're safe.
Q. So you said the presence of victims, right? Presence and safety of victims, right?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. Whether they are going to -- whether they were compliant in the arrest?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was the third one?
A. The variables of what led us to the arrest decision in the first place.
Q. Well, I guess I'm just wondering, what
would the variables that led up to the decision matter for behavior -- for determining whether the behavior is continuing or not?
A. If there are -- if the arrest decision culminated because this has been ongoing, that's different than if it was a one-off, which is to say -I'm trying to think of an example.

Somebody who is harassing another. Did they call in once and hang up, or have they been harassing them over the course of a day?
Q. So if something has happened numerous times and you -- and you think it's likely to happen again without you taking them into custody --
A. That's right.
Q. And in that case they would, of course, be a victim, right?
A. In that case, yes.
Q. You also mentioned that you -- you said you always watch cruiser cam videos before writing your affidavit of probable cause. Do you watch them while you're writing it or before?
A. It's before and then sometimes during, in case my notes are incomplete.
Q. Why would you only sometimes watch it while you're writing the affidavit of probable cause?
A. Because sometimes I think my notes were complete; that I didn't miss anything.
Q. So it just depends on what you think?
A. Right.
Q. You said you watched the cruiser cam video of your stop and arrest of Mr . Bombard on February 9th, 2018, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You watched that this morning?
A. Yes.
Q. So do you remember, or I guess can you describe the weather on February 9th, 2018?
A. It was cloudy but otherwise -- cloudy and cold but otherwise dry.
Q. How cold would you say?
A. I don't remember.
Q. When you watched the video did you see the -- you could see your breath when you were talking?
A. I didn't remark on that.
Q. You didn't notice it?
A. No.
Q. How cold would you say it was?
A. I have no idea.
Q. Would you be surprised if it was in the

20s that day?
A. No.
Q. When you were -- so the initial stop was initiated when you were driving, I believe south on Main Street in St. Albans, right?
A. North.
Q. North. You were driving north;

Mr. Bombard was driving south?
A. Yes.
Q. And you passed each other?
A. Yes.
Q. This isn't on the video, so do you remember -- what do you remember seeing when you passed Mr. Bombard?
A. I remember a display of what looked like the operator and his middle finger.
Q. And before that where were you going?
A. I don't believe I was heading anywhere specific.
Q. Were you just on patrol?
A. Yes.
Q. How long had you been on patrol at that point?
A. I don't remember the time of the stop, so I'm not sure.
Q. I'll represent to you that the stop was around noon --
A. Okay.
Q. -- that day. Does that help you understand how long you might have been on the road at that point?
A. Yes.
Q. How long do you think you were on the road?
A. About four or five hours.
Q. Do you know how fast you were going?
A. I don't.
Q. You know there's a traffic light at the intersection of Lower Newton and North Main Street, right?
A. Yes.
Q. When you saw Mr. Bombard's car were you already through -- you were already heading north and had passed through the traffic light there, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you remember if you had come from -like did you make a left off of Lower Newton to get onto North Main, or were you just driving on North Main?
A. My recollection is $I$ was driving on North

Main.
Q. So you were driving on North Main. Are you looking for anything when you're driving on patrol typically?
A. Yes.
Q. What are you looking for?
A. Violations. People who may need my help.
Q. Do you look at every car that's passing you?
A. It's not every; it's a lot of them.
Q. So when you're driving you're typically looking at the traffic going the other way?
A. With regard to making sure that I'm driving safely, yes.
Q. I hope so, as a traffic safety officer.
A. I was going to say that exactly.
Q. So when you're driving north on North Main, Mr. Bombard is driving south, when did you first notice Mr. Bombard?
A. As we were passing each other.
Q. So was his car -- so I'm just trying to get a sense of where the cars were when you first noticed him. Was his car ahead of yours or right next to it?
A. I remember it being right as we met each
other.
Q. So they were right next to each other?
A. Yes.
Q. So you turned left and looked into his car?
A. No. I meant as we met each other so hood to hood, passing each other.
Q. Okay. And why don't you tell me what you saw.
A. Just saw the male operator with what I believe was his middle finger extended.
Q. And where -- like can you describe where he -- what it looked like to you?
A. It looked like his hands were on the steering wheel. It looked like he had put his hands up above the steering wheel and displayed it as -which got my attention, and then he continued as he drove by, and that was it.
Q. Like he put -- like his hands were on the steering wheel. Did he turn his fist around --
A. Yes.
Q. -- as you were coming towards him?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And did he -- as you passed each other did he look at you?
A. I don't remember.
Q. Did he turn towards you?
A. I don't remember.
Q. What do you remember about when you passed each other what you saw?
A. It was his left hand, and it was as you demonstrated during the audio record. You
demonstrated it was the display of the middle finger through the windshield.

And I looked, kind of at that 45, 40-degree angle, and as he went by just remarked -remarked that it was happening and then kept driving.

MR. SARACHAN: Excuse me, I'm not taking the depo. I just didn't hear the last thing. Would you just read back what?
(The record was read back by the court reporter as follows:
"ANSWER: It was his left hand, and it was as you demonstrated during the audio record. You demonstrated it was the display of the middle finger through the windshield.

And I looked, kind of at that 45,
40-degree angle, and as he went by just remarked -- remarked that it was happening and then kept driving.")

BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. So did you see Mr. Bombard's face at this point?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you recognize him?
A. No.
Q. You had never seen him before?
A. No.
Q. Did you -- what did his face look like?
A. A guy wearing glasses.
Q. Did you see any emotion on his face?
A. No.
Q. Just a blank -- blank look?
A. Unremarkable.
Q. After you passed each other what did you do next?
A. I kept driving north.
Q. And did you take notice of the make and model of the car?
A. Yes.
Q. And as it says in your affidavit, you turned around, right?
A. Yes.
Q. How far -- how far did you drive before you turned around?
A. I don't know the distance. Time was probably 15 or 20 seconds after I had seen it.
Q. Did you look -- as you passed each other did you look into the car?
A. No, I don't remember doing that. It was -- sorry.
Q. No, please.
A. There was windshield glare and so, like I said, there was a guy wearing glasses. Couldn't determine anything else other that, other than the display.
Q. And the display was remarkable to you, you said, I believe?
A. It got my attention.
Q. You remarked on it, you said?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. Wouldn't it make sense that you would turn as the car was passing you to look into it?
A. I didn't want to engage the person actually, so I didn't continue. I didn't continue any -- best to describe I didn't engage him by continuing to look at him.
Q. Why didn't you want to engage him?
A. I didn't want to participate in what his display was. I didn't want to participate in giving
him any -- the satisfaction of any response or even eye contact with me.
Q. And that's because the gesture you thought you saw, you recognized it?
A. Yes.
Q. And it was a -- he put up his left hand and gave you the middle finger; that's what you saw?
A. Yes.
Q. And what does that mean to you?
A. It's a sign of displeasure.
Q. Would you call it a -- well, I believe in the affidavit you called it a negative gesture; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Does giving the middle finger to someone have a specific meaning?
A. I think it's probably in the eye of the beholder. The eye of the issuer, I should say. I'm not sure it has a specific defined --
Q. Has anyone ever given you the middle finger other than Mr. Bombard?
A. Yes.
Q. What do you think they meant?
A. Something negative.
Q. Anything specific?
A. I think it could be anything under the umbrella of negative.
Q. Have you ever given someone the finger?
A. Yes.
Q. And what did you mean to communicate when you did that?
A. Well, if I did it, it was probably in jest so it was in the context of probably a joke with a friend.
Q. And what did you mean to communicate?
A. I'm not looking to be unresponsive. I don't know. For me it would be a sarcastic gesture with a friend because $I$ don't do that stuff in public.
Q. What do you think most people would say when they see someone giving the middle finger?
A. I don't know.
Q. What would they say that means?
A. I don't know.
Q. Do you listen to music?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you ever listen to Kid Rock?
A. Sometimes, yeah.
Q. Did you hear about the -- I don't know if you heard about this, but did you hear about the Vermont woodcarver who carved a middle finger statute
for Kid Rock?
A. Was that for Kid Rock? I've driven by it a bunch of times, yeah.
Q. You've driven by the other statute of the middle finger? I don't remember the town it's in.
A. Westford. Westford, yeah.
Q. What do you think that means when you see it?
A. I -- it seems like somebody is unhappy with somebody else, but I would never -- I don't want to put words in anybody's mouth. I don't know what they intend to say to that person. It just seems like it's a negative thing directed at somebody else. I mean, that's all that $I$ make of it.
Q. Doesn't giving someone the middle finger mean, "Fuck you"?
A. I think it depends on who's issuing it. I really do. I don't think it has a specific this equals that with some finite guardrails.
Q. Whether it's a joke or not, isn't that what it means?
A. I don't know.
Q. So you don't know what the middle finger means?
A. No. I know that it's negative. I know
that one may want to say such things to somebody else, but I would never put the words in their mouth that that's what they're saying. I don't know what they intend to say to somebody when they display it, but I would umbrella it as a negative gesture toward another and what they intend is what they intend.
Q. And when Mr. Bombard showed what you believe to be the middle finger to you what did you think he was saying?
A. I don't think he was happy. That's what I'm thinking to myself. Oh, he's not happy.
Q. Sure. That's not what I'm asking. What did you think he was trying to communicate to you?
A. I think he was trying to communicate that he was not happy. I didn't think to myself what his words were via that gesture. It was simply the emotional state of the person issuing was he is not -this person is not happy.
Q. Not happy with what?
A. With -- I didn't know if it was police or State Police or the government at large. I don't know, but not happy with something that I represent.
Q. So you thought he was telling -- he was telling you that he was not happy with the State

Police by giving you the middle finger?
A. No. I thought that he was saying that he was not happy, either, and I didn't know if it was because of police, the State Police, or the government at large. I didn't go that far. I just said this person is not happy.
Q. Well, something -- you already said that -- you said, right, that you believed he was showing you his middle finger, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Specifically you. And so he was communicating a message to you, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And that message was unhappiness with something related to police or the government, is that what you thought?
A. Probably, yes.
Q. Okay. When your cars passed each other you didn't see any problem with his driving, did you?
A. No.
Q. You didn't see anyone else in the car, right?
A. No.
Q. You didn't have any reason to think there was someone else in the car, right?
A. No.
Q. Did you see Mr. Bombard put his middle finger down?
A. I don't remember if he did or not.
Q. Earlier we talked about the First Amendment, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you said it was about the right to free speech, the right to protest, the right to assemble, and we went over the Vermont State Police policy that talked about what First Amendment activities are, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Do people have a right to be unhappy with the government?
A. Yes.
Q. And do they have a right to express their unhappiness with the government?
A. Yes.
Q. And you work for the Vermont State Police, right?
A. Yes.
Q. That's a part of the Vermont state government, right?
A. Yes.
Q. So didn't Bombard have a right to be unhappy and express his unhappiness with the government to you?
A. Yes.
Q. I think you know what I'm going to ask next. So why did you turn around and stop him?
A. Well, I initially -- initially I didn't. Right? We passed each other. I continued to drive for 15, 20 more seconds.

As I was reflecting on what I had seen and I thought, Doesn't the public want its police to check in on people to make sure that they're okay? And I was reflecting on my experience up to that point, which was I never -- very rarely had ever seen that. Nowadays it's far more common, but now back then it wasn't more common.

But is this worthy of a brief check-in to make sure that this person was okay? I was going through that thought process in my mind as I continued to drive, and that's why I thought, well, I'll check in with him, and so I turned around and went back.
Q. And when you say "check in with him" what do you mean?
A. Stop his vehicle and have a conversation with him.
Q. And so you drove -- you turned around, right?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Correct?
A. Sorry. Yes.
Q. You drove back towards the traffic light at Lower Newton and North Main, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you remember, do you know when you put on the blue lights?
A. Slightly -- just before the Lower Newton intersection.
Q. And when you -- and you watched the video this morning, you said, right, so you saw that you didn't just drive in your lane. You moved into the other lane to get around cars to get up to behind Mr. Bombard's car, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You went into the lane that was supposed to be going in the opposite direction; the northbound lane?
A. Yes.
Q. And then you edged in front of, I think two -- two cars to get behind Mr. Bombard who was stopped at the traffic light, right?
A. Yes.
Q. When you passed Mr. Bombard's car the first time and saw what you thought was a display of the middle finger directed at you what did you feel?
A. Nothing.
Q. Nothing at all?
A. No.
Q. Were you angry?
A. No.
Q. On a scale of -- you felt nothing?

MR. MESSINA: Objection; asked and
answered.
BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. So somebody -- when somebody -- when somebody is unhappy and they express that to you, is your reaction usually to feel nothing?

MR. MESSINA: Objection to form.
Attorney Sarachan.
MR. SARACHAN: I can't talk to him?
MR. MESSINA: All right.
BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. So when somebody expresses that they're unhappy and unhappy with you, is it common that you would feel nothing?
A. I don't tend to have an emotional
response to someone professionally being unhappy with me. I don't usually have an emotional response to that.
Q. Did you have an emotional response to Mr. Bombard's gesture?
A. No.
Q. On a scale of zero to ten, zero being zero, no anger, and ten being apoplectic, how angry were you?
A. Zero.
Q. Were you irritated?
A. No.
Q. Were you upset?
A. No.
Q. Were you annoyed?
A. No.
Q. So going back to before you turned around, you said you were thinking, well -- you said you were thinking something along the lines of wouldn't the people of Vermont want me to check on people, make sure they were okay; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And why did you -- why did that come to mind?
A. Why did it come to mind?

Well, so like the original gesture itself was remarked upon but elicited no emotional response to me. I said, Yeah, this guy is not happy. I kept driving, really informal, blowing it off.

Then I started thinking about, Hold on a second. What if he is in some form of crisis right now? Does the public want its capable guardians to not respond in some non-adversarial way to check in on that crisis before it mushrooms into something else?

So I had that kind of -- that societal morays type of dialogue with myself. I said, Well, this is -- this I think is what the public needs its capable guardians to do, and so that's what I did.
Q. So you said to yourself what if he's in some kind of crisis?
A. Right.
Q. So you had an emotion?
A. So it's the -- so the emotion would be -perhaps there was one under the fear category, of the afraid category, and like a low-level afraid would be a level of concern. So I suppose I did have an emotion, yes.
Q. Now, you asked yourself what if he is having a crisis. What made you think he might be having a crisis?
A. That up to that point, as I said a moment ago, that that type of gesture was fairly foreign to me. I didn't see it in a lot of public interactions, and so the context of the gesture and where the gesture had occurred was important to me.
Q. I'm sorry, did you say the gesture was foreign to you?
A. In police public interactions I hadn't seen it very much leading up to that moment.
Q. But you had seen it in your personal life many times?
A. Yes.
Q. When you saw Mr. Bombard you didn't see him crying, did you?
A. No.
Q. You didn't see him -- you said his face was unremarkable, right?
A. Yes.
Q. He wasn't showing emotion on his face, correct?
A. Right. I also said it was unremarkable. It was hard to see because of windshield glare.
Q. But you didn't see him showing any emotion?
A. I was not able to see it, right.
Q. You didn't know if he was having any emotional response whatsoever?
A. That's right.
Q. And so I want to go back. We talked a little bit earlier about the one stop you did that went up to the Vermont Supreme Court. You remember State v. Button, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you remember the circumstances of the stop for that case?
A. I do.
Q. Did you read the decision of the Vermont Supreme Court on that case?
A. I did.
Q. When was the last time you read it?
A. It's been years.
Q. What did you learn from that decision?
A. What I learned was -- here's what my recollection of the decision, without having read it for a few years. My take-away was that this was not to be -- it was stated in the decision that this was not to be taken to the larger context of the community caretaking; that the public still needs its police to engage in community caretaking activities.

The decision was narrowed to the context
of this particular stop; that they thought that the operator needed to gesture to the police in order to begin the community caretaking conversation. And so, therefore, simply slow driving by itself and pulling oneself over by itself in that narrow decision was not under the community caretaking doctrine.

And the Court was, my recollection is, explicit in that this must not be translated to other community caretaking doctrines. It's simply this moment didn't satisfy it.
Q. So you read that case as applying to that exact situation and no other, is that what you're telling me?
A. My recollection is that that was -- and, again, if you presented the decision and said here's what they said, my recollection sitting here was that the Court seemed concerned that this would erode the community caretaking at large, and they wanted to express that it was -- the community caretaking function is an essential function of police, but in this case the operator didn't gesture any -- any need for intervention and, therefore, he should not have been intervened upon. They needed to have some sort of outward gesture is what they wrote. That's my recollection.
Q. Did you learn anything else from that decision other than what you've already talked about?
A. That's all that $I$ recall.
Q. Do you recall the Court in State v. Button saying, quote, In the absence of any specific indicia of distress and given that the cars in these cases were safely and lawfully parked in places that are needed --
(There was a phone interruption.)
MR. SARACHAN: I'm sorry.
MR. DIAZ: I'm going to start again.
MR. SARACHAN: Please.
BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. In the absence of specific indicia of distress and given that the cars in these cases were safely and lawful parked in places designated for such parking and at times and locations that did not suggest distress, law enforcement concern for the well-being of the occupants was not sufficient to justify the intrusion of a seizure.

Do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. And what do you think qualifies as a specific indicia of distress?
A. I think it could be one slumped over a
wheel. I think it could be some outward motion of, you know, Hey, help me, I'm having a heart attack.

I also think -- and we talked about this at length earlier in our conversation, about when stress is simmering, percolating, boiling over, and again I understand my definition, when I use the -when I use word "stress" it doesn't jive with the Oxford, Cambridge, whatever dictionary you showed me.

Distress is something that departs from the norm, but it needs to be something that one can see or hear or something more tangible than simply a vehicle pulled over.
Q. And, I mean, a person being in distress is, I think you said, your definition actually did align with the Cambridge dictionary, which is a feeling of extreme worry, sadness, or pain; isn't that right?
A. I think it's right. I missed out on the connection.
Q. I just asked the question. Doesn't your -- your definition of distress align with the Cambridge dictionary definition, which was an outward showing of a feeling of extreme worry, sadness, or pain?
A. Right.
Q. That's right, right?
A. Yeah, if that's what it said, yes.
Q. And so -- and you've told me earlier about some situations where you might see something in a car, be concerned, and you would be concerned that there might be distress and you would pull alongside the car to take a look, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Or you would -- maybe you would follow that car for a while, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You don't automatically stop every car just because you have some concern about the people's well-being, right?
A. Depends on the context.
Q. By the way, you don't always do that, right?
A. I don't always?
Q. Stop a car because you are concerned there might be someone in distress?
A. I think if the -- I do -- I do always act if the actions or display syncs up with context and environment. I do think I don't have a discretion to not act upon that.
Q. Well, you said earlier, you talked about
two people having an argument. You took a look at them in the car first. You didn't pull them over automatically?
A. There's a little bit of nuance missed there, I think.
Q. Fair enough. In terms of specific indicia of distress, what was the specific indicia of distress in this case for Mr. Bombard that you thought required you to, as you said, check in on him?
A. It was the departure of what I had believed to be normal up to that point, departure from the norm, coinciding with the environment where it occurred.

Could I confer with Jeff for a minute?
MR. SARACHAN: Yes, you can.
(A recess was taken from 11:29 a.m. to 11:33 a.m.)

BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. Other than Mr. Bombard showing what you believed to be the middle finger to you, what led you to believe that he -- what led you to wonder whether he was in distress or not?
A. It was the environment where it occurred.
Q. What do you mean when you say "the environment where it occurred"?
A. The location.
Q. What about that location led you to believe that he was in -- might be in some kind of distress?
A. The -- the signal itself was, like I said, in that time was unusual but freedom of his expression, I didn't have any reaction to it at all. And then when $I$ was thinking over 10, 15, 20 seconds after he and I passed each other, I was reflecting on where this had occurred, and I remembered that it was that literal intersection a few years before where a woman had been shot and killed because of a road rage incident that had precipitated from a similar type of encounter.

I remember standing at that gym with the caution tape and dealing with motorists. The guy was taken into custody, and the trooper was off duty and stopped. He thought was a mass shooting at rush hour, and I was like, my God, this is where this happened all these years ago and here I am with a moment, perhaps, to intervene. Not aggressively, not even assertively, just not adversarially, just to check in. Because if someone had checked in on that guy, would that woman still be alive? It was the same benign type of thing. That was my thought. What does
the public need from its guardians? And that's what I was reflecting on, and that's why it took me 10, 15, 20 seconds.

It wasn't because of the gesture in the vacuum. It was the gesture where it occurred and what my experience had been three years prior, being one of the first troopers on the scene of that, and that's what I was reflecting on.
Q. So it was something that came to your mind from a previous event. Was the middle finger involved in that event?
A. I believe it was, yes.
Q. In what way?
A. That one motorist was displeased with another motorist and was unhappy, to use my umbrella, about that gesture, and it then mushroomed into the motorists pulling themselves over. And the male who had witnessed the middle finger or witnessed the middle finger in that negativity got out of his car and shot a woman to death in the middle of the road.

And I was thinking in the 10, 15,
20 seconds after I saw Mr. Bombard's middle finger, like what if guy is trolling right now? Like what if he's unhappy and he's looking for a fight? Doesn't the public want someone to check in with him to make
sure that this doesn't end in another Mrs. Alger murder on Main Street in St. Albans in the same intersection, in literally the same place, and that was my thought.

I thought I know he can do this by way of expression, but doesn't the community caretaking doctrine mandate that if a capable guardian is present to intervene, that he or she should?

I said, I think I have to. And that was the delay for the stop because I was going through that thought process in my mind, and then the ultimate decision to intervene with him.
Q. Did you have any reason to think that Mr . Bombard was a danger to others?
A. I didn't know, and that was my concern.
Q. You didn't have any reason to think he was a danger?
A. I didn't have any reason one way or the other.
Q. And so you didn't have any reason to think he was a danger?
A. My concern is being able to rule out things as much as rule things in, and so I wasn't able to rule that out, much like I presumed in my thought process how I don't know if the gentleman who
perpetrated the murder had any overt signs beyond his -- beyond his gesturing and his -- and then ultimately getting out of the car.

So I said this is an unusual action. It feels a lot like it did that day by way of this benign thing that happen. Doesn't and shouldn't somebody intervene?
Q. Is there anything else that leads you to believe that Mr. Bombard might be in distress?
A. No.
Q. So in total it was that he showed you his middle finger, and you had a recollection of a past event with other people; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. By the way, I noticed you have a notebook with you. Is there -- are there notes related to this case in that notebook?
A. This is a prop. There's nothing in here. Something for my hands.
Q. Okay, so there's nothing written in there?
A. No.
Q. Okay. This is a copy of your -(Mr. Diaz and Mr. Sarachan conferring.) (Plaintiff's Exhibit 7 was previously
marked for identification, attached at the end of the original transcript.)

BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. Do you see Exhibit 7 in front of you?
A. Yes.
Q. What is Exhibit 7?
A. It's the affidavit of probable cause related to this case.
Q. And you wrote this, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you show me where in here you mentioned your recollection of the past story that you just relayed to us about what happened at the gym nearby?
A. I don't -- I don't have it in there.
Q. It's not in here?
A. No.
Q. When you do affidavits you take your time with it, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You watch the video from the stop, you said, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You -- clearly from what's in here, you put in your inner thought process and describe it in
the affidavit at times?
A. I don't always go into inner thought process.
Q. But you did here, didn't you?
A. To a certain level, yes.
Q. Just quickly look on Page 2, Paragraph 4. Do you see at the bottom there of Paragraph 4, there's a parentheses?
A. Yes.
Q. And before that, the sentence before that starts, Ultimately I explained to the operator that due to the very uncommon action, I want to be sure that he was, quote, unquote, okay.

Did I read that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And then it starts, open parentheses, Although I did not articulate it to the operator by, quote, unquote, okay, I was referring to him experiencing a mental health crisis, experiencing an excalating despondency or other need that a brief non-adversarial law enforcement encounter could identify and/or resolve, close parentheses.

Did I read that right?
A. Yes, you did.
Q. And this is a description of your inner
thought process, isn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. And so in this affidavit you did include your inner thought process that -- when you were talking, describing what you meant when you were talking to Bombard, right?
A. Yes.
Q. When Mr. -- when you saw Mr. Bombard show what you believe to be the middle finger towards you, did you think he was asking for your help?
A. When I first saw it I believed that he was expressing his unhappiness.
Q. And later did you think he was asking for your help?
A. I wondered if it was a -- an iceberg of an escalating despondency. And so at the top of his consciousness is he saying, Help me? No, I didn't think so, but I'm not sure that people do always cry for help before something happens.
Q. If you look on the first page of your affidavit, it says on Paragraph -- in Paragraph 2, about halfway down it starts with, Although a negative gesture. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Although a negative gesture, I was
concerned that the driver was seeking and needing my attention.

Did I read that right?
A. Yes.
Q. So when he gave you the middle finger you thought he needed your attention; is that right?
A. I'm sorry, ask that again.
Q. When you saw Mr. Bombard give you the middle finger you concluded that he needed your attention, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And when you say he needed your attention what did you mean?
A. This is a 30,000-foot macro concept way above the minutia, which is attention is -potentially serves as intervention; attention in the form of -- in the form of a law enforcement contact.
Q. So you thought he wanted to talk to you?
A. No, that's not what I thought.
Q. Well, but you said, I believe I heard you say you thought he needed -- him needing your attention in your mind was he needed a law enforcement contact?
A. Right, so this is -- I think we're going to combine two themes here. The first is the initial
gesture did not get a reaction from me. I was sensitive to not wanting to engage him at all. I think my earlier comment was something to the effect of not wanting to give him the satisfaction of some type of response.

And then, as I reflected over the 10, 15, 20 seconds that passed, it was somebody needing attention, and needing attention is the form of an escalating despondency potential, as I had experienced a few years prior.
Q. So you didn't think he wanted your attention. You thought you had to give him attention; is that right?
A. Ish. Also, perhaps, needing the attention from me. But whether he wanted it or not, I didn't think he wanted it. I opined or I wondered or pondered if he needed the attention.
Q. Going further from Paragraph 2 right where we left off, you have said, I was unsure if this was a mental health crisis or other need, but I decided that a brief motor vehicle stop to ascertain the well-being of the operator and any passengers was not only prudent but necessary.

Did I read that right?
A. Yes.
Q. We already said you didn't see other passengers; is that right?
A. Right.
Q. Going back to the first part of that sentence, you say, I was unsure if this was a mental health crisis or other need, right?
A. Yes.
Q. I think before you said it could have been; it might not have been, right?
A. Right.
Q. Is there anything short of -- well, let's back up a second.

When you pull someone over, that's a law enforcement action, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it a seizure?
A. Yes.
Q. And under your understanding of the Fourth Amendment, it's a seizure, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And so -- and that's whether it's for a community care purpose or for to investigate traffic violations or criminal activity, right?
A. Right.
Q. Short of pulling Mr. Bombard over, was
there anything else you could have done to cure your uncertainty about whether he was having a mental health crisis or other need?
A. Given that -- given that roadway and not knowing where he was headed, I would say "No".
Q. You drove up right behind him, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Could you have followed him for a while?
A. I don't think that would have been prudent.
Q. Why not?
A. Because I don't know where he was headed. So I'm not sure where, by following him what, if anything, I could have observed regarding -- regarding despondency.

I would have preferred to have pulled up alongside to just look over without any blue lights, therefore not engaging in that seizure but, as I said, the roadway was not designed to allow me to do that.

And returning to that -- returning to that feeling, not of anger but more of concern, it was the sense of that if this is something that he is, as I said before, trolling for a confrontation with somebody, I am not going to follow the person, waiting for him to decide that. I'd rather decide.
Q. If you had -- couldn't you have followed him to a place where you could go up beside him to look into the vehicle?
A. Not knowing where he was going, that stretch of road doesn't afford any opportunity to do that. And, also, with the volume of traffic that was present, I don't think there would have been a way to do that in some reasonable period of time.
Q. Could you have run his license plate and checked police records related to the person who the car was registered to?
A. Those doesn't -- that would not -- no, no.
Q. Why not?
A. That would not have resolved my concern.
Q. Well, if you knew who it was registered to, couldn't you have looked at their -- couldn't you have searched any police reports related to their name?
A. So the answer is sure, as in that potential exists, but that would take some time, digging and reading records. Meanwhile, I'm driving a vehicle, so $I$ wouldn't be in a position to do that.

And then, in addition to that, a name and records wouldn't necessarily absolve a concern, an
acute concern that was developing in that moment.
Q. Well, when you look at -- you have like a, kind of computer screen in your cruiser, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you can look up -- you can, I guess, punch in a name to look up the records on a person, right?
A. Yes.
Q. This is how you search for people if they have warrants and things like that?
A. Yes.
Q. And when you get their license this is what you use?
A. Yes.
Q. When you put in someone's name into that system can you get a list of reports about that person?
A. Yes.
Q. And would that list that pops up tell you what kind of incident it was that led to the report?
A. Not necessarily.
Q. What would it tell you about the incident that led to the report?
A. It would -- it would list it potentially by nature of incident. But the nature of an incident
tells us nothing about what actually the incident could be. And meanwhile, like I said, I'm driving a car so I can't really do that.
Q. And when you say the nature of the incident, can you give me some examples of what it says on the screen?
A. So Jay Diaz, and you see on there, aside from all the humanitarian awards that you've won and all that stuff, DUI, suspicious, family fight. Again, macro concepts that in and of themselves doesn't actually tell us what the incident was.

And so it is not my practice to -- in this type of a concern to learn everything about a driver before I contact them when really these concerns can be mitigated or mediated by a motor vehicle contact.
Q. Would the screen tell you if the person was subject to a welfare check at some point?
A. Yes. And that incident could pop up, yes.
Q. Would -- is there a separate way that the screen would tell you that there was a mental health call of some kind?
A. At that time, knowing that there was a mental health incident name, I think it would be under
welfare check.
Q. And welfare check and mental health call, are they synonymous to you?
A. They feel synonymous, yes.
Q. So it was possible to have run the plate, gotten the name and seen if there were any welfare checks for the person registered for the car, right?
A. I would classify it as possible but not feasible.
Q. A couple times you said -- and we'll go a few more minutes here. A couple times you said you were concerned he might be trolling for a confrontation. What does that mean?
A. I should use more concise or clear language than --
Q. Use your language. That's what's most important.
A. Trolling in the context that I used it in. Somebody is out here with the purpose of -- of creating harm. For the purpose of having conflict I guess is the better way to put it.

When I say "trolling", it's that fishing terminology of putting a line in the water and see what you get.
Q. And what led you to believe that?

Did you think Mr. Bombard was trolling for confrontation?
A. I didn't know. I didn't know what his intention was.
Q. So you didn't know if -- you did think he was trolling for confrontation, or you didn't?
A. I did not know.
Q. And did you see him display the middle finger to anyone else other than you?
A. No.
Q. Do you think he was looking for a confrontation with you?
A. I don't know.
Q. At the time did you think he was looking for a confrontation with you?
A. So at the time I did not know, and I've reflected on that in the years that have passed.
Q. You may not be aware, but we deposed your supervisor, Tara Thomas. You remember her, right?
A. $\quad I$ do.
Q. Your former supervisor, I should say.

Did you talk to her about her deposition?
A. No.
Q. What do you think about Tara Thomas?
A. What do you mean?
Q. Well, in terms -- is she good police?
A. Yes.
Q. Was she a good supervisor?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you trust her?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you think she's a principled police officer?
A. Yes.
Q. Was she on patrol?
A. In her career?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. You're aware of her being on patrol?
A. Yes.
Q. And in terms, as a supervisor -- and she was your supervisor for how many years?
A. Two or three.
Q. Do you think she has good judgment?
A. Yes.
Q. When we spoke to her and asked her about this stop, specifically we asked her whether the stop -- whether it would make sense to -- let me back up a second.

When we asked her about the stop and she
looked at the affidavit, her response to the initial stop was -- was that something was missing. When we asked her about what was missing, she said that there was no traffic violation, and so there shouldn't -she concluded there shouldn't have been a stop.

Why do you think she would say that in this situation that you encountered?
A. I --

MR. MESSINA: I'm going to object because
I think there's a mischaracterization there.
BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. You can answer the question.
A. So you're asking me to suppose what's in her mind when she answered that question?
Q. Yes.
A. I mean, I think she's -- I think that if that's what she said, she is only -- I presume she's speaking only about is this a motor vehicle violation or not, and she's not -- because it's not a motor vehicle violation.
Q. We also asked her whether it made sense that someone would be looking for the assistance of an officer by communicating "Fuck you", and she said, No, that doesn't make sense.

How do you respond to that?
A. I agree with her.

MR. SARACHAN: All right, let's stop there.

MR. DIAZ: Break for lunch; I'm hungry. MR. SARACHAN: Let's take an hour. 1 o'clock.
(Lunch recess taken from 12:00 p.m. to 1:02 p.m.)

BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. Mr. Riggen, we just came back from about an hour break. Did you speak with your attorney during that time?
A. A little bit, yes.
Q. Did you speak about the substance of this deposition?

MR. MESSINA: Objection; privileged.
MR. DIAZ: Well, if he spoke about -- if you gave him advice about the substance of his testimony, of his deposition testimony, it is not privileged.

MR. MESSINA: How is that not privileged? Doesn't that go to the very heart of the relationship?

MR. DIAZ: Well, if you talked to him about how he needs to be testifying, it's
important to how he testifies here.
MR. MESSINA: I see what you're saying. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, we didn't talk like that.

BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. So you didn't speak about the substance of your testimony today?
A. No.
Q. During the break you took earlier today did you speak to Mr. Messina about the substance of your testimony?

MR. MESSINA: I'm going to renew the objection on privilege, but go ahead.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. So we talked earlier about -- we talked about community care stops, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Community care motor vehicle stops, to be clear, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And we looked at the Vermont Supreme

Court review of one of your stops, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And that was State v. Button?
A. Yes.
Q. When you make a community care stop -let me back up.

And we also talked about motor vehicle stops. Generally the policy of the Vermont State Police, and I think you agreed with this, was to -that motor vehicle stops require a probable cause of a motor vehicle violation, a traffic violation, or a criminal -- reasonable suspicion of a crime occurring or serving a community care function.

Does that summarize it, generally?
A. Yes.
Q. And is there a specific standard that you're aware of for a community care stop?
A. Not that I am able to speak to.
Q. Well, traffic violation stops require reasonable suspicion, right?
A. Right.
Q. And motor vehicle stops for suspicion of a crime also requires reasonable suspicion, right?
A. Correct.
Q. When you're doing the community care stop is there a requirement of the reasonable suspicion of distress?
A. I believe that there would have to be some articulable concern about what is going on with a person or a group of people to use that -- to use that concern.
Q. Right.
A. To act on that concern.
Q. And the case said, I think specific indicia of distress, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that what you understand as what would constitute reasonable suspicion to make a community care stop?

MR. MESSINA: Objection as to form. BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. You can answer.
A. Could you just rephrase, please?
Q. Well, I'll repeat the question.

Is that what you understand --
MR. DIAZ: Well, can you actually just repeat back my question?
(The record was read back by the court reporter as follows:
"QUESTION: Is that what you understand as what would constitute reasonable suspicion to make a community care stop?")

THE WITNESS: And that's the specific indicia?

BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. Yes.
A. I suppose, yes.
Q. Going back to your affidavit, I believe you have a copy in front of you, Exhibit 7?

Yes?
A. Yes.
Q. I think we've been over this, but just to be sure, everything that you put in affidavits is truthful, right?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. And you try to be as complete as possible?
A. Yes.
Q. And you put in all the important facts, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you certainly talked about for the initial stop, you included in your affidavit the reason for that stop, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And it was that you saw Mr. Bombard display his middle finger, right?
A. That was among the reasons, yes.
Q. Right. And you said, also, that later on, 20 seconds later I believe, you know, a previous incident came to your mind that resulted in violence in the area related to road rage. Is that a fair --
A. Yes.
Q. -- summary of what you said?
A. Uh-huh (affirmative).
Q. In the same general area, right?
A. It was at that location.
Q. Well, it was at what location?
A. It was at the Lower Newton Road, North Main Street intersection.
Q. Okay. And remind me, do you know the year of when that incident occurred?
A. $\quad 2013$.
Q. So five years before?
A. Like four and a half.
Q. Sure.
A. Three and a half, excuse me. Four and a half, okay.
Q. At least.
A. Sorry.
Q. And you did not include this recollection about this 2013 incident in your affidavit of probable
cause, right?
A. No.
Q. Now, you said earlier that these were the -- the middle finger and this recollection were the two things, put together, that constituted the environment that led you to believe you had to make a stop; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. So if the recollection was so important, why didn't you put it in your affidavit?
A. Well, I referenced it, and that is what Paragraph 4 and those parentheses is referring to; the mental health crisis, the escalating despondency. And a non-adversarial law enforcement encounter was exactly what that day needed in 2013, and that's what I was thinking about when $I$ wrote that.
Q. So you're telling me that what you put in the parentheses here is -- well, tell me where in this parentheses do you talk about the 2013 incident?
A. That is what $I$ was thinking about when $I$ described the basis for the stop.

I don't -- affidavits of probable cause are not every second of everybody's experience and life experience, professional experiences. It is a -it is a summary for probable cause, and that is a
summary of that experience. Like that's what I learned from that event; somebody experiencing mental health crisis, an escalating health despondency that resulted in what occurred in 2013.
Q. You just told me that there were two important facts that led you to stop Mr. Bombard. One was that he showed you his middle finger, and the other was this recollection. You said there were no others.

Why wouldn't you put anything about that recollection in this affidavit?
A. When I wrote this affidavit, although I was very familiar with that -- I'm sorry, what?

MR. SARACHAN: No, I was talking to him. BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. Go ahead.
A. Lost my train of thought, but my affidavits don't include every part of my experience leading up to a moment, and so that is -- I didn't -I made a choice not to reference that incident by name, but that is what that refers to.

It is, I want to make sure he's okay, which is he wasn't that guy experiencing mental health crisis, experiencing escalating despondency and, therefore, in need of a brief, non-adversarial law
enforcement encounter to identify and resolve that incident before it had mushroomed. That's what that refers to. If I didn't reference the incident, then I didn't reference it.

I didn't get any feedback that I should have, and that's it.
Q. Did you write down -- write anything about this incident anywhere else?
A. No.
Q. And what's the date on this affidavit?
A. The date of -- the date of signing the affidavit was February 21st.
Q. When did you write the affidavit?
A. Probably contemporaneous to that, but I don't remember.
Q. Do you think you wrote it that day?
A. I don't remember.
Q. Do you think you might have written it that day?

MR. MESSINA: Objection; asked and answered.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, I don't remember.
BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. Do you usually -- when you write an affidavit do you usually, once it's complete, send it
to the -- for signing that same day?
A. As soon as the affidavit is done I would have it signed, and then I would have it filed.
Q. And how long do you usually take to write an affidavit of probable cause?
A. It's very dependent.
Q. On average.
A. From an hour to a month.
Q. How long did it take you to write this affidavit of probable cause?
A. I don't remember.
Q. Do you think it took you one hour?
A. I don't remember.
Q. Do you think it took you more than a day?
A. I don't remember.
Q. Well, is it possible it took you more than a day to write it?

MR. MESSINA: Objection; asked and answered.

THE WITNESS: I really don't remember.
BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. I'm not asking you if you remember. I'm asking, is it possible that it took you less than a day to write it?
A. This is not -- I'm not looking at nine
hours of work product here. So it probably didn't take me more than nine hours to write this thing, no.
Q. Is it safe to assume that you wrote it within a day or two on February 1st, 2018?
A. I don't remember.
Q. Would it surprise you if you wrote it within a day or two of February 21st, 2018?
A. No.
Q. And just for the record, the stop and arrest took place on February 9th, 2018, right?
A. Correct.
Q. So before the date of the signature on this affidavit that was 12 days earlier?
A. Yeah, that's the math, yes.
Q. And so you had 12 days before submitting this to think about what you should put in it, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You had -- and according to you, there were these two main important facts that initiated this whole interaction. One was what you saw and the other was what you remembered, and yet you didn't put what you remembered, your recollection, into this to contextualize your justification for stopping Mr. Bombard, did you?
A. No.
Q. Let's go to the stop. You pulled Mr. Bombard over. Where did you pull him over?
A. Just south of the intersection of Main Street and Lower Newton, on Main Street.
Q. And you watched the video this morning, you said, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you remember seeing snow on the side of the road?
A. Yes.
Q. And there was like snowbanks?
A. Yes.
Q. Snow all over the trees and lawns nearby?
A. Yes.
Q. When you approached the vehicle do you remember what you said?
A. I think, Hey, do you need something?
Q. And how would you describe your demeanor when you approached the vehicle?
A. Probably blunt. Probably.
Q. Earlier we talked about, you know, your interactions with people in community care stops.

Can you take me through your normal procedure when you do community care motor vehicle stops?
A. It's -- community care motor vehicle stops would be, and this is what happened, what did I say, yesterday or the day before, it's roll up alongside somebody, try not to turn my blue lights on if I don't have to, and I said, Hey, do you need something? Hey, are you all set? Some version of that.
Q. When you said -- when you watched the video this morning you said -- you walked up to him, Need something?

Do you think your demeanor appears concerned about Mr. Bombard?
A. Reflecting if I could have shown more concern, and I think I could have shown more concern, yes.
Q. Why do you think you should have shown more concern?
A. The --
Q. Well, let me rephrase that.

You approached this car. You said you were blunt and that you could have shown more concern. Why would you not have shown more concern in this situation?
A. It was, I guess -- well, I guess I'll say I don't know. I don't know the answer to that.
Q. Are you usually blunt with people when you're concerned about their mental health?
A. Sometimes.
Q. Is that what you're trained to do as a Vermont state trooper?
A. No.
Q. What are you trained to do as a Vermont state trooper when you approach someone who you think might have a mental health need?
A. Start it more warmly.
Q. What's an example of starting an interaction more warmly?
A. Introducing myself.
Q. And you didn't introduce yourself at this stop, did you?
A. No.
Q. Do you think you showed anger to Mr. Bombard when you first started talking to him?
A. No.
Q. What do you think -- other than being blunt what emotion do you think you showed?
A. I think it was -- I think it was unemotional.
Q. I'm sorry?
A. It was without emotion. I don't think it
had emotion.
Q. Are you trained to approach people who you believe to be in mental distress by saying, Need something?
A. No.
Q. You were trained to first introduce yourself?
A. I don't know if that's in the prescribed training, but I'm sure that's part of the roadmap is you need to be more warm.
Q. What are you trained to say first off the bat?
A. I don't know in my training. I don't know what the script is.
Q. There's a script?
A. I don't think so.
Q. In your experience, other than the one example you gave a moment ago, how do you -- how have you approached people who you believed to be in some kind of mental distress?
A. I don't know if I always introduce myself. I think sometimes I do, sometimes I don't, and that's more of an explanation of how we are and where we are. It's not always, Hey, I'm Jay, and I'm here to help. I don't always say it like that.
Q. That would be a reasonable way to approach someone --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- in mental health distress, right?
A. That would be a good strategy.
Q. And do you remember asking Mr. Bombard if he was -- let me back up.

In that first minute of the interaction do you remember asking Mr. Bombard if he was okay?
A. I remember asking if he was okay. I'm not sure how long it took to get there.
Q. And did you -- but it wasn't the first question you asked him, is it?
A. No.
Q. The first question you asked him was -well, the first thing you said to him after asking if you needed something twice, you say in your affidavit at Paragraph 4, I identified to him that I observed him look at me, and then $I$ saw him flicking me off; in parentheses, slang for a middle finger gesture.

That's the first thing you talked about with him, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You asked him if he needed something.

What did you think he might need?
A. Need something like -- again, it sounds -- it may sound ridiculous but need someone to talk to, need some action, need something regarding this conversation.
Q. Do you think the way you approached him would lead someone to want to speak to you about their mental health needs?
A. No.
Q. So why did you speak to him that way?
A. It -- it could have been done more warmly, and what --
Q. Go ahead.
A. The pending question is why did I not speak to him more compassionately?
Q. My question was -- well, we established that you didn't -- you acknowledged that you didn't speak to him in any way that would lead him to talk to you about his mental health needs. It wasn't warm. It was blunt, in your words.

So my question is, if you were concerned about his mental health needs, why did you speak to him that way?
A. Yeah. I was thinking more -- thinking too much about the presence of conflict and, therefore, coming in more Alpha than I could have or
should have, given -- given a concern that he may need something more gentle from me.
Q. Becoming an Alpha?
A. Well, I came at him more Alpha instead of more collegial than I perhaps should have, in hindsight.
Q. What does that mean to you, coming in somewhere more Alpha?
A. I desired to control the action instead of being more collegial, of it based on the memory of the gentleman who was riding around with a gun and then had that road rage incident. So I was thinking more -- I was thinking more assertively than -- I guess my -- my feeling of concern about the experience there betrayed the overall mission, which -- which was a good -- a good understanding of whether he needed help or open that window for him. So my actions didn't really sync up with my concern.
Q. Do you think your actions didn't sync up with your concerns because you weren't actually concerned about his mental health?
A. No.
Q. Do you think your actions didn't sync up with your concern because some part of you was angry about his gesture?
A. No.
Q. When you got out of your car you didn't run over to his car, did you?
A. No.
Q. You didn't rush over to check to make sure he was okay, right?
A. No.
Q. Do you remember as a -- in the video as a point where someone asks you for directions?
A. Yes.
Q. You saw that this morning, right, on the video?
A. Yes.
Q. And there was a lot of background noise, but could you hear what he said?
A. What he said?
Q. Well, the person who asked you for directions, where were they, do you remember?
A. I think they were driving north in the other lane.
Q. And I don't know if you remember or whether you saw on the video this morning, were you able to catch what they said?
A. Yes.
Q. And then -- and you gave them directions, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know how far away from you he was?
A. She.
Q. Sorry, yeah.
A. The -- we were pulled off on the southbound, half on the lane, half off the lane probably, and they were driving north so it's that distance. I'm not sure how long or how wide a lane but 20, 30 feet-ish.
Q. Okay. Earlier we talked about, a little bit about your interactions with drivers who disagree with your actions. You said that there have been occasions where a driver has been upset about you stopping them, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And there have been occasions where a driver has been upset about getting a ticket?
A. Yes.
Q. I'm sure there have been occasions about people getting upset about getting arrested, right?
A. Yes.
Q. When they -- and as a part of that, when you've stopped people and they've been upset, have they cursed at you?

Have any of them cursed at you?
A. Probably, yeah.
Q. And when you've written people a ticket and they were angry did any of them -- any of those people curse at you?
A. Sometimes, sure.
Q. And when people get arrested and you've arrested them, sometimes they curse at you?
A. Yes.
Q. And in this case, and when people have cursed at you for giving them a ticket on the side of the road, it's in public, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you arrested those people?
A. I don't know if it's escalated to that point or not. Dependent on context.
Q. And people who have cursed at you after you stopped them, before you might have given them a ticket and they cursed at you, did you arrest them?
A. I'm sorry, repeat the question.
Q. That's fair. You said you stopped people on the side of the road, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And some of them have been mad about the stop itself, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you -- and they've cursed at you because they were mad about the stop, right?
A. The answer is "Yes". I'm just trying to -- the reason $I$ kind of allow myself to leave the presence of the moment here, allowed to think of the time it's happened, it's very rare. I'm trying to think of a specific example. To be honest with you, I don't remember.
Q. Did you arrest any of those people?
A. I don't -- I don't remember.
Q. Is it possible that you arrested the people, or it's not possible?
A. I would say it's more likely than not that I did not arrest them.
Q. When you interacted with Mr. Bombard at this initial stop he told you he was going to file a complaint against you, didn't he?
A. Yes.
Q. And how did you respond when he told you that?
A. I don't remember the quote. Something to the effect of "That's fine" and gave him my name and my job location.
Q. And the conversation kept going for a
little while after that, right?
A. It did.
Q. And you were explaining to him why you stopped -- why you stopped him, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You explained it to him several times, right?
A. Yes.
Q. I think you said the conversation was getting cyclical at one point, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You say that in your affidavit, right?
A. Yes.
Q. At what point in the stop do you talk about your recollection of that 2013 incident?
A. That didn't happen.
Q. You didn't tell Mr. Bombard about your recollection?
A. No.
Q. Why didn't you tell him about it?
A. A combination of two things that occurred. One was I was almost immediately confused. Because maybe the gesture wasn't the gesture, because he was so adamant that he hadn't done it so maybe I -I thought for sure it happened, and now I'm sort of
wondering maybe it didn't happen. And so I was confused so I kind of got off script, and I never even got to that point because Mr. Bombard hijacked the conversation. So I never got off the launching pad with the dialogue with him.
Q. Well, you do explain to him several times, and I think here -- we'll go to your affidavit.

Several times you say -- here, I'm
looking at Paragraph 5. I spoke with the operator about the nature of his gesture. I asked him if he understood my perception that if someone was looking for or needing the attention of a trooper, the way to get that attention, although unusual, would be to display that negative symbol.

Did I read that correctly?
A. Yes.
Q. And in Paragraph 6 you say, and I'm looking at, starting at the second sentence, I explained to the operator that I wouldn't be able to understand the mindset of the gesture or affirm that the gesture had occurred as observed until I had the chance to speak with him/her.

Did I read that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And then going to the last line in

Paragraph 6 on that page, The operator then laughed as I attempted to explain the following.

If someone gestures in that way, I don't know if they are gesturing because they need my assistance, my attention, or because they need my attention as the gesture itself is not, quote, unquote, normal behavior.

Did I read that right?
A. Yes.
Q. So you explained your reasoning several times to Mr. Bombard, as recorded in your affidavit, right?
A. That's reflective of what happened, but I don't think it's fully accurate.
Q. What's not accurate about it?
A. Was that this wasn't a -- this wasn't a good dialogue. One person speaks, one person listens, responds to what the speaker says, and we go back and forth.

It was a lot of talking over each other, a lot of -- a lot of, I would say -- I would say not formative dialogue, and so this wasn't -- this wasn't the purpose of my conversation. This was the entryway into the conversation about what happened there and so forth. I never got there.
Q. But that's not my question.

My question is, what did you say to
Mr. Bombard?
And I'm asking what, did you explain your actions several times?
A. I was able to explain metaphorically me choosing to open the door and walk into Mr. Bombard's life.
Q. You spoke -- you told him several times why you stopped him; is that right?
A. I don't think that that -- I don't think that that's accurate. I explained to him what it was that I saw, and I never got off the launching pad.

After that point we talked about what that could be reflective of and what it could not be reflective of, but we never got into the 2013 incident because we just got into this cyclical non-formative type of conversation. It wasn't very productive so I had to . . .
Q. Well, you said a number of things. You said, at least according to your affidavit, you said you reviewed the video before you wrote this.

In your affidavit it says, I think one, two, three times at least you explained why you were stopping him. And, you know, just to go back, it says
because -- because if someone gestures in that way, I -- meaning you -- don't know if they are gesturing because they need my assistance, my attention, or because they need my attention as the gesture itself is not normal behavior.

You talked to him. You tell him that a few times at least, you'd say, right?
A. I think where we are stuck, if I can answer it this way.
Q. No, just answer the question. You tell him something along -- you talk to him about why the stop based on the gesture a few times, right?
A. I think a better way to look at it is I attempted to explain and never --
Q. Okay, that's fine.

And where did you attempt to explain that, in addition to seeing the gesture, it was also because you had this recollection?
A. I never got that far in the conversation. That became the problem.
Q. And it's not in the affidavit, right?
A. Correct.
Q. And you didn't have that conversation with Mr. Bombard either, right?
A. No.
Q. Do you remember saying to him that you were trying to put him in my mindset?
A. Yes.
Q. When you stop someone, when you conduct a traffic stop do you normally try to explain -- well, going back to 2018, your time in St. Albans, did you normally explain yourself or explain the reasons why you stopped someone and try to put that person in your mindset?
A. Yes.
Q. And did you talk to them about -- and if they argued with you, did you continue to explain it?
A. Sometimes.
Q. You told Mr. Bombard that the gesture you saw was so supremely unusual; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. That it required you to intervene, is that basically what you said?
A. Yes.
Q. And you also said that it was clear -you also said something along the lines of if someone shows that symbol, they are looking to get my attention; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. You mentioned that several times; that
you were -- that someone showing the middle finger gesture to a police officer must be trying to get their attention, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And by that did you mean looking for your -- or by that what did you mean?
A. Like I said earlier in our conversation, which was that this idea of trolling for somebody. They're expressing a state of probably unhappiness with whomever they're directing it at, and I didn't want to give him the attention.
Q. You didn't want to give him the attention?
A. No.
Q. And today you're saying that you didn't think him giving you the middle finger was looking for your assistance, is that what you're telling me?
A. Yeah, I don't think "assistance" would be the right word.
Q. What would be the right word?
A. I think it's -- I think it's attention is the right word.
Q. Well, is it -- is it help? Was he looking for your help?
A. I don't think he thought he was looking
for help, no.
Q. Just going back to Paragraph 6 in your affidavit, Exhibit 7, at the bottom you say, If someone gestures in that way, I don't know if they are gesturing because they need my assistance, my attention, or because they need my attention as the gesture itself is not normal behavior.

What do you mean when you say, I don't know if they are gesturing because they need my assistance, attention, so on and so forth?
A. I suppose at the end of the day I don't really know what their intention is, and it can probably only be one of a few different things and that's the list, I suppose.
Q. And I guess in this list you don't include expressing their political opinion, right?
A. No.
Q. Is that -- is that -- that's not included in getting your attention?
A. That might be a -- that might be a given, I suppose. I don't know.
Q. What might be a given?
A. That an expression could -- it could be something as benign as expressing one's opinion about something, or it could be these other things that have
more nefarious roots.
Q. And when someone does the middle finger gesture you don't know -- here you're saying you don't know their intention?
A. That's right.
Q. Now, someone giving any person the middle finger wouldn't typically mean that they're looking for assistance, right?
A. Right.
Q. That would be -- would you say that would be rare?
A. Yes.
Q. Has it ever happened to you?
A. The short answer is "No".
Q. Has any of the troopers, any of your colleagues ever told you about a time when someone showed them the middle finger because they were looking for their assistance?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever heard of anyone asking for assistance by showing the middle finger?
A. No.
Q. In the video you said that once you realized Mr. Bombard wasn't flipping you off, he was free to go. Do you remember saying that?
A. Yes.
Q. And you saw that when you watched this morning, right?
A. Yes.
Q. If he had told you, yes, I was flipping you off, would he have not been free to go?
A. No.
Q. So, no, he would not have been free to go?
A. No, he would not have been free to go? Right, as in he would have been free to go.
Q. He would have been free to go?
A. Yes.
Q. Double negative.
A. Yes.
Q. So if he had told you, yes, I flipped you off, he would have been free to go?
A. We would -- well, we could use that now as a starting point. Are you okay? What's going on? Blah, blah, blah, blah, blah.

The fact he denied it, it just -- it really threw me off about that $I$ was wrong and that $I$ didn't see that; that $I$ made a mistake, and so I really was caught -- I was caught off guard by the denial. I didn't anticipate that he would just deny
it. I thought we would use it as a launching pad, and so we would have been engaged in the conversation that I hoped to have that we never got to.

But none of that, barring any need for intervention, the form of assistance $I$ talk about, which is access to services, if necessary, if we had gotten there, barring any of that it all would have been voluntary, presumably. He would have been free to go. There wouldn't have been any arrest or consequences.
Q. Going to the conversation you hoped to have, you talked about that with Mr. Bombard. You said -- he asked you what I just asked. If he had flipped you off, you know, what was the crime? Would he have been free to go?

And I think his exact words were, What if I did flip you off? Do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. And you responded something to the effect of, Then we would be having a conversation about what's appropriate and what's not appropriate?
A. Yes.
Q. Why, if he had flipped you off, why would you have to have a conversation about what's appropriate and what's not appropriate?
A. Because that is -- I believe that that was the crossroads that led to a woman being shot. It was this dramatic escalation and escalating despondency that was set into motion by negative gestures in a road rage environment, and so the conversation could have been this formative moment of you have a right to do such things.

I'm talking about what happened here, and I just don't think that's appropriate. I would have said that to him. I would have said that in my experience I don't think that's an appropriate way to express yourself.

Can you do it? Yes. I want to make sure that he's not in a position where he's going to be creating harm to somebody or to himself. We just never got there.
Q. Do you think if a police officer tells someone that in a way -- saying something is inappropriate would be likely to stop them from doing it?

MR. MESSINA: Objection; speculation. Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: I think a qualified type of language, say something is inappropriate. I find that telling people what to do actually
is -- doesn't help deter people, but I think guiding them through a conversation, asking them questions and them coming to a conclusion themselves is a way to encourage a change of behavior. Not tell but show or lead them to a path themselves.

But, again, we just never got there. I was thrown off by the denial, and it never got relaunched again.

BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. You don't think it was appropriate for Mr. Bombard to have shown his middle finger to you?
A. I think that it -- I think -- I don't think that it's appropriate, no. I know that he's allowed to do it, but I don't think that it's appropriate given what it can lead to.
Q. Do you think it's inappropriate for a civilian to give a middle finger to a police officer?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you think it's appropriate?
A. Do I think it's appropriate?
Q. Do you think it's inappropriate? I'm sorry.
A. Yeah, I don't think that that's appropriate, no.
Q. And what does it mean for someone to be inappropriate to you?
A. Yeah, I think, you know, moving aside from any dictionary definitions, I think if something is inappropriate or appropriate, which is, is it something that I would want my mother to see or my child to see? I think that would be the morals that I would lead into, or societal moray that that would be. MR. SARACHAN: You never met my mother. THE WITNESS: Sounds like a colorful
lady.
BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. And talking about societal morays, do you think that it's a police officer's role to enforce those societal morays?
A. I do.
Q. And do you think that it's -- you think that you can use and should use your law enforcement authority to enforce those societal morays?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's part of what you were doing here?
A. Yes.

MR. DIAZ: Let's take a break for ten.
(A recess was taken from 1:50 p.m. to

2:00 p.m.)
BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. So, Mr. Riggen, we've taken our time and looked through all the documents in this case, close to a thousand pages of documents plus the video, and we know you've spoken to people about this stuff, right?
A. Yes.
Q. I mean, when we look at the documents we don't see any discussion of this recollection of this 2013 incident when you tell people about why you stopped Mr. Bombard, and that's because you didn't tell anyone about it, right?
A. That's not true.
Q. That's not true?
A. No.
Q. Can you explain that?
A. I absolutely have spoken with people about the meaningfulness of that intersection and what happened. I don't know if any of the people who are involved in the incident that brings us all together here were a part of that case, but a lot of the troopers in the St. Albans barracks were on scene that day and I have mentioned that to them.

I mean, probably not in a long time now
because this incident has fallen to the background, but that was -- that was absolutely part of the conversation I mentioned to people.
Q. So I'm sure you've talked to people about the 2013 incident before, right?
A. Yes.
Q. I believe you there.

What I'm asking is when you talked about the stop of Mr. Bombard with anyone else, you didn't mention your recollection about the 2013 incident, did you?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. When?
A. For certain whether it was that day or the days that passed, we talked about some of the -the societal, what I think is a societal mandate of the community caretaker, and this was part of that decision.

Because we all agree that a middle finger for a middle finger's sake cannot and should not be enforced. There's nothing to enforce on that. It's this larger piece of what that means in that place. I mean, I have had conversations about that.
Q. You talked to Tara Thomas about this stop, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And she became aware of it because of the -- you said Vermont Records' request related to this stop, right?
A. I'm not sure.
Q. When did you speak to Tara Thomas about the stop of Mr. Bombard?
A. I don't remember.
Q. Well, we spoke to Tara Thomas, and are you aware that she recorded information about the stop that you had given her?
A. I don't quite know what you're referring to.
Q. Are you aware that she summarized your reasons for the stop in writing?
A. Yes.
Q. Because you and her talked about it, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And she showed you what she wrote, didn't she?
A. Probably.
Q. And she also told you that, in reference to this stop, it's the policy of the Vermont State Police to encourage troopers to stop vehicles only for
traffic violations; isn't that right?
A. I guess partly right.
Q. Did she tell you something else?
A. I think there's also the community caretaking piece of that as well.
Q. Well, what did she tell you?
A. I don't remember.
Q. If I showed you what she wrote, would it refresh your recollection?
A. Yes.
Q. I'm going to give you what is marked as AGO-000729.
(Plaintiff's Exhibit AGO-000729 was
marked for identification, attached at the end
of the original transcript.)
MR. SARACHAN: Do you have one for
Mr. Messina?
MR. DIAZ: I don't right now.
MR. SARACHAN: Can you share that?
MR. DIAZ: Can you share that for now?
MR. SARACHAN: Do you have one for you?
BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. What is AGO-000729?
A. Is it an e-mail? I'm not sure. I'm not sure what the basis of this is, but . . .
Q. Well, what does it look like to you?
A. It looks like an e-mail.
Q. And looking at the signature line on the bottom of the e-mail, what does it say?
A. It's an e-mail written by Lieutenant Tara Thomas.
Q. And it's summarizing the February 9th, 2018 stop of Mr. Bombard, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And it talks about the arrest, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And then it goes through that it was sent to the Franklin County State's Attorney's Office, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Where in that paragraph does it talk about your recollection about the 2013 incident?
A. It doesn't.
Q. And that's because you didn't tell Tara Thomas about the 2013 incident in the context of the 2018 stop with Mr. Bombard, right?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. You told her?
A. Yes.
Q. When did you tell her that?
A. I don't remember. It was presumably contemporaneous to this, and it was remarkable to me because she either reminded me or informed me. I didn't -- I didn't follow it beyond that she was the investigating detective of that case.

So she remembered the incident, and she goes, Oh, that's right, yeah. Now, the fact that it wasn't memorialized doesn't make it suddenly untrue. That's a significant event for me.
Q. Do you think that Lieutenant Thomas -you said earlier that Lieutenant Thomas has good judgment, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And she was investigating this because her superiors asked her to, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And she was going to send a summary like this to her superiors, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you think if she knew that you had stopped Mr. Bombard in part because of your recollection of the 2013 incident, that she would have told that to her and your superiors?

MR. MESSINA: Objection; speculation.
Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, I don't know what her style of writing or this theory of writing would be.

BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. Do you think it's bad judgment that she didn't include it here?
A. That's not for me to say.
Q. Well, I'm asking you, do you think it's bad judgment to not include that incident in here?
A. I don't know.
Q. Well, it's either good judgment or bad judgment. What is it?
A. It's not for me to say. I don't know.
Q. Do you think it's -- do you think it would have been helpful for her to put that in here?
A. I don't know.
Q. Do you remember writing a press release about the February 9th, 2018 stop of Mr. Bombard?
A. Vaguely.
Q. And do you remember sending that to anyone for your -- for approval?
A. I don't remember if I had to have it approved or not, but the e-mails speak for themselves, I presume.
(Plaintiff's Exhibit AGO-000142 was
marked for identification, attached at the end of the original transcript.)

BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. I'm going to show this to you. It's labeled Bates AGO-000142, and this is a -- can you tell me what this document is?
A. It's a press release of the events sent from me to the station commander, Lieutenant Lamothe.
Q. And it includes a summary of the stop and arrest?
A. Yes.
Q. And where in this do you include reference to the 2013 incident?
A. Yeah, it doesn't.
Q. Thank you. And that's the same press release that you sent to the Vermont State Police media, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And that meant that went out across the state?
A. I'm not sure.
Q. Well, it goes out to various media outlets in Vermont, though, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And before we move on, on Page 3 of this
document what do you see?
A. It's a mugshot of Mr. Bombard.
Q. Were you there when he had his mugshot taken?
A. No.
Q. And did you attach it to this e-mail?
A. Probably.
Q. And what's the subject of this e-mail?
A. St. Albans barracks/disorderly conduct.
Q. And what does it say next to
"Attachment"?
A. Bombard mugshot, dot APD.
Q. So you did attach the mugshot to the e-mail?
A. Yes.
Q. And that mugshot went out to the Vermont State Police media list serve, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And that means it went out to the various media outlets in the State of Vermont?
A. Yes.
Q. As I mentioned, we talked to Lieutenant Thomas and we talked to Chief Lamothe.

And when we asked Lieutenant Thomas what you said to her about your reasons for the stop, about
what happened, she didn't mention anything about the 2013 incident. Why do you think that is?
A. I don't know.

MR. MESSINA: Objection; speculation.
THE WITNESS: Yeah, I don't know.
BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. Well, she was under oath like you are today. Do you think she was -- do you have reason to believe she would be less than complete with us?
A. No.
Q. So going back to the stop, for the initial stop when did you -- do you remember when you first introduced yourself?
A. I don't think $I$ ever did.
Q. When did you ask for Mr. Bombard's license and registration?
A. I didn't.
Q. Now, as you -- eventually you walked away, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Tell me what happened when you returned, were returning to your vehicle.
A. I -- I ended the interaction.

MR. SARACHAN: I apologize, would you say that again?

THE WITNESS: Sorry. I had ended the interaction and was walking back to my cruiser. Got back to about the side-view mirror, and I heard him start to swear. And so it kind of got my attention, so I stopped and just turned for a moment and looked at him through his -- I could see him looking at me through his side-view mirror and he yelled "Fuck You" twice, called me an asshole, okay, and then stuck his middle finger up again. And so that's what I observed.

BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. Was that -- was that all while you were standing at your -- at your door?
A. Yes.
Q. So you were standing at your door. Was the door open or closed?
A. Closed.
Q. So you were outside the car?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. And he said some swear words and stuck his middle finger up; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And that -- and what happened next?
A. Well, I looked around, and there was a
pickup truck two or three cars back in the north lane. I looked at the driver looking at me and kind of like, what happens now?

And I was like, I looked and there was a school bus over here on the corner and there was a car behind me, and I'm like now it's become disorderly conduct in the presence of all these people and I said, well, I'm going to have to arrest this guy.
Q. And this is all before you get in the car?
A. Yes.
Q. How far away were you from Bombard, would you say; your best estimate?
A. Two or three car lengths, perhaps.
Q. And I don't know what two or three car lengths means. Do you have an estimate of what that is in feet?
A. $30,35,40$. I'm estimating but maybe 30.
Q. So somewhere between 30 -- you were somewhere between 30 and 40 feet from Bombard at this point?
A. I'm estimating.
Q. Your best estimate is you were somewhere between 30 to 40 feet away from him?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So you get back in your car, and what happens next?
A. I -- the blue lights were still on, so I wanted to reinitiate the stop. He -- I observed him still looking at me in the side-view mirror. He was distracted by me. Appeared to be distracted by me, I should say.

So he held his middle finger up out the window, and then I think he had been distracted enough that he didn't see that a car was trying to get by at the car stop. So he stopped to make sure that he wouldn't cause a crash, and then that car continued, he merged out, and I tried to reinitiate the motor vehicle stop.
Q. So -- so are you saying he gave you -- he showed his middle finger three times?
A. I'm saying that he -- the initial display that was part of the initial contact. Then it was the obscenities, so perhaps it was -- whatever is in my affidavit would reflect the truth, and so if it was only after he was driving away, then that's what happened.
Q. Okay. You said a moment ago that Mr. Bombard appeared to be distracted. What do you mean by that?
A. Because he was -- I could see his face in the side-view mirror, as in he was looking back at me, and he was looking at me as he was driving away with his middle finger out the window, and he didn't seem to observe that a car had been passing our car stop at that moment. So he had to stop to let him or her proceed, and then he continued.

So I said, Well, look at that. He appears now to be escalating. I'm sorry it's come to this point, and I'm going to stop him again.
Q. And at this point where were you when you say he appeared to be distracted?

Where were you?
A. I was back in my car.
Q. So you were in your car at that point?
A. Yes.
Q. And he's 30 to 40 feet away from you, by estimate, and you're seeing his face in his rearview mirror; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay, so I just want to make sure I understand. You walk back to your car. You hear Mr. Bombard swear. You turn around. You hear him swear twice more. And then you get in your car, and you see him display his middle finger; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And can you just demonstrate for me like how he displayed his middle finger?
A. It that fair for an audio record? I mean --
Q. I'm going for you to do it for me, yeah.
A. Just go for the charade? Okay.

So he had his left hand out the window and held it up like this.
Q. So it was like just outside the window? A. Yes.

MR. MESSINA: Let the record reflect that Trooper -- Sergeant lifted up his left hand and demonstrated the middle finger to everybody in the room.

BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. Now, you watched the video this morning. When you watched it did you -- you said there were some cars across from Mr. Bombard; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you remember about how many?
A. There was -- a school bus had gone by, stopped off camera. I think there was one car next to us, a truck next to that one, a couple cars behind us. I'm not sure other than that.
Q. Okay. And do you remember seeing any of the cars with their windows down?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Do you remember seeing -- do you remember anybody having their windows down?
A. No.
Q. Would it make sense to you that people would have their windows down on a cold day in February?
A. I would say down, no, but cracked perhaps.
Q. Did you see anybody with their windows cracked that day?
A. No.
Q. And how far apart would you say Bombard's driver's seat was from -- to the car right across from him?
A. 30 feet, maybe.
Q. And how far to the back of the school bus?
A. 40 feet, maybe.
Q. A moment ago I believe you said that you looked at somebody in one of the vehicles next to you; is that right?
A. That was the operator of a pickup truck
that was behind the car that was next to the car stop.
Q. So the operator in the pickup truck across -- you know, that was across from Bombard's car?
A. No. There was a pickup truck behind a car that was next to Bombard's car.
Q. And how far were you from that pickup truck?
A. $\quad 50$ feet, maybe.
Q. And I believe you said -- well, what was the interaction there?
A. I remember him looking at me, presumably had seen what had transpired. He looked at me kind of like, What are you going to do? I'm like, Okay, well. That was it. Stare at each other; that was it.
Q. So from 50 feet away he looked at you?
A. Yes.
Q. And did he do anything else?
A. No.
Q. He just looked at you?
A. Yes.
Q. Did he say anything?
A. No.
Q. He didn't gesture?
A. No.
Q. Did he look at Bombard?
A. I don't know.
Q. You didn't see him look at Bombard?
A. No.
Q. You saw him look at you?
A. Right.
Q. Did anybody else look at you, do you remember?
A. No.
Q. So at that moment nobody else -- you didn't see anybody else looking at you?
A. No.
Q. Did you see anybody else looking at

Bombard at that moment?
A. No.
Q. Can you tell me where in your affidavit you say that the person in the pickup truck looked at you, and you saw that as some kind of communication?
A. I didn't write that.
Q. You didn't include that in here?
A. No.
Q. Did you write it down? Write down this fact anywhere else?
A. No.
Q. Did you tell Tara Thomas about that fact?
A. Yes.
Q. And you didn't see it in the report that she wrote, though, right?
A. No.
Q. You didn't see it in the press release you wrote, right?
A. No.
Q. And, again, this person looked at you. Did they -- how did you know that -- that they were trying to tell you something?
A. He really gave me a look kind of like, What's going to happen now? That was the expression that he gave me. That's how I perceived the way that he was looking at me.

I said, Oh, well, this has all played out in front of this person. I wonder who else has seen this now, and I feel like I have to do something about this. This has now become a crime.
Q. Did he seem -- was he angry?
A. I couldn't tell.
Q. Did he have any emotion on his face?
A. I couldn't tell.
Q. Did you perceive an emotion on his face?
A. I couldn't tell.
Q. Is it possible that he could have just
been looking at you?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it possible that he could have just meant to communicate something else if he communicated anything at all?
A. Yes.
Q. So based upon him looking at you, you assumed what he -- that he saw Bombard and was trying to communicate to you?
A. My perception was that he was quite taken by what had unfolded, and that was just the way -- it was the expression that he gave.

My perception certainly could be wrong. That is how I perceived it, and that was -- led me to believe, I wonder who else has seen this play out now and has been a -- now observed the tumultuous behavior play out, and I have to do this now. I have to arrest this guy.
Q. How did the pickup driver's expression make you feel?
A. It really -- I'm chuckling because I'm like, Whoa, I've really -- I've lost control of this stop. This is too bad. I didn't want it to go like this. That's what $I$ was thinking to myself.
Q. What do you mean, you didn't want it to
go like this?
A. I really thought we could have a non-adversarial encounter, make sure he was okay, as in he wasn't this guy from a few years ago, could talk to him about what those gestures lead to, although not illegal, not inappropriate. The community caretaking would be resolved. He would be better for the conversation. All these things in my mind that never happened, never played out, and now I've lost control and now a middle finger has now turned into gross profanity in front of these people.

I'm like, Huh. I felt kind of bummed out, I guess. That was the feeling; too bad.
Q. Because you lost control?
A. That $I$ was in control. I kind of lost control of the moment.
Q. Right, because you lost control of the situation?
A. That's right, that it had escalated to that point.
Q. And you were bummed about it, you said?
A. Yeah, disappointed because I don't like my -- all of my encounters over all the years are almost always positive encounters, even the arrest situations. The ones where there was enforcement,
they're positive encounters for the most part, so I was bummed out that it came out that way.
Q. Let's talk about, you said that there were other people in the area; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. But you said you didn't see anyone see Bombard during this time, right?
A. I had -- I had assumed that if that guy had seen it, that everyone else here could or did see it, but I --
Q. But you didn't see if anyone else saw Mr. Bombard's -- or let me rephrase that.

You didn't notice anyone else reacting to Mr. Bombard's statements?
A. No.
Q. You said there was a school bus about 40 feet -- the back of the school bus was about 40 feet behind Mr. Bombard; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And when did you first notice the school bus?
A. I think I was aware of it driving by us when I was on the car stop.
Q. Is that when you were back at your car?
A. I'm not sure when I became aware. I knew
that it had driven by at some point.
Q. And where were you when you first noticed?
A. I'm not sure. I just was aware that it was there.
Q. And how far was the bus from you?
A. I think it was just off the back of my cruiser, stopped at that red light.
Q. So the back of the bus was how many feet would you say, an estimate?
A. If the front of my car was approximately 30 feet from Mr. Bombard, maybe it was less, right, but approximately. Then it was 20 feet, maybe, back off the shoulder. Maybe 30 feet; I'm not sure.
Q. And remind me, we said it was around noon that day, right --
A. Yes.
Q. -- this was all happening? You didn't see anyone on the bus, right?
A. No.
Q. And you didn't see any -- I mean, obviously someone was driving it, right?
A. Right.
Q. You didn't see that person, though?
A. No.
Q. And you didn't see any kids on the bus, right?
A. No.
Q. You didn't see anybody in the back of the bus?
A. No.
Q. And in your affidavit you didn't write that you saw students in the back of the bus, right?
A. Right.
Q. So putting aside the pickup truck driver, you didn't know if anyone else heard Mr. Bombard's statements; is that right?
A. I wasn't -- I didn't know one way or the other.
Q. But you didn't know that anyone else heard Mr. Bombard's statements?
A. I don't know one way or the other.
Q. Well, it's a "Yes" or "No" question. You either knew that they heard -- you either knew someone heard the statements, or you didn't know that someone heard his statements. Did you know that?

It's true that you didn't know whether anyone heard his statements, right?
A. It's true that $I$ didn't know, that's right.
Q. In listening to the video today -- you listened to it, right? You had audio?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you hear Mr. Bombard's statements?
A. No.
Q. So you didn't hear him on the video say "Asshole"?
A. No.
Q. And you didn't hear him say "Fuck you"?
A. No.
Q. Why do you think you didn't hear him?
A. Because the body mic was attached to my belt, which was right next to the running engine of my cruiser, $V-8$ engine, idles kind of hot.

Meanwhile, my ears are up here and the line of his voice and my ears are far more sensitive than these body microphones which have a lot of background noise, in this case right next to the cruiser engine.
Q. Now, when you were standing next to Mr. Bombard's car talking to him, his car was still running, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And, as we talked about, someone on the other side of the street drove up and asked you for
directions, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you heard that person, right?
A. Yes.
Q. The mic picked it up, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's amidst -- a car goes by in the middle of them talking and still you heard them, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You're out in the middle of the street at that point, same -- basically same position as you are when you're next to your car, right?
A. No.
Q. No?
A. No.
Q. Why not?
A. I returned to my cruiser. I was by my side-view mirror. The body mic was faced right towards the engine and at the point of the stop with Mr. Bombard, when that person came and talked to me, I turned toward them, taking me away, and so it picks up their voice a lot clearer.

The evidence of that -- take my word for it. The evidence of that when we're talking to

Mr. Bombard, you can hear what he says but it's not clear. You can hear the random person driving by asking for directions is not clear because it's open space. Metal doors and things that I might be up against, so --
Q. Let me be clear. I think there's a misunderstanding. I'm not saying whether you could understand what Mr. Bombard said, whether you said he made these statements as you were back at your car after the initial stop.

I'm asking -- what I meant to ask was, did you hear him at all on the video?
A. Right, and I answered that.
Q. You didn't hear anything?
A. Right.
Q. And so when you're standing at your vehicle right near the side-view mirror, you turn left to look at Mr. Bombard, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And your mic, where is your mic on your body?
A. It would be down here.
Q. On your right hip?
A. More -- my center belt buckle to my hip, it's in the middle of that space.
Q. Okay. And when you say you saw someone looked at you, the pickup truck driver looked at you and communicated with you somehow, did you take down that person's license plate?
A. No.
Q. At that time you had determined a crime had occurred, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you didn't -- you didn't seek to like ask that person to come over, right?
A. I was more interested in -- no, I didn't. No.
Q. You didn't, and you didn't take down the license plate, you said, right?

Did you ever find that person to talk to them?
A. No. And I had gone back into the video hoping that the video quality was better than it is, and I would have loved to have gotten a front license plate off of it to bring him into the conversation, but it wasn't to be.
Q. So after Mr. Bombard makes his declarations or statements -- declarations is a legal term. I don't want to use that.

After Mr. Bombard made these statements
and swear words, you get back in your car, and you're both about to pull away; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Mr. Bombard -- a few moments ago you said that Mr. Bombard -- you're in your car. I'm just confused about how can you see Mr. Bombard if you're in your driver's seat?
A. The way my cruiser is positioned, I can easily see the -- depending on how the driver has their seat and their mirror positioned, sometimes I can see them quite clearly, and so he was looking down in his side-view mirror back at me.

And so I'm not trying to be snarky; if you can see me, I can see you kind of thing. So I can see his face in the side-view mirror looking at me, clear line of sight.
Q. And he's getting ready to pull out into the lane, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, and you're a traffic safety instructor. When you are going to pull out into a lane, you're supposed to look in your side-view mirror, right?
A. There's another part of that, but yes.
Q. Well, that's one part of it for sure,
right?
A. Yes.
Q. You've got to look into your side-view mirror to see if anyone is coming behind you, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Your car is positioned behind Mr. Bombard's, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And he's got to look behind your car to see -- in his side-view mirror to see if anyone is coming, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it possible that he was looking in your direction but not at you?
A. No.
Q. It's not possible?
A. No.
Q. So from 30 feet away your testimony is that you know he was looking at you and not at the cars -- at the area behind you to see if there were cars coming?
A. Yes.
Q. And when you were talking to Mr. Bombard at his window, cars were coming by you, right?
A. Yes.
Q. A little bit of a -- I mean, a little nerve-racking to having cars screaming by you, right?

Maybe you're used to it.
A. They were going pretty slow.
Q. Okay. And when you get back to your car, there's a truck that comes up next to you and -- let me go back.

And when they're going by you as you're at Mr. Bombard's door, they're giving you a fairly wide berth, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You can see in the video they're kind of going into the opposite lane, right?
A. Yeah, the video speaks for itself. I presume so.
Q. Do you remember seeing that?
A. No.
Q. Okay. I'll represent to you that some of them are going into the opposite lane, at least to some extent, and many vehicles go by, right --
A. Yes.
Q. -- during that time?

When you get back to your car, a truck comes up as Mr . Bombard is preparing to merge into the lane, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you remember him putting on his left turn signal?
A. No.
Q. And Mr. Bombard pulls up or, I'm sorry, excuse me, the truck comes up, and it's going around your car and his car, right?
A. Yes. I don't remember this exactly, but --
Q. Do you know where that truck came from?
A. I don't.
Q. So you don't know if it came from Lower Newton or from North Main?
A. I don't know.
Q. When you watched the video this morning did you notice that truck that went by you as you were at your car, did you notice that truck swerve in any way to avoid Mr. Bombard?
A. No.
Q. Did you notice that truck go farther than any of the other cars into the opposite lane --
A. No.
Q. -- than the cars before?
A. No.
Q. Did you notice that car slow down at all
when it saw Mr. Bombard's car?
A. No.
Q. Did you notice that car -- that truck -did the truck driver hit the horn?
A. No.
Q. Did you hear the horn?
A. No.
Q. Did the truck driver stop his car?
A. No.
Q. When you merge into traffic isn't it -would you say it's common for you to kind of edge out before you fully enter the lane?
A. Sometimes.
Q. You kind of go a little bit, stop, check, go a little bit, stop, check, right?
A. Yes.
Q. That's what most people do?
A. Depending on the environment, yes.
Q. Right. And was it before -- so I guess Mr. Bombard is pulling out. The truck goes by. Can you tell me when in that sequence he stuck his middle finger out the window?
A. It was as he was pulling away, so I couldn't give you a frame-shot necessarily but as he was pulling away.
Q. And then -- and your affidavit says, and this is at Paragraph 10 on Page AGO-7. Are you with me?
A. Yes.
Q. It says, going down to the third sentence, starting with, The operator. Are you with me?
A. I watched the operator.
Q. The next sentence starts with, The operator?
A. Yes.
Q. The operator extended his middle finger outside of his window for no less than five seconds and as he drove for no less than 15 yards.

I read that right?
A. Yes.
Q. After he was done displaying his middle finger out the window what did he do?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Did he -- well, did Mr. Bombard keep his middle finger up in the air?
A. No.
Q. He stopped displaying the middle
finger --
A. I think so.
Q. -- as he was still driving?
A. I think so.
Q. Did you see any other signal from him after that?
A. No.
Q. Any other gesture?
A. No.
Q. Did you hear anything that he said after that?
A. No.
Q. You were in your car at that point?
A. Yes.
Q. And you were driving?
A. Yes.
Q. Your window was up?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Do you think your window was probably up?
A. As I said before, it could have been cracked. I don't know.
Q. You didn't hear anything through your window?
A. No.
Q. At this point in the video do you remember saying on the microphone, at least you say Mr. Bombard -- or you say he said "Asshole", he said
"Fuck you" and flipped you the bird.
Do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. And that was after he had put his middle finger away, right?
A. Yes.
Q. He then puts his blinker, his left blinker on to turn onto Brainerd Street, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And at that point do you remember what you say?
A. Refresh my recollection, and I'll believe you.
Q. Let's go back a second. Do you -- you said that when your car was stopped and you were talking to Mr. Bombard, you had your blue lights on that whole time; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. At any point after you got back to your car did you turn your lights off?
A. I don't think so.
Q. And would you normally just leave the lights on when you are getting back in your car?
A. Depending on what function I may need to be doing, my practice is usually turn the front blue
lights on. So there's no front blue lights in front of me; there's only behind.
Q. And were the front blue lights on or off?
A. I don't recall. I'm going to suppose that everything was still on.
Q. Okay. And you never -- in this whole interaction you never turned them off?
A. I don't think so.
Q. And so as you're following Mr. Bombard south on Main Street, your blue lights are on that whole time?
A. Yes.
Q. But he doesn't -- you're not trying to pull him over right there, are you?
A. I was.
Q. Your siren wasn't on, though, right?
A. No.

MR. DIAZ: Let's take another ten.
(A recess was taken from 2:50 p.m. to
3:05 p.m.)
BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. Taking you back to when Mr. Bombard is pulling away, you said he put his middle finger out the window and that there were a few cars around, right?

Did you see anyone see Mr. Bombard put his middle finger out the window?
A. No.
Q. So you don't know that anybody saw him put his middle finger out the window?
A. I don't know.
Q. You don't know that anyone saw him put his middle finger out the window?
A. Correct.
Q. Now, next up Mr. Bombard puts his blinker on. He turns onto Brainerd Street, and you conduct another stop; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And he pulls up over to the right on Brainerd Street, and you pull up behind him, right?
A. Correct.
Q. And this is to effectuate the arrest you wanted to do --
A. Yes.
Q. -- for disorderly conduct?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, after watching the video this morning did you -- do you remember telling Mr. Bombard that -- or let's go back.

We talked about earlier when you were
interacting with members of the public, whether you're just talking to them on the sidewalk or arresting them, you're always truthful with them, right?
A. Unless the -- unless the job, you know, and the need at the moment gives me a procedural ability to be less than honest.
Q. Well, when you're -- when you're explaining your actions you're always honest, right?
A. Articulating. Say -- I don't want to suppose what you're getting. Articulating an arrest decision, for example.
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. You're always honest when you're doing that?
A. Yes.
Q. And you don't exaggerate when you do that, right?
A. No.
Q. When you watched the video did you see any pedestrians on the street?
A. No.
Q. There were no pedestrians, right?
A. I don't think so.
Q. And outside of the few cars that were in
the area that you mentioned, there were no other people on the road or behind you, right?
A. No.
Q. When you -- after you stopped Mr. Bombard for the second time, you walk up to his car, and you ordered him to get out, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You told him he was under arrest?
A. Yes.
Q. You told him he had committed a crime, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And that crime was disorderly conduct, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you explained it, and you said it was Disorderly Conduct 101, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you told him that his use of swear words and his middle finger, you told him that all the public around at that time heard it and saw it; isn't that right?
A. Those are my exact words, I'll not disagree with you.
Q. Your exact words were, All that public
there heard it and saw it?
A. Okay.
Q. Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And if you need the video, just tell me.
A. No, I believe you, if you have the quotes there. The video speaks for itself.
Q. And you ordered him to get out of the car a few times, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And can you tell me about your training -- you know, tell me about what you're trained to do when you're ordering someone from a vehicle.
A. Thinking about like say textbook stuff, it's certainly don't want to use force, and so there's no reason to rush through the encounter and so to avoid that. We're trained to extract people from vehicles, but it's not really the hope or the objective.

So the goal is to kind of get clear from the door in case he swings it open so I won't get hit or something, and other than that it's simply let's get this guy to comply without having to use force. That's really important.
Q. And where are you trained to -- are you trained in particular places to stand or ways to stand, anything like that?
A. As a general interview or things have a potential to escalate, like we talked about the belated stance, which is just angle a weapon away from somebody so it makes not lunge-able basically.
Q. So you mean you angle your weapon away from somebody, is that what you're saying?
A. Correct.
Q. And Mr. Bombard responded to you saying that you were arresting him for disorderly conduct by -- he was in disbelief, right?
A. I don't know.
Q. Well, when you watched the video this morning what did he think he was -- let me go back. When you watched the video this morning you heard him say things like, I can't believe this, right?
A. Things like that, yes.
Q. Yeah, so what do you think was going through his mind?

MR. MESSINA: Objection; speculation. THE WITNESS: So I -- yeah, in review he did seem surprised.

BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. And he questioned whether his actions constituted disorderly conduct, right?
A. I think so.
Q. And at one point you said to him, It wasn't a problem until it became a problem; is that right?
A. I think something like that, yes.
Q. What did you mean by that?
A. That the -- I think what I meant was that the middle finger that was part of the reason for the initial contact was not the problem. The arrest has to do with what happened since then, which was the profanity and the middle finger in front of all those people.
Q. All those people who you don't know if anyone saw it, right?
A. Well, the affidavit speaks for itself. The video does as well. It was the people were present to be exposed to such things, and I don't -- I didn't take a poll or an attendance of people, but I know there's a lot of people. There seemed to be quite a few people present to observe it, and that was what I made the decision based on.
Q. When you say there were quite a few
people, we talked about I think a total of four vehicles; is that right?
A. In the immediate space, yes.
Q. Do you know how many people were in any of those vehicles?
A. No.
Q. So it's possible that there were four people, maximum, we're talking about here?
A. Potentially.
Q. And you didn't see if any of those people in any of those cars witnessed what Mr. Bombard said, right?
A. That's not -- that's not what I said. I said I had the non-verbal exchange with the pickup truck driver, so I thought that based on his expression that he gave me that he had seen what had happened and he was curious how I was going to respond to it. So I thought if he saw that, then anyone else here also could have seen it. That was my testimony.
Q. Let me go back. You said that you didn't know if anyone else saw -- let me go back.

You didn't -- you said you didn't know whether anyone else heard Mr. Bombard's statements; is that right?
A. That's right.
Q. And you also said you don't know if anyone saw Mr. Bombard display his middle finger; is that right?
A. I said I believe that that gentleman did or was in a position to because we had already had that interaction with each other. But to the extent that other people were exposed to it, I wasn't sure. That's what I said.
Q. I mean, we can read it back. I believe you said you didn't know if anyone else saw it.
A. Right. I'm not sure. I didn't say that, no, no one else certainly didn't see it. I said, no, I don't know.
Q. In that second interaction with

Mr. Bombard when you were on Brainerd Street how would you describe your demeanor?
A. It was more direct.
Q. Do you remember what you were feeling at that point?
A. I was concerned about the -- how the incident escalated, and I knew that I needed to present myself in a way that could affect this arrest without using force. I did not want to have to engage in an arrest situation with him. And so -- but yet I needed to present myself in a way that he knew that I
was serious, that this was serious and that it wasn't a time for question or debate. He just had to comply.
Q. And would you say that you were surprised by Mr. Bombard's actions after the initial stop?
A. Yes.
Q. And would you say that his expressions to you, the swear words and the middle finger, were shocking to you?
A. No.
Q. Would you say that they were upsetting?
A. No.
Q. Did you feel angry at Mr. Bombard?
A. No.
Q. When you approached his vehicle on Brainerd Street do you remember that you raised your voice?
A. Yeah, I did raise my voice, yes.
Q. When you're angry do you raise your voice?
A. Yes.
Q. You've been angry before, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Who hasn't. It's common that people when they get angry raise their voices, right?
A. Sometimes they do, and sometimes they
don't.
Q. In your training -- after you got

Mr. Bombard out of the car did he resist the arrest at all?
A. No.
Q. He was compliant?
A. Yes.
Q. And you walked him over to the hood of your car, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you had him put his hands on the hood, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And then you had him put his hands behind his back, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you handcuffed him behind his back, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you have any reason to think that Mr. Bombard was -- after he's out of the car did you have any reason to think that Mr. Bombard was a danger to you?
A. It's not a question to have to ask, yeah.
Q. I can rephrase it.

After you got Mr. Bombard out of the car you didn't think he was going to hurt you, right?
A. No.
Q. You didn't think that he was going to try to run, did you?
A. No, I didn't think so.
Q. You didn't think he was a dangerous person, did you?
A. No.
Q. And you didn't think that he was under the influence of alcohol, did you?
A. No.
Q. You didn't think he was under the influence of any illegal drugs, right?
A. No.
Q. When you conduct an arrest or when you've conducted an arrest in the past do you always handcuff suspects?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you always handcuff them behind their backs?
A. I'd say with very few exceptions.
Q. When would you make an exception?
A. I think if somehow they had some demonstrable shoulder issues where that would cause
them some type of pain, I wouldn't do it. If they were children or something.

And I admit that these are not -- this would not be the -- that would be against procedure from the State Police. They would instruct us to always handcuff people behind their back, and I've departed from that from time to time when I thought that the situation felt like it needed it.

You could argue about compassion and so forth and how you do that and how you don't, but I think it's different in front and back. And I think some people, in very few situations I have handcuffed them in the front because I thought the circumstances warranted it, and that would be against policy.
Q. And have you ever handcuffed a person in front because you didn't think they were a danger to you?
A. It's -- I really try to resist that kind of thinking because that type of complacency is exactly what kills and injures police officers and leads to an escalation to the suspects themselves, leading to their injury, so it's -- I really don't think like that. So it's hard for me to answer that.
Q. When you arrest someone -- I'm sorry, remind me, when you arrest someone, I think you said
you always put them in handcuffs; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. In addition to handcuffing Mr. Bombard, you also searched him, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You patted him down, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You searched his pockets, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You didn't find anything illegal in there, right?
A. No.
Q. You didn't find anything dangerous?
A. No.

I'd like to be on the record saying that cigarettes are dangerous.
Q. You found cigarettes on him?
A. I don't remember. I don't remember.
Q. So he was a very dangerous person.

Earlier we talked about when you would put someone under custodial arrest versus when you would put someone -- when you would cite them into court. And you told me that when you have that kind of discretion, so outside of Rule 3 exceptions, you make that decision based upon whether the behaviors
are continuing; that's right, right?
A. It's a summary, yes.
Q. That's essentially what you said?
A. That's the gist, yes.
Q. In this case Mr. Bombard, as you said, said some swear words, drove off with his middle finger out the side window and then put it back and continued driving and then went to make the left onto Brainerd Street before you put the siren on; is that right?
A. That's actually not accurate.
Q. Okay. How is that not accurate?
A. I think the piece that we're missing is that I really wanted him to get him to stay on Main Street. He probably could have found himself a parking spot down there. And so he didn't yield to the blue lights, which $I$ was thinking to myself, all right, well, there was no break in the blue lights and so perhaps he's not clear that I'm looking to contact him again.

So I was hitting -- once I realized that, as he started to signal before he made the turn, I'm like, whoa, whoa, no, stay down here. And so I started hitting my siren before he did that, and he didn't respond to that. He made the turn at that
point, and he continued up to past the exit of a bank that's right there.
Q. And -- but to be clear, before you put the siren on he had put his middle finger away, right?
A. Yes.
Q. So his behavior had -- the behavior you were concerned about, his orderly conduct, had stopped; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And yet you had -- you had already decided to arrest him, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And then you did arrest him, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You put him into custody. If his behavior had stopped why in this situation did you not follow your typical procedure of citing him to court?
A. So the part of the story that we're missing was the way he left the stop, which was that he was -- he was looking at me in the side-view mirror. He wasn't looking for traffic. He was fixated on me, and so -- and as a result of that I think he had missed the fact that that truck was trying to get by.

So he was stopped, while still looking at
me, and so I said, look, this guy is agitated now. I'm going to continue custody. This isn't a lodge-able offense, nor would I care to do that, but I am going to cool him down by bringing him -continuing the custody for that processing period, and then we'll release him on a citation. So that was the plan.

It was by the nature of those two co-occurring things, which was the -- which was the profanity. He had gotten himself -- he had gotten himself escalated, and then the fact that he had fixated on me and the way that he exited that stop.

The concern was if he's agitated, I don't want him to now -- now perhaps I've put into motion this road rage incident that is yet to unfold. I have to just chill him out. And so I'm going to do that by bringing him into custody, processing him up at the barracks, make sure we deescalate this thing, and then we can release him again. So that was the thought process.
Q. In your experience does arresting people and putting them into handcuffs deescalate people?
A. Yes.
Q. Does it ever escalate people?
A. Sometimes.
Q. Were you worried about that?
A. It's not about -- no, I wasn't.
Q. So you weren't worried about him escalating as a part of your interaction with him while you were arresting him, but you were worried about his escalating if you didn't arrest him, is that what you're saying?
A. I was concerned that there was an escalation that had already been put into motion. And I thought that by continuing custody we can make sure that we normalize this encounter that clearly is not normal at this point. So let's normalize it.

It's not handcuffs that escalate or
deescalate. It's the conduct that happened afterwards. So the whole strategy from this point moving forward is to make sure that we can deescalate Mr. Bombard, make sure that he's safe to return to the driving population.
Q. And would you say it was out of your normal procedure -- you know, we talked a moment ago about, you know, when you have discretion to make these arrests, you said you would only do it if it was a continuing behavior, right?
A. Or concern of continuing behavior, yes.
Q. And in this instance the behavior itself
had ceased; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. So this was a departure from your normal practice of only -- of putting people into custody when they have ceased the behavior that you were concerned about; is that right?
A. That's not true.
Q. Okay. Well, tell me where I'm wrong.
A. I was concerned that Mr. -- I just said this.

> Mr. Bombard was escalated. I was concerned that this thing had now reached a point where if he's this upset, I don't know what kind of -what kind of action may occur beyond a -- let me stop the logic here for a second.

I am going to arrest this person. So whether I choose a citation at the side of the road for disorderly conduct and send him on his way or continue that custody, he's going to get the citation.

Already he didn't like the community caretaking encounter that I attempted to have with him. He then escalated from that into a disorderly conduct, actually a criminal offense. If I cut this guy a citation and allow him to continue to drive, what will happen now? I can't have that. That's why

I have to.
This is going to happen, and this is going to happen in the form of a continued custody so that we can make sure he leaves deescalated. I'm not going to just give someone a criminal citation and let them just drive away when this had only gone in one direction at this point, so that wasn't a departure from my norm.

In fact, it was consistent with how I treat people in these situations.
Q. And I'm just trying to understand because you said that you only do it when there's a continuing behavior, you know, and the example you gave earlier today was that someone's harassing another person. You know, calling them repeatedly, repeatedly and not stopping. You know, you would bring them into custody because they might -- it appears likely that they would do it again, right?

If they're calling numerous times, trying to harass someone, right?
A. That's right.
Q. We talked about that.

In this instance you had an initial no middle finger, which -- you know, according to you, and then you had Mr. Bombard swear and show his middle
finger as he was driving away.
Why do you think that he would have continued that behavior?
A. It's not necessarily about the criminal behavior that -- not the minority report. A red ball doesn't go off and a siren and the next thing you know this guy is going to commit a murder a few hours from now. No. It's not about him continuing the disorderly conduct behavior per se, no.

The disorderly conduct offense had been committed. He's going to get arrested for that. My discretion is potentially -- even though the Vermont State Police prefers that I continue custody when I witness a misdemeanor, sometimes if $I$ think this can be resolved from a citation, sometimes I just do a citation. And so the variable is not just about continued disorderly conduct behavior. That's not what I said before.

It's about a concern about just continued public safety concerns generally. Sometimes it involves a victim. That was the example that I gave, but this was a -- this was a -- I wasn't concerned about some third-party victim at this point. It was I'm going to give him a citation for disorderly conduct.

Based on what I've seen with Mr. Bombard so far, he's not going to respond very well to this, and I don't want to own him now having some potential road rage incident after I -- his last contact was with Trooper Riggen, who dropped a citation on him after having witnessed what he witnessed, and now everything is cool, Bro. Like that's not how it works.

So he's going to continued custody. He's going to come back to the barracks. We're going to make sure that he's deescalated before we release him with this citation. He has to have this cooling-down period. And that was the logic.

I think the public would want that from their police; to make sure that we're not putting things into motion for the worst.
Q. You put him in the back of the squad car after he was handcuffed, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you remember calling his behavior ridiculous?
A. I think so.
Q. What did you mean by "ridiculous"?
A. I heard -- I heard my tone this morning
as I was listening to the interaction, and it -- I
believe what I was thinking at the time was I thought that it was ridiculous akin to unnecessary.

And I was -- I think I was disappointed in the fact that this whole thing was unnecessary and yet here we are.
Q. When you were going through with him, you had said to him a couple of times that people -- that there were a lot of people around when he swore and showed his middle finger, right?
A. Yes.
Q. In fact, you said there was over 100 people around; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Why did you tell him there were over 100 people around?
A. You know, I -- at that time that I said that to him I really believed it, and I think somewhere in my mind I was taking a mental tally of all the cars that had driven by in the three minutes of the stop or something. I have no idea, but I was way off the mark, clearly.
Q. You didn't see 100 people?
A. No.
Q. You didn't see ten people?
A. I think there was -- yeah, you can say
there was four cars around, I think that we could push it to a dozen or something, but there wasn't 100 for sure.
Q. And so I mean in the moment there you didn't tell him the truth?
A. I really -- I really believed that I did. In my mind I was like there was a lot of people there. That was my truth at that moment. And the reason it doesn't reflect in the affidavit is because upon review I was like, yeah, dude, you're way off on that. There wasn't 100 people there.
Q. Do you remember telling Trooper Bruzzi that there were --
A. Yes.
Q. -- over 100 people?
A. Yes.
Q. I mean, at the time you were certain there were 100 people?
A. Yes.
Q. $\quad 100$ percent certain?
A. I wouldn't have said it if I didn't think there was a lot of people there. I don't think -- I don't think that was some euphemism or some metaphor for some crowd or something, but I really thought there was a lot of people there.

So I probably pulled 100 out of the sky but, you know, I thought there was more than -- I mean, it was noon on Main Street and so there were a lot of cars going back and forth throughout the entire encounter, and so somewhere in my mind I just -- I overestimated, let's say.
Q. So you brought Mr. Bombard back to the barracks, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You put him in a holding cell?
A. Yes.
Q. And you, he, and Trooper Bruzzi had a conversation, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And as a part of that conversation you told him that he would get his property back, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You told him that he would be there for about a half an hour, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You talked to him about -- he mentioned the freedom of expression, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you talked to him about your perspective on that, right?
A. I don't remember exactly what I said.
Q. You said one can argue what freedom of expression is. One can argue that his actions were so unusual that it mandated intervention. This is about the first stop --
A. Okay.
Q. -- is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And after he was in a holding cell he was processed, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And he was released, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you know how long that process took?
A. I don't remember.
Q. But you had told him it was going to take a half an hour. Do you think it took longer than that?
A. I -- I think it probably took longer than half an hour. I don't remember the time.
Q. Did you -- and you gave him the citation, right?
A. I actually don't remember.
Q. Let's see.
(Plaintiff's Exhibit 32 was marked for identification, attached at the end of the original transcript.)

MR. DIAZ: I'm just going to mark this as Exhibit 32 .

BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. Mr. Riggen, I'm handing you what's marked as Exhibit 32. Can you tell me what Exhibit 32 is?
A. Yes. It's a citation for disorderly conduct.
Q. And who is it to?
A. Greg Bombard.
Q. And what is the date of issuance?
A. 2/9 -- February 9th, 2018.
Q. And where it says signature, issuing officer, is that your signature?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you remember when you signed this?
A. So I -- it would have been contemporaneous to this incident, obviously the day of. I don't think I handed this to him. I think I filled it out, but $I$ don't think I actually handed it to him.
Q. And this is his citation to court, right? A. Yes.
Q. So you and Trooper Bruzzi both told Mr. Bombard that he would be there for about a half an hour, right?
A. Yes.
Q. That's what you expected?
A. Yes.
Q. You knew that you were going to cite him, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you remember about how long he was at the barracks for?
A. I don't remember.
Q. Do you think it was more than an hour?
A. I don't know.
Q. Was it -- I mean, it wasn't five hours?
A. I don't think so, but I don't remember.
Q. Before you put Mr. Bombard in the squad car he asked you what was going to happen to his car, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you responded to him by telling him that it was parked in a "No Parking" area, and so it would have to be towed, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And was there any other reason that you
thought Mr. Bombard's vehicle had to be towed?
A. No.
Q. It wasn't blocking the driveway behind him, right?
A. It was not blocking the driveway, no.
Q. And it wasn't -- and it wasn't blocking the roadway, right?
A. No.
Q. And Mr. Bombard didn't choose to park where he was parked, right?
A. He did choose that spot.
Q. Well, he had to pull over, right?
A. He chose where he stopped that car.
Q. Did he have a -- did he have a choice to drive further?

You put the blue lights on, right?
You had the blue lights on the whole time, you said, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You were following him. You followed him onto Brainerd Street, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You had your blue lights on, and you had put the siren on by that point?
A. Yes.
Q. So -- and it's possible he didn't, he just didn't see your blue lights, right?
A. That's not likely, but I concede, and I did that day. I said maybe he doesn't realize I'm trying to stop him.
Q. Right, so that's why you put the sirens on --
A. Right.
Q. -- to let him know that you were there?
A. Right.
Q. Right, and that you wanted to pull him over?
A. Yes.
Q. Is he allowed under -- and I mean you're a traffic safety expert, right?

We've been over that?
A. Yes.
Q. Is he allowed -- when he recognizes that an officer is trying to pull him over is he permitted by law to continue driving?
A. No.
Q. Is he permitted to turn around?
A. No.
Q. Is he permitted to go into a parking lot somewhere or try to find a parking lot to go into?
A. No. No.
Q. He has to pull over right away, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you were aware of that at the time, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You wouldn't want him to continue driving, right?
A. Right.
Q. So can you really say that he chose to park where he parked?
A. I'm making myself a note to mail him a ticket for not yielding to my blue lights on Main Street where I wanted him to stop in the first place.

You know, he chose to make that left-hand turn up to Brainerd, and he chose to stop right past an exit to a bank where a sign says don't park here.

And if the environment had been different and it was summertime and we could have moved him past that sign to where the people coming out of the bank wouldn't have an obstructed line of sight, which is why that sign was there, then we would have a different outcome.

Unfortunately, he chose to disregard the siren on Main Street, and he chose to travel up

Brainerd just far enough to get past that driveway and park in front of a sign that says do not park here. So at that point the -- I don't have any -- any other choice but to remove the vehicle from the road.
Q. We're going to watch this part because I think we want to make sure we get this one right.
A. Okay.
Q. So I'm showing Mr. Riggen what has been marked as Exhibit 12, which is the -- well, I'll let Mr. Riggen explain it.

What is Exhibit 12?
A. It's the cruiser video from that day.
Q. From your cruiser, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And I've moved it ahead to Minute 5:17, which is after the initial stop had concluded. I'm going to press "Play", and I'd like you, Mr. Riggen, to watch and take note of when you put the siren on as it relates to when Mr. Bombard puts his left turn signal on. Okay?
A. Okay.
(A video was played on Mr. Diaz's
computer for the witness to view.)
BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. Did you -- do you need to watch it again?
A. Yes, please.
Q. It's not a problem at all. I'm backing it up. Let me just pause. I'm backing it up to Minute 5:02 of Exhibit 12.
(A video was played on Mr. Diaz's computer for the witness to view.) BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. Do you see the blinker?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you heard your siren yet?
A. No.
Q. So you put your siren on. He's getting ready to turn, and he has a choice there. I'm stopping at Minute 5:37. He has a choice there, right, of whether to -- he's on -- he's getting ready to make a left turn. He can stop what he's doing and go back into -- onto North Main Street and stay and then pull over to the other side of the road, or he can make a left turn and pull over out of traffic.

What is the safer option?
A. The safer option was to stay on Main Street like I signaled him to do.
Q. And is that the safer?

I mean, obviously Brainerd Street is a side street, right?
A. Right.
Q. There's not a lot of traffic on that street, right?
A. There's less traffic than Main Street, if that's what you're saying.
Q. Yes, less traffic than Main Street. A lot -- much less traffic, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And on Main Street there was quite a few cars going past you and his car when you were previously on the side of the road, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Don't you think it's safer for him to turn left onto Brainerd Street since he was already doing that, he was already on that side of his lane, and it wouldn't be where there would be other traffic?
A. No, and that's also not what the video shows.
Q. I'm asking you.
A. Yeah. I'm saying "No".
Q. Okay, but after he turns onto Main Street he stops because you're behind him, right?

Brainerd Street, sorry.
A. He eventually choses to stop at a location on Brainerd.
Q. Eventually. How long did it take for him to stop on Brainerd?
A. You can play the rest of the video to see where he stops, but it speaks for itself, I suppose.
Q. So I'm starting Exhibit 12 at 5:37.
(A video was played on Mr. Diaz's computer for the witness to view.)

BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. And he's pulled over now, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And it's at Minute 5:43; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. So approximately six seconds?
A. Six seconds on Brainerd.
Q. And he had to drive past a driveway entrance, right?
A. Exit, right.
Q. A driveway exit; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And is that an entrance or an exit from a parking lot?
A. Yes, in that -- I'm sorry.
Q. Now, earlier today we talked about parking violations, didn't we?
A. Yes.
Q. And you said that when you've encountered cars parked, stopped, or standing in an area where they're not supposed to be and there's no driver in them, you said you've left them there for hours, didn't you?
A. There was an "if" in there, but -- so, no, I didn't say that in the way that you're framing it.
Q. Well, you said that you've encountered cars on the side of -- on the side of the road, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Without a driver in them, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you said that you left them there; is that right?
A. You're missing part of that statement.
Q. What am I missing?
A. You're missing the "if", and the "if" is if they don't pose a hazard.
Q. Right.
A. And that's the difference in whether a car gets removed or whether a car is allowed to stay.
Q. Right. And -- but Mr. Bombard's car wasn't blocking the road, was it?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. Well, actually you just said a moment ago that it wasn't blocking the road.
A. That's -- that's not the context of what I said. It wasn't blocking the road. It was obstructing traffic's ability to exit that parking lot, though.

And that little white mark on that telephone pole is a sign that says, "Do Not Park Here". And the concern that the hazard that this poses was demonstrated during an interaction where a woman is exiting the bank parking lot, and she needs Trooper Bruzzi's help to see past Mr. Bombard's car. That's why that sign is there; because it poses a sight obstruction because it does block the road.

No, he doesn't block traffic from being able to go up Brainerd. It was posing a hazard for people exiting that driveway, and that's why it got towed.
Q. And -- but that's not why you told Mr. Bombard why you had to tow his car, is it?
A. Well, what did I say to him? I don't remember.
Q. You told him there was a "No Parking" sign, right?
A. Right. That's exactly what I just said
to you.
Q. Was anyone allowed -- was there -- was anyone allowed to park on that side of the street anywhere on that street?
A. I'm not sure.
Q. Is anyone allowed to park on the other side of that street?
A. I'm not sure.
Q. He asked to move his car, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you didn't let him, right?
A. No.
Q. And you said that you had already decided, you know, you were going to arrest him but he was going to get a citation, right?
A. I'm not quite sure what you mean.
Q. Well, at that point you said he's going to get a citation, right?
A. Well, that was the ultimate outcome, what I referred to, yes.
Q. And when you got back to the barracks earlier, just moment ago you said he was going to be released in a half an hour, right?
A. Yes.
Q. So his car was, in your estimation, going
to be in that spot for a total of maybe an hour; isn't that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you thought it was such an obstruction that it had to be towed within -- you know, before that hour was up?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you think it would have been a courteous thing to do, knowing that he was going to be back out in about an hour and could have went and moved his car, to just have left it there?
A. There was absolutely no scenario that car was allowed to stay where it was.
Q. But there are scenarios where you have left cars on the side of the highway; isn't that right?
A. If they don't pose a hazard to other vehicles, yes, that's true.
Q. And you've left cars on the sides of roads in other situations, right?
A. If they are safe to be left there, yes.
Q. Mr. Bombard's keys were still in the car, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you -- did you happen to look at the
other side of the street and see if there were "No Parking" signs there?
A. I didn't.
Q. Would you be surprised if you're allowed to park on the other side of the street?
A. If it's allowed, I wouldn't be surprised.
Q. But you didn't check to see if you could move his car just to the other side of the street, right?
A. No.
Q. You didn't check to see if you could move it up -- I should ask, how far up -- how much farther would you have needed to have the car for it to not be a hazard to the driveway?
A. Again, I'm not sure, in that in February in St. Albans I don't know if street parking is allowed.

You're posing some things here I don't know if they're real or not, and it occurred to me --
Q. That's not the question that's pending. The question that's pending is you said that his car was a hazard because it was blocking the exit from a parking lot in some fashion; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And I'm asking you, how far would it have needed to have moved forward for it no longer to be a hazard?
A. I don't know. I'd have to take a look at where the line of sight is and what that sign actually wants. I don't know.
Q. Well, we have a picture of it so we can look.

I'm showing Mr. Riggen the Exhibit 12 again at Minute 5:43. I'm not going to press "Play".

Well, let's press "Play" and just make sure the car is fully stopped.
(A video was played on Mr. Diaz's computer for the witness to view.)

BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. The car is fully stopped, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You see the snowbank just to the right of it, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And if we go back to 5:38 and press "Play", you can see the driveway, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Mr. Bombard pulls up to the snowbank, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And then while we're at it, we can look at the car that comes out. Let's take a look at it. I'm going to show Mr. Riggen Exhibit 12 at -- starting at Minute 11.

Can you see this okay?
A. Yes.
(A video was played on Mr. Diaz's computer for the witness to view.)

BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. So I'm going to stop at 11:19. There's a car coming out of that exit driveway, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And it exits. Stopping at 11:33, you actually move your car back, right, to get out of the way of the exit?
A. Yes.
Q. But the car that comes out of the exit makes it out fine, right?
A. Trooper Bruzzi was directing her out.
Q. I'm just saying, it gets out without incident, correct?
A. Actually, no.
Q. Well, it makes a left-hand turn, doesn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. And it -- the person who was driving it went on her way, right?
A. And she drove off the road to do it. That's why Trooper Bruzzi goes, Well, that's one way to do it. Because she had to pull out further than she probably needed to, to cut the curb because I was there and, also, because she couldn't see. The cruiser was obstructing her, too, and so, too, was that car. So she had to drive off the road to do it so, no, I wouldn't say it was without incident.
Q. Well, she had to drive around your car?
A. Yes. That's what I said, yes.
Q. What I'm saying is she was able to clear the driveway --
A. Yes.
Q. -- regardless of Mr. Bombard's car being there, right?
A. Mr. Bombard's car, as the video shows, is obstructing people's views leaving that driveway, which is why that white sign says, "Do Not Park Here".
Q. I'm not asking you whether it's obstructing anyone's view.

I'm asking you whether it obstructed her exiting the driveway there?
A. Yes.
Q. She had to go around his car?
A. Visual obstructions are an obstruction nonetheless.
Q. I'm asking, what's your definition of an obstruction, first of all?
A. Obstruction is something that can be a physical barrier that $I$ either have to go around or I cannot see there. It is not transparent. It is opaque.

And that vehicle is an obstruction for her visual ability to see up the hill and, therefore, it is imposing an obstruction there, and that's why that sign was there.
Q. You know that that's why that sign is there?
A. I believe that sign said either do not park on that side of the street, which doesn't really make the case there, or it said don't park from here to the curb or the corner or whatever, and in that case that is why that sign is there.
Q. So you don't know if that sign is there because of the driveway or because you're not supposed to park on that side of the street, is that what you're telling me?
A. I'm saying that sign says don't park, and that's the end of the debate for me.
Q. My point being, she was able to exit the driveway and didn't run into Bombard's car, right?
A. Right.
Q. Okay. I'm going to ask you again. You just watched the video. You saw where Mr. Bombard's car was; that the back of the car was right up against the edge of the snowbank, right?
A. Yes.
Q. How far forward would Mr. Bombard have needed to drive or move the car forward -- let me rephrase.

How far forward would Mr. Bombard's car need to go in order to not pose a hazard to people exiting that driveway?
A. So after reviewing that video, I would say there's no distance that it would not pose a hazard.
Q. If he moved his car a thousand feet forward, it would still pose a hazard?
A. The video shows the hazard that that car would have posed given the environment on that day.
Q. It would have posed a hazard to people exiting that driveway if he had moved it forward

1,000 feet, is that what you're saying?
A. Are we talking just the driveway right now?
Q. Yes. That's the reason that you said it needed to be moved, right?
A. It posed a hazard. It posed a hazard.
Q. A hazard to who?
A. To vehicles that may be needing that road. I continue to reference that driveway exit because that was the sign, purpose of the sign. You posed a hypothetical about how far to move. By moving it, it might -- it might absolve the concern from the driveway exit, but it creates another hazard.

Like, for example, the UPS truck that we saw in that video. He would never be able to get around that car. That day, sir, the snowbanks were down onto the road, essentially creating a one-way road. And if I leave Mr. Bombard's car on that road for 30 minutes or an hour or 90 minutes, who knows what kind of operations people are going to do, to include damaging Mr. Bombard's car.

The great paradox in all of this is that I'm being accused of something when really I did it for his benefit. I didn't even want him to be in that position. I wanted him to stay on Main Street where
there were hundreds of parking spots probably, anywhere. He could have pulled over to the right, and it would have been fine.

He made the decision to go left up
Brainerd. As soon as I saw his signal come on to turn left I'm like, whoa, no, don't do that, stay here, and that's evidenced by my siren.

He continued to drive south. He continued to turn left, and he stopped himself in a zone, Don't Park Here. That road is so narrow it would not be possible to leave his car there. It's that simple. And there's no place for me to reasonably bring it to.

There's a busy teller driveway there. It was all residential driveways. It was a bummer that it came to that, and that's what was required.
Q. When you took Mr. Bombard in a squad car up to the station you drove past his car, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You didn't hit the car, did you?
A. There was no one coming down the road at that time.
Q. That's not what I asked.

You didn't hit the car, did you?
A. No.
Q. You didn't have to go up onto the curb, did you?
A. No.
Q. You just went around the car and continued, right?
A. Right.
Q. Did Trooper Bruzzi hit Mr. Bombard's car when he was coming the other direction on Brainerd Street?
A. No.
Q. And did he have to go onto the curb to avoid Mr. Bombard's car?
A. No.
Q. So, again, I'm going to ask because I've not gotten an answer to this question yet, we're talking about the driveway only that you said Mr. Bombard's car posed a hazard to because people couldn't see -- wouldn't be able to see other cars coming from their right, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. How far forward -- assume that he can park. You know, we don't know if there are "No Parking" signs going up that road, right?
A. I don't know.
Q. We don't know, right?

Correct?
A. Right.
Q. So let's assume that this is the one "No Parking" sign on Brainerd Street, and we're not going to move his car in front of someone else's driveway, right?
A. Right.
Q. If he moved his car up, how far would it have to go to no longer pose a hazard to people exiting the driveway you see in the video?
A. Probably the other side of that pole.
Q. And how far do you estimate that was?
A. Ten feet.
Q. So if he had moved his car up ten feet and it wasn't blocking a driveway and it wasn't blocking the road that people couldn't at least go one way on it, would you have still towed it?
A. You know, it really depends on what that sign says, right?

If we make some assumptions of what the sign says or doesn't say. If the sign says don't park here to the corner, that's a different sign than don't park on this side of the street.

And so in any event, you know, we've gotten to your answer about moving his car up beyond
the pole from the driveway to the bank. That then poses -- puts into motion a second hazard that still is going to require that vehicle not being able to remain on that road on that day.
Q. And that hazard is what?
A. That the road is narrowed because of the overflowing snowbanks. St. Albans Public Works didn't seem to have the opportunity -- maybe there was a snowstorm recently, I don't know, but the banks had come onto the road, and so if he was allowed to park there, vehicles would not be able to get through.

And I submit that the UPS truck would actually not been able to get through unless the UPS truck drove off the road to do it.
Q. Have we seen a UPS truck when we've watched this video?
A. Yeah. When he pulls onto Brainerd there's a UPS truck that is looking to turn onto Main Street. And so that's a wide -- that's a wide box obviously, and so if Mr. Brainerd -- Mr. Brainerd -Mr. Bombard's car is allowed to stay here, it just puts into a motion a ripple here about posing hazards to other vehicles now.
Q. Is it a hazard to have a vehicle on a street for one hour when people can stay on the road
and drive around it?
A. Yes. There are -- yes, it does.
Q. Is it a hazard when a vehicle is on the shoulder of a -- of Interstate 89?
A. Well, that's a bad example because you can't stand or stop up there, so that would be towed anyway.
Q. I'm asking, is it a hazard?
A. Yes.
Q. It's a hazard for a vehicle to be on Interstate 89?
A. Yes.
Q. On the shoulder, left there?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it a hazard for a vehicle to be on North Main Street on the side unattended?
A. Potentially, yes.
Q. Have you encountered vehicles -- earlier we said you've encountered vehicles that were left on the side of a road, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you've encountered vehicles on the side of the road on I-89, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Is there ever a time that you encountered
a vehicle on I-89 that was unattended, on the shoulder, and that you towed it?
A. Yes.
Q. Is there a time in that situation that you didn't tow it?
A. Yes.
Q. So there are times when you've seen a -witnessed a vehicle unattended in the shoulder of I-89 and did not have it towed?
A. Yes.
Q. And how did you make that decision?
A. What time of day is it? Are we approaching commuter hours, as in darkness poses a different circumstances. We'd want to remove it before darkness.

Policy about the interstate specifically, about how many hours a vehicle can remain up there before it's towed automatically, two or three.

So environmental factors. Is it snowing? Is it wintertime, or is it summertime? Is there rain in the forecast, or isn't there? And so environmental factors weight very heavily throughout this decisionmaking matrix?
Q. It's your discretion?
A. Yes.

MR. DIAZ: Let's take a break, and then we'll be able to do it a little bit longer and wrap up.
(A recess was taken from 4:10 p.m. to 4:18 p.m.)

BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. Mr. Riggen, a moment ago you said that you were making a note in your book there to remind you to give Mr. Bombard a ticket.
A. Yes.
Q. Were you serious about that?
A. No.
Q. You were joking?
A. Yes.
Q. And you are aware that Mr. Bombard was charged with disorderly conduct, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And are you aware that there was a second charge?
A. I don't think so.
Q. So you're not aware that he was charged with a second disorderly conduct by -- by vehicle?
A. I don't know if $I$ knew that or not.
Q. Did you -- when you were talking to or
when you were -- when you were preparing your
affidavit did you speak with anyone in the State's Attorney's Office?
A. $\quad$ No.
Q. After you prepared your affidavit did you speak with anyone in the State's Attorney's Office in Franklin County?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever talked to anyone in the State's Attorney's Office about Mr. Bombard?
A. Yes.
Q. And when was that?
A. It was after the arrest before the citation.
Q. Who did you talk to?
A. Jim Hughes.
Q. And what was the substance of the conversation?
A. I have taken this person into custody, here's how it started, here's the elements, and is this a charge that you would bring?
Q. And what did Jim Hughes say?
A. He said "Yes".
Q. What else did you discuss?
A. That was it.
Q. You know you talked to Mr. Bombard about

Disorderly Conduct 101, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you give me -- and you talked to Jim Hughes about the elements of disorderly conduct, you said?
A. Yes.
Q. What is Disorderly Conduct 101?
A. There are a few different components that could be disorderly conduct, and one is violent or tumultuous behavior that is -- profanity being one of those potential variables. It's not in the presence of police. Police cannot be victims of disorderly conduct but members of the public can.

And then another variable that I guess there was a second charge, disorderly conduct of a motor vehicle which is obstructing the flow of traffic.

And so to me Disorderly Conduct 101 is probably informal language for this is -- this is cut and dry, DC, disorderly conduct. That's what I mean when I say that.
Q. And you said it would include violent or tumultuous. When you say "violent or tumultuous" what does that mean to you?
A. I think -- I think standing in a park and
pounding on top of a trash can could be perceived as violent or tumultuous behavior.

I also think that yelling profanities is a form of tumultuous behavior. And, again, I'm acutely aware that police cannot be the victims of such things but members of the public can, and in this case this was a witnessed misdemeanor by me, which was -- the tumultuous behavior was exemplified through the profanity and the middle finger.
Q. We've talked about the First Amendment, and you agreed that -- with Vermont State policy that verbal abuse is protected by the First Amendment, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And that includes profanities, the use of profanities?
A. Yes.
Q. That includes the use of profanities in public, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And that includes whether it's in front of a large crowd or a small group of people, right?
A. So I think I disagree with that. I think context matters.
Q. How so?
A. I think that if one is at a protest and there's a lot of profanity expressed, that is a different environment than people who are trying to get to their lunch hour on whenever day in February.
Q. So if you use profanity at a protest where there's a crowd getting riled up, it's less impactful, is that what you're saying?
A. Yes.
Q. And it's in that -- in that context not a crime?
A. I believe in that context that would not rise to the level of disorderly conduct because people are willfully submitting themselves to that type of language and atmosphere.
Q. And, you know, taking -- you didn't think Mr. Bombard's expressions here were violent, did you?
A. No.
Q. But you did think they were tumultuous?
A. Yes.
Q. And so separating these two words out, what does "tumultuous" mean to us?
A. "Tumultuous" means behavior that involves profanity and is somewhat perhaps exaggerated or, again, this would not be Merriam Webster, but wound up. So not just profanity for profanity's sake but
loud profanity. And holding a middle finger out the window, for example, with those loud profanities in front of people who aren't willfully wanting to receive that to me is tumultuous.
Q. So even if Mr. Bombard intended for his expressions -- well, let me back up.

When Mr. Bombard used profanities and showed his middle finger, you knew he was directing those at you, right?
A. Yes.
Q. He was upset about you having stopped him, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And so he was speaking to you, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And he was expressing his displeasure with the employee of the State of Vermont, right?
A. Yes.
Q. So if he wants to display his displeasure with an employee of the State of Vermont who had just stopped him in public and he wants to use profanity to do that, how can he avoid a disorderly conduct charge?
A. I think the -- rewinding time, if he
wanted to express his displeasure, he certainly had me at the side of his window during that first
interaction. He could have sworn all he wanted there. This is me and him talking. No problem.

The problem becomes he didn't just express profanity. He was yelling it. I heard it all the way back in my cruiser. It got my attention where I actually turned around, and he continued. And I saw people lay witness to that; this one man in particular. I didn't know who else lay witness to it, but they certainly weren't willful participants in having to experience that. And that becomes the crime.
Q. Let me just show you one more part of the video here. This is Exhibit 12.
You can see this okay?
A. Yes.
Q. It's at Minute 22:28, and this is after you've had Mr. Bombard in a holding cell for a little bit and you've had a conversation with him. Will you take my word for it?
A. Yes.
Q. I just want you to watch what happens.
(A video was played on Mr. Diaz's
computer for the witness to view.)
BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. At Minute 23:20, that was you walking by,
right?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you see your expression?
A. No.
Q. Let's watch it again real quick. (A video was played on Mr. Diaz's computer for the witness to view.)

BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. Did you see your expression that time?
A. Yeah, it's hard to tell.
Q. Did it look like you were smiling?
A. No. That is not what I was doing there.
Q. No?
A. No.
Q. You weren't smiling?
A. No. I -- well --
Q. And just to confirm, you know Ryan Wood, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You both work for the Vermont state Police?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you remember him e-mailing you on February 9th --
A. Yes.
Q. -- 2018?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you seen or have you looked at that e-mail recently?
A. Not recently.
Q. When did you look at that e-mail?
A. A few months ago, probably.
Q. What caused you to look at the e-mail?
A. I think it was presented to me with a list of discovery, perhaps.
Q. I'm going to mark as Exhibit 33 --

MR. SARACHAN: It's already been marked. Off the record.
(A discussion was held off the record.)
(Plaintiff's Exhibit AGO-000136 was previously marked for identification, attached at the end of the original transcript.)

BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. So this exhibit has already been marked, but we'll just for now call it AGO-000136. Do you see that?

Do you have that in front of you, Mr. Riggen?
A. Yes.
Q. And at the bottom you see AGO-000136?
A. Yes.
Q. Going to the second -- going to the second page for a moment.
A. Okay.
Q. What do you see on the second page?
A. It's the press release of the incident.
Q. And going back to the first page, the e-mail towards the bottom, it says from Riggen, Jay, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And then it says sent in Friday, February 9th, 2018, 3:10 p.m., right?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's the -- and it's to the vspmedia@listserv.dps.state.vt.us, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And above that Ryan Wood sends you an e-mail, right?
A. Yes.
Q. In response to the e-mail you sent to VSP Media, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And this is at -- this was sent in Friday, February 9th, 2018, at 8:12 p.m.; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And he says in the e-mail, I recently learned through training these are possible signs of impairment. I haven't been through ARIDE so maybe I'm not the best resource. Did you check his pupils/groin area? Never mind. I see it's in St. Albans. He's probably just retarded.

Did I read that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Going to the first sentence, can you explain what "ARIDE" is?
A. It's an acronym for Advanced Roadside Impaired Driving Enforcement.
Q. And you do training, ARIDE's trainings, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You're the instructor for them?
A. Yes.
Q. And were you the instructor at this time?
A. Yes.
Q. And you had recently learned -- and so Ryan Wood had recently taken up training with you?
A. I'm not sure.
Q. Actually he said he hadn't been through ARIDE, so he's not the best resource.

And then he asks, Did you check his pupils/groin area?

Do you have any idea why he would ask you that?
A. No.
Q. Do you normally check the -- you didn't think Mr. Bombard was under the influence when you stopped him, right?
A. No.
Q. And you didn't note that anywhere in the press release, right?
A. Right.
Q. And so going down to the next line it says, Never mind. I see it's in St. Albans. He's probably just retarded.

Have I read that right?
A. Yes.
Q. What does the word "retarded" mean to you?
A. I think it's a slang for people who may have a mental disability.
Q. And did he tell you why he wrote that word there?
A. No.
Q. Is that a word you use?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever said the word "retarded"?
A. Probably.
Q. And in reference to what?
A. Nothing in particular.
Q. Well, what?
A. Referring to something as silly or stupid.
Q. So something is retarded if it's silly or stupid?
A. No. I'm saying that if I've used that word in the past, that may have been the context of how I used it.
Q. That's how you meant it when you used it in the past?
A. Yes.
Q. And in reference to St. Albans, do you have any idea why he would say that?

I see it's in St. Albans. He's probably just retarded.

MR. MESSINA: Objection; speculation.
THE WITNESS: No.
BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. Did he tell you why he said that?
A. No.
Q. Do you think he was making a joke?

MR. MESSINA: Objection.
THE WITNESS: Yes, I believe he was
trying to.
BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. And did you think it was funny?
A. No.
Q. You didn't think when he wrote this -did you think the first line was funny?
A. No.
Q. Did you think the second line was funny?
A. No.
Q. Did you tell him it wasn't funny?
A. No.
Q. So going up to the top e-mail, it's an e-mail from you to -- back to Ryan Wood, right?
A. Yes.
Q. It's from Friday, February 9th, 2018, at 8:14 p.m., right?
A. Yes.
Q. Two minutes later, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And says, Hahaha ... I definitely missed some good clues harvesting opportunity.

What does "hahaha" mean?
A. It's the word for laughter.
Q. And you laugh at things because you think they're funny, right?
A. That's when people laugh, yes.
Q. And this is in response to Ryan Wood's e-mail, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And it's in response to his e-mail that says both -- that both references checking Mr. Bombard's pupils and groin area and then saying that people -- that $I$ see it's in St. Albans, he's probably just retarded, right?
A. Yes.
Q. So you thought it was funny?
A. No, I didn't.
Q. But you wrote that you were laughing?
A. I wrote that I was laughing, yes.
Q. Do you think that people with mental disabilities are funny?
A. No.
Q. Do you think that that is an acceptable behavior for a Vermont state trooper?
A. No.
Q. Did you tell Ryan Wood that?
A. No.
Q. Why not?
A. There's no reason.
Q. You didn't think it was important to tell him?
A. It didn't occur to me, no.
Q. And you've done the Law Enforcement Torch Run, you said, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's -- that run is about supporting people with disabilities, right?
A. Yes.
Q. So you've represented Vermont State Police in an event supporting people with disabilities, right?
A. Yes.
Q. How do you think the people with
disabilities who you're supporting in that event would feel about that language?

MR. MESSINA: Objection.
THE WITNESS: That it's offensive.
BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. Do you think you should have told Ryan Wood that that's not acceptable?
A. Knowing Ryan I don't think that's what's in his heart, so I think it's a flippant, stupid
comment. I didn't think it needed correction.
Q. And now do you think it still doesn't need correction?
A. I think he's gotten the message.
Q. Did he get that message from you?
A. After -- I don't think I've ever talked to him about this, but $I$ think he told me that it came up -- when did I talk to him about this?

I don't know, but I think this came up in his deposition with you, and I think he's gotten the message.
Q. So you talked to him about this because of his deposition --
A. I don't --
Q. -- or after his deposition?
A. I don't remember. I'm screwing up timelines. I'm not sure.
Q. I mean, what else did he say about it?
A. I recall -- whatever fit into the timeline here. He -- I think he had probably gotten a subpoena, and he was like, What is this about? And I'm like, I'm not going to talk about this.

And then he had some conversation with the AG's Office. I think he got this e-mail, and he was like basically, I'm going to have to answer to
that. I'm like, Yeah. Yeah, you are.
So it was very -- it was very brief. I just don't remember where exactly it fit in.
Q. And did you tell him anything in regard to this e-mail?
A. No.
Q. And so after Mr. Bombard was in the holding cell, you walked away, you called Jim Hughes, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you take me through what happened next?
A. That was the end of it. I didn't have a good rapport with Mr. Bombard, so I asked Detective Sergeant Richard Desany to do the processing. I filled out the citation on the back end. I think Sergeant Desany actually handed it to him, and that was the end of my involvement.
Q. Did you speak with anyone at the Franklin County State's Attorney's Office after you submitted the affidavit of probable cause?
A. No.
Q. Are you aware if there's a video system, like a CTV system in the St. Albans barracks?
A. There is.
Q. And are the cameras in particular places? A. Yes.
Q. Are they throughout the barracks?
A. Not throughout.
Q. Where are they?
A. The processing room is one place. And I don't know if I want to keep this line of questioning as far as barrack security.

MR. MESSINA: Can you proffer just a basis, just for --

MR. SARACHAN: Why don't we just make this part of the deposition confidential?

MR. DIAZ: I'm happy to stipulate to any kind of -- if there's a particular phrase?

MR. SARACHAN: No, we'll just make this confidential.

MR. DIAZ: I'm happy to stipulate that this section will not be released to the extent it reveals any St. Albans barracks security measures. Fair enough?

MR. MESSINA: Sure.
MR. DIAZ: Fair enough, Jay?
MR. MESSINA: That's okay.
MR. DIAZ: And I'll also try to direct my questions more specifically.

MR. MESSINA: Thank you.
BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. You said there's a camera facing the processing area. Is that what you said?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that where the holding cell is?
A. There are two holding cells in the processing room.
Q. And are there cameras -- so I guess at some point Mr. Bombard was taken out of the cell, and he was fingerprinted?
A. Yes.
Q. And he was photographed?
A. Yes.
Q. Would he have been on camera during his fingerprinting?
A. Yes.
Q. Would he have been on camera during the -- his mugshot?
A. Yes.
Q. And would he have been on camera whenever he was interacting with officers during that time?
A. I think most of it, yes.
Q. Have you ever seen a video of Mr. Bombard from the St. Albans barracks cameras?
A. I have.
Q. When was that?
A. A long time ago. Years ago.
Q. Was it around the time of the stop?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know if that video was ever shared with anyone outside of the St. Albans barracks?
A. I would think that it would have been made as part of discovery, the State's Attorney's Office, but other than that, no.
Q. You did the press release on this stop, and you included Mr. Bombard's mugshot, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Why did you include his mugshot?
A. I had to.
Q. Why?
A. The State Police rules are very clear around press releases.
Q. And what do they say?
A. That essentially it's the who, what, where, when, and then a mugshot needs to be attached if it's available.
Q. So the -- is a mugshot always taken when someone is brought in for processing?
A. It should be, barring external
circumstances.
MR. DIAZ: Can you give us two minutes? THE WITNESS: Yes.
(A recess was taken from 4:43 p.m. to
4:50 p.m.)
BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. Mr. Riggen, we talked about how the mugshot, Mr. Bombard's mugshot was attached to the press release, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And earlier we talked about that you're aware that the press releases go out to the various news outlets in the Vermont media, yes?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you aware of any information about that stop being printed in Vermont Media?
A. I'm not sure.
Q. Are you aware of any -- of anything related to the press release that you sent out on February 9th, 2018, being covered by Vermont Media?
A. No.
Q. Would it surprise you if it was covered in the St. Albans Messenger, for instance?
A. It wouldn't surprise me, no.
Q. We talked about your communications with
the State's Attorney's Office a little bit, and you said you spoke with James Hughes, Jim Hughes?
A. Yes.
Q. The former state's attorney?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you also speak with John Lavoie?
A. Yes.
Q. Was that at the same time you talked with Jim Hughes?
A. Yes.
Q. So they were both on the phone at the same time, at that time?
A. No.
Q. So when was the conversation with Jim Hughes?
A. This -- the same day.
Q. And when was the conversation with John Lavoie?
A. The same day.
Q. So you had two conversations with attorneys at the Franklin County State's Attorney's Office?
A. Yes.
Q. So what was the -- why did you -- why did you speak to -- and who did you speak to first?
A. John.
Q. So why did you -- did you call John?
A. I called the State's Attorney's Office, and they put John on the phone.
Q. And what was the substance of that conversation?
A. Oh, I ran the variables of this case by John, and I said, What do you think?

And he said, I'm not sure, you should have a conversation with Jim.
Q. Did he say anything else?
A. Not that I recall.
Q. Did you ask him any questions?
A. No.
Q. That was the end of the conversation?
A. Yes.
Q. And then how did you get in touch with Jim Hughes?
A. I don't know if I was put on hold and he picked up the phone, or if I called right back and then got put through to Jim.
Q. Okay. When did you first learn the name of the driver that you stopped and then arrested on February 9th, 2018?
A. Probably when I arrested him.
Q. The arrest took a little bit of time, right?

We talked about how you brought him out of the car, put him on the hood, put his hands behind his back, et cetera. You put him in the car. When during that time did you first identify him?
A. I'm not sure if I looked at his driver's license after I arrested him. There's a communication I had with dispatch, which I -- well, I asked him. I said, Is this car registered to you? And so I told dispatch, This is the male RO I have in custody for starting the paperwork on that.

I don't know if $I$ knew his name even at that point. It may not have been until I put his name on the citation because, like I said, I had no interaction with him after the arrest. So I just don't remember if I saw his driver's license when I was searching him, or again I -- and the only reason I think I didn't know was because, I said, Hey, are you the registered owner of this vehicle? He said, yeah.

So I said, I have the male RO, 95. I didn't know his name.
Q. Could you say again what "RO" is?
A. I'm sorry. Male registered owner.
Q. And "95" meant?
A. I'm sorry. I don't know why I talk like that. In custody.
Q. Did John Lavoie tell you why he was unsure about whether his office would pursue the charge?
A. I don't recall.
Q. He might have told you, or he might not have?
A. I don't think so. It was such a -- it was such a brief conversation, and he almost immediately put me on to Jim so I don't remember.

MR. DIAZ: All right. I'm all set.
MR. SARACHAN: You have some questions?
MR. MESSINA: I have a couple of
questions.
Do you want to take a quick five, regroup and then come back, or do you want me to just shoot right into them?

MR. DIAZ: I'm happy to go, but before I do that I just want to say that so at this point we will -- I think that's good.

Yeah, you can go ahead.
EXAMINATION
BY MR. MESSINA:
Q. Sergeant Riggen, thank you very much. I
know it's been a long day. I'm going to be as quick as I possibly can. I just want to dot some Is and cross some Ts.

So, first, you were provided earlier with what was marked as both Exhibit 8, Crowd Control and Management, and Patno 3, which was Investigative Motor Vehicle Stops.

Do you recall being presented with those?
A. Yes.
Q. In Exhibit 8, I guess it's technically Page 3, Section 4.4(D), you were read that section. Vermont State Police members shall avoid negative verbal engagement with members of the crowd. Verbal abuse against officers shall not constitute a reason for an arrest or for any use of force against such individuals.

Is that correct? Did I read that correctly?
A. Yes.
Q. And this is in the Crowd Control and Management Policy, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that specific and limited to conducting crowd control and management, or is that an expectation that the State Police have for the
troopers engaging with any civilian in any context at all?
A. This is -- this is more specific to the crowd management policy.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

You were asked earlier in what regard you would speak to a SA for charging support.

Would you do it to look to find a way or the correct way to make a charge?
A. It would be done when I had probable cause for an arrest, but $I$ would want the fair or best outcome for whatever this moment was. But perhaps it wasn't so cut and dry, so I would want their counsel as far as here are the variables, is this a charge you want to pursue?
Q. Can you give an example of where you were on the fence -- my word -- in speaking to the State's Attorney, the respective state's attorney, you decided not to charge?
A. So I recall on occasion responding to the port of entry in Highgate. A father had crossed over the border with his son, and there was an active restraining order where the father couldn't be in contact with his son.

So I had arrested the father, brought him
back to the barracks, and during that -- that conversation after the arrest began to just get not concerned but perhaps there was more to it than this.

Like perhaps this was supposed to have been withdrawn and it wasn't, but meanwhile this guy is going to be lodged on this offense. And so I just didn't feel quite right in fairness to the 13- or 14-year-old son who was there, for the father himself. This wasn't what it was supposed to be, and perhaps a mother or an ex-wife out there somewhere, so I had to run it by the State's Attorney Office.

So I called and talked to, in that case I think it was John Lavoie and said, Hey, this is what's happened. I think that there's some -- here's what happened. Like you tell me, what do we do next? And he opted not to charge him. And so the father was released, and that was the end of that.

Another case I had an occasion to encounter someone on a -- using a personal mobility device. They were alcohol impaired, and so I arrested them for DUI. And when they were in my cruiser I started to think, Wait a second, I think that the mobility device is actually an exception to the motor vehicle definition. So I called up the State's Attorney at the time. It was Heather Brochu at the
time.
And said, Hey, am I remembering this correctly or not? She goes, No, this isn't DUI, you can't arrest him. So I ended up towing the personal mobility device to his house and then giving him a ride home.

So two examples there as far as effecting an arrest but then needing to bounce it off the State's Attorney to say, is this something you're pursing or not? Make sure it was a fair for everybody.
Q. Thank you. We talked about a little bit, did you know or know of Mr. Bombard before this encounter?
A. No.
Q. Did his face look familiar to you beforehand?
A. No.
Q. Is it fair to say that you had no intention of arresting him for that initial stop?
A. That's right.
Q. You were going to your car to drive away?
A. That's right.
Q. Thank you.

We talked a little bit earlier about --
if we go back to Patno 3, Policy 2.1, the three causes of an appropriate stop being the probable cause for a motor vehicle violation, reasonable suspicion for a crime has or is being committed, and upon a community caretaking function.

Do you recall having that conversation?
A. Yes.
Q. And I believe something that you said, it might even have been in your affidavit was that there was -- you thought that there might be a need for attention in this case?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you mean that somebody was specifically -- that Mr. Bombard was specifically asking for it?
A. No.
Q. So what do you mean by a need for attention in a matter like that?
A. I think if people are in a mental health crisis, they could have escalating despondency. I don't think that -- I don't know of any occasion where they're asking for help but yet still needing assistance, which requires someone to do a non-adversarial check-in to have that conversation to determine if there is that need or not.
Q. Thank you.

One of the questions that was asked was could you have effectuated the answers that you needed by running the plate.

Can you tell the immediate mental state of someone by their criminal record?
A. No.
Q. Does a criminal record in and of itself dictate someone in distress?
A. No.
Q. So how does that procedure work?

Assuming you got to those records, you're in your cruiser, you want to go check a plate, how does that work?

What first information do you get by checking the plate?
A. A license plate check will reveal the license -- excuse me, the registered owner, the status of the vehicle as in registered or expired registration, and whether or not the registered owner's license is valid or not.
Q. If you wanted to or need to go the step further, how would you get that criminal record, or could you?
A. The system we had at the time would
require running the name separately to then -- to then get his police -- a record of his police encounters.

I wouldn't be able to access his criminal record like that. It requires a separate check that I'm not able to run. So I would see his police encounter record, and then I would have to do a -basically a narrative search. Read all the narratives to learn about it.
Q. So assuming you got do that point, you were able to do that and you're considering whether or not somebody is in distress or despondent, would looking at those records tell you whether or not, say they lost their job that day?
A. No.
Q. Or whether, for instance, that they were in the process of a divorce or lost a child?
A. No.
Q. So how else would you be able to tell if they were despondent other than by other -- if not by checking their records?
A. Yeah, I don't think I would be able to.
Q. People cursing at you. People don't always like interactions with the police; is that fair to say?
A. Yes.
Q. And I believe you were asked something along the lines of have you ever been sworn at for either giving a ticket or giving a citation?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was your answer to that?
A. The answer is "Yes".
Q. I think you were asked whether or not you had made arrests as a result of them swearing at you. Do you remember that question?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was your answer to that?
A. I think it was I don't recall.
Q. Okay. Would you arrest somebody -- have you arrested somebody for simply swearing at you for giving you a ticket -- I'm sorry, for you giving them a ticket?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever added a charge to somebody who swore at you for simply giving them a citation?
A. No.
Q. There are a couple questions regarding whether or not you thought it was appropriate for somebody to give you the middle finger. I believe you answered that you thought it was inappropriate; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. You know that that doesn't mean that it's unlawful?
A. What was the question again?
Q. Sure. So you believe that somebody, a civilian giving you the middle finger is inappropriate, but you are aware that that does not make it unlawful?
A. Yes, I know that.
Q. Now, do you think it's inappropriate for that civilian to just give the police the finger or anybody else?
A. Yeah, I think it's inappropriate for anyone to give anybody the finger.
Q. But you don't question the lawfulness of it?
A. No.
Q. Okay.

MR. MESSINA: May I have access to one or two of those, your documents? Just because they were not marked.

MR. SARACHAN: Sure. What do you need?
MR. MESSINA: I'm looking for AGO-729 and
I guess 142.
(Documents were handed from Mr. Diaz to

Mr. Messina.)
MR. MESSINA: Thank you very much.
BY MR. MESSINA:
Q. So I'm going to direct your attention again to what --

MR. MESSINA: This wasn't actually an exhibit that went in, though, was it?

We just talked about it?
MR. SARACHAN: That was an exhibit in the Thomas deposition by number, but since I think we just referred to it by Bates.

MR. MESSINA: Thank you.
BY MR. MESSINA:
Q. So we reviewed Bates AGO-000729, which does have an exhibit number but we're going to go by AGO-000729 for the time-being. Can you refresh what this is?
A. Right. It looks like it's an e-mail that was authored by Lieutenant Tara Thomas.
Q. So in this e-mail, this was in regards to this stop, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And the last sentence says, Sergeant Riggen was advised that although in the scope of his law enforcement authority, commanders of the Vermont

State Police encouraged the presence of a motor vehicle violation for the initial cause of a traffic stop.

Is that what that says?
A. Yes.
Q. Is there anything in this e-mail that specifically says you did something wrong?
A. No.
Q. And the press release, looking at AGO-000142, which is the press release I believe you drafted on February 9th, 2018?
A. Yes.
Q. At 3:04. I think you answered this before, but I want to make sure.

So when the Vermont State Police effectuates an arrest or some sort of incident, is it standard practice and procedure to draft a report about that incident?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it standard practice and procedure to draft an actual press release?
A. Yes.
Q. In what context -- do you have discretion to do a press release?
A. No.
Q. And if you do a press release, I think you said before you were required to provide a mugshot if one was available; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So is there anything outside of the ordinary course of business procedure, practice with this press release regarding Mr. Bombard compared to anyone else that you would have done?
A. I would say there's one difference I think it's important to highlight --
Q. Okay.
A. -- which is that the departure from the norm is that this was at an e-mail from me to my supervisor, the station commander at the time. I -in that era I did not like sending press releases and yet -- and so, therefore, I was ordered to by my supervisors to send press releases every time you arrest them, but send them to us first so we can approve them to make sure that they're appropriate.

And so in that way, if it had been up to me, I wouldn't have sent a press release on any arrest that I made, but that's -- that was the procedures of the State Police. My supervisors wanted me to do it, and that's why you see it in the flow sheet that you have. First with the lieutenant and then followed up
with a press release to everybody.
Q. But the fact that one was done was not rare or --
A. It's -- it's explicitly required per State Police policy.
Q. And the fact that a mugshot was attached to it was not rare in and of itself either?
A. It's explicitly required.
Q. Thank you.

Do you generally allow people to move their cars once they're in your custody?
A. No.
Q. Once the people are in your custody?
A. No.
Q. Are any of the actions you took against Mr. Bombard on -- I don't know what actual day of the week it was, but February 9th, 2018, in any way retaliatory against him specifically?
A. No.
Q. Is there anything that you did with him that you wouldn't, sitting here today, generally have done had it been anybody else other than Mr. Bombard?
A. That would have been anybody else.

MR. MESSINA: Thank you. I don't have any further questions.

MR. DIAZ: Just a couple, and we'll get out of here.

FURTHER EXAMINATION
BY MR. DIAZ:
Q. Mr. Riggen, before your encounter with Mr. Bombard had you ever heard his name before?
A. I don't know that I -- I probably had heard it, and I don't think that I ever retained or recorded it.
Q. Why do you think you would have heard it?
A. There was a complaint that had been made about a couple of the troopers that worked at the barracks, and so that had circulated that that complaint had been made and an investigation had taken place to determine if it was true or not. And I didn't really care. And so perhaps I knew his name for a moment, and then $I$ just moved on.
Q. Are you saying that you learned his name because of this complaint you referenced?
A. Yes.
Q. And then after -- okay.

You said to Mr. Messina that you called the State's Attorney?

You call the State's Attorney sometimes before submitting an affidavit of probable cause,
right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you said that -- I think you said you do that when it's -- I think you were asked when you would do that.

Can you explain to me when you would do that?
A. When I would call the State's Attorney?
Q. Yeah.
A. In the context that these questions are occurring it's when I have made a probable cause for an arrest. I've made the arrest, and then upon special circumstances or other things that are learned after the arrest, $I$ like to bring it to the State's Attorney to make sure that the decision to continue the arrest moving forward with a charge is prudent, or if it's not then to discontinue the process.
Q. When you say "special circumstances" what do you mean?
A. So in a case where a person is arrested for disorderly conduct and is asking the State's Attorney be contacted and let them know that the ACLU is going to be involved. I said, all right, we should probably involve the State's Attorney to make sure that this is a real charge. Otherwise, that this
person will be released without a citation.
Q. You called the State's Attorney to make sure that it was a real charge?
A. Well, I had probable cause for the arrest, and that's what I made. But I wanted to make sure that before I issued a citation the State's Attorney was going to bring the charge. And if they weren't going to bring the charge, then I wouldn't have issued the citation.

MR. DIAZ: I think we're good.
MR. MESSINA: Okay.
MR. DIAZ: Close the deposition. Thank you very much.

Can I say one thing quickly? I do want to keep it open only pending the production of the video, any video that exists related to what happened inside the St. Albans barracks when Mr. Bombard was there, which has not yet been produced.

MR. MESSINA: Okay, and I did not know that that was a request.

MR. DIAZ: Well, it's certainly relevant.
MR. MESSINA: I'm not arguing right now.
I wasn't made aware it was asked for.
MR. DIAZ: We've only been notified right
now, just pending if we need to have further discussion about what is in those videos, so keeping it open just as to that.

MR. MESSINA: Sure.
MR. DIAZ: Thank you.
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Q. Okay.
A. Administratively strong is what I would say.
Q. Okay. I'm sure there's others I'm not going to hold you to if you didn't get through all of them. I understand.

What the discipline -- as a supervisor would you be the person to discipline somebody, a trooper who was being supervised by you?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you -- you may have said this, and I apologize. Did you do reviews of their work?
A. Can you -- what do you mean, reviews of their work?
Q. Okay. Did you as a supervisor do annual reports on the troopers under you on how he or she were doing?
A. Oh, an evaluation?
Q. I'm sorry, evaluations.
A. Yes.
Q. I'm sorry.

This case we're here about today, this
Greg Bombard case, when did you learn about it?
And I don't expect you to remember the date exactly, but how long after the event?
A. I knew it had been years.
Q. Years after the event?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And I'm going to show you some things so it's not a memory deal, but do you remember how you learned about it?
A. I don't remember the specific person who brought it to my attention.
Q. Okay. Would it have been Trooper Riggen, or you just don't remember who, one way or the other, who brought it to you?
A. I don't believe it was Trooper Riggen.
Q. And. Was it brought -- whoever brought it to your attention -- was it brought to your attention because you were Trooper Riggen's supervisor?
A. Yes.
Q. And when it was brought to your attention by whoever brought it to your attention were you told about what had transpired?

What were you told?
A. The highlights that we just discussed, yes.
Q. Okay. Just sort of on a global basis?
A. Yes.
A. (Brief pause.)
Q. You can do it by paragraph, however you want to show me.
A. (The witness perused the document.)
Q. Tell me.
A. Paragraph Number 2.
Q. Okay. Tell me what's in Paragraph 2 that did not make sense to you.
A. That the -- a motor vehicle infraction for the basis of the stop --
Q. Okay.
A. -- was missing.
Q. Okay. And did you learn that there was no other basis other than what is contained in here?
A. I learned there was no other basis --
Q. Okay.
A. -- than what was contained in here.
Q. Right. And you knew and you told Trooper Riggen he was wrong, didn't you, to make that initial stop?
A. I did not tell him that he was wrong for making that initial stop.
Q. You believed he was?

Ms. Thomas, we're here. Come on, tell the truth.
A. I wouldn't have done so.
Q. I know. And you -- all right. You told Trooper Riggen you wouldn't have, didn't you?
A. No, I did not tell him that.
Q. Why not? You're a supervisor.
A. I did not tell him that I wouldn't have done that.
Q. Okay. Who -- okay. All right.

Is there anything else in Exhibit 7 that didn't make sense to you?

Take your time. I mean, take your time.
A. (The witness perused the document.) What was your question?
Q. My question was now that you've had a chance to study Exhibit 7, other than Paragraph 2 which didn't make sense to you, I was asking you is there anything else in Exhibit 7 that didn't make sense to you?
A. Well, the part that didn't make sense to me was Paragraph 9. As Trooper Riggen was walking back to his car, that the operator continued with the behavior that initially got Trooper Riggen's attention.
Q. I see. So when you say it didn't make sense, you're talking about the behavior that's --
or not it was, in fact, an incident that was supposed to come into this?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. So, okay, I'll go with the "Yes". And are these, the Incident List Reports, it's not necessarily a slap on the wrist or a gold star; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. It's just a documentation of a conversation to ensure that there's a record of something when something had to be conveyed to a particular officer; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Prior to the 2019 incident, the arrest on February, 2019 and the ensuing communications, had you ever heard of the name Gregory Bombard before?
A. No.
Q. Were you ever familiar with him before?
A. No.
Q. All right. Last sort of set of questions.

Attorney Sarachan asked you a couple of questions about the initial stop that Trooper Riggen performed on Mr. Bombard. Do you remember talking to
him about that?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And if $I$ recall correctly, you said that you would not have necessarily made that first stop; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. All right. Is it fair to say that police officers on the ground, in the trenches have a certain amount of discretion to act when they see something?
A. Yes.
Q. That subjective perspective is part of what allows the discretion to act or not act; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. So would it be fair to say that just because you wouldn't necessarily do something doesn't mean it's wrong for the other officer to have done the same thing?
A. Yes, that's fair.

MR. MESSINA: All right. Thank you.
That's all.

## FURTHER EXAMINATION

BY MR. SARACHAN:
Q. Why wouldn't you have done it? Why wouldn't you have stopped him?
A. Because I would have wanted a motor vehicle infraction.
Q. Thank you. And Mr. -- Jeff said to you or asked you, and you answered that for this Incident List Report, the reason or one of them that you put in there that you wanted, and this is his words and you said "Yes", to convey something to the particular officer, right?
A. Right.
Q. What did you want to convey to Sergeant Riggen?
A. That this incident was brought to our attention and moving forward command prefers, although he was in his legal scope, to have a motor vehicle infraction linked to a traffic stop.
Q. You keep saying -- and I'm not -- within his legal scope. That's what police officers do. They have the legal right to enforce the law. Is that what you mean by the "legal scope"?
A. That, and he had the legal right to do a welfare check, which to Sergeant Riggen is what he was doing.
Q. Right. In theory you have that right to do that; that's all you're saying, right?
A. Yes.
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happen, yes.
Q. And did a person ever ask you for help when they were driving in the opposite direction as you?
A. I have had people yell to me from the side of the road, yes.
Q. Okay, and so they were driving in one direction, you were driving in the other?
A. I've had that happen, yes.
Q. And they've asked for help?

Oh, has anyone ever asked you for helped by giving you the middle finger?
A. No.
Q. What does the middle finger mean to you?
A. It could mean a lot of different things. Trying to get your attention. It could be derogatory. It could be a friend giving a friend -- who knows. I can't interpret that.
Q. How do you interpret the middle finger?
A. How do I interpret? It depends who it was coming from.
Q. If it was coming from someone outside your car while you're on patrol, what would that mean to you?
A. I would probably wonder what the
reasoning was behind it, but I wouldn't think much of it. I don't -- it's happened. I've heard it happen, happening to people. I've seen it happen to me, but what would it mean to me? It's another day. Q. So the times that it did happen to you, what did you believe that was being communicated? MR. MESSINA: Objection, but you can answer.

THE WITNESS: I don't know what people are thinking. I never -- I've had it happen multiple times, maybe a handful of times over my career. I didn't think anything of it.

BY MS. RICH:
Q. Okay. And during your time on patrol did you make traffic stops?
A. Several.
Q. How many, would you say? Several? An estimate.
A. I mean, I wouldn't be able to put an accurate number on it, but maybe a thousand.
Q. Okay. And there were several different reasons that you would have made these stops, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. So I'd like to show you what has previously been marked as Exhibit 3.
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## EXHIBIT 6

## VSP-DIR-403

## Investigative Motor Vehicle Stop

### 1.0 PURPOSE

1.1 To enhance our ability to detect criminal activity within the State of Vermont, through the development of professional patrol techniques.
1.2 To guide members when making contact with motorists and provide methods for making safe and effective motor vehicle stops.

### 2.0 POLICY

2.1 All motor vehicle stops shall be based upon probable cause that a statutory motor vehicle violation has occurred or upon a reasonable suspicion to believe that a crime has been or is being committed or upon a community care taking function.

### 3.0 PROCEDURE

3.1 Each member shall perform his/her duties in a courteous and expeditious manner while enforcing the law pertaining to the traffic stop.
3.2 When a motor vehicle stop is authorized under this directive the following procedures for stopping and approaching the operator of the vehicle is intended to provide maximum safety for members, the operator and other users of the highway. Members should consider conditions such as the engineering of the road, the urgency of the stop, the existing volume of traffic and availability of communications which may require adjusting or altering these procedures.

### 4.0 STOPPING A VEHICLE

4.1 Members in a marked cruiser shall:
(A) Communicate with dispatch the impending motor vehicle stop, identifying the plate number and location of the stop;
(B) Activate the emergency lights and siren, as necessary;
(C) Ensure that the violator and police vehicle have stopped in a safe location; and
(D) Position the police vehicle behind the violator at a safe and reasonable distance or otherwise as circumstances dictate.
(E) Activate remote microphone for MVR.
4.2 Members operating unmarked, semi-marked or specialty police vehicles should be aware that motorists may not recognize them as police officers and may refuse or be reluctant to stop. In such cases the motorist may drive to a safe area with increased population, illumination or to a police station before feeling safe enough to stop.
4.3 Members operating unmarked, semi-marked or specialty vehicles shall:
(A) Communicate with dispatch the impending motor vehicle stop, identifying the plate number and location of the stop;
(B) Activate emergency lights and siren;
(C) Request assistance from a marked cruiser if the motorist does not comply;
(D) Advise dispatch of the situation.

### 5.0 HIGH RISK FELONY STOPS

5.1 Members making high risk or felony stops shall conduct the stop in accordance with established training guidelines and shall:
(A) Contact dispatch and provide the location, direction of travel, description of the vehicle and occupant(s), if possible, and the reason for the stop;
(B) Request radio priority for emergency radio traffic only;
(C) Position the cruiser in a manner that provides protection and cover;
(D) Make an effort to conduct the stop with back up support;
(E) The member conducting the stop should give all verbal commands to the occupants of the vehicle unless circumstances do not permit this;
(F) Assisting members should not give additional commands unless necessary for safety;
(G) Assisting members should remain in a position to cover the arresting member and follow training procedures.

### 6.0 APPROACHING A VEHICLE

6.1 When approaching a vehicle members should:
(A) Ensure that his/her portable radio is in the "ON" position;
(B) Approach quickly and safely; and
(C) Remain alert for any sudden or suspicious movement within the vehicle.

### 7.0 OBSERVATION

7.1 The member shall remain vigilant and alert throughout the traffic stop and note any indication or evidence of possible criminal conduct within the stopped vehicle.
(A) While conversing with the occupant(s), the member should note any discrepancies or evasive answers to normal and routine type questions. The member should observe the mannerisms of the vehicle's occupant(s) and be alert to excessive and/or abnormal nervousness, speech, sweating, eye contact, etc.
(B) The member should visually inspect each stopped vehicle to identify any alterations, modifications or other physical characteristics that indicate that the vehicle may possibly be used for illegal purposes.

### 8.0 OFFICER SAFETY AND SAFETY PROTOCOL

8.1 The operator and occupants of the stopped vehicle should be instructed to remain in the vehicle, except when the member has specific articulable facts or reasonable suspicion such as:
(A) A criminal violation;
(B) Specialized enforcement functions;
(C) When conducting an interview; and/or
(D) Officer safety or public safety concerns.
8.2 If individuals refuse to remain in the vehicle, they should be directed to a position of safety off the roadway and away from the police vehicle but within view of the member or other law enforcement officer.

### 9.0 AUTOMOBILE SEARCHES

9.1 In all search and seizure matters, constitutional standards shall be followed.
9.2 The member shall conduct the search in a professional manner while protecting him/herself and ensuring the safety of all occupants of the vehicle. Reasonable requests made by the occupants should be accommodated whenever possible.
9.3 A motor vehicle may be searched upon issuance of a search warrant supported by probable cause.
9.4 Depending on the circumstances, there are three lawful ways in which a motor vehicle may be searched without a warrant during a traffic stop.
(A) Warrantless automobile searches may be based on:
(1) exigent circumstances.
(2) consent - based on probable cause.
(3) consent - based on reasonable suspicion.
9.5 Whenever a member views contraband, wanted persons, stolen property, or evidence of a crime in plain view inside a motor vehicle, such evidence can be lawfully seized without a warrant.

### 10.0 EXIGENT CIRCUMSTANCES

10.1 If a member forms a reasonable belief that officer safety, safety of another or destruction of evidence is likely and imminent, he/she may conduct such a search and/or seizure as is reasonably necessary.
10.2 A search conducted under exigent circumstances shall be limited to that which is necessary to protect the officer or another and/or to prevent the destruction of evidence.
11.1 If a member has probable cause to believe that a crime has been or is about to be committed and that evidence of that crime or contraband will be found in the vehicle, the member shall:
(A) Ask the operator for consent to search the vehicle. If the operator consents it is advisable, but not required that the consent be reduced to writing on DPS form 245B.
(B) If the operator declines, the member shall again request consent, explaining to the operator that he/she has probable cause to believe that evidence of a crime or contraband will be found in the vehicle and that if consent is not obtained that he/she will "apply to a judge for a search warrant".
(C) The member will explain this process in a non-confrontational manner and stress that the choice between consent and the member applying for a search warrant is the person's decision.
(D) If consent is obtained under this scenario, the consent should be reduced to writing on DPS Form 245B, on the side which indicates (When probable cause exists and you intend to apply for a warrant), or recorded by some other method.
(E) If the person refuses to sign a consent form, the officer should consider applying for a search warrant in order to avoid potential court challenges on the issue of voluntariness.
(F) If consent is denied the member should apply to a judge for a search warrant.
11.2 In certain situations, it will not be possible for a voluntary consent to be obtained (example, the person is combative, forcibly restrained, or is incoherent). If the member believes, based on the circumstances, that the person cannot voluntarily consent, the member may apply for a warrant without first attempting to obtain consent.
11.3 A person subject to a consent search may withdraw consent at any time. In a situation where probable cause exists and a consent search has commenced but the person has subsequently withdrawn the consent, the officer shall halt the search and apply for a warrant.

### 12.0 CONSENT SEARCHES BASED ON REASONABLE SUSPICION

12.1 A member may ask for consent to search a vehicle based upon the totality of observations during the stop. The member's observations, coupled with circumstances surrounding the stop must give rise to a reasonable suspicion that criminal activity is or has occurred.
12.2 Members must be able to articulate those facts upon which a request for a consent search was made. Examples of such facts include the occupant being evasive or untruthful in response to routine conversation; inconsistencies in facts offered by the occupant or his/her explanation of events; observing items in the vehicle that you know have been used in area burglaries such as a screwdriver, pillowcases, etc., the discovery of hidden compartments or other physical characteristics not common to the vehicle stopped.
12.3 The facts relied upon when asking for a consent search need not rise to the level of probable cause, but should be sufficient enough to alert a trained member to the fact that criminal activity may be present.
12.4 Consent searches are judgmental in nature. As a result, each member should assemble as many articulable facts as possible to justify his/her request to conduct a search.
12.5 Consent searches are reviewed with "the most careful scrutiny" by courts. In view of this, members will be mindful of the following identified areas of concern:
(A) Show of force is a factor which weighs heavily in the issue of voluntariness. Show of force includes but is not limited to the number of members present, the tone and manner in which they conduct themselves, display of weapons and use of restraints. Any show of force may result in the consent being interpreted as coerced, therefore invalid.
(B) Voluntariness is a critical aspect of valid consent. Trickery, deception or threats will render a consent search involuntary and therefore illegal.
(C) A person subject to a consent search may withdraw consent at any time. If consent is withdrawn, the officer shall immediately terminate the search.

### 13.0 OFFICER SAFETY DURING MOTOR VEHICLE SEARCHES

13.1 The member shall promptly request a backup officer to respond to the scene for the search.
13.2 Every effort shall be made to provide the member with backup for the execution of a vehicle search. In the event that there is no backup officer available, the member shall request approval from a supervisor to conduct the search. Only a member with the rank of sergeant or above may approve a motor vehicle search without backup present.
13.3 The location, complete vehicle description, registration information, and occupant descriptions shall be radioed to and acknowledged by the dispatcher prior to the beginning of the search.

### 14.0 DOCUMENTATION OF SEARCHES

14.1 The use of a consent search form is not a constitutional requirement, but it will aid the member later in court when establishing that a voluntary consent was obtained.

### 14.2 Consent form DPS Form \#245B is strongly recommended.

14.3 If consent to search is obtained, the member shall advise the dispatcher to add a call (start a law incident). Offense Code 0099 shall be used to document all consent searches. This will be a secondary code if the stop itself resulted in a law incident entry and the primary code if no other offense is generated.
14.4 All additional crimes that are discovered will be recorded in this case with the appropriate offense and circumstance codes being entered by the member when he/ she completes the report.
14.5 The member conducting the search shall complete the VIBRS report in CAD at his/her earliest convenience. The narrative section shall contain a brief description of the motor vehicle stop and the reasons why the request for consent was made. The results of the search shall also be briefly noted as well as any enforcement actions taken by the member.
Effective August 1, 1990
Revised March 1, 1997
Revised December 1, 1997
Revised January 1, 2001
Revised August 1, 2004
Revised October 15, 2007
Revised May 1, 2011
Revised November 10, 2014

The Vermont State Police Manual is not intended to apply in any criminal or civil proceeding outside of internal Department proceedings. No policy included in this publication should be construed as creating a higher legal standard of safety or care in an evidentiary sense with respect to third party claims. Violations of law will form the basis for civil and criminal sanctions in a recognized judicial setting.

## EXHIBIT 7

## Police Cruiser Video (Physical Exhibit Filed with the Court)

The file, with the Bates Number AGO 000288 was produced in its native video format on June 10, 2022 as a supplemental production for Defendant Jay Riggen's Responses to Plaintiffs First Set of Requests to Produce.

## EXHIBIT 8

## Barracks Video (Physical Exhibit Filed with the Court)

To view the video, open the .exe file (on a computer running Windows operating system) then drag the .ps file into the open .exe file. While the recording starts at 12:21:59, audio begins at the 12:45:00 mark and Mr. Bombard is processed beginning at 12:52:00.

The files, with the Bates Numbers AGO 000174 and AGO - 000175, were produced in their native video formats on February 28, 2022 with Defendant Jay Riggen's Responses to Plaintiffs First Set of Requests to Produce.

## EXHIBIT 9

From: Riggen, Jay
Sent: Friday, February 9, 2018 3:08 PM
To: VSPMedia@Listserv.dps.state.vt.us
Subject: ST. ALBANS BARRACKS / Disorderly Conduct
Attachments: Bombard Mug Shot.JPG

## STATE OF VERMONT

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
VERMONT STATE POLICE
PRESS RELEASE
CASE\# 18A200787
RANK/TROOPER FULL NAME: Trooper Jay Riggen
STATION: St. Albans Barracks
CONTACT\# (802) 5245993
DATE / TIME: February 9, 2018, 1220 hours
INCIDENT LOCATION: North Main Street, St. Albans, VT
VIOLATION: Disorderly Conduct
ACCUSED: Gregory Bombard
AGE: 51
CITY, STATE OF RESIDENCE: St. Albans

## SUMMARY OF INCIDENT:

On February 9, 2018 at approximately 12:20pm the Vermont State Police arrested 51 year-old Gregory Bombard of St. Albans, VT for Disorderly Conduct. While Troopers concluded a vehicle stop of which Bombard was the operator, Bombard became disorderly as he yelled profanities and made an exaggerated and continuous obscene hand gesture as he drove south on Main Street. These vulgarities were in the presence of a school bus and many members of the public during high traffic volume.

Bombard was ultimately taken into custody by Troopers for his tumultuous public behavior. He was transported to the St. Albans Barracks for processing. At the conclusion of the processing, Bombard was released with a citation to appear in Franklin County District Court on 03/05/2018 at 1:00pm to answer the charge of Disorderly Conduct.

COURT ACTION: Yes
COURT: Franklin County District Court
BAIL: None
MUG SHOT: Yes.


## EXHIBIT 10

uefendant: Gregory W Bombar
DOB: 10/26/1966 AGE: 51
ADDRESS:
7 Ashton Dr
St. Albans, VT 05403

SUPERIOR COURT
FRANKLIN UNIT
STATE OF VERMONT
v.

GREGORY W BOMBARD
arraignment date: rch 5, 2018
SA CASE ID. $\because 18-3495$
ASSIGNED (D)SA: James Hughes Esq. ERN:
police dept.: VSP-St. Albans
Investigating officer: Jay Riggen
VICTIM ADVOCATE: incident no.: 18A200787

## STATE OF VERMONT

FEB 282018
Vermont Superior Court
Franklin Unit
CRIMINAL DIVISION
DOCKET NO. 241-2-18FRCR

## INFORMATION BY STATE'S ATTORNEY

By the authority of the State of Vermont, the State's Attorney for Franklin County, upon the oath of office charges:

## COUNT 1 OF 1

CHARGE CODE: 13V1026A1 | CODE ID: 158 | OFFENSE CLASS: M CHARGE NAME: DISORDERLY CONDUCT- FIGHT ETC

Gregory W Bombard, in the County of Franklin, at St. Albans on or about February 9, 2018, with intent to cause annoyance, engaged in tumultuous behavior, in violation of 13 V.S.A. § 1026(a)(1).
Penalty: Imprisoned not more than 60 days or fined not more than $\$ 500.00$ or both.

Against the peace and dignity of the State.
DATED: February 26, 2018


## Referral(s) if applicable: -

$\square$ Diversion $\square$ Tamarack $\square$ No Referral - Reason:

This information has been presented to me and I have found probable cause.
DATED:


## EXHIBIT 11

## STATE OF VERMONT

## SUPERIOR COURT

Franklin Unit

## State of Vermont

v.

## Gregory Bombard

# CRIMINAL DIVISION 

Docket Nos: 241-2-18 Frcr
ENTERED

## AUG 312018

DECISION ON DEFENDANT'S SUPPRESS AND DISMISS Franklin Unit $\begin{aligned} & \text { Vermont Superion }\end{aligned}$
Following an encounter with law enforcement on February 9, 2018, Defendant Gregory W. Bombard was charged with one count of disorderly conduct, a violation of 13 V.S.A. § 1026(a)(1). Information. Specifically, the charge states that, "with intent to cause annoyance," Defendant "engaged in tumultuous behavior...." Id.

On August 2, 2018, through counsel, Attorney Nicholas Hadden, Defendant moved to suppress and to dismiss the case against him. Motion to Dismiss (Rule 12(d)) Motion to Suppress (Rule $41(f)$ ). ${ }^{1}$ The State, through Franklin County State's Attorney James Hughes, responded in opposition on August 10. Response to Defendant's Motion. No evidentiary hearing has been held on this motion; rather, the parties stipulated to its resolution on the basis of the affidavit of Trooper Jay Riggen and footage from his cruiser camera.

## BACKGROUND

Shortly after noon on February 9, 2018, Trooper Riggen of the Vermont State Police ("VSP") was driving his fully-marked cruiser north on North Main Street in St. Albans. At the same time, Defendant was driving his car south on North Main Street. As the vehicles neared one another, Trooper Riggen observed Defendant to "look[] at me, lift[] his fist, and then extend[] and display[] his left middle finger over his steering wheel." Affidavit.

Trooper Riggen was aware of the negative message generally conveyed by this hand gesture. Calling on his twelve years of experience in the VSP, Trooper Riggen "could not immediately recall" another occasion on which a member of the public had given him the middle finger. Trooper Riggen explained that, based on the "supremely unusual" nature of Defendant's behavior in the context of his experiences as a law enforcement officer, he became "concerned" that Defendant was seeking his attention to address an outstanding need, such as a mental health

[^0]crisis. Accordingly, Trooper Riggen determined that he would execute a brief motor vehicle stop to ascertain the well-being of Defendant and any passengers which might be in the car.

Trooper Riggen turned around, caught up with Defendant as he sat in traffic at the intersection of North Main Street and Lower Newton Road, and executed a traffic stop. Defendant pulled over to the side of the road in an appropriate manner. The trooper then exited his cruiser and approached Defendant's driver's-side window.

Trooper Riggen began the interaction by asking Defendant "You need something?" twice. Defendant's responses are not entirely audible on the video. Trooper Riggen then said, "It looked like you, ah, flicked me off as you were going by there." In his affidavit, Trooper Riggen explains that he spoke with Defendant regarding his observations and Defendant denied making the gesture, "claim[ing] that he had been wiggling and stretching his fingers over his steering wheel and had not signaled to [Trooper Riggen] with his middle finger alone." Affidavit. Defendant then said Trooper Riggen must be "sensitive."

Trooper Riggen denied being "overly sensitive," explaining that he did not like that insinuation as this was the first time in twelve years he had stopped someone for making that gesture. He explained that the "unusual behavior" was the impetus for the stop, and that someone who was seeking the attention of a trooper would probably find it by making that type of negative signal. Following a somewhat circular exchange between the two men, the interaction concluded, with Trooper Riggen verbally conceding that Defendant may not have flipped him off. Trooper Riggen walked away.

In his affidavit, Trooper Riggen described subsequent events as follows:
As I arrived back at my cruiser I heard the operator yell "asshole!" I turned around and I could see him looking at me in his sideview mirror. His window was still lowered all the way down and I could clearly see his face as he stated loudly "Fuck you!" two times. I could clearly see his face as he loudly exclaimed the obscenities. I was aware at that moment that a school bus had slowed down and stopped behind traffic at the Lower Newton Road / North Main Street intersection. I was also aware that there were multiple vehicles that were traveling both north and sound on Main Street passed [sic] the operator and I who were in plain view of his tumultuous declarations. I observed that several vehicles had stopped behind this traffic and were watching my cruiser and the operator's car. While I could see the operator from behind and in his side view mirror, I observed that there were members of the public who were directly across from him and in close proximity who were certainly at risk of observing his tumultuous profanity and behavior much more directly than I was. These members of the public included any students who may have been sitting at the rear of the aforementioned school bus. As I continued to watch the operator, he attempted to merge into southbound traffic but was so fixated on me that he did not appear to notice an oncoming southbound vehicle. Therefore, he
needed to stop short so he didn't cause a crash. I watched as the operator exterided his hand outside of his window and, again, extended his middle finger as he entered successfully into southbound traffic and began driving south. The operator extended his middle finger outside of his window for no less than five seconds and as he drove for no less than 15 yards. The operator displayed this signal in the presence of a northbound car, a southbound truck (that he needed to stop short to avoid striking) a northbound truck, and a northbound car. Based on the yelling vulgarities through an open window (tumultuous, obscene, and vulgar) in close proximity traffic [sic] and in the presence of a school bus and multiple other vehicles in moderate-volume traffic (public place) in combination with the exaggerated and continuous display of his middle finger through his open window (obscene and vulgar), while being so fixated on his behavior toward me that he didn't recognizing approaching southbound traffic for which he needed to stop short to avoid a side-swipe crash, I recognized this as the criminal offense of Disorderly Conduct pursuant to Title 13 VSA 1026(a)(1)(3).

## Affidavit.

In his Motion, Defendant "acknowledges that the officer's overall conduct was upsetting, prompting him to say something to the effect [sic]: 'if you really want the finger, here's the finger asshole." Defendant's Motion.

## DISCUSSION

## I. Motion to Dismiss

On a motion to dismiss under Rule 12(d), the Court views the evidence in the light most favorable to the State, excluding modifying evidence, to determine whether the State has "produced evidence fairly and reasonably tending to show the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt." State v. Dixon, 169 Vt. 15, 17 (1999). Ultimately, the State bears the burden of demonstrating that it has "substantial, admissible evidence as to the elements of the offense challenged by the defendant's motion." Id. (quoting State v. Fanger, 164 Vt. 48, 51 (1995)).

Defendant was charged with a violation of 13 V.S.A. § 1026(a)(1), which provides that "[a] person is guilty of disorderly conduct if he or she, with intent to cause public inconvenience or annoyance, or recklessly creates a risk thereof ... engages in fighting or in violent, tumultuous, or threatening behavior ...." See also State v. Pickett, 137 Vt. 336, 339 (1979) (holding, with respect to disorderly conduct statute, that " $[t]$ o support a finding of guilt, it is sufficient that the defendant have committed the act prohibited by the statute with the intent to cause public inconvenience or annoyance."). Specifically, the State alleges that Defendant engaged in tumultuous behavior with intent to cause annoyance. Information; see also State $v$. Amsden, 2013 VT 51, $\mathbb{1} 15,194 \mathrm{Vt}$.128 (noting that "State bound when language in charging document and accompanying affidavits narrows and specifies conduct alleged.").
"Although [the Court] ha[s] not extensively addressed the meaning of 'tumultuous' behavior under the statute, we have indicated that it may include a 'violent outburst' or behavior that agitates a crowd." State v. Lebert, no. 2015-120, slip op. at 2, 2015 WL 9275488 (Vt. Dec. 1, 2015) (mem.) (citing In re Lund, $144 \mathrm{Vt} .171,179$ (1984) (holding that attempting to bite and struggling with sheriff, yelling, and persistently using profanity constitutes "tumultuous" behavior), overruled on separate grounds by State v. Begins, 148 Vt. 186 (1987)). "Other conduct within the meaning of the term may include behavior marked by 'commotion [or] agitation," as well as "behavior that is itself 'agitated' or turbulent in nature." Id. at 2-3 (citing State v. Amsden, 2013 VT 51, ๆ 16, 194 Vt. 128).
"The United States Supreme Court has long recognized that persons may not be arrested for uttering constitutionally protected speech." Long v. L'Esperance, $166 \mathrm{Vt} .566,572$ (1997). "The freedom of individuals verbally to oppose or challenge police action without thereby risking arrest is one of the principal characteristics by which we distinguish a free nation from a police state." City of Houston v. Hill, 482 U.S. 451, 462-63. Thus, a person doing so "could be arrested for expressing his views only if his manner of doing so removed his speech from the realm of constitutional protection." Long, 166 Vt. at 572

Taking the facts in the light most favorable to the State, after the initial seizure had concluded, Defendant yelled "asshole!" in reference to Trooper Riggen and twice stated, "fuck you!" In his fixation on doing so while simultaneously attempting to merge into traffic, he narrowly avoided colliding with another vehicle. He also extended his middle finger out of his window for no less than five seconds, over a distance of 15 yards. All of this took place in public. However, Defendant contends that his conduct constituted protected speech under the First Amendment.

Defendant argues, and the Court agrees, that exhibiting the middle finger constitutes protected First Amendment speech. Defendant's Motion. Therefore, he contends that, after State v. Schenk, 2018 VT 45, 2018 WL 2075484, and State v. Tracy, 2015 VT 11, 200 Vt. 216, the State cannot make out a prima facie case under "the disorderly conduct statute, which criminalizes conduct which is not speech." Schenk, 2018 VT 45, $\mathbb{\$} 33$ (internal citation omitted) (holding, in case involving distribution of KKK flyers, that "a method of delivery that is incidental to the speech alleged ... cannot meet the requirement for physical conduct."). Of course, as Defendant recognizes, Schenk and Tracy did not involve the "tumultuous behavior" section of the disorderly conduct statute, but he argues that the same analysis must lie thereunder.

However, the Court need not decide that issue, because, viewing the facts in the light most favorable to the State, a factfinder could conclude that the physical act of driving with disregard for traffic and almost colliding with another car during an agitated display was tumultuous, and that Defendant had the intent to cause annoyance to the surrounding members of the public.

## II. Motion to Suppress

Defendant also argues that Trooper Riggen did not have a lawful basis for the initial traffic stop, suggesting that Defendant's later conduct must be suppressed on this basis. Defendant's Motion. However, regardless of whether the initial seizure was justified based on reasonable suspicion of criminal activity, the emergency assistance doctrine, or the community caretaking doctrine, the fact remains that it was Defendant's voluntary actions after the seizure had ended that led to his arrest on a charge of disorderly conduct. Affidavit. Thus, as set forth below, even if the initial seizure was-as appears likely ${ }^{2}$-without a lawful basis, the remedy for the initial unlawful stop does not include suppression of the conduct that led to Defendant's arrest.

In State v. Phillips, the Vermont Supreme Court considered a case in which police may have converted an investigatory car stop into a de facto arrest without first developing the requisite probable cause. ${ }^{3} 140 \mathrm{Vt}$. 210, 216-17 (1981). However, following this initial detention, officers received additional information which rose to the level of probable cause to justify a search of the vehicle. Id. at 217. The Court noted that, "[w]ith probable cause existing at the time the search was actually made, we must determine whether such probable cause, arising from an independent source after a period of arguably illegal detention, can justify the subsequent search." Id. at 218.

To answer this question, the Court looked to Wong Sun v. United States, 371 U.S. 471, 488 (1963), in which the Federal Supreme Court "recognized the now fundamental principle that the connection between an illegal arrest and the discovery of challenged evidence may become sufficiently 'attenuated' to make the evidence admissible when it results from investigation which can be considered as independent of the illegality." Id. Under Wong Sun, the critical

[^1]inquiry is "whether, granting establishment of the primary illegality, the evidence to which instant objection is made has been come at by exploitation of that illegality or instead by means sufficiently distinguishable to be purged of the primary taint." Id. (quoting Wong Sun, 371 U.S. at 488). An "intervening independent act of a free will" operates to "purge the primary taint of the unlawful invasion." Wong Sun, 371 U.S. at 486.

Applying this test, the Court held that the evidence which provided probable cause for the search "arose independently, simply from the additional information...relayed to the scene," noting that " $[t]$ he onily nexus between the first detention and the later search was defendant's detention at the scene." Id. To hold otherwise, they observed, "would be tantamount to adopting the 'but for' rule rejected by the Supreme Court in Wong Sun." Id.; see also Wong Sun, 371 U.S. at 487-88 ("We need not hold that all evidence is 'fruit of the poisonous tree' simply because it would not have come to light but for the illegal actions of the police.").

In so holding, the Court distinguished Phillips from that class of cases in which "probable cause for a second arrest ... is discovered from the defendant himself (as $t[h]$ ough words or conduct directly resulting from illegal arrest)." Id. at 218-19. Indeed, this case is dissimilar to Phillips in that the conduct leading to Defendant's arrest for disorderly conduct was "discovered from the defendant himself." See id. However, a number of federal circuit courts "have held that if a defendant's response to an illegal stop 'is itself a new, distinct crime, then the police constitutionally may arrest the defendant for that crime.'" United States v. Bellamy, 592 F.Supp.2d 308, 321-22 (E.D.N.Y. 2009) (quoting United States v. Bailey, 691 F.2d 1009, 101718 (11th Cir. 1982) (concluding "that the police may legally arrest a defendant for a new, distinct crime, even if the new crime is in response to police misconduct and causally connected thereto.")) (collecting cases); see also, e.g., United States v. Sprinkle, 106 F.3d 613, 619 (4th Cir. 1997); United States v. Dawdy, 46 F.3d 1427, 1430-31 (8th Cir. 1995); United States v. Waupekenay, 973 F.2d 1533, 1537 (10th Cir. 1992). The reason for this rule is that "[a]llowing a defendant who responds to an unconstitutional stop with an illegal act to benefit from the exclusionary rule would immunize that defendant from prosecution for all crimes he might commit that have a sufficient causal connection to the police misconduct." Id. at 322; see also United States v. Remington, 208 F.2d 567, 570 (2d Cir. 1954) (recognizing that it would be "an unwarranted extension of the [fruit of the poisonous tree] doctrine to apply it ... to a new wrong committed by defendant."). This principle was recognized by the Vermont Supreme Court in State $v$. McDermott, in which the Court noted, in dicta, that even if an officer's temporary seizure of the defendants had been unlawful, defendants' subsequent arrests for disorderly conduct were not the "fruits" of that stop under the exclusionary rule, because "it was the actions of the defendants during the inquiry which provided an independent basis for arrest." State $v$. McDermott, 135 Vt. 47, 50 (1977).

Clearly, "but for" the traffic stop initiated by Trooper Riggen, the interaction between Defendant and the trooper on that day would have been limited to passing each other in separate vehicles, and Defendant would not have engaged in the conduct which gave rise to his arrest for
disorderly conduct. However, that is not the relevant inquiry. See Bellanzy, 592 F.Supp.2d at 321 ("The poisonous tree doctrine does not extend as far as a 'but for' causation test might take it."). Rather, the relevant question is whether Defendant's actions were an "intervening independent act of a free will" sufficient to "purge the primary taint of the unlawful invasion." Wong Sur, 371 U.S. at 486. Here, that is the case. After Trooper Riggen ended the seizure and walked away from Defendant, Defendant, of his own free will, decided to drive erratically while raising his middle finger again to Trooper Riggen and yelling at him. Assuming that the initial seizure was unlawfil, Defendant's actions purged the taint of that uniawfuiness. Accordingly, there is no basis for suppression here.

## ORDER

For the reasons set forth above, that Defendant's Motion to Suppress and Dismiss is DENIED.

Dated at St. Albans, Vermont, this 31st day of August, 2018


## EXHIBIT 12

defendant: Gregory W Bomb
DOB: 10/26/1966 AGE: 52
ADDRESS:
7 Ashton Dr
St. Albans, VT 05403

SUPERIOR COURT FRANKLIN UNIT

STATE OF VERMONT
v.

GREGORY W BOMBARD
arraignment dati Iarch 5, 2018
SA CASE ID.: 18-3495
ASSIGNED (D)SA: James Hughes Esq. ERN:
police dept.: VSP-St. Albans
INVESTIGATING OFFICER: J.
VICTIM ADVOCATE:
incident no.: 18A200787
STATE OF VERMONT


DOCKET NO. 241-2-18FRCR

## INFORMATION BY STATE'S ATTORNEY

By the authority of the State of Vermont, the State's Attorney for Franklin County, upon the oath of office charges:

COUNT 1 OF 2

## CHARGE CODE: 13V1026A1 | CODE ID: 158 | OFFENSE CLASS: M CHARGE NAME: DISORDERLY CONDUCT- FIGHT ETC

Gregory W Bombard, in the County of Franklin, at St. Albans on or about February 9, 2018, with intent to . cause public annoyance, engaged in tumultuous behavior, in violation of 13 V.S.A. § 1026(a)(1).
Penalty: Imprisoned not more than 60 days or fined not more than $\$ 500.00$ or both.

## COUNT 2 OF 2

## CHARGE CODE: 13V1026A5 | CODE ID: 166 | OFFENSE CLASS: M

CHARGE NAME: DISORDERLY CONDUCT- OBSTRUCTING VEHICLE OR PEDESTRIAN TRAFFIC
Gregory W Bombard, in the County of Franklin, at St. Albans on or about February 9, 2018, recklessly created a risk of public annoyance by obstructing vehicular traffic, in violation of 13 V.S.A. § 1026(a)(5).
Penalty: Imprisoned not more than 60 days or fined not more than $\$ 500.00$ or both.

Against the peace and dignity of the State.
DATED: November 21, 2018

## Referral(s) if applicable: -


$\square$ Diversion $\square$ Tamarack $\square$ No Referral - Reason:

## EXHIBIT 13

## STATE OF VERMONT

SUPERIOR COURT
Franklin Unit

CRIMINAL DIVISION
Docket No. 241-2-18 Frcr

STATE OF VERMONT
v.

GREGORY BOMBARD
Defendant.

## RULING ON MOTION TO DISMISS COUNT TWO

On February 28, 2018, the State charged the Defendant with one count of disorderly conduct, with intent to cause annoyance and otherwise engage in tumultuous behavior in violation of 13 V.S.A. § 1026(a)(1). On August 31, 2018, this Court issued a ruling denying the Defendant's Motion to Suppress and Dismiss Count I, familiarity with which is assumed.

In its August 31, 2018 ruling, the Court found, inter alia, that "viewing the facts in the light most favorable to the State, a factfinder could conclude that the physical act of driving with disregard for traffic and almost colliding with another car during an agitated display was tumultuous, and that Defendant had the intent to cause annoyance to the surrounding members of the public" in violation of 13 V.S.A. § 1026(a)(1). State v. Bombard, Decision on Defendant's Motion to Suppress and Dismiss, No. 241-2-18 Frcr, slip op. at 4 (Vt. Super. Ct. Aug. 31, 2018) (Maley, J.).

On November 21, 2018, the State filed an amended Information which included a second count of disorderly conduct by recklessly creating a risk of public annoyance by obstructing vehicular traffic in violation of 13 V.S.A. § 1026(a)(5). Arguing that the State cannot show that he disrupted or blocked traffic during the episode on February 9, 2018 which forms the basis of the State's allegations, he has moved to dismiss Count Two pursuant to V.R.Cr.P. 12. See Defendant's Motion to Dismiss Count Two (filed Nov. 26, 2018).

When reviewing a motion to dismiss for lack of prima facie case under Rule 12(d), the Court "look[s] to whether the evidence, taken in the light most favorable to the State, excluding modifying evidence, would fairly and reasonably tend to show defendant committed the offense, beyond a reasonable doubt." State v. Millette, $173 \mathrm{Vt} .596,596,795$ A.2d 1182 (2002) (mem.)

Under 13 V.S.A. § 1026 (a)(5), "[a] person is guilty of disorderly conduct if he or she, with intent to cause public inconvenience or annoyance, or recklessly creates a risk thereof. . . obstructs vehicular or pedestrian traffic." To interpret this statute in order to effectuate the intent of the Legislature, the court must "look first to the plain, ordinary meaning of the statutory language." State v. Millette, 173 Vt. at 597. When construing § 1026(5), the predecessor of § 1026(a)(5), the Vermont Supreme Court noted the obstruction it criminalizes "must be a physical obstruction, a result of the body or objects and not of minds or words." State v. Arbeitman, 131 Vt. 596, 602, 313 A.2d 17 (1973). One cannot be convicted of obstructing traffic by simply conveying offensive messages or ideas. See State v. Albarelli, 2011 VT 24, IT 22, 189 Vt .293 (insufficient evidence of disorderly conduct where "Defendant's conduct also lacked any significant physical component . . .").

Applying this standard, Count Two of the Information fails to state a prim facia case that the Defendant violated 13 V.S.A. § 1026. The Affidavit by Trooper Riggen's (dated February 21, 2018), submitted in support of the Information (filed February 28, 2018) setting forth Count One does not set forth any allegation that the defendant physically obstructed vehicular or pedestrian traffic. The closest relevant allegation is that the Defendant was "so fixated on his behavior toward [Trooper Riggen] that he didn't recognize approaching southbound traffic for which he needed to stop short to avoid a side-swipe crash...." Riggen Affidavit at I 11. This objectively falls short of the type of physical obstruction contemplated as violating § 1026 (a)(5).

On December 11, 2018, the State supplied the Court with DVD dash camera footage of the Defendant's encounter with Trooper Riggen. That footage shows that Trooper Riggen stopped the Defendant twice, arrested him for disorderly conduct and transported him to the police barracks after his arrest. It shows the Defendant's vehicle parked on the side of the road after each stop. After both stops, it further shows other automobiles driving by it. In short, upon review, the DVD video of the incident does not show any time when the Defendant or his vehicle physically obstructed traffic or pedestrians.

The Defendant's Motion to Dismiss Count Two for failure to set forth a prime face case is granted.

Dated at St. Albans, Vermont, this $\qquad$
Dated at St. Albans, Vermont, this 17 day of December, 2018.


Hon. A. Gregory Rainville
Superior Court Judge

## EXHIBIT 14

| Docket No. | 241-2-18 Frcr | State vs. Bombard, Gregory W. 241-2-18 Frcr |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Prosecutor: | James A. Hughes | Defendant: | Gregory W. Bombard |
| Motions pdg: |  | D0B: | $10 / 26 / 1966$ |
| Bail set: | POB: | Nicholas L. Hadden |  |
| Incarcerated: | released | Atty: |  |
| Case Status: |  | Aliases: |  |
| Disposedions: | Address: | 7 Ashton Drive |  |
| Next Hearing: |  | St Albans VT 05478 |  |



02/28/18 Information and Affidavit filed on 1 dispute.
Dispute 1 for Docket No. 241-2-18 Frcr Count \#1, DISORDERLY CONDUCT-FIGHT ETC, Misdemeanor, 13 V.S.A. 1026(a)(1). Alleged offense date: 02/09/18. Arrest/citation date: 02/09/18 VSP-St. Albans.
Arraignment set for 03/05/18 at 01:00 PM.
03/02/18 Appearance entered by Nicholas L. Hadden.
Motion Challenging Probable Cause filed by Attorney Nicholas L.
Hadden for Defendant Gregory W. Bombard on dispute 1. Motion
Challenging Probable Cause given to judge.
Motion Challenging Probable Cause given to Judge Martin A. Maley.
03/05/18 Arraignment held by Martin A. Maley. (CDVIDEO) Baker/Hadden/def present.
Probable Cause found by Judge Martin A. Maley on dispute 1.
Copy of Affidavit and Information given to defendant. 24 hour rule waived.
Reading of Information waived. Defendant pleads not guilty on dispute 1. Pre-trial discovery order issued.
Defendant released on recognizance on dispute 1 per Martin A. Maley.
03/07/18 Jury Drawing set for 05/08/18 at 08:30 AM.
Pre Trial Conference set for 05/07/18 at 08:30 AM.
03/16/18 1 document filed by Attorney Nicholas L. Hadden for party 1: Motion for Discovery.
05/07/18 Pre Trial Conference held by Martin A. Maley. (CDVIDEO)
Hughes/Hadden/Dft present DA would like to continue DA to file motion in two weeks.
Jury Drawing scheduled for 05/08/18 cancelled.
05/21/18 Motion to Extend Time to file Motion filed by Attorney Nicholas L. Hadden for Defendant Gregory W. Bombard on dispute 1. Motion to Extend Time to file Motion given to judge.
Motion to Extend Time to file Motion given to Judge Martin A. Maley.
05/24/18 Motion 2 (to Extend Time to file Motion) granted by Mary L. Morrissey.
06/11/18 Motion to Extend Time filed by Attorney Nicholas L. Hadden for Defendant Gregory W. Bombard on dispute 1. Motion to Extend Time given to judge.
Motion to Extend Time given to Judge Martin A. Maley.
06/13/18 Motion 3 (to Extend Time) granted by Martin A. Maley.
06/29/18 Motion Extend Time filed by Attorney Nicholas L. Hadden for Defendant Gregory W. Bombard on dispute 1. Motion Extend Time given to judge. Motion Extend Time given to Judge Martin A. Maley.
07/05/18 Motion 4 (Extend Time) granted by Martin A. Maley.
08/06/18 Motion to Dismiss and Suppress filed by Attorney Nicholas L. Hadden

```
    for Defendant Gregory W. Bombard on dispute 1. Motion to Dismiss and Suppress given to judge.
Motion to Dismiss and Suppress given to Judge Martin A. Maley.
```

08/08/18
A response was filed to Motion to Dismiss and Suppress filed by
Attorney James A. Hughes for Plaintiff State. Motion 5: Under Advisement.
08/31/18 Motion 5 (to Dismiss and Suppress) denied by Martin A. Maley. See order in file.
Pre Trial Conference set for 10/08/18 at 08:30 AM.
Jury Drawing set for 10/09/18 at 08:30 AM.
10/08/18 Pre Trial Conference held by A. Gregory Rainville. (CDVIDEO) Hughes/Hadden/Dft present Motion to dismiss filed this am Set motion hearing.
Jury Drawing scheduled for 10/09/18 cancelled.
10/24/18 Motion Hearing set for 11/21/18 at 08:30 AM.
11/21/18 Motion to Amend Information; Add Count 2 filed by Attorney James A. Hughes for Plaintiff State on dispute 1. Motion to Amend Information;
Add Count 2 given to judge.
Motion to Amend Information; Add Count 2 given to Judge A. Gregory Rainville.
Motion 6 (to Amend Information; Add Count 2) granted by A. Gregory Rainville. Parties notified on the record.
Probable Cause found by Judge A. Gregory Rainville on dispute 2. Copy of Affidavit and Information given to defendant. 24 hour rule waived.
Reading of Information waived. Defendant pleads not guilty on dispute 2. Pre-trial discovery order issued.
Motion Hearing held by A. Gregory Rainville. (CDVIDEO)
Hughes/Hadden/Dft present Motion to dismiss charge $1 \& 2$ to be filed by Hadden. If not filed within 2 weeks - set ptr.
Dispute 2 for Docket No. 241-2-18 Frcr Count \#2, DISORDERLY
CONDUCT-OBSTRUCTING VEHICLE OR PEDESTRIAN TRAFFIC, Misdemeanor, 13 V.S.A. 1026(a)(5). Alleged offense date: 02/09/18. Arrest/citation date: 02/09/18 St. Albans PD.
11/26/18 Motion to Dismiss count two filed by Attorney Nicholas L. Hadden for Defendant Gregory W. Bombard on disputes 1-2. Motion to Dismiss count two given to judge.
11/27/18 Motion to Dismiss count two given to Judge A. Gregory Rainville.
12/10/18 Entry Order: See entry order in file.
12/11/18 Note: Recieved Tpr Riggen's cruiser camera footage disc from the states atty this date.
12/18/18 Motion 7 (to Dismiss count two) granted by A. Gregory Rainville. See Ruling in file.
Note: xmailed Ruling on Motion to Dismiss Count two to aparties this date/ht.
12/24/18 Dispute 2: Dismissed by court without prejudice. Judgment of No judgment entered by Judge A. Gregory Rainville on dispute 2. Pre Trial Conference set for 01/07/19 at 08:30 AM.
Jury Drawing set for 01/08/19 at 08:30 AM.
01/07/19 Pre Trial Conference held by A. Gregory Rainville. (OFFREC) Case to be dismissed in about 10 days. Jury Drawing scheduled for 01/08/19 cancelled.
01/18/19 Dispute 1: Dismissed by state without prejudice. Judgment of No judgment entered by Judge A. Gregory Rainville on dispute 1. Case closed.
Motion 1 (Challenging Probable Cause) rendered moot.
01/24/19 1 document filed by Attorney Nicholas L. Hadden for party 1: Letter regarding donation.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Defendant purports to move for suppression pursuant to V.R.Cr.P. 41(f). Rule 41(f) allows for a motion to return unlawfully seized property. It is Rule $41(\mathrm{~g})$ which provides for a motion to suppress. As there is no allegation that Defendant's property was seized at any point during this encounter, the Court presumes that the reference to subsection (f) was a clerical error.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ In Swartz v. Insogna, the Second Circuit was called to consider a seizure which occurred after an officer observed the passenger of a vehicle to gesture at him with his middle finger. 704 F.3d 105 (2d Cir. 2013). In that case, as here, the police officer stated, "somewhat inconsistently," that he initiated the stop because he believed the passenger was attempting to get his attention for some reason, and because he was concerned for the wellbeing of others in the car. Id. at 110. The Second Circuit stated,

    Perhaps there is a police officer somewhere who would interpret an automobile passenger's giving him the finger as a signal of distress, creating a suspicion that something occurring in the automobile warranted investigation. And perhaps that interpretation is what prompted [the officer] to act, as he claims. But the nearly universal recognition that this gesture is an insult deprives such an interpretation of reasonableness. This ancient gesture of insult is not the basis for a reasonable suspicion of a traffic violation or impending criminal activity. Surely no passenger planning some wrongful conduct toward another occupant of an automobile would call attention to himself by giving the finger to a police officer. And if there might be an automobile passenger somewhere who will give the finger to a police officer as an ill-advised signal for help, it is far more consistent with all citizens' protection against improper police apprehension to leave that highly unlikely signal without a response than to lend judicial approval to the stopping of every vehicle from which a passenger makes that gesture.
    Id.
    ${ }^{3}$ Because, as discussed supra, the officers later developed information sufficient to provide probable cause from an independent source, the Court declined to hold that the officers unlawfully converted the investigatory stop into a de facto arrest. State v. Phillips, 140 Vt. 210, 216 (1981) ("Arguably, the police actions in this case extend beyond the proper scope of an investigatory stop. We need not, and do not, determine this point because of our holding...").

