

Nos. 07-208

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

STATE OF INDIANA,
Petitioner,

v.
AHMAD EDWARDS,
Respondent.

**On Writ of Certiorari
to the Supreme Court of Indiana**

JOINT APPENDIX

MARK T. STANCIL*
Robbins, Russell, Englert,
Orseck, Untereiner &
Sauber LLP
1801 K Street, N.W.
Suite 411
Washington, DC 20006
202-775-4500

MICHAEL R. FISHER
151 N. Delaware Street
Suite 200
Indianapolis, IN 46204
317-327-3404

**Counsel of Record
Counsel for Respondent*

[Additional Counsel for Respondent Listed on Inside Cover]

STEVE CARTER
Attorney General
THOMAS M. FISHER*
Solicitor General
JULIE A. BRUBAKER
HEATHER L. HAGAN
JUSTIN F. ROEBEL
NICOLE M. SCHUSTER
Deputy Attorneys General
Office of the Indiana
Attorney General
IGC South, Fifth Floor
302 West Washington Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204
317-232-6201
317-232-7979 facsimile

**Counsel of Record
Counsel for Petitioner*

**Petition for Writ of Certiorari filed August 18, 2007
Certiorari Granted December 7, 2007**

DANIEL R. ORTIZ
MICHELLE D. MORRIS
University of Virginia
School of Law
Supreme Court Litigation
Clinic
580 Massie Road
Charlottesville, VA 22903
434-924-3127

DAVID T. GOLDBERG
Donahue & Goldberg, LLP
99 Hudson Street
New York, NY 10013
212-334-8813

Counsel for Respondent

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chronological List of Relevant Docket Entries.....	1a
Selected pleadings and documents included with Respondent Edwards’s Appendix filed in the Indiana Court of Appeals and Supreme Court of Indiana	
<i>Pro Se</i> Correspondence (09/03/99)	4a
<i>Pro Se</i> Motion to Dismiss Counsel (11/08/99).....	7a
<i>Pro Se</i> Plea Entry (11/09/1999)	9a
<i>Pro Se</i> Correspondence (11/19/99)	10a
<i>Pro Se</i> Motion to Dismiss Counsel (11/23/99).....	11a
Combined Notice of Insanity Defense and Petition for Examination And Motion For Psychiatric Examination to Determine Competence to Stand Trial (12/07/99)	13a
Psychiatric Appointment and Sheriff’s Authorization (12/08/99)	15a
Dr. Ned P. Masbaum’s Report (12/22/99)	17a
Dr. Dwight W. Schuster’s Report (12/31/99).....	23a
Dr. Lance E. Trexler Neuropsychological Examination Report (02/23/00)	28a
<i>Pro Se</i> Motion State Trial Transcription and Stenographic Reporting (07/06/00)	40a
<i>Pro Se</i> Correspondence (07/20/00)	43a

Commitment Order Indiana Department of Mental Health (08/16/00)..... 48a

Correspondence to Court from Family and Social Services Agency (11/02/00)..... 50a

Confinement Authority Lacking Ability to Understand and Assist (11/08/00) 52a

Correspondence to Court from Family and Social Services Agency (03/14/01)..... 54a

Competence to Stand Trial Report of Steven H. Berger, M.D. (03/14/01)¹ 56a

Pro Se Motion to Dismiss Criminal Charges and Discharge the Defendant on Criminal Rule 4.[c] (05/29/01) 65a

Pro Se Motion of Permissive Intervention (06/26/01)..... 69a

Pro Se Correspondence (07/23/01) 80a

Dr. Ned P. Masbaum’s Report (10/03/01)..... 84a

Pro Se Petition (04/22/02) 91a

Pro Se Petition (04/22/02) 93a

Pro Se Defence Objection (04/23/02) 95a

¹ Pages 2 and 4 of this report, which appear at pages 58-60 and 62-64 of this Joint Appendix, were omitted (apparently unintentionally) from Edwards’s appendix on appeal. Those pages are nonetheless part of the official record on appeal pursuant to Rules 2 and 27 of the Indiana Rules of Appellate Procedure (Rule 27 is reprinted at footnote 2, *infra*). They have now been supplied to the Clerk of the Supreme Court of Indiana, along with a notice dated February 1, 2008, explaining the circumstances, for transmittal with the remainder of the record to this Court.

Pro Se Motion for Competnet Dress Code (04/23/02) 97a

Pro Se Orders to the Clerk (04/15/02) 102a

Pro Se Order of Reference (04/15/02) 103a

Pro Se Consent to Jurisdiction by a Superior Court
Magistrate Judge (4/15/02) 105a

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law on Defendant’s
Competence to Stand Trial (04/16/02)..... 106a

Pro Se Orders to the Clerk (04/22/02) 116a

Pro Se Orders to the Clerk (04/23/02) 117a

Pro Se Orders to the Clerk (04/23/02) 118a

Pro Se Orders to the Clerk (09/10/02) 120a

Pro Se P/T Motion to Protect Orders (09/16/02)..... 122a

Pro Se Satisfactory Service Line Proposed in Tort
Claim Extent of Loss (09/25/02) 133a

Pro Se Motion for Competent Dress Code (09/26/02) ... 136a

Pro Se Motion For Transcript of Prior Trial
(10/01/02) 146a

Pro Se Orders to the Clerk (10/03/02) 151a

Pro Se Defendants Plea (10/23/02) 153a

Pro Se Notice of Defense of Mental Disease and/or
Defect (10/23/02)..... 155a

Dr. Philip M. Coons’s Psychiatric Evaluation
(11/26/02) 157a

Suggestion Of Incompetency (11/27/02) 166a

Pro Se Resonable Calculations (12/02/02) 170a

<i>Pro Se</i> Practice Routine (12/02/02)	181a
Dr. Dwight W. Schuster's Report (12/31/02).....	186a
Dr. Ned P. Masbaum's Report (01/10/03)	190a
<i>Pro Se</i> Admission of Facts and Notice of Defense and Mental Disease and or Defect (03/21/03).....	197a
<i>Pro Se</i> Petition for Hearing under IC 12-26-12-2 (05/14/03)	202a
Findings of Fact (11/24/03)	206a
Commitment Order Indiana Department of Mental Health (11/24/03).....	210a
Dr. Robert J. Sena's Report (06/01/04).....	212a
Dr. Robert J. Sena's Report (07/29/04).....	226a
<i>Pro Se</i> Orders to the Clerk (09/13/04)	237a
<i>Pro Se</i> Notice of Criminal Rule 4.C. (09/13/04).....	238a
<i>Pro Se</i> Petition for Hearing (09/13/04)	239a
<i>Pro Se</i> Correspondence to Judge Hawkins (09/22/04)	241a
<i>Pro Se</i> Correspondence to Judge Nancy Broills: (09/22/04)	243a
<i>Pro Se</i> Motion for Court to Furnish Docket Sheets (10/21/04)	244a
<i>Pro Se</i> Motion to Dismiss and Discharge (11/01/04)	246a
<i>Pro Se</i> Correspondence to Judge Hawkins (11/01/04) ..	249a
<i>Pro Se</i> Petition for Hearing (11/01/04)	250a

Notice of Intent to Interpose Defense of Insanity (08/01/05)	252a
<i>Pro Se</i> Filing (08/30/05)	254a
<i>Pro Se</i> Petition (08/30/05)	258a
<i>Pro Se</i> Correspondence (09/12/05)	261a
<i>Pro Se</i> Notice of Request Made (10/05/05).....	263a
<i>Pro Se</i> Petition for Hearing (10/27/05)	265a
Marion County Jail Inmate Message Card	267a
<i>Pro Se</i> Correspondence to the Clerk of Court (12/09/05)	268a
<i>Pro Se</i> Petition (12/12/05)	275a
<i>Pro Se</i> Correspondence to the Clerk of Court (12/13/05)	277a
<i>Pro Se</i> Petition for <i>Pro Se</i> Actions (12/13/05)	279a
<i>Pro Se</i> Petitions for <i>Pro Se</i> Actions (12/13/05).....	281a
<i>Pro Se</i> Correspondence to Judge Hawkins (12/19/05)	283a
<i>Pro Se</i> Petition of Settlement (12/19/05)	284a
<i>Pro Se</i> Orders to Clerk (12/22/05)	290a
<i>Pro Se</i> Correspondence to the Clerk of Court and <i>Pro Se</i> Motion (12/22/05).....	293a
<i>Pro Se</i> Orders to the Clerk (12/28/05)	300a
State of Indiana Pre-Sentence Report (01/13/06).....	305a
<i>Pro Se</i> Petition for Writ Mandamus (01/23/06)	326a

<i>Pro Se</i> Petition for Writ Mandamus (01/23/06)	328a
Edwards Exhibits	334a
Hearing transcripts and reports that are part of the official record on appeal pursuant to Indiana Rule of Appellate Procedure 27,² but that were only recently transcribed and were not included in Respondent Edwards’s Appendix filed with the Indiana Court of Appeals and Supreme Court of Indiana	
Verified Notice of Submission of Additional Transcripts (01/30/08).....	343a
Competency Hearing Transcript (02/02/00)	347a
Competency Hearing Transcript (08/16/00)	357a
Competency Hearing Transcript (03/20/02)	383a
Competency Hearing Transcript (04/29/03)	464a
<i>Pro Se</i> Motion Hearing Transcript (06/27/05)	507a
Trial Court Order Under Review	
Excerpt from Trial Transcript (12/19/05).....	522a

² Rule 27 provides as follows: “The Record on Appeal shall consist of the Clerk’s Record and all proceedings before the trial court or Administrative Agency, whether or not transcribed or transmitted to the Court on Appeal. Any provision of these Rules regarding preparation of the Record on Appeal may be enforced by order of the Court on Appeal. The Record of Proceedings is abolished.”

The following opinions have been omitted in printing this joint appendix because they appear on the following pages in the appendix to the Petition for Certiorari:

Opinion of the Indiana Supreme Court reversing Edwards’s convictions issued May 17, 2007	Pet. App. 1a
Opinion of the Indiana Court of Appeals issued September 18, 2006	Pet. App. 16a

Chronological List of Relevant Docket Entries

Marion Superior Court

July 15, 1999—Initial charges filed.

December 7, 1999—Defendant files Motion of Combined Notice of Insanity Defense and Petition for Examination to Determine Competence to Stand Trial.

December 8, 1999—Court appoints Drs. Schuster and Masbaum to examine Defendant.

February 2, 2000—Competency hearing.

August 16, 2000—Competency hearing.

August 16, 2000—Court issues order finding Defendant incompetent to stand trial and ordering commitment to Indiana Department of Mental Health.

March 14, 2001—Dr. Smith of Logansport State Hospital files report finding that Defendant is competent to stand trial.

September 12, 2001—Court orders Drs. Schuster and Masbaum to reexamine Defendant.

March 20, 2002—Competency hearing.

April 16, 2002—Court issues findings of fact and conclusions of law finding Defendant competent to stand trial.

November 27, 2002—Defendant files Suggestion of Incompetency.

December 2, 2002—Court orders Drs. Schuster and Masbaum to reexamine Defendant.

April 29, 2003—Competency hearing.

November 24, 2003—Court issues order finding Defendant incompetent to stand trial and ordering commitment to Indiana Department of Mental Health.

June 1, 2004—Logansport State Hospital files report suggesting Defendant has not gained competency.

July 29, 2004—Logansport State Hospital files report suggesting Defendant has gained competency.

August 4, 2004—Court orders Defendant returned to custody of Marion County Jail.

June 27-28, 2005—Two-day jury trial, where Defendant was convicted of theft and criminal recklessness, but hung on attempted murder and battery with a deadly weapon.

December 14, 2005—Defendant requests to proceed *pro se*.

December 19, 2005—Court denies Defendant's request to proceed *pro se*.

December 19-21, 2005—Jury trial, where Defendant was convicted of attempted murder and battery with a deadly weapon.

January 13, 2006—Pre-sentence investigation report filed.

January 17, 2006—Defendant sentenced to total executed sentence of 30 years.

Indiana Court of Appeals

February 15, 2006—Defendant files Notice of Appeal.

September 18, 2006—Court of Appeals issues order and opinion, reversing trial court in part and remanding with instructions to vacate Defendant's convictions for attempted murder and battery and to hold a trial on those charges.

Supreme Court of Indiana

October 18, 2006—State files Petition for Transfer.

May 17, 2007—Supreme Court issues order granting transfer, ordering Defendant's convictions for attempted murder and battery reversed, and remanding for further proceedings.

Supreme Court of the United States

August 15, 2007—State files Petition for Writ of Certiorari.

December 7, 2007—Petition for Writ of Certiorari granted, but limited to the following question, "May States adopt a higher standard for measuring competency to represent oneself at trial than for measuring competency to stand trial?"

5:30 AM

9/3/99

Ahmad Edwards Cause No. 49G059907CFI21975

To my most hights fair and car judge, Gary L. Miller out of a great deal of honor and respect I wrote earlyer characterizing my concern with the high crim rate amoung young Americans and how influenced I am about organizing an association that helps the city with the war on volient crimes. I'm a unique example of the theory that works on young Ameracns. "If the essential expectations of success, by what is right is not balanced appropriately in the impression of our growing Ameracins. Then endeavors of tremendous offenceses will leave us empty of the ambishions it takes to properly establish respectfull goals and dreams. Trying to stress the importance of eathices and values is what set's the standers, gentailmen, rather require for exceptance into dignified socity.

My amazing dection has grown vastly focused throught my own theoreogical informed exposures of socializam this is the exclusive means for volountering my organization skills to services for young Americans. As an leader one must be self-controlled sensible well behaved friendly to strangers, and be able to teach. So now I must appropriatly build a good strong reputation and manifest a faithful marriage.

One has all-ready accomplished a humbbling loyalty for the improvement of mankind.

These are just some of the projects exposing comendable atubrutes that's accrediting to dignified socity I've made so far.

5a

Volountered to help feed the homeless

Volountered helping hand to orfins

Volunte at Wisner Morail Hospital

Volunteer for bible study school

Volonntered with organization that worked with crim offenders

Volonntered to help clean-up Lake Shore Drive Nashvill

Volunteer each Sunday to ride and help elderly people

Teached a small class twice a week of little kids self defence for free

Donate new clothing to church clothing room when thay are low

Exceptance in to a magnate program selected from 5000 as one of 5

Offered job with dupety sheriff's of Indianapolis Indiana

2000 hours down from beeing a licened privet dective

Attented Holy Angels Christian school

Volunter at the church to run films and cook popcorn for the kids

Elected for student goverment as pressdent of the borad

Donated art work to striving new youth group Nashvill

Master hights leveal of self defence

Elected for youth director N.A.A.C.P.

6a

These are my short and long range goals I've set for myself.

- 1 Endorcement of liceneses oprators
- 2 G.E.D. deploma
- 3 Family in God's Name
- 4 Collage higher learing
- 5 Preast hood
- 6 Ploticial sicences background
- 7 Law background
- 8 Miltary Armed Forces
- 9 U.S.A. Olimipac Team
- 10 Privet dective liceneses

I'm proud of how well I have tryed to show respect to my public and socity

(Page 1 of 2)

STATE OF INDIANA) SS: IN THE MARION
) SUPERIOR COURT
COUNTY OF MARION) CRIMINAL DIVISION,
AHMAD EDWARDS) ROOM 5
VS.) CAUSE NO.:
) 49G059907CF121975
STATE OF INDIANA,)
RESPONDENT.)

<<stamped>> FILED NOV 08 1999 <<signature>>
Sarah M. Taylor CLERK OF THE MARION
CIRCUIT COURT

‘MOTION TO DISMISS COUNSEL’

Comes now the defendant ‘Ahmad Edwards’ hereby request that this court grant this motion, to dismiss the counsel of ‘Mis. Diane Abel’, and Mr. Bob Hill, for the following reasons:

- 1.) That defense counsel was appointed to this cause on the 13th day of October, 1999.
- 2.) The defense counsel refuses to answer defendants letters/questions or correspond with defendant pertaining to this cause.
- 3.) That a strong breakdown in communication has come forth between defendant and counsel, due to counsel and not defendant.
- 4.) That strong conflict of intrest exist between defendant and counsel, that defendant would not recieve fair and proper representation if counsel remain attached to defendants case.

(Cont. on page 2 of 2)

(Page 2 of 2)

“MOTION TO DISMISS COUNSEL – CONT.”

- 5.) That defense counsel has not conducted proper investigation or filed motions in defendants behalf, as defendant has requested.
- 6.) That defense counsel has not visited defendant on a regular bases to inform defendant of findings or discuss the stragity of possible defense.

The defendant in this cause, cannot recieve the necessary assistance in order to prove his innocense to this court.

WHEREFORE, the defendant prays that this court grants this motion, or schedule a hearing where defendant can state his claim in this action for this said motion.

Respectfully submitted,

Ahmad Edwards
Defendant

C.C.: Clerk of Court
File

STATE OF INDIANA) SS: IN THE MARION
COUNTY OF MARION) SUPERIOR CORT
) CRIMINAL DIVISION,
AHMAD EDWARDS) ROOM 5
VS.) CAUSE NO.:
) 49G059907CF121975
STATE OF INDIANA,) (AS TO COUNT (II) C
RESPONDENT.) FELONY 35-42-2-1
) (AS TO COUNT (III) D
) FELONY 35-42-2-2

I, the defendant, Ahmad Edwards, on the 9th day of November 1999, fully acknowledge and understand my right to enter a plea.

I, the defendant, Ahmad Edwards, hereby enter a plea of guilty, as to count II battery, class C felony I.C. 35-42-2-1.

I, the defendant, Ahmad Edwards, hereby enter a plea of guilty, as to count III criminal recklessness, class D felony I.C. 35-42-2-2.

Respectfully submitted

/s/ Ahmad Edwards

Ahmad Edwards

Defendant

<<written>>

Notary Cynthia Mann

Date 11-19-99

Dear Judge; Gary L. Miller

My name is Ahmad Edwards, and I am proud to say that the finishing up of two very important proposals, has come. The first proposal is a community base operation, that works for young disadvantaged Americans under the age of twenty one. Helping develop them into government professionals of the community (this program is governmental associated).

The second proposal is a campaign supporter of governmental relations association. That design campaign strategys for governmental candidates pursuancing publicly elected official offices of the state. Exclusivly networking throught the community to present candaites, of the Democratic and or Republican Party's (this program is a federal cooperative education program).

Respectly Conststent;

/s/ Ahmad Edwards

Ahmad Edwards

Defendant

<<written>>

Notary Cynthia Mann

Date 11-19-99

STATE OF INDIANA) SS: IN THE MARION
) SUPERIOR CORT
) CRIMINAL DIVISION,
) ROOM 5
AHMAD EDWARDS)
 VS.) CAUSE NO.:
STATE OF INDIANA) 49G059907CF121975
RESPONDENT.)

<<stamped>> FILED NOV 23 1999 <<signature>>
Sarah M. Taylor CLERK OF THE MARION
CIRCUIT COURT

‘MOTION TO DISMISS COUNSEL’

Comes now the defendant “Ahmad Edwards” hereby request that this court grant this motion, to dismiss the counsel of ‘Mis Diane Able,” and “Mr Bob Hill”, for the following reasons:

- 1.) That defense counsel was appointed to this cause on the 13th day of October, 1999.
- 2.) The defense counsel refuses to answer defendants letters/questions or correspond with defendant pertaining to this cause.
- 3.) That a strong breakdown in communication has come forth between defendant and counsel, due to counsel and not defendant.
- 4.) That strong conflict of intrest exist between defendant and counsel, that defendant would not recieve fair and proper representation if counsel remain attached to defendant case.

(cont. on page 2 of 2)

(page 2 of 2)

“MOTION TO DISMISS COUNSEL – CONT”

- 5.) That defense counsel has not conducted proper investigation or filed motions in defendants behalf, as defendant has requested.
- 6.) That defense counsel has not visited defendant on a regular bases to inform defendant of findings or discuss the stragity of possible defense.

The defendant in this cause, cannot recieve the necessary assistance in order to prove his innocense to this court.

WHEREFORE, the defendant prays that this court grants this motion, or schedule a hearing where defendant can state his claim in this action for this said motion.

Respectfully submitted

/s/ Ahmad Edwards

Ahmad Edwards

Defendant

<<written>>

Notary Cynthia Mann

Date 11-19-99

STATE OF INDIANA) IN THE MARION
COUNTY OF MARION) COUNTY
) SUPERIOR COURT
) CRIMINAL DIVISION,
) ROOM 5
STATE OF INDIANA) CAUSE NO.
 V) 49G059907CF121975
AHMAD EDWARDS)

<<stamped>> FILED DEC 07 1999 <<signature>>
Sarah M. Taylor CLERK OF THE MARION
CIRCUIT COURT

COMBINED NOTICE OF INSANITY DEFENSE
AND PETITION FOR EXAMINATION
AND MOTION FOR PSYCHIATRIC EXAMINATION
TO DETERMINE COMPETENCE TO STAND TRIAL

The defendant, Ahmad Edwards, by counsel of the Marion County Public Defender Agency, moves this Court, pursuant to I.C. 35-36-3-1, to appoint two (2) competent, disinterested psychiatrists to examine the defendant, Ahmad Edwards, and report to this Court on his competence to stand trial, and for a hearing on said issue, on the following grounds:

1. Counsel for the Defendant believes that the Defendant lacks ability to understand the proceedings and assist in the preparation of his defense.
2. Further, the defendant, Ahmad Edwards, by counsel, and pursuant to I.C. 35-36-2-1, hereby serves notice of the Defendant's intent to raise the defense of insanity at the time of trial or the aboved entitled cause and contemporaneously with this notice petitions the Court, pursuant to I.C. 35-36-2-2, to appoint two competent, disinterested psychiatrists to examine the Defendant and to testify at trial.

WHEREFORE, the Defendant, by counsel, respectfully moves this Court to appoint two competent psychiatrists to examine the

Defendant and report on his competence to stand trial, and for all other relief just and proper in the premises.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/

Diane E. Abel
Deputy Public Defender
18510-49 A2998

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing was served upon the Marion County Prosecutor's Office by leaving a copy of same in the designated mailbox in Superior Court 5 on or before the date of filing.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/

Diane E. Abel

Marion County Public Defender Agency
1222 City-County Building
200 E. Washington St.
Indianapolis, IN 46204
317-327-4100

STATE OF INDIANA) SS: IN THE MARION
) SUPERIOR
) COURT
COUNTY OF MARION) CRIMINAL DIVISION,
) ROOM FIVE
STATE OF INDIANA) THE HONORABLE
VS.) GARY L. MILLER,
) JUDGE
) CAUSE NO.
<<written>>) 49G059907C7121975
Ahmad Edwards) <<written>>

<<stamped>> FILED DEC 08 1999 <<signature>>
Sarah M. Taylor CLERK OF THE MARION
CIRCUIT COURT

PSYCHIATRIC APPOINTMENT AND SHERIFF'S
AUTHORIZATION

Dr. <<written>> Masbaum
P.O. Box 3010
<<written>> Carmel Indianapolis, Indiana
<<written>> 43032 46082
Dr. <<written>> Schuster
1016 Tuckahoe
Indianapolis, Indiana <<written>> 46260

YOU HAVE BEEN APPOINTED by the Court to
examine the above named defendant, <<written>>
Ahmad Edwards, as to whether he/she was of sound or
unsound mind on the date of the alleged offense [] and
as to whether or not the defendant has comprehension
sufficient to understand the nature of these proceedings
and aid his/her attorney in his defense.

The defendant is being held in the Marion County Jail.
PLEASE CONTACT THE JAIL TO SET UP A TIME
FOR YOUR EVALUATION OF THE DEFENDANT.

If you want to have the defendant admitted to Wishard Memorial Hospital Detention Ward for further tests, turn in this sheet to the Jail, and it will serve as authority for the Marion County Sheriff to transfer the defendant to the Hospital and to return the defendant to the Jail upon completion of the examination.

/s/ Gary L. Miller
GARY L. MILLER, JUDGE
MARION COUNTY
SUPERIOR COURT
CRIMINAL DIVISION FIVE

DATE: <<written>> 12-8-99

<<masthead>>

Indiana University
IU MEDICAL GROUP Specialty Care

Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation
Clinical Building 368

541 North Clinical Drive
Indianapolis, Indiana
46202-5111

317-278-0200
Fax: 317-278-0206

NED P. MASBAUM, M.D.
Forensic Psychiatry
P.O. Box 3010
Carmel, Indiana 46082 U.S.A.
Telephone (317) 846-7727 Fax (317) 575-1898
Toll Free (888) 203-7746

December 22, 1999

Honorable Gary L. Miller, Judge
Marion Superior Court Criminal 5
W-305 City County Building
200 East Washington Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Re: Ahmad Edwards B/M 1/29/73 Cause No. 49G05-
9907-CF-121975

Dear Judge Miller:

In accordance with your order, the above individual
was seen for Psychiatric Examination.

PURPOSE OF EXAMINATION:

Provide an opinion regarding soundness of mind at
the time of the alleged offense(s).

Provide an opinion regarding Competence to Stand
Trial.

CHARGES AGAINST THIS INDIVIDUAL:

Count I: Attempt Murder, Class A Felony, 7-12-99

Count II: Battery, Class C Felony, 7-12-99

Count III: Criminal Recklessness, Class D Felony, 7-
12-99

Count IV: Theft, Class D Felony, 7-12-99

QUALIFICATIONS OF EXAMINER:

Enclosed please find a copy of my resume that states my qualifications to provide a psychiatric opinion regarding this individual.

DATE OF EXAMINATION:

12-22-99

LOCATION OF EXAMINATION:

Marion County Jail, under satisfactory conditions.

DURATION OF EXAMINATION:

Approximately two (2) hours.

RECORDS AND INFORMATION AVAILABLE FOR REVIEW:

- 1.) Copy of the Probable Cause Affidavit and Charging Information.
- 2.) Copy of this individual's Criminal History.
- 3.) Copies of his letters sent to his Defense Attorney provided by Miss Abel.

IDENTIFICATION DATA:

This individual provided the following information:

NAME: Ahmad NMN Edwards

AGE: 26

DOB: 1-29-73

SSN: 309-78-9239

This individual was advised that this was a court ordered non-confidential psychiatric examination and agreed to proceed.

ACCOUNT OF THE ALLEGED OFFENSE(S) BY THIS INDIVIDUAL:

He described goal directed behavior, thinking and flight from the crime scene that occurred at that time. At that time he had not been consuming alcohol nor using illicit substances nor taking prescription medication from a Physician.

PAST MEDICAL HISTORY:

He said that he had no past Psychiatric care. However, he said then he saw a Psychiatrist "once" when he was on the "youth board of the National Urban League and they noticed that I had stress." He also said that he saw a "female Psychologist from 1991 to 1995 who was a mentor...she took a liking to me and encourage my creativity." No further specifics regarding treatment was obtainable from him. He is not receiving psychotropic medication at this time in Jail. He has received pain medication for his gun shot wound that occurred at the time of his arrest. He denied any past history of alcohol or illicit substance abuse nor dependence. It was noted that his Criminal History revealed an arrest for Public Intoxication. He said that he had been diagnosed once with heart flutter. He also sustained an injury to his left forehead in a motor vehicle accident when he was a passenger. He also sustained a fractured collar bone and hip bone when struck by a truck in a MVA in which he was a pedestrian. He could not recall more specifics about this accident.

PERSONAL HISTORY:

He was born in Indianapolis. His parents were married. He never knew his father because prior to his birth, his father died of a gun shot wound. He was

reared by his mother and moved to Nashville, TN with her when he was age 14-15. He was the youngest of his mother's 2 children. He has a step father. He said, "My childhood was sheltered...I was a Parochial School...Holy Angels...grades 2-5...then public schools." He went to the 11th grade at Broadripple then moved to TN and did not continue in school. He did not obtain a GED. He said that he can read and write. He had no military duty. He had Job Corps training for one year in WI. He has not been in prison. He had 2 previous arrests according to his Criminal History. He said that he has worked a security guard and he has his own business. He said that his business includes "campaign supports...strategies for the US Senate."

MENTAL STATUS EXAMINATION:

He was a black male who said that he was 5 ft 6 in tall and weighed 150 pounds which he said was down from 185 pounds that he weighed prior to his arrest. He had short black hair, brown eyes and a mustache. He was unshaven. He was alert, cooperative and overly friendly for the jail environment. He was loquacious providing rambling intellectual responses to questions. However, when questions of clarification or specifics were asked he avoided providing the requested information. He was grandiose, superficial and had poor reality expectations. He said he had an IQ of "198 to 200." He described writing the prosecutor from jail and offering services to the prosecutor for a political campaign. He denied having hallucinations. He denied cyclic mood and sleep changes. He was able to abstract a proverb. He was oriented. His memory of recent and remote events was intact. He was able to name the current

president and spouse. He had difficulty performing simple calculations. He was not able to determine the correct change from a dollar for a purchase. He was not able to correctly subtract serial 7's from 100. He said that he "was not very good in math."

He understands the charges against him. He understands that if he is found guilty that he could receive a significant sentence. He understands the Criminal Proceedings. He was able to provide reasonable definitions of the roles of the Judge, Jury, Witnesses, Prosecutor and Defense Attorney.

DIAGNOSTIC IMPRESSION:

- 1.) Delusional Disorder Grandiose Type 297.1
- 2.) Probable Malingering demonstrated by excessive control of the exam through verbosity, avoidance of specific information when requested, curious attempts to engage the Prosecutor and bizarre letters to his Defense Attorneys.

PSYCHIATRIC OPINION:

It is my opinion, based on reasonable medical certainty, that this individual, does have comprehension sufficient to understand the nature of the proceedings. He is able, in spite of his mental disorder to aid his attorney in his defense in accordance with I.C. 35-36-3-1.

Furthermore, it is in my opinion, based on reasonable medical certainty, that this individual, in spite of his mental disorder was of sound mind at the time of the alleged offenses. He was able to appreciate the wrongfulness of his conduct at that time in accordance with I.C.35-41-3-6.

22a

Sincerely,

 /s/ Ned P. Masbaum, M.D.
Ned P. Masbaum, M.D.

NPM/em

Dwight William Schuster M.D.
1016 Tuckahoe
Indianapolis, Indiana 46260
(317) 259-1584

The Honorable Gary L. Miller, Judge
Superior Court of Marion County
Criminal Division, Room Five
City-County Bldg.
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

December 31, 1999

Dr. Dwight W. Schuster's Report (12/31/99)

RE: Ahmad Edwards

Cause Number: 49G05 9907 CF 121975

Dear Judge Miller:

Pursuant to your appointment I have examined the above named defendant as to his competency to stand trial and as to his soundness of mind at the time of the alleged offense. My examination was carried out in a private room at the Marion County Jail in Indianapolis under satisfactory conditions and it was supplemented by a review of the Probable Cause Affidavit, an interview with his mother and grandmother and a review of lengthy letters written by the defendant.

The defendant was informed of the nature of the examination and he was told that his statements were not confidential. He expressed understanding of those facts and he was willing to continue with the examination. He identified himself and stated that he was 26 years of age with a birth date of January 29, 1973. He gave me his home address including the correct zip code.

Mr. Edwards went into great detail about events in July, 1999 but nothing about what happened at the Parisian's Department Store on July 12, 1999, other than to say that he did have "the shoes" when arrested. He stated that he had been apprehended by "a store detective" outside the store which caused him to react and that he shot his gun "because "he had attacked me and was hitting me". He stated that he was licensed to carry a gun because he worked in the field of law enforcement, namely, security work.

Past History and Family history given by Mr. Edwards included that his general health has been free of serious illnesses and accidents. He said his father had died in 1976 after being "mugged and shot 15 times". His mother and sister now live in Phoenix, Arizona and he alleged that his sister has "an addiction to drugs". He told me he was accepted in a magnet program in a local High School and went for three years. Then his mother moved and he decided to get a GED. He did not give details about his time in school and what problems he might have had. He said he returned to Indianapolis in 1992 and had worked for different Security companies since then. He denied having had any mental illness or any treatment. He said he used to drink for recreation and that he had one arrest for Public intoxication. He denied any drug problems and said he had never experimented with drugs. He gave a convoluted accounting of his arrest in July, 1998 for Criminal Trespassing and said he thought he should have been placed on Probation so that he would have has a mentor, "some one mature to relate to". He reported that he was not receiving medicine in Jail although he did receive paid medicine after being shot in the leg on July 12, 1999.

Mental Status examination on December 14, 1999 revealed a well nourished and developed man who was alert, coherent and cooperative. He spoke clearly and was very polite. His thinking was organized but obsessively detail with stilted use of words and phrases. A number of his statements were unusual and appeared grandiose. For example he said "I'm keeping a Journal (in Jail). I believe I have some solutions for World's problems". Also he stated "my being shot by a Federal agent will keep me from participating in the Olympics in Judo". There were no bizarre delusional statements or any unusual affect as are found in Schizophrenia. His intelligence was judged to be good but hampered by what appeared to be a learning disability. This was particularly noted in reading his lengthy letters to his attorney and to the Prosecuting Attorney. They were filled with spelling and grammatical errors as well as convoluted sentence structures. Mr. Edwards displayed good understanding of Court room officials and their duties and basic concepts of a trial and its consequences. He was well oriented and did not show any gross defects in attention span and memory.

I spoke with his mother in Phoenix, Arizona who described her son as "high strung". She said he had a high IQ. but that he did have a Learning Disability. She said he had never been examined or treated for mental illness. She said he had been turned down for Social Security Disability. She did not provide me with much detail about his family life and early development. She did say that his sister is receiving Haldol for emotional problems and that Ahmad might have interpreted the Haldol as his sister being "addicted". I also talked with his grandmother in

Indianapolis who referred me and my questions to Mr. Robert Hill, one of his attorneys.

In summary my examination of Ahmad Edwards led me to two diagnostic impressions. I believe that he does have a mixed Learning Disability classified as a Developmental Expressive Writing Disorder and Expressive Language Disorder as shown by his patterns of using erroneous and inappropriate sentences both verbally and in writing, but more marked in writing. A second diagnosis is that of Delusional disorder, Grandiose type. This condition is manifested by the individual believing he or she has great, but undiscovered talents with delusions of inflated worth, power and knowledge. These delusions are not bizarre and in general the individual does not show disorganization of personality. These conditions may make it difficult for Mr. Edwards to communicate satisfactorily with his attorney, but he does know he is charged with a crime and he understands the legal procedures associated with his trial. His delusional disorder impairs his judgment such as in his selection of Security work and carrying a gun.

I believe Mr. Edwards is in need of psychiatric treatment although his condition is difficult to treat. He is potentially dangerous to others.

OPINION:

As a result of my examination it is my opinion with reasonable medical certainty that Ahmad Edwards is competent to stand trial at this time. I believe he was of unsound mind, in the legal sense of that term, on or about July 12, 1999 in that he was suffering from a mental

27a

disease which impaired his appreciation of the wrongfulness of his conduct.

Sincerely,

/s/ Dwight W. Schuster M.D.
Dwight W. Schuster M.D.

NEUROPSYCHOLOGICAL EXAMINATION**Patient Name:** Edwards, Ahmad**Date of Examination:** February 23, 2000**Referral Source:** Diane Abel and Robert Hill,
Attorneys at Law**MEDICAL HISTORY:**

This is a 27-year-old, right handed man who reports that he is ambidextrous. The accuracy of this is unclear. He also reports that he stopped at the 11th grade, and that he has a history of being diagnosed with dyslexia in approximately the 7th grade. It should be noted at this point that the reliability of this patient in terms of reporting this history is quite suspect. He appears to be consistently confused, and it also is entirely possible that he confabulates secondary to memory loss. For example, in one interview he reported a different name for his girlfriend that he had immediately prior to the crime for he is currently incarcerated, and in another interview he gave an entirely different name. This does not appear to be purposeful or intentful, but reflective of either a significant neurologic, psychiatric, or combination of both. He does have some consistent reports, however, which may be more reliable. He has been seen by Dr. Dwight Schuster and Dr. Ned Masbaum, both of whom felt he had a delusional disorder, grandiose type.

The patient also has a history of a motor vehicle accident with a loss of consciousness on September 13, 1995. Apparently he was, according to the patient, en route to elope with his girlfriend, when his car went under a semi-tractor trailer and then the trailer rolled over the car. Again, the reliability of

this report is unclear, but he was taken to Methodist Hospital Trauma Center. At the time of arrival at Methodist he had a Glasgow Coma Scale of 14 out of 14. It was noted that according to medical records he had an approximate five-minute loss of consciousness and he was incontinent of urine. He was apparently unrestrained. His head struck the windshield. Interestingly, medical records report that it was a head-on collision with the semi-tractor trailer. It was noted that in the emergency room he was alert and oriented times three, but had a wandering gaze when not focusing on the examiner's finger on visual examination. He had a scalp laceration apparently in the right frontal region. CT studies of the head showed soft tissue and scalp swelling of the right frontal region with negative midline shift or bleed. He had a diagnosis of closed head injury and acute alcohol intoxication and scalp laceration with repair. He also had a fracture of his ribs. He was seen in follow-up with Methodist Hospital approximately 13 days later for removal of sutures and it was noted that he also had significant difficulties with range of motion with his neck.

This patient was also apparently hit as a pedestrian, by his report. It is impossible to determine in interview with him when this occurred. He reports that after this accident his "right leg drew up." He also reports that he lost his job at that time because of increased fatigue and decreased range of motion in his leg. He reports that he broke his left collarbone in this accident. He reports that there was no loss of consciousness.

By way of history, he apparently has a mother who is living in Phoenix. His father died in approximately 1974 to 1976. He apparently was shot in a drug deal, according to Mr. Edwards' report. He has a sister who was apparently recently diagnosed with AIDS and is schizophrenic. There is apparently a long family history of major psychiatric illness. School records from Broad Ripple High School suggest that at least in 1987 his grades were mostly Fs with two Cs. Testing done with apparently the Iowa Test of Basic Skills in March 1988 shows that he was mostly in the 3rd to 5th grade for all levels of academic functioning, and at that time he was in the 9.6th grade.

NEUROPSYCHOLOGICAL FINDINGS:

In consultation with this patient, it is noted that he is quite tangential, expansive, and disorganized in his verbal output. He initially starts off with some structure, but then quickly decompensates. It is noted in the file that he has written extensive and disorganized letters to a variety of people which are delusional in nature and as previously diagnosed certainly grandiose.

With respect to his pedestrian accident, Mr. Edwards reports that he was hit at 71st and Michigan Street when he was crossing the street. He said that he broke a collarbone and his hip and back. He is unable to reliably tell where he was hospitalized. At this time, he reported that this was in 1993 or slightly before. He also reports a motor vehicle accident, again in 1993. He reports that he had a loss of consciousness and hit the windshield. He reported that he was with his girlfriend and they were eloping. Mr. Edwards reports that he was unconscious until he was hospitalized, although this may have represented posttraumatic amnesia rather than loss of consciousness. He reports that he was in the hospital for four to five hours and then released. He spontaneously reports that he often gets these two accidents confused.

Mr. Edwards goes on to say that after these two accidents “nothing was going right.” He reports that he became very depressed and was very concerned about his sister, who was apparently using drugs and prostituting in his apartment. He said that life had been going well prior to the accident, and that things were “spectacular.” When questioned about his arrest, he said that life prior to this time “was mind-boggling.” He apparently had set certain goals for himself, which probably reflected some grandiose delusion, and then his sister had been diagnosed with AIDS and a “mental illness.” Apparently his sister relocated to Indianapolis and was living with him intermittently and also was using drugs. She also apparently lived with his grandmother, who then according to Mr. Edwards had a stroke secondary to stress one week prior to the robbery. His sister apparently had significant financial difficulties and

he was trying to help her pay some of her bills. He reports that she began prostituting to make money. Apparently he then started to break up with his girlfriend secondary to the stress. He was “trying to be a man in life for the first time” with his girlfriend and help with her three children, but things were falling apart by his report. He indicated, “her pimps were trying to get him to do things to pay her debts” with

Page 2

Ahmad Edwards

Neuropsychological Examination

reference to his sister. In the meantime, Mr. Edwards also indicated, exemplary of his delusional system, that he had decided to build three to four “dream homes.” Then he goes on to say that he was considering suicide the day before the offense for which he was arrested. He apparently locked himself in his apartment and held his gun to his head while he was talking to his ex-girlfriend on the phone. He reports that he hung up and loaded the gun and sat down on the couch, and the gun went off and apparently the bullet went through the couch and the wall, according to his report. He reports that he began crying, and that his ex-girlfriend showed up at the door. He reports feeling very confused at that time. In interview he also reports that his sister was dating a man who was apparently involved in his father’s murder and that he was watching his sister have sex with his father’s murderer prior to this event. He reports seeing her naked with five to six men in his apartment, and reports that this was “totally confusing” to him. Mr. Edwards also reports that since he has been in jail he has encountered one of the individuals who shot his father and apparently

in his mind this individual told him that if he sought revenge the same thing would happen to him.

When asked about the crime, he begins talking about his role as an agent for entertainment stars and that he was going to the mall to sign a contract with a talent. He was, according to Mr. Edwards, going to meet him in the mall in the morning and when this individual did not appear he became distraught. He reports that he was feeling ashamed. He reports that he was going to use money from this contract to pay off his sister's debts. He reports that he does not remember stealing the shoes. It is interesting to note in some previous records, that this patient had some obsession with shoes, incidentally. He reports that he had purchased some other things at another store with his girlfriend's credit card, although this is again confusing because he previously indicated that he had broken up with his girlfriend. He indicates that he remembers next people jumping on him and he thought it was related to the fact somehow that this famous artist had not shown up at the store. He remembers saying, "please let us get out of this busy street." Interestingly, he said the feeling or emotion was like "I was a virgin and the heat and I couldn't see." He reports that he was blanking in and out and at this time when the crime was occurring he felt as if he saw only black. He said, "I hated that I was out of control – a third party saying to myself – Ahmad, what are you doing." He said everything thereafter was "in slow motion." He also reports some out-of-body experiences, in particular after the pedestrian accident, and he endorses some olfactory hallucinations, although again the reliability of this report is unknown.

On examination, this patient demonstrated very good persistence and put forth a good effort. He seemed to comprehend directions. His mood was appropriate and in fact was outgoing and friendly. A valid determination of his neuropsychological status was obtained.

This patient was given the Reitan-Klove Sensory Perceptual Examination, the Finger Tapping Test, the Grooved Pegboard Test, the Controlled Oral Word Association Test, the Aphasia Screening Test, the Paced Auditory Serial Addition Test, the California Verbal Learning Test, the Rey Complex Figure Test, the Ward Short Form of the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale – R, the Wide Range Achievement Test-3, the Wisconsin Card Sorting Test, the Stroop Test, and the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2 as well as the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory – 3.

Page 3

Ahmad Edwards

Neuropsychological Examination

On measures of gross motor speed of the upper extremities, it is noted that this patient is within normal limits to slightly above average on the dominant right upper extremity as well as on the left, nondominant upper extremity. Fine motor dexterity and coordination, however, is noted to be slightly slower than might be expected on the upper right extremity, although within normal limits. However, he was noted to be mildly impaired for the left, nondominant upper extremity.

On the Wide Range Achievement Test –3, this patient obtained a reading score of the 12th percentile or a

grade score of 7, a spelling percentile of the 1st percentile or a grade level of 4, and arithmetic percentile of 2 with a grade score of 4. These are consistent with his previous academic levels of performance. On examination for sensory and perceptual functions, it is noted that he is within normal limits for tactile, auditory and visual sensory confrontation examination. Examination for aphasic symptomatology is within normal limits. He did have some significant difficulties with mental calculations. Generative phonemic naming is noted to be at the 89th percentile. On the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale – Revised, he obtained a Verbal Intelligence Quotient of 88. This places him at the low end of the average range. On the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale – Revised he obtained a Performance Intelligence Quotient of 99. This resulted in a Full Scale Intelligence Quotient of 91.

On examination for attention and concentration functions, he is within normal limits for short-term auditory attention span. His general cognitive speeds are intact, although it is noted that he is extremely impulsive with an inability to inhibit prepotent responses. This would seem to represent a disinhibition and an inability to maintain cognitive set. Consistent with this finding, he had significant difficulties and was markedly impaired on a measure of his ability to serially add digits under the constraints of time. His performance in this respect was markedly and severely impaired. On measures of cognitive flexibility that are less sensitive, he falls into the lower end of the average range which is probably consistent with his premorbid level of intellectual functioning. On measures of memory, it is noted that he is at the 81st percentile for immediate

recall of short paragraph-length material read to him auditorially and at the 84th percentile for delayed recall. Similarly, his immediate visual memory is at the 90th percentile and at the 89th percentile for delayed recall. When given a task of new verbal learning in the form of a 16-word list to recall over five trials, he was ultimately able to acquire 14 out of 16 in immediate recall, but he also began significantly perseverating. He was not aware that he was perseverating. On immediate recall he was able to retain 14 of the items that he had learned, and on long delay free recall he was able to retain 12. He still showed some mild propensity towards perseveration. Cueing did not facilitate his recall and interestingly recognition memory was perhaps mildly impaired. On a more complex task of spatial learning and memory, it is noted that his immediate recall was at the 65th percentile and his 20-minute delayed recall was at the 65th percentile. On a measure of ability to generate hypotheses to solve novel problems, it is again noted that he is perseverative and had some difficulty maintaining cognitive set.

This patient was given the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory – 2 as well as the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory – 3. On both of these inventories he demonstrated a “fake good” profile where he denied any kind of psychological difficulties whatsoever. Therefore, these inventories were not helpful with clinical diagnosis.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The results of the neuropsychological examination point towards a patient who clearly has a compromise of brain functions. He has decreased motor speed on the left upper extremity for fine motor dexterity and coordination and he is extraordinarily impulsive, disinhibited and has impairments of his ability to maintain cognitive set. He has difficulties learning new cognitive strategies and is extremely slow in this respect. He is perseverative on a variety of measures, again demonstrating his impairment of cognitive set. These findings are consistent for patients who have frontal lobe injuries, particularly orbital and mesial surfaces of the frontal lobes.
2. He clearly presents with a delusional disorder, grandiose type. He does appear to be hypergraphic, and he does endorse olfactory hallucinations, so it might be important to rule out partial complex seizures.
3. As noted from clinical interview, this patient is extremely tangential and decompensates in the course of a conversation. He is going to have considerable difficulty participating in his legal defense. These are neurobehavioral changes that are seen with frontal lobe brain damage. Additionally, I suspect this patient also has a major thought disorder, such as schizophrenia, and it should be noted that he has a very strong family history in this regard. Additional psychological testing is required to make this differential diagnosis.

4. This patient clearly needs neuropsychiatric treatment that should be inpatient. He needs pharmacological treatment as well as group psychotherapy to help with his behavioral disturbances. Clearly the penal system does not provide this kind of intervention and he is likely to at least not benefit from incarceration and probably will deteriorate.
5. With respect to the crime for which he has been arrested, it would appear that his behavior reflects the effects of frontal lobe brain damage, including impulsivity with decision-making. It is also obvious that he was under a great deal of stress at the time this offense occurred, and it seems likely that he was psychotic at the time of the offense secondary to the interactive effects between frontal lobe damage and significant environmental stress. He uses his delusional system to cope with profound feelings of inadequacy, and his very strong family history of psychiatric illness certainly provides for a predisposition towards a major psychiatric illness that is now made even worse by frontal lobe dyscontrol.

Thank you for asking me to evaluate this most complex patient.

/s/ Lance E. Trexler, Ph.D.

Lance E. Trexler, Ph.D., H.S.P.P.

Clinical Neuropsychologist,

Director of Neuropsychological Services and

Clinical Assistant Professor;

Clinical Director,

Center for Neurological Rehabilitation

Community Hospitals Indianapolis

39a

/s/ Ahmad Edwards

Page 5
Ahmad Edwards
Neuropsychological Examination

07/03/00

MR. AHMAD EDWARDS)
VS.)
THE STATE OF INDIANA)
CAUSE NO.)
49G059907CF121975)

<<stamped>> FILED JUL 06 2000 <<signature>>
Sarah M. Taylor CLERK OF THE MARION
CIRCUIT COURT

STATE TRIAL TRANSCRIPTION
AND STENOGRAPHIC REPORTING

Provide state trial transcription of trial judge exercising jurisdiction and stenographic reporting denoting files the defendant "Mr. Ahmad Edwards" recorded testimonyes and statments of the defendant causeing the court judge in proceedings to record order representation of the defendant action.

Defendant shall have factual basis to first waiver application of trial extension of time counter affidavits

Habeus corpus law reasonable care rule by the court having inquired the defendants order. Magistrate or special judges pursuant to inorders annotations Indiana Code title (35) thirtyfive; a county lawful legal officers, legal machinery and means for carrying out the powers and performing the duties pertaining to it as a quasi municipal corporation. 164 S.W. 2d 753, 757.

The dignity of the Marion County Sheriff Department mail room officers responsible for the collection and distribution of all U.S. mail for

the Marion County Jail and the nineteenth judicial circuit and the “clerk of court” in the Marion Superior Court Division in the State of Indiana.

Therefor the defendant Mr. Ahmad Edwards testimony and statments on the months days and years as to:

- 1) The ninth month on the sixteenth day of the year ninteenhundred ninetyfive – throught to the ninth month on the seventeenth day of the year ninteenhundred nindyfive. (09/16/95 – 09/17/95)
- 2) The seventh month on the thirdth day of the year ninteenhundred ninetyeight – throught the ninth month on the ninth day of the year ninteenhundred ninety. (07/30/98 – 09/09/98)
- 3.) The seven month on the twelveth day of the year ninteenhundred ninetynine – throught the six month on the thirteenth day of the year twothousand (07/12/99 – 06/13/2000)
- 4.) The seven month on the seventh day of the year twothousand (07/07/2000 --)

Of misdemeanors and felonys matters court recordings used as transcript of the oral matters and as stenographic objections thereof occurring during the hearings proceeding of the defendant Mr. Ahmad Edwards transcripts or stenographic equipment shall be selected in respects to the judge.

Shall trial consist on any date continuing later than the seventh month of the fifthteenth day in the year twothousand (07/15/2000) the accepting jurisdiction of rule 4(A)(C) adoption statutes of the 42 U.S.C. § 1983 briefly will support factual basis in claim for administrative relief tobe supplied by the court.

The defence respectfully hopes that this courts “clerk of court” urgently makes the commitment required for the needs of the defendant “Mr. Ahmad Edwards” requested hearin as motion.

Legal request of;

/s/ Ahmad Edwards

Mr. Ahmad Edwards
40 South Alabama St
Indianapolis, IN 46204

(3-I)

#494657

(S.S.I) (SSN Redacted)

(D.O.B) 01/29/73

SS: Fill

<<stamped>> FILE

<<stamped>> FILED JUL 20 2000 <<signature>>
Sarah M. Taylor CLERK OF THE MARION
CIRCUIT COURT

<<stamped>> RECEIVED MAY 09 2000 BY:

<<written>> Ahmad Edwards – CAUSE # 99-121975

Dear; Judge Pration

I am honored to have the chance to write you and your staff. My wildest dream of the ciritical issues that confront us as young people today. Seem to be changing the values of importance for the newer generation that are destroying our world the modern host of assumptions and beliefs are what premeate our lives as youth in todays marketplace.

To a great extent these corporate values are synonymous with industrialism, which separates land from people, and personal values from the values of commerce. The business world has become a type of addiction to money, fame, and power. Like all addictions. It is a way of not feeling and when business doesn't feel it is at least amoral, almost always harmfull. If business economics is the study of how we add values to raw matererials and processes I propose that we as youth can not add values unless we first have them. This youth communit based organization I have designed will bring a courageous hartfelt sense of connectedness

Important new values of logical coherence to commerce they'll not only bring these coherences to business but first to their own lives – in other feeling

of morale values. These feelings for morale are not merely an organization rules for good value they are what will drive business forward in this century to come if it's to fulfill it's role as restorer of our planet our community and our faith in the youth again.

We cannot be afraid of the words young people in the community...without them we are limited treating only the social educational, and political circumstances that do the vicitimizing...we are in...a national crisis and we must work at more than an individual level. The history of other crises shows us that. We are hampered as youth, by a barn-raising mentality that likens major problems to the simplistic gathering

of hardy pioneers coming to the assistance of a frontier neighborhood in distress. The increasing sophistication of this city's society is now requireing leadership able to see beyond the first line of trees at the edge of the clearing and into the forest of national need.

We hear much these days of the coming to battle with our neighborhood problens yet we ignore the consequences of having half our youth population face that battle with out any help at all. It is not difficult these days to believe that the promise of America made to the youth for a better futcher may be hereinafter dispensed selectively...left to their own devices how can you realy help us crystallize an participate in a solution as an public offical? First you must inspire the local strenth or effect of elective conceptual idea originating interest to form the powers that help youth of this city in every county understand

Such idea and believe firmly in them and reward those who can help support the goal of helping those youth meet the status quo of the city after a difference can be made is well know become an subsidiary to the view of those who do wish to support the youth several major insoluble emergence of issues. Escalating the problems that produce threatening unpleasnt calculations of youthfull disgracing discourse and their statistics I “Ahmad Edwards” have reflected in this lack of services offered to the young people of this city the clear means to do away with the problems that plague the youth.

Supporting the goal of helping youth meet “the status quo” of quality state of being is not the only activism I support that helps the youth. I also have made a practical social applicability to end the disturbing thoughts and emotions between youth resembling any negative energy betaked by a friend

It’s a resource of provenience for the special interest and is an exclusive focus of the mayor “ and the multiple interest of deputy mayor “Susan Brooks”

I Ahmad Edwards pray to be considered and chosen to the process of this organization that admits young people voluntarily. Then no one will force them to join. No one will force them to attain a desire to be successful with the existing situation of the environment their individual attention as well as their conscious mind will make that choice clear.

Intentionaly the careful judgship of opinion is reconciled by public officals for assurance of health and normal production advantageing these original concepts of positive intelectual ideas to set the

impressions that ring with energy and truth. Thus encouraging youth to imagine questions that ask people of all ages about music media, friendships, family-life computers, food, global differences, business education, English, social studies, and beginning adulthood, giving – the direction to change hostilities – exchanging those negative energy capacity for action constructive in to positive presence of affirming ability to learn and understand how to deal with new or trying situations by becoming intelligent to what is correct politically, symbolic of professional corporation, and physically educational through the forms of entertainment all the way up to practices of tasks concerned with corporate fortune.

“For example” – if I’m able to teach our youth to learn to control their networking competition efficiency will allow them to make honest mistakes and profit from them...putting them in a class of distinctions for privileges...of broad social reform and internationalism (relating to or appealing to the section on exercising power through exactitude auxiliary for commendable more favorable relation with international politics.)

Such idea’s young people should believe firmly in and we as competent or commissioned citizens should reward those who can support the goal of helping young people meet their goals. After a difference can be made is well known become an subsidiary to the view of those who do wish to support the youth out of the several major insoluble emergence of issues escalating the problems that produce threatening unpleasant calculations of youthful disgracing

47a

discourse and unrelaxing rate of un-abundant statistics.

Help support the young people of this town by first helping our-selfves reach the quality practical of social applicability to end what is realy revoking our young peoples succession

I pray that you can help me;

/s/ Ahmad Edwards
Ahmad Edwards

CAUSE NO. 49G059907CF121975
CRIMINAL DIVISION RM.5

STATE OF INDIANA) SS: IN THE MARION
) SUPERIOR COURT
 COUNTY OF MARION) CRIMINAL
) DIVISION, ROOM V
 STATE OF INDIANA) THE HONORABLE
 VS.) GARY L. MILLER,
) JUDGE
) CAUSE NO.
 <<written>>) 49G059907CF121975
Ahmad Edwards) <<written>>

<<stamped>> FILED AUG 16 2000 <<signature>>
 Sarah M. Taylor CLERK OF THE MARION
 CIRCUIT COURT

COMMITMENT ORDER
INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH

TO THE MARION COUNTY SHERIFF:

This cause came to Court for hearing on Court's own Motion for Psychiatric Examination alleging the Defendant has insufficient comprehension to understand the nature of the criminal action against him and the proceedings therein. Evidence was submitted on the oral testimony and written reports of two competent disinterested psychiatrists. Court did find that the Defendant does not have sufficient comprehension to understand the nature of the criminal action against him and the proceedings therein and to make his defense.

IT IS THEREFORE, ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED, that the Defendant, <<written>> Ahmad Edwards, be committed to the care and custody of the Indiana Department of Mental Health for evaluation and treatment, and the Indiana Department of Mental Health is hereby directed to file a written

report to this Court within a period of ninety (90) days stating therein its findings as to whether or not there is substantial probability that he will attain the capacity to understand the proceedings in the foreseeable future.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED by the Court that Indiana Department of Mental Health continue to evaluate <<written>> Ahmad Edwards, and if he is unable to understand the proceedings and assist in the preparation of his defense within six (6) months after the date of his admission to a psychiatric institution, the Department of Mental Health shall institute regular commitment proceedings under IC 16-14-9.1.

/s/ Gary L. Miller

Honorable Gary L. Miller, Judge
Marion County Superior Court
Criminal Division, Room Five

Date: <<written>> 8-16-00

50a

<<masthead>>

Indiana Family & Social Services Administration
“People helping people help themselves”
Frank O’Bannon, Governor
State of Indiana

Office of General Counsel
MS27 402 W. WASHINGTON STREET, ROOM
W451
INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204-2744
Katherine Humphreys, Secretary

November 2, 2000

The Honorable Gary L. Miller
Marion Superior Court
(Criminal Division #5)
200 E. Washington St., Room W-305
Indianapolis, IN 46204

RE: Ahmad Edwards
CAUSE NO: 49G05-9907-CF-121975

Dear Judge Miller:

We are enclosing the Confinement Authority designating Logansport State Hospital – Isaac Ray Unit as the appropriate facility to receive custody of Ahmad Edwards.

Please instruct the individual responsible for transporting Ahmad Edwards to contact Bonnie Richter, (219) 722-4141, Logansport State Hospital – Isaac Ray Unit to arrange a mutually agreeable admission date.

51a

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Katherine Gerber Gregory

Katherine Gerber Gregory

Deputy General Counsel

Family and Social Services Administration

KGG/bls

Enclosure

cc: Bonnie Richter, Logansport State Hospital –
Isaac

Ray Unit

Equal Opportunity / Affirmative Action Employer

<<Seal of State of Indiana>>

STATE OF INDIANA) IN THE MARION
COUNTY OF MARION) SUPERIOR COURT
) (CRIMINAL DIVISION
) #5)
VS.) SS:
Ahmad Edwards) CAUSE NO:
) 49G05-9907-CF-121975

<<stamped>> FILED NOV 08 2000 <<signature>>
Sarah M. Taylor CLERK OF THE MARION
CIRCUIT COURT

**CONFINEMENT AUTHORITY
LACKING ABILITY TO UNDERSTAND
AND ASSIST**

Pursuant to I.C. 35-36-3 and the Order of this Court dated August 16, 2000, (in which the defendant was found to lack the ability to understand the proceedings and assist in the preparation of his defense), the Director of Mental Health (by his designee) designates the Logansport State Hospital – Isaac Ray Unit as the appropriate institution for the defendant’s confinement for further evaluation and treatment.

As soon as said defendant attains the ability to understand the proceedings and assist in the preparation of his defense, the Superintendent of the above-named facility is to certify that fact to the Court. If the defendant has not already been returned to the Court for the criminal trial, then within **ninety (90) days** of the defendant’s admission to the above-named facility, the Superintendent thereof shall certify to the Court whether there is a substantial probability that the defendant will in the foreseeable future attain the ability to understand the proceedings

and assist in the preparation of his defense. If there is not such a substantial probability, the Superintendent or his designee shall initiate regular civil commitment proceedings. In any event, if the defendant has not been returned to the Court for the criminal trial in **six (6) months**, the Superintendent or his designee shall initiate regular commitment proceedings.

In no event may the defendant be retained pursuant to this Confinement Order for a period longer than SIX (6) MONTHS, although he may be retained for a longer period if so ordered in civil commitment proceedings.

Director's Designee

/s/ Katherine Gerber Gregory

Katherine Gerber Gregory

Deputy General Counsel

Family and Social Services Administration

<<written>> 11/2/00

<<masthead>>

Indiana Family & Social Services Administration

“People helping people help themselves”

Frank O’Bannon, Governor
State of Indiana
LOGANSPOORT STATE HOSPITAL
DIVISION OF MENTAL HEALTH
1098 S. STATE ROAD 25
LOGANSPOORT, IN 46947-9699
219-722-4141
FAX: 219-735-3414
TDD: 219-732-0069
Katherine Humphreys, Secretary

<<stamped>> FILED MAR 14 2001 <<signature>>
Sarah M. Taylor CLERK OF THE MARION
CIRCUIT COURT

<<written>>
16 Mar 01

Have Mr Edwards returned to M.C.J. Set this matter
for pretrial 27 Mar 01 @ 9:00 AM <<signature>>
GWH

March 9, 2001

Honorable Gary L. Miller
Judge, Marion Superior Court
Criminal Division #5
200 E. Washington St. Room W 305
Indianapolis, IN. 46204

Re: Ahmad Edwards
Cause #:49 G05-9907- CF 121975

Dear Judge Miller:

By my signature below, I certify that, according to the report filed by Steve H. Berger, M.D., that Mr. Edwards has attained the ability to understand the proceedings and assist in the preparation of his defense.

Pursuant to IC 35-36-3-2, we would respectfully request that your court enter an order directing the sheriff to return the defendant to your county jail, along with his personal belongings, at

your earliest possible convenience. Please direct your county sheriff to notify the Isaac Ray Treatment Center no less than 24 hours prior to the anticipated transport of this defendant. This notice will allow appropriate medications, money, clothing, etc. to be ready upon arrival of county personnel.

Sincerely,

/s/ Jeffrey H. Smith

Jeffrey H. Smith, Ph.D.

Superintendent

cc: Steve Sarris, IDMH Legal

I swear and affirm, under the penalties of perjury, that the foregoing statements are true to the best of my knowledge and belief..

<<written>> 3-13-01 /s/ Jeffrey H. Smith

J.C.A.H.O. Accredited
Equal Opportunity / Affirmative Action Employer
<<Seal of the State of Indiana>>

Indiana Family and Social Services Administration
Logansport State Hospital
Logansport, IN

Competence To Stand Trial Report

<<stamped>> FILED MAR 14 2001 <<signature>>
Sarah M. Taylor CLERK OF THE MARION
CIRCUIT COURT

Patient: Ahmad Edwards #48948
DOA: 12-12-00
DOB: 01-29-73
DOE: 02-2-7-01
DOD: 02-27-01

IDENTIFYING DATA:

The patient is a 28 year old man.

DESCRIPTION OF EXAMINATION AND CAUSE
NUMBER:

On February 27, 2001, I performed an evaluation of this patient regarding his competence to stand trial. At the beginning of the examination, I explained to him the purpose of the examination, and that it would not be confidential. I explained that my report would be sent to the judge. With that understanding, the patient agreed to proceed with the examination.

The patient was found incompetent to stand trial in Cause #49G05-9907-CF-121975, by Judge Gary L. Miller in Marion County Superior Court, Criminal Division #5 on August 16, 2000.

DATA REGARDING COMPETENCE TO STAND
TRIAL:

The following is the information given to me by the patient during this examination.

The patient does have a criminal charge pending against him. The charge against him is, "Attempted murder, battery, criminal recklessness, theft." The pleadings available to the patient include, "Guilty, not guilty." If the patient is found guilty, the maximum sentence he faces is, "125 years" and the minimum sentence he faces is, "Not sure." The other sentences that the patient might get include, "Temporary insanity." If the patient is found guilty, the sentence he is most likely to get is, "Class A 30 years, plus Class C 10 years, plus criminal recklessness 18 months, plus theft 18 months, this equals 42 years."

The patient does have an attorney. The attorney is a public defender. The role of the patient's attorney is, "Assist me in my defense."

The attorney on the other side of the patient's case is called, "Prosecuting attorney." The role of the prosecuting attorney is "Defends the public safety and assist counsel of the plaintiff."

The role of the judge is, "Makes sure the rules of the court are followed and assist the jury in pronouncing a verdict." The role of the jury is, "Seek for the truth."

What happens in a trial is, "It's where they hear the facts of allegations and hear strategies of the parties." The patient's turn to talk during a trial is, "Whenever I'm asked a question or put on the witness stand."

If, during the trial, the judge overrules and objection, that means, "Judge didn't find enough facts in the opposing parties view." If the judge sustains the objection, that means, "He agrees with the issue." If a witness is testifying against a patient, and the

patient sees that the witness is lying, the patient should, "Let my attorney know."

Ahmad Edwards #48948

03/01/01

Page 1

The patient is familiar with plea bargaining. Plea bargaining is, "When prosecutor negotiates with the defense to settle the dispute. It's a waiver of my rights."

The patient's plan for his legal strategy regarding the charges against him is, "My attorney already got the insanity defense, I guess we will go with that for the time being."

The events leading to the charges presently against the patient were, "The commission of a crime." If the patient is asked on the witness stand if you committed a crime, then he would testify, "That I had done it. It's a fact that I discharged my firearm."

PRESENT SYMPTOMS:

The following is further information given by the patient in today's examination.

The patient sleeps "Not too good. I don't sleep that well. My leg injury makes it hard." His appetite is, "Healthy." The patient states, "My concentration is off a little bit since the collision." He is able to remember things. He denies loss of interest in his usual activities.

The patient denies feeling depressed. The patient reports a history of a suicide attempt last July and also earlier the same year. The patient denies homicidal thoughts or any history of homicide attempts.

The patient denies hearing things that are not there, seeing things that are not there, others following or spying on him, others listening in on his thoughts, others controlling his thoughts, his listening in on other peoples' thoughts, his controlling other peoples' thoughts, or the television watching him.

The patient denies lack of energy. He denies feeling worthless. He denies feeling slowed down.

With regard to symptoms of mania, the patient denies inappropriate euphoria, manic sleep pattern, pressured speech, manic spending pattern, or grandiosity.

The patient is a drinker of alcohol. He denies being an alcoholic. The patient is a user of street drugs. He denies ever having been treated for alcoholism or substance abuse.

The patient is physically healthy. He reports a history of an irregular heartbeat. He denies any other serious illnesses in his history such as cancer, diabetes, or epilepsy.

PERSONAL HISTORY

The patient has never been married. He has no children. He lives with his grandmother.

The patient dropped out of school after the 10th grade due to a learning disability. He reports having attended additional training through Job Corp for business administration for 6 months. He has not attended any college.

The patient was last employed with an airline in Phoenix, AZ, as a bellhop.

Ahmad Edwards
#48948
03/01/01
Page 2

MENTAL STATUS EXAMINATION:

The following are the answers given by the patient today to the questions I asked him in a mental status examination.

Today is, "Tuesday, February 27, 2001." I am, "Ahmad Edwards." This place is, "Logansport State Hospital, Isaac Ray Treatment Center." The presidents in reverse order are, "George Bush, Jr., Clinton, George Bush, Sr., Ronald Reagan, and Jimmy Carter." Serially subtracting 3 from 20, "20-17-14-11-8-5-2".

If the patient were walking down the street, and found a letter lying next to a mailbox, he would, "Pick it up and see if it was correctly addressed and then put it in the mailbox. If it was not correctly addressed, take it to the post office." If the patient were in a theater and saw the curtains on fire, he would, "See if an attendant was close enough to tell and help people get out." If someone said to the patient that the grass is always greener on the other side of the fence, that person would be trying to say, "Things are always the same." If someone said, don't cry over spilled milk, that would mean, "Put things aside, don't worry over what is done."

The patient is able to name 3 objects after 5 minutes. The patient is able to repeat 7 digits forward and 4 digits backward. With regard to calculations, "5+6=", "11." 5x6=", "40." 6-5, "1."

Five large cities are, "Dallas, New York, Los Angeles, Indianapolis, and Detroit." Choosing between New York and Los Angeles, the one that is further east is, "New York." The distance from New York to Los Angeles is, "About 2000 miles."

The reason that people pay taxes is, "Finance Federal Government." The reason that games have rules is, "So the game is played fairly."

The similarity of a bush and a tree is, "Both are plant life." Their dissimilarity is, "One is taller than the other." The similarity of a coat and a hat is, "Both are items of apparel." Their dissimilarity is, "One is designed for your head, that's a coat. One is designed to cover your body." The number of legs on a horse is, "4." The shape of the window on that wall is, "Square." The colors of the American flag are, "Red, white and blue."

MEDICATIONS:

The medications the patient presently takes are Benadryl on an as needed basis for sleep. No psychiatric medications.

OBSERVATIONS:

The following are my observations regarding this patient.

The patient is alert, oriented, appropriate, calm, cooperative, likable, and friendly. The patient related to me in a normal fashion during today's examination. The patient is free of psychosis, depression, mania, and confusion. He appears able to think clearly. At this point the patient appears to be psychiatrically normal.

The patient is able to carry on a normal conversation and answer questions appropriately. The patient's behavior in today's examination was calm and cooperative. The patient demonstrates during today's examination that his motivation is self-serving and not self-defeating.

Ahmad Edwards #48948

03/01/01

Page 3

McGARRY CRITERIA:

The following are the McGarry criteria for competence, and my determination of whether this patient fulfills each criterion. My determination is based upon my judgment regarding the information gathered during today's examination.

1. Does the patient have the ability to appraise the legal defenses available to him? Yes.
2. What is the level of the patient's unmanageable behavior? Low.
3. What is the quality of the anticipated manner in which the patient will relate to his attorney? Cooperative.
4. Does the patient have the ability to plan a legal strategy? Yes.
5. Does the patient have the ability to appraise the roles of the various participants in the courtroom proceedings? Yes.
6. Does the patient understand the procedures of the court? Yes.
7. Does the patient have an appreciation of the charges against him? Yes.

8. Does the patient have an appreciation of the range and nature of the possible penalties he faces? Yes.
9. Does the patient have the ability to appraise the likely outcome of the charges against him? Yes.
10. Does the patient have the capacity to disclose to his attorney available pertinent facts surround the offense? Yes.
11. Does the patient have the capacity to challenge prosecution witnesses realistically? Yes.
12. Does the patient have the capacity to testify relevantly? Yes.
13. Does the patient manifest self-serving motivation or self-defeating motivation? Self-serving motivation.

CONCLUSIONS:

The following are my conclusions regarding this patient, based upon the above history and findings.

1. It is my judgment that this patient presently does have comprehension sufficient to understand the nature of the criminal action against him. He is adequately able to describe the charges against him, the possible sentence he faces, the roles of the various people in the courtroom, the process of plea bargaining, and the part he plays in his trial.
2. It is my judgment that this patient presently has comprehension sufficient to make a defense regarding the criminal action against him. He is free of psychosis, depression, mania, and

confusion. He is able to think clearly. He is able to answer questions appropriately. He is able to carry on a normal conversation. He is able to relate to me appropriately in today's examination. He is able to put his thoughts into words.

Ahmad Edwards #48948

03/01/01

Page 4

3. Based upon above 2 conclusions, it is my judgment that this patient presently is medically competent to stand trial.

Neil Wilkey, MD

IRTC

/s/ S Berger, M.D.

Steven H. Berger, MD.

Staff Psychiatrist, Isaac Ray Treatment Center

Logansport State Hospital

Board Certified Forensic Psychiatrist

02-27-01, dkr

Finalized: 03-01-01

Ahmad Edwards #48948

03/01/01

Page 5

MR. AHMAD EDWARDS) IN THE MARION
) SUPERIOR COURT
 V.) ROOM 5 CRIMINAL
 THE STATE OF INDIANA) DIVISION.
 CAUSE NO:

<<stamped>> FILED MAY 29 2001 <<signature>>
Sarah M. Taylor CLERK OF THE MARION
CIRCUIT COURT

**“MOTION TO DISMISS CRIMINAL CHARGES”
AND DISCHARGE THE DEFENDANT
ON CRIMINAL RULE 4.[C]**

The defendant, Mr. “Ahmad Edwards” hereby notifies
the court and respectfully request the dismissal and
discharge of the defendant on the grounds of the
following good and sufficient reasons.

[Continued on page 2 of 8]

[cont - page 3]

**“MOTION TO DISMISS CRIMINAL CHARGES”
AND DISCHARGE THE DEFENDANT ON C.R.4[C]**

1] The defendant, in this cause Mr. “Ahmad
Edwards” injunctioned receiverships of the court
to determine to expedite trials within this cause
by the exercising of his right to affects thereto
the United States Constitution statute of
Amendment One Article Six therein states for all
persons whome may be permissive in criminal
prosecutions shell enjoy the right to a speedy and
public trial,

[Continued on page 3 of 8]

[cont - page 4]

“MOTION TO DISMISS CRIMINAL CHARGES”
AND DISCHARGE THE DEFENDANT ON C.R.4[C]

- 2] Assignment for a defendant in jail extensive discretion and exercised by the defendant of this cause Mr. “Ahmad Edwards.” The rules of criminal procedure Rule 4[C] defendant discharged. No person shall be held on recognizance or otherwise to answer a criminal charge for a period in aggregate embracing more than one year from the date the criminal charges, against such defendant is filed, or from the date of his arrest on such charge, whichever is later; rules of criminal procedure. Criminal rule 4[C] designated as initial classification by the defendant, Mr. “Ahmad Edwards” whome arrived at the Marion County jail in Indianapolis Indiana on

[Continued on page 4 of 8]

[cont – page 5]

“MOTION TO DISMISS CRIMINAL CHARGES”
AND DISCHARGE THE DEFENDANT ON C.R.4[C]

- 2] 07-21-99 untill 09-29-00 thereon for more than one year. For a total number [428] days in general. By written stipulation of the justice information system of Indianapolis. Awaiting trial-held for authority verdict thereon for more amended circumstances as effect by judgment, on 3-27-2001 where no continuance was had on the defedant, “Mr. Ahmad Edwards” motion, so held on recognizance for [53] added days of the courts calendar as to date 05-25-2001.

[Continued on page 5 of 8]

[cont – page 6]

“MOTION TO DISMISS CRIMINAL CHARGES”
AND DISCHARGE THE DEFENDANT ON C.R.4[C]

- 3] Any extensive additional proceedings of law by the right of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution which states “No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges of citizens of the United States nor deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. Which sequenced the convenience of justice by the federal rules of civil procedure rule 71A.[A] applicability of other rules. Such as federal rule of civil procedure rule 83.[B] procedures when there is no controlling law. To subscribe the dismissal

[Continued on page 6 of 8]

[cont – page 7]

“MOTION TO DISMISS CRIMINAL CHARGES”
AND DISCHARGE THE DEFENDANT ON C.R.4[C]

- 3] of the defendant, “Mr. Ahmad Edwards” existing criminal charges and discharge the defendant from the Marion County jail in Indianapolis Indiana at 40 South. Alabama Street. In an cell housing numbered block [4-B]. Under the gallery number [494657] as his exclusive right as the accused to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the state Indiana which district having been previously ascertained by law of the criminal procedure rule 4.[C] discharge for delay in criminal trials not sufficient in time to try him.

[Continued on page 7 of 8]

[cont – page 8]

**“MOTION TO DISMISS CRIMINAL CHARGES”
AND DISCHARGE THE DEFENDANT ON C.R.4[C]**

The defendant, moves the court of this cause to order the dismissal and the discharge of the defendant Mr. “Ahmad Edwards”. On the grounds that it is in violation of the jurisdiction of this states constitution and laws of the criminal procedure rules. Criminal rule 4[C] defendant discharged. With corporation incorporated under the laws of the United States Constitution of America Amendment One Article Six.

cc:

/s/ Ahmad Edwards
Ahmad Edwards

“MR. AHMAD) IN THE MARION
EDWARDS”) SUPERIOR COURT
V.) ROOM 5 CRIMINAL
THE STATE) DIVISION
OF) CAUSE NO: 99121975
INDIANA)

<<stamped>> FILED JUN 26 2001 <<signature>>
Sarah M. Taylor CLERK OF THE MARION
CIRCUIT COURT

Pro Se

“MOTION OF PERMISSIVE INTERVENTION”

Now comes the defendant Mr. Ahmad Edwards thereof as an submissison under the counsel of Mark Jones of the Marion County Public Defender Agency by disqualification by the honorable “Gary Miller” of Mis. “Diana Able” and Mr. Bob Hill ruling pendency expires by rules of the trial procedure trial rule 53.2

[Continued on page 2 of 21]

[p.1] “MOTION OF PERMISSIVE INTERVENTION
-CONT”

Time for holding issue under advisement. As permanent records to be kept together with its orders thereto shall be kept as the matter interested by this parties oualification of the trial rule 24[B] permissive intervention. As the defendant Mr. Ahmad Edwards in this cause accepts to proposed as the following:

[A.]

In the year [“1999”] nineteen hundred and nindy nine. The defendant Mr. Ahmad Edwards applied for a job in the fifth largest shopeing mall in Indiana. To relize the existence of a genuine issue as to an material fact by interrogatories

[Continued on page 3 of 21]

p.3] "MOTION OF PERMISSIVE INTERVENTION
-CONT"

of the county Marion in Indianapolis, Indiana to help cure the vital stictics, in witch negligence was being apoximated as the cause of the exacerbation of the young American citizens of the United States in Indianapolis, Indiana injury.

[B]

The defendant Mr. Ahmad Edwards wishes to offer the material relevant thereto the discovery to be entered as evidence to the trial court of admissions, interrogatories, and testimony mentioned and/or physically attached to support the affidavit that is present to and/or

[Continued on page 4 of 21]

p.4] "MOTION OF PERMISSIVE INTERVENTION
-CONT"

for the trial court's consideration.

[C.]

The exhibits of the defendant Mr. Ahmad Edwards qualifys as proper evidence to be taken into consideration by trial court to specifically state there is genuine issue of material fact that could be fatal, to require the trial court to designate the issues of claims upon which the defendant Mr. Ahmad Edwards finds as genuine issue as to material facts to succeed in makeing specific findings in regard to an summary judgment that necessary to mandate.

[Continued on page 5 of 21]

p.5] “MOTION OF PERMISSIVE INTERVENTION
-CONT”

[D.]

The issues of fact effects the young American citizens of the United States in Indianapolis Indiana as they fall within class of documents to be considered and only examined for legal propositions for facts to support a motion for summary judgment based upon the defendant Mr. Ahmad Edwards defense of ‘res judicata’ as memorandum has been published ruling on this motion of permissive intervention.

[Continued on page 6 of 21]

p.6] “MOTION OF PERMISSIVE INTERVENTION
-CONT”

[E.]

Ruling on a motion for summary judgment trial court may rely on briefs submitted by the defendant Mr. Ahmad Edwards as constrained to rely on the pleading, depositions, answers to interrogatories, admissions on file, affidavits and testimony claiming the defendant Mr. Ahmad Edwards was insufficient mentally to establish reson to withstand the alleged commission.

[F.]

Under this trial rule 24 [B] permissive intervention. The trial court

[Continued on page 7 of 21]

p.7] “MOTION OF PERMISSIVE INTERVENTION
-CONT”

[F]

is required to permit anyone to intervene in an action determining whether there question of law or fact in common that relies for ground of claim. Upon any statute or executive order administered by a federal, state governmental officer, agency, agreement issued made pursuant to the statutes of executive administrative order.

[G.]

Required is an summary judgment as the defendant Mr. Ahmad Edwards is in a statutory provision that

[Continued on page 8 of 21]

p.8] “MOTION OF PERMISSIVE INTERVENTION
-CONT”

[G.]

has retroactive effect, as an presumptive statute limiting the defense, impairing his rights acting, to increase the young American citizens of the United States in Indianapolis Indiana liability for past conduct, and impose duties with respect. C.A.10[Colo.] 1999. Statutes imposing liabilities.

[H.]

Agency’s interpretation of statute with which it has been charged with administering and which has been reduced to regulation is to be fully accepted by court as long as

[Continued on page 9 of 21]

p.9] “MOTION OF PERMISSIVE INTERVENTION
-CONT”

[H.]

Congress has not directly spoken as to precise question at issue and interpretation proffered by agency is a permissible one. C.A.4 [W.VA.] 1999. Erroneous construction; conflict with statute.

[I.]

An action is being brought by the members of an unincorporated association named Ambergress & Zenagencies imposing conditions as proposed omission properly to counsel. Young American citizens of the United States in Indianapolis

[Continued on page 10 of 21]

p.10] "MOTION OF PERMISSIVE INTERVENTION
-CONT"

[I.]

Indiana by law as an class action [trial rule 23]. Directed by Mr. Ahmad Edwards as the President and his executives with the right to claim an recover or regain any possession entitled to them devise by the law given to orgainzations. With data compilation for relief the orgainzational agency Ambergress & Zenagencies shell sufficient or otherwise thereto the civil procedure constitute compromise for the young American citizens of the United States in Indianapolis Indiana. Tobe completely transfered to the control of the members. Acquired by the power of the excutive directors

[Continued on page 11 of 21]

p.11] "MOTION OF PERMISSIVE INTERVENTION
-CONT"

[I.]

of the organizational agency Ambergress & Zenagencies executives.

[J.]

The defendant Mr. Ahmad Edwards has the right to the organization "Ambergress & Zenagencies" exclusive board of directors membership upon the surrender of his signature as the chief executive officer under the agency Ambergress & Zenagencies organizational statute. To act according to the terms of the organizational agency by-laws and security pledges. In any court that may take judicial

[Continued on page 12 of 21]

p.12] "MOTION OF PERMISSIVE INTERVENTION
-CONT"

[J.]

notice of a fact [the rules of evidence rule 201 [F].
Time of taking notice.

[K.]

The defendant has the right to revise charitable contributions to mankind that, ratify articles of the organizational agency Ambergress & Zenagencies by-laws that continue its incentive program. As the majority ruled him in favor of a vote for the exclusive board of directors chief executive officer chair.

[Continued on page 13 of 21]

p.13] "MOTION OF PERMISSIVE INTERVENTION
-CONT"

[L.]

An interest in the purposes dealings of the young American citizens of the United States in

Indianapolis Indiana made by the defendant Mr. Ahmad Edwards has been consistent with the truth within his statement as to the purport of the documents to exchange commission from oral to written assertion intended by the defendant Mr. Ahmad Edwards as the chief executive officer of the organizational presence of the agency Ambergress & Zenagencies, as an assertion.

[Continued on page 14 of 21]

p.[14] “MOTION OF PERMISSIVE INTERVENTION
-CONT”

[M.]

Quotations, tabulations, lists, directories, published compilations, are called to attention upon examination of the discovery of the relied direct contractual agreements of the subject of history, science and art, admissions presently in an time of need for an agency or an organization to sought after the defendants Mr. “Ahmad Edwards” discharge.

[N.]

The methods provided by statute and or the rule of the organization

[Continued on page 15 of 21]

p.[15] “MOTION OF PERMISSIVE INTERVENTION
-CONT”

[N.]

Ambergress & Zenagencies genuine issue as to an material fact of that in a civil trial court upon all necessary elements of a claim would not support the contrary that specifically is pointing out insufficiency prior to an subsequent criminal trial newly

discovering material evidence which could with reasonable diligence produced to constitute tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court the United States Constitution of America Article One [1] Section 8. [9].

[Continued on page 16 of 21]

p.16] "MOTION OF PERMISSIVE INTERVENTION
-CONT"

Therefore the defendant Mr. "Ahmad Edwards" and chief executive officer of the exclusive board of directors of the organization Ambergress & Zenagencies which claimed him to be with the genuine issue of material fact based upon the familiarity acquired for purposes to better mankind in litigation distinctive for the young American citizens of the United States in Indianapolis Indiana characteristics such as appearance substance abuse, internal patterns of thinking and distinctive behavior disorders taken into conjunction with other circumstances under the identification of first hand

[Continued on page 17 of 21]

p.17] "MOTION OF PERMISSIVE INTERVENTION
-CONT"

problems of the state of Indiana city of Indianapolis as the opinion of the general public voicing the circumstances in conversations filed in a public office, purporting public record. That have created negligence and suspicion concerning the defendant Mr. "Ahmad Edwards" and chief executive officer of the exclusive board of directors of the organizational agency Ambergress & Zenagencies authentic genuine issue of material fact. To process system as evidence describing the use of the organization "Ambergress &

Zenagencies” to produce an accurate result with methods provided by this orginazitional statute

[Continued on page 18 of 21]

p.18] “MOTION OF PERMISSIVE INTERVENTION
-CONT”

or rule however in the discretion of the court that shows truthfulness and not untruthfulness as to the character of the defendant being examined for the purpose to stop the young American citizens of the United States in Indianapolis Indiana from committing murder, rape, robbery, criminal confinement or any crime involving dishonesty. Equivalent to pardon the defendant Mr. “Ahmad Edwards” and the annulment orginazitional agency Ambergress & Zenagencies based on the finding of innocence with adjudications admissible upon the faces of this or any trial court admission necessary

[Continued on page 19 of 21]

p.19] “MOTION OF PERMISSIVE INTERVENTION
-CONT”

for a fair determination of the genuine issue of material fact as the defendant Mr. Ahmad Edwards renders evidence adopted as the effect of an orginazitional agency that shell negligently drive these stated concerns, process, systems, plainly with out the body and mind of the defendant Mr. “Ahmad Edwards” wherefore the defendant and the orginazition agency named Ambergress & Zenagencies demands the order of special verdict and interrogatories to the jury trial abolished [trial rule 49]; to the due care of responsible civil procedur where his evidence may justify a finding of wilfulness

[Continued on page 20 of 21]

p.20] "MOTION OF PERMISSIVE INTERVENTION
-CONT"

as to the complaint for conversion the organization agency Ambergress & Zenagencies specifically plained performance of contract to convey the jurisdiction of vital approximated exacerbation of the young American citizens of the United States in Indianapolis. The United States Constitution of America should the post facto law be violated will also be impaired on the obligation of contracts granting the defendant Mr. "Ahmad Edwards" title of nobility as to affects thereto the United States Constitution statute of Amendment One Article One Section [10] Ten. By law depriveing this right shall violate the United States Constitution of America as the defendant Mr. "Ahmad Edwards"

[Continued on page 21 of 21]

p.21] "MOTION OF PERMISSIVE INTERVENTION
-CONT"

personal right to due process of law. The United States Constitution statute of Amendment Forteen Section [1] One.

Respectfully the defendant,

cc:

Mr. "Ahmad Edwards"
40 South Alabama Street
Indianapolis, IN – 46204

p.21] "MOTION OF PERMISSIVE INTERVENTION
-CONT"

79a

Personal right to due process of law. The United States Constitution Statute of Amendment Fourteen Section [1] One.

/s/ Ahmad Edwards
Mr. Ahmad Edwards
The Defendant
40 South Alabama Street
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Collective traditional class;

I'm not going to introduce or include a judges time as an "short-lived insert". In edition to membership adequately apocaling truly. Set with representing all Americans in this age victories includeing every citizens practical or maybe even smaller basic ones. Side tobe taken broadly in sanctuary of the court room...telling you this is missing rules. But is applying human exacuation to prove on occasion successful representatives properly come sooner for the damages and proxy

Yet I'm tired of small overpriced minded American citizens runing, justifying big minded thoughts. To the out of order stage. To their own living larger procuring relations capitaly. "Indy is a nonsense –on the ball type of town, and once this actions granted in good faith. I shell be stating to all members

searching [with me] through the courts constitutional rights the matters that terminat qualified competition that wants to become "spokesmen" officialy commenting on my own. Incriminated against my own eurges of force. Or communicat to receive relief for it is the informal that incriminates monumentaly. Such an compulsion of personal individual rights commonly the small minded men fail. When agreements are actioned to amend. In adviseing one personal privileges that requir administrative warrants that would afford to regulat broad spacious homes for the calling of better family distinguished with "clubs" being built in their name. Square loveing the presidents of their dining room as the life it-self reaches new volumes.

And the children shall live glorious within in raiment
needlework. This be their fortune instead of poverty.

Authorized by laws debts incurred with payment.
Struggle to establish “no more”. One eight is
disability simply as business guidelines. Congress
may associate naturally three fourths, -im to pioneer
and send home from school in “Harvard” spending
something around \$600,000 in over head for the
maintenance of appearances for the compulsory
Boston society there is not that much to do maybe the
“opera” – the great vessel of social salvation the
general dynamics of monopoly creates a clear degree.
Boady body building will give me years of competition
in the social science of clubing civilly – “amusingly-
so”.

“Entertaining companionable hospitable pleasant
looking young man shouldn’t fear competition
anyway,” I’d say.

From my own state-of-the art design aircraft...to the
systems headquarters in “New York City.” The
industrie electronics center for economic. As one
forth with great satisfaction at the least. The
inherits friends “my-God” – that comes from the
profund effect on traditional lodges. That dealing
sharply with welth and not talking about it’s
forms.....becomeing their autocrat at the breakfast-
tables.

Society journal fortunately at Harvard well write
very precise “professor of class among other things, I
am.

The dynastic proportion of two thirds well be as the
house of standard along with the famly idea to raise
the proper child or children.....all to encourage our

city of young people. To help make hundreds of intellectually successful characters. With the help of your office they might understand to do what is right with confidence in the event of seeing that nothing is hopeless setting goals [by "your" personal best]. As this may help them out in lives they live further into having what ever they imagine every day when they wake up....go to school and do the right thing for all the rest of the year. I know I can and well express what it means to surrender at life and finally be able to use considerable enterprise and imagination with gusto.

A greater willingness has laid me to write you from this place and an progression to essentially set young people with an out look on everything I turned away when I was begaing – without. Truly is the cause of - what-I-became. Once I came back to Indianapolis by bus in an harmed state of depression with major problems "at that".

Intellectually successful characters. Have no doubts about whome or what will be. But only discover how to achieve ideals facing the world head on in hopes to maybe help relieve someone to learn that in the finish of good things you do never be overwhelmed yet again become resigned to amaze!

Be the "Protestant" in the specialized treatment I care to have to help the young people with "as consciousness". Be the president of the student body university of life. This programs has made of a few more judges wanting to know what young people are doing, on the enterprise with their imagination. Just starting in the service to stop and creat for the ends-to-meet. So that they can ask for your viewpoints to have other respect their opinions, aptitude of

83a

promising goals they set. Your spiritual support
helps besides all others

Situations of the young
people or necessary, vital,
and practical;

/s/ Ahmad Edwards
Ahmad Edwards

NED P. MASBAUM, M.D.
FORENSIC PSYCHIATRY
P.O. BOX 3010
CARMEL, INDIANA 46082 USA
TELEPHONE (317) 846-7727 FAX (317) 575-1898
TOLL FREE (888) 203-7746
Web Site: www.FORNPSYCH.com

October 3, 2001

Honorable Grant Hawkins, Judge
Marion Superior Court Criminal 5
W-305 City County Building
200 East Washington Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Re: Ahmad Edwards B/M 1/29/73 Cause No.
49G05-9907-CF-121975

Dear Judge Hawkins:

In accordance with your order, the above individual
was seen for a Psychiatric Reexamination.

PURPOSE OF EXAMINATION:

Provide an opinion regarding soundness of mind at
the time of the alleged offense(s).

Provide an opinion regarding Competence to Stand
Trial.

CHARGES AGAINST THIS INDIVIDUAL:

Count I: Attempt Murder, Class A Felony, 7-12-99

Count II: Battery, Class C Felony, 7-12-99

Count III: Criminal Recklessness, Class D Felony, 7-
12-99

Count IV: Theft, Class D Felony, 7-12-99

QUALIFICATIONS OF EXAMINER:

Enclosed please find a copy of my resume that states my qualifications to provide a psychiatric opinion regarding this individual.

DATE OF EXAMINATION:

10-3-2001

LOCATION OF EXAMINATION:

Marion County Jail, under satisfactory conditions.

DURATION OF EXAMINATION:

Approximately one hour.

RECORDS AND INFORMATION AVAILABLE FOR REVIEW:

- 1.) Copy of the Probable Cause Affidavit and Charging Information.
- 2.) Copy of this individual's Criminal History.
- 3.) Copy records from Logansport State Hospital
- 4.) Copy of my prior Forensic Psychiatric Examination, dated 12-22-99

Re: Ahmad Edwards B/M 1/29/73 Cause No.
49G05-9907-CF-121975

IDENTIFICATION DATA:

This individual provided the following information:

NAME: Ahmad (NMN) Edwards

AGE: 28

DOB: 1-29-73

SSN: (SSN Redacted)

This individual was advised that this was a court ordered non-confidential psychiatric examination and agreed to proceed.

ACCOUNT OF THE ALLEGED OFFENSE(S) BY THIS INDIVIDUAL:

He said that he was crossing the street (crime scene) when he was pursued by an “undercover officer.” He said, “I had a bag with me...I assumed he was a mugger...I was in the middle of the street...the bag ended up flying on the street...from the bag came a pair of shoes and shirt and firearm. The firearm was mine. It was licensed and registered...I was in the middle of the street...I fired a shot in the air, a warning shot for the traffic to stop...I fired another shot...I was told in a situation like this, fire at the individual, at his feet...I struck him with the bullet. Another individual said ‘I’m going to hold you here...at that point, I fired another shot at his feet and struck him in the ankle...a Federal Officer picked me up...I ran into a parking garage...shot me in the thigh.’”

PAST MEDICAL HISTORY:

See report of prior exam. Medical records from Logansport State Hospital revealed that he was found to be ICST and admitted there on 12-12-2000 and discharged 2-27-01. No diagnosis was established. He was not treated with psychotropic medication. He was discharged with a Psychiatric Opinion of Competence to Stand Trial. He is not receiving psychotropic medication at this time in jail.

PERSONAL HISTORY:

See report of prior exam. He also said that he was diagnosed with "Dyslexia" in the 4th grade and was in Special Education "rest of life."

MENTAL STATUS EXAMINATION:

He was a black male with his hands handcuffed behind his back. He said that he had asked for deadlock due to conflicts with other inmates. His head was shaved. He was alert and reasonably cooperative. He was less hyperactive than his prior exam. He was also less grandiose. He rambled and described events in the third person, "The bag ended up flying into the street." However, his speech was not disorganized. He had no delusions nor hallucinations. However, he said, "The day prior (alleged offenses) I was hallucinating dark clouds...contemplating suicide...as if death was above me...I placed a firearm in my mouth and tried to pull the trigger 4 times...due to problems with my sister...I couldn't sleep." He was able to partially abstract a proverb. He was oriented. His memory for recent and remote events was reasonably intact. He was able to name the current President. He was able to perform some simple calculations. He could determine the correct change from a dollar for a purchase. He had difficulty subtracting serial 7's from 100 and serial 3's from 20. He was able to draw simple geometric designs that revealed no neurologic deficit.

Re: Ahmad Edwards B/M 1/29/73 Cause No.
49G05-9907-CF-121975

He understands the charges against him. He understands the charges are serious. He understands that if he is found guilty that he could receive a significant sentence. He understands the Criminal Proceedings. He was able to provide reasonable definitions of the roles of the Judge, Jury, Witnesses, Prosecutor and Defense Attorney.

DIAGNOSTIC IMPRESSION:

- 1.) Delusional Disorder, Grandiose Type 297.1, improved
- 2.) History, Probable Malingering

PSYCHIATRIC OPINION:

It is my opinion, based on reasonable medical certainty, that this individual, in spite of his disorder, does have comprehension sufficient to understand the nature of these proceedings. He is able to aid his attorney in his defense in accordance with I.C. 35-36-3-1

Furthermore, it is my opinion, based on reasonable medical certainty that this individual was of sound mind at the time of the alleged offenses. He was able to appreciate the wrongfulness of his conduct at that time in accordance with I.C. 35-41-3-6.

Sincerely,

/s/ Ned P. Masbaum, MD

Ned P. Masbaum, M.D.

NPM/em

89a

NED P. MASBAUM, M.D.

FORENSIC PSYCHIATRY

P.O. BOX 3010

CARMEL, INDIANA 46082 USA

TELEPHONE (317) 846-7727 FAX (317) 575-1898

TOLL FREE (888) 203-7746

WEB SITE: www.FORNPSYCH.COM

RESUME

EXPERIENCE:

- * Private Practice of Psychiatry, Indianapolis Metropolitan Area since 1969.
- * Member of the Medical Staff of Clarian * Methodist Hospital.
- * Court appointed Forensic Psychiatrist in Marion County Courts and Courts throughout Indiana.
- * Forensic Psychiatric Testimony in Federal Courts.
- * Former Lieutenant Commander and Chief of Psychiatry, United States Naval Hospital, Portsmouth, New Hampshire 1967-1969.
- * Forensic Psychiatric Testimony in Military Courts-martial cases.

EDUCATION:

- * A.B. Indiana University, 1960.

- * M.D. Indiana University, School of Medicine, 1963.
- * Rotating Internship Wishard Hospital (formerly Marion County General), 1963-1964.
- * Residency in Psychiatry, Indiana University Medical Center, 1964-1967.
- * Current and Regular Recipient of the American Medical Association Physician's Recognition Award in Continuing Medical Education.

QUALIFICATIONS:

- * Board Certified by the American Board of Psychiatry and Neurology in Psychiatry, 1970.
- * Board Certified by the American Board of Psychiatry and Neurology in Forensic Psychiatry 1994.
- * Licensed to Practice Medicine in the State of Indiana since 1963.
- * Member of the American Medical Association, Indiana State Medical Association, Indianapolis Medical Society, American Psychiatric Association, Indiana Psychiatric Society, American Academy of Forensic Sciences, American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law.

REFERENCES:

- * Available on request.

MR. "AHMAD EDWARDS") IN THE MARION
V.) SUPERIOR COURT
THE STATE OF) ROOM NO.5
INDIANA) CAUSE NO.
) 49G059907CF
) 121975

<<stamped>> FILED APR 22 2002 <<signature>>
Sarah M. Taylor CLERK OF THE MARION
CIRCUIT COURT
<<written>> 23 Apr 02 <<signature>> GWH

"PETITION": "MR. AHMAD EDWARDS"

[p.1]

I Mr. Ahmad Edwards appearance in court is detrimental to my well-being. Im being held for a type of civil commitment that will take additional hearing for good cause I would an will voluntary commit for treatment personally.

However the issue or concern ~~wed~~ now, involes

[continued on page; 2 of;]

"PETITION": MR. AHMAD EDWARDS

[p.2]

services [inmates] are] not afforded here at the Marion County jail that participate; in the judicial circuit of the Marion County superior court at; 200 E Washing ton St. in; Indianapolis Indiana; 46204; program excluding [inmates] from hearings evaluated by physical health professionals that have identified the inmate from regular visits;

[continued on page; 3 of ;]

“PETITION”: MR. AHMAD EDWARDS

[p.4]

with stated case of continued pain

I Mr. Ahmad Edwards totally will be responsible for a action if there is significant guilty to be committed to me Mr. Ahmad Edwards as a result of defenses loss for haveing participated in trial court procedure in such an ~~contu~~ contunes exagerated state of extreme pain. As I Mr. Ahmad Edwards at; the Marion County jail [cell block 2-T] 40. South Alabama Street in; Indianapolis Indiana; 46204; shall

[continued on page; 5 of;]

“PETITION”: MR. AHMAD EDWARDS

[p.5]

ask as the petitioner for the purpose of discrimination not n due to my physical disability the court to elicit perpetuated and established my [Mr. Ahmad Edwards] petition of grievance and deliver me Mr. Ahmad Edwards to the most appropriate physical health service advocacy of the courts public poiicy.....

I affirm, under the penalties for perjury, that the foregoing representation is true.

/s/ Ahmad Edwards
Mr. Ahmad Edwards

file c.c.

MR. "AHMAD) IN THE MARION
EDWARDS") SUPERIOR COURT
V.) ROOM NO. 5
THE STATE OF) CAUSE NO. 49G05
INDIANA) 9907CF121975

<<stamped>> FILED APR 22 2002 <<signature>>
Sarah M. Taylor CLERK OF THE MARION
CIRCUIT COURT
<<written>> 23 Apr 02 <<signature>> GWH

"PETITION : "MR. AHMAD EDWARDS"

[p.1]

1. I Mr. Ahmad Edwards expects to be in process an individual may petition as being incapable of managing human needs.
2. Therefor I Mr. "Ahmad Edwards" condition substantially; a physician Lance E. Trexler Ph.D., H.S.P.P. recommends by

[continued on page; 2 of; 4]

[cont-]PETITION:MR. AHMAD EDWARDS

[p.2]

2. An court determined reasonable inquiry the court to provide for my mental deficiency of a excessive undue duress; individual incapacity [as defined in I.C. 12-7-2-61] or order an guardianship.
3. As I Mr. Ahmad Edwards desires to consent to the civil commitment's as they require admissions for regular commitment at Logansport State Hospital ; 1098 S. State Road 25; Logansport Indiana; 46947 – 9699.

[continued on page:3 of; 4]

[cont-] PETITION: MR. AHMAD EDWARDS

[p.3]

4. The established state of mind of [I] Mr. Ahmad Edwards as to proceedings for regular commitment admission prejudice fails and withdrawals from trial rule 36 [B]. Certain of the rules of law, a person can commit to such as the trial rule 41. Sentences that decides action withheld not for order
5. Therefor form the legal will of courts that authorize an mental action to plead to the commitment to an state institution provisions of I.C. 12-7-2-61

[continued on page; 4 of; 4]

[cont-] PETITION : MR.AHMAD EDWARDS

[p.4]

I affirm, under the penalties for perjury, that the foregoing representations are true.

 /s/ Ahmad Edwards
Mr. Ahmad Edwards

“MR. AHMAD) IN THE MARION
EDWARDS”) SUPERIOR
V.) COURT ROOM 5
THE STATE) CRIMINAL DIVISION.
OF) CAUSE NO:
INDIANA) 496059907CF121975

<<stamped>> FILED APR 23 2002 <<signature>>

Sarah M. Taylor CLERK OF THE MARION
CIRCUIT COURT

“DEFENCE OBJECTION”

[p.1]

I the defendant object so to be timely herein trials the public may be virtue of power against I the defendant Mr. Ahmad Edwards, as consultation intention to plead statute of constitutional duty I.C. 12-27-3-3.[1] [4] is thereof I.C. 12-27-3-2

[continued on page; 2 of; 3]

[cont- “DEFENCE OBJECTION”]

[p.2]

Therefore the defence objects, because of courts decisions that enforce it to be unconstitutional to decline to this right of the defendant Mr. Ahmad Edwards – but see, Brooks v. Texas, 381 F. 2d 619 [5th cir, Tex. 1967] as to the validity of an public trial being held illegal – shall the times upon probable cause set the terms I the [as president] defendant of the elected public shall meet representatives dress codes of the agency titled Ambergress & Zenagencies manner provided by the motion for competnet dress coad

[continued on page; 3 of; 3]

[cont- "DEFENCE OBJECTION"]

[p.3]

Section; E [1][2][3]. Thereof for the states, [United] Memphis, New – Orleans young American citizens as subjects, shall there be member's after the powers discharged under the United States Constitution Article [V]. I as right to effective provision the defendant of such class stated claims.

"I affirm, under the penalties for perjury, that the foregoing representations are true.

 /s/ Ahmad Edwards
The Defendant
Mr. Ahmad Edwards
[C.E.O.]

“MR. AHMAD)	IN THE MARION
EDWARDS”)	SUPERIOR COURT
V.)	ROOM 5 CRIMINAL
THE STATE OF)	DIVISION
INDIANA)	CAUSE NO:
)	496059907CF121975

<<stamped>> FILED APR 23 2002 <<signature>>
 CLERK OF THE MARION CIRCUIT COURT
 <<written>> 23 Apr 02 << signature>> GWH

“MOTION FOR COMPETNET DRESS
COAD CODE
 AGENCY FORM [9000]

[p.1]

The agent Mr. Ahmad Edwards by the agency powers of Ambergress & Zenagencies an orgainzational agency with the substantial rights of the United States Constitution; as executive rule the means for young American citizens to use element, power and

[continued on page ;2 of ;12]

“cont- “MOTION FOR COMPETNET
DRESS COAD”]

[p.2]

forsights for other young American citizens to take on penalties as to the orgainzational agencies foregoing conclusion drawn and found by young American citizens. Failing negligents thats classified as antiest-ablishment, therefor the agency’s of Ambergress & Zenagencies or leaning not toward antiestablishment or their attitudes of standards that avoid authoritative apparel; as it is congressional intent the agency has

[continued on page; 3 of; 12]

“cont- “MOTION FOR COMPETNET
DRESS COAD CODE”]

[p.3]

interpreted the following statutory permissible construction:

Corporate Image. – for executive instinct of agency dress code includes the following rights:

- [1] Representing the public in the public in the agency eye agent should dress conservatively
- [2] Each branch, division office is exempted from part or all of the dress

[continued on page ;4 of ;12]

“cont- “MOTION FOR COMPETNET
[p.4] DRESS CODE”]

- [2] code upon argument that are valid or suggesting other parts of the country and or offices in the world; or:
- [3] Executives in charge of blue-collar workers should dress like the workers; or:
- [4] Upon amateur operations of nonverbal business that sales products or services to different citizens;
- [5] The men and woman in marketing as well as executives in corporate

[continued on page ; 5 of: 12]

[cont- “MOTION FOR COMPETNET
p.5 DRESS CODE”

they shall follow the competent dress code of comfortable traditional attire reflecting convention logical, conservative competent positive adulthood ; alone or by agency advocate guidance therefor this dress code is valid for classmates potential to use the powers of the United States Constitution Article IV, §4, thereof; or in:

Boston, New York, San Francisco

[continued on page ; 6 of ; 12]

[cont- "MOTION FOR COMPETENT
[p.6] DRESS CODE"]

- 1] Suit: dark gray without pinstripes;
- 2] Shirt ; white
- 3] Tie : upper-middle class conservative

Atlanta, Dallas

- 1] Suit: light-colored
- 2] Shirt: white
- 3] Tie: traditional
[with panache]

Jacksonville, Florida

- 1] Suit: mid-range gray
- 2] Shirt: blue
- 3] Tie : striped

[continued on page ; 7 of; 12]

[cont- "MOTION FOR COMPETENT
[p.7] DRESS CODE"]

Salt Lake City

- 1] Suit: blue pinstripe
- 2] Shirt : white
- 3] Tie : conservative

Seattle, Portland

- 1] Suit: brown
Shirt : wite
- 2] ~~Shirt~~ : Tie: conservative

California, Hawaii

- 1] Suit : medium-range blue
- 2] Shirt: light blue

[continued on page; 8 of; 12]

[cont- "MOTION FOR COMPETNENT
[p.8] DRESS CODE"] _____

Tallahassee, Memphis, New Orleans

- 1] Suit: medium-range solid blue;
- 2] Shirt : wite;
- 3] Tie : maroon
[tie must be solid]

Chicago, Minneapolis, St. Paul

- 1] Suit : gray plaid:
- 2] Shirt : medium blue;
- 3] Tie : dark blue [tie must be solid]

[continued on page;9of;12]

[cont- "MOTION FOR COMPETNENT
[p.9] DRESS CODE"] _____

South America

- 1] Suit: light-beige
- 2] Shirt : wite
- 3] Tie : dark beige

This is directed to the young American citizens of the
United States: with being created for the value of

young Americans to call them to the official offices delegations of business and thereof the United States

[continued on page ;10 of; 12]

[cont- "MOTION FOR COMPETNENT
[p.10] DRESS CODE"]

so in so far as to direct all others a white shirt and conservative tie crosses all racial, age socioeconomic and or sex: proestablishment professional establishment associates whom may have dealing with this cause number: 496059907CF121975 ; on a regular basis, in an traditional manner of business as executives thereof the courts delegation or upon the continuals of this court

[continued on page; 11 of; 12]

[cont- "MOTION FOR COMPETNENT
[p.11] DRESS CODE"]

their shall be an suit: made by any designer that dose not suit the unusual clothing of revolutions for the serious businessman and or businesswoman: of, beige and or brown in the summer

Wherefor, the agency Ambergress & Zenagencies may provide law to help the young American citizen as agents we as an agency when speaking declarat-

[continued on page ;12 of;12]

[cont- "MOTION FOR COMPETNENT
[p.12] DRESS CODE"]

ing powers discharged under the United States Constitution Article [5] Five Section [1] One, and thereof Amendments Twenty Section [3] Three proposed and ratified respectively in United States Conventions historicaly on April 26, 1933 therein the

United States Constitution and therefore order shall be the emphasised law herein.

‘I affirm, under the penalties for perjury, that the foregoing representations are true’

 /s/ Ahmad Edwards
Ahmad Edwards
The Defendant
[C.E.O.]

<<stamped>> FILED APR 15 2002 <<signature>>
Sarah M. Taylor CLERK OF THE MARION
CIRCUIT COURT
<<written>> 12 Apr 02 denied <<signature>> GWH
4/10/02

“ORDERS TO THE CLERK”

I the defendant in the cause number 496059907CF121975 order the clerk of the Marion Circuit Court Mr. Taylor to no later than the supervision of times sessioned of [your] his official office to the following:

1. Make copies of all exhibits offered and admitted into evidence of this cause above.

c.c. file

A party to this action
 /s/ Ahmad Edwards
Mr. Ahmad Edwards

“ORDER OF REFERENCE”

[p.2]

Adjudged that the above-captioned matter be referred to "The Division of Mental Health" for services of developmental training with interest thereon at the Indiana family and social services administration in Logansport Indiana titled "central."

c.c.file

HONORABLE
GRANT HAWKINS
DISTRICT JUDGE
IN THE MARION
SUPERIOR COURT

MR. AHMAD) IN THE MARION
EDWARDS) SUPERIOR COURT
V.) ROOM 5 CRIMINAL
THE STATE OF) DIVISION
INDIANA) CAUSE NO:
) 496059907CF121975

"ORDER OF REFERENCE"

[p.1]

This action came on trial before the court and a honorable "Grant Hawkins" district judge presiding and the issues of mental health having been duly tried and the honorable "Grant Hawkins" district judge having duly rendered the verdict.

It is **ordered** and

[continued on page ; 2 of;]

"CONSENT TO JURISDICTION
BY A SUPERIOR COURT
MAGISTRATE JUDGE"

[p.2]

104a

from a service provider at the Indiana Family and Social Services Administration in Logansport Indiana titled "Central" Apon Order of the Entry of "Final Judgment."

"I affirm, under the penalties for perjury, that the foregoing representation is true.

/s/ Ahmad Edwards
Mr. Ahmad Edwards

c.c.file

copies to:

Prosecuting
Attorney

MR. AHMAD) IN THE MARION
EDWARDS) COURT ROOM 5
V.) CRIMINAL
THE STATE OF) DIVISION
INDIANA) CAUSE NO:
) 496059907CF
) 121975

<<stamped>> FILED APR 15 2002 <<signature>>
Sarah M. Taylor CLERK OF THE MARION
CIRCUIT COURT
"CONSENT TO JURISDICTION
BY A SUPERIOR COURT
MAGISTRATE JUDGE"

[p.1]

In accordance with the provisions of I.C. 12-27-1 the undersigned party to the above-captioned criminal matter hereby voluntarily consent to health services of developmental training

[continued on page; 2 of; 2]

<<stamped>> FILED APR 15 2002 <<signature>>
Sarah M. Taylor CLERK OF THE MARION
CIRCUIT COURT
Canon 3

A]

5. A judge should dispose promptly of the business of the court.

Indiana Rule of Court

STATE OF INDIANA) IN THE MARION
COUNTY OF MARION) SUPERIOR COURT
STATE OF INDIANA) SS:
VS.) CRIMINAL DIVISION,
AHMAD EDWARDS) ROOM FIVE
) CAUSE NO. 49G05-
) 9907-CF-121975

<<stamped>> FILED APR 16 2002 <<signature>>
Sarah M. Taylor CLERK OF THE MARION
CIRCUIT COURT

**FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF
LAW ON DEFENDANT'S COMPETENCE TO
STAND TRIAL**

Comes now the Court on the SECOND SUGGESTION
OF INCOMPETENCY filed by the Defendant's counsel
and determines as follows:

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

1. On July 15, 1999, Defendant was charged in this matter with the offenses of Attempt Murder, Battery as a class C felony, Criminal Recklessness as a Class D felony, and Theft, a class D felony.
2. On December 7, 1999, counsel for Defendant filed a Combined Notice of Insanity and Defense & Petition for Examination to Determine Competence to Stand Trial after which this Court, Hon. Gary Miller presiding, appointed Dr. Ned Masbaum and Dr. Dwight Schuster to examine Defendant.
3. Dr. Masbaum filed his report of December 22, 1999, and later testified before Judge Miller as to his diagnostic impression and psychiatric opinion:

- A. "Defendant suffered from Delusional Disorder Grandiose Type 297.1"
- B. "Probable Malingering demonstrated by excessive control of the exam through verbosity, avoidance of specific information when requested, curious attempts to engage the Prosecutor and bizarre letters to his Defense Attorneys (sic).

1

- C. "It is my opinion, based upon reasonable medical certainty, that this individual does have comprehension sufficient to understand the nature of the proceedings. He is able, in spite of his mental disorder to aid his attorney in his defense in accordance with I.C. 35-36-3-1.

Dr. Masbaum went on to opine that Defendant, again in spite of his mental disorder, was of sound mind at the time of the offense.

- 4. Dr. Schuster filed his report of December 31, 1999, and later testified before Judge Miller as to his diagnostic impressions and psychiatric opinion:
 - A. "I believe that he does have a mixed Learning Disability classified as a Developmental Expressive Writing Disorder and Expressive Language Disorder as shown by..."
 - B. "A second diagnosis is that of Delusional disorder, Grandiose type. This condition manifested by...These conditions may make it difficult for Mr. Edwards to communicate satisfactorily with his attorney, but he does

know he is charged with a crime and he understands the legal procedures associated with his trial. His delusional disorder impairs his judgment such as in his selection of Security work and carrying a gun. I believe Mr. Edwards is in need of psychiatric treatment although his condition is difficult to treat. He is potentially dangerous to others.”

- C. “As a result of my examination it is my opinion with a reasonable degree of medical certainty that Ahmad Edwards is competent to stand trial at this time. I believe he was of unsound mind, in the legal sense of that term, on or about July 12, 1999, in that he was suffering from a mental disease which impaired his appreciation of the wrongfulness of his conduct.”
5. Dr. Lance E. Trexler, an expert neuropsychologist retained by Defendant’s counsel, submitted a report dated February 23, 2000, and later testified as to his diagnosis and impressions:
 - A. “The results of the neuropsychological examination point towards a patient who clearly has a compromise of brain functions...”
 - B. “He clearly presents with a delusional disorder, grandiose type. He does appear to be hypergraphic, and he does endorse olfactory hallucinations, so it might be important to rule out partial complex seizures.”

- C. “As seen in from the clinical interview, this patient is extremely tangential and decompensates in the course of a conversation. He is going to have considerable difficulty participating in his legal defense. These are neurobehavioral changes that are seen with frontal lobe brain damage. Additionally, I suspect this patient also has major thought disorder, such

2

as schizophrenia, and it should be noted that he has a very strong family history in this regard...”

- D. “This patient clearly needs neuropsychiatric treatment that should be inpatient. He needs pharmacological treatment as well as group psychotherapy...”
- E. “...it seems likely that he was psychotic at the time of the offense secondary to the interactive effects between frontal lobe damage and significant environmental stress.

In conclusion, Dr. Trexler testified that it was his opinion, within a reasonable degree of professional certainty, the Defendant was not competent to stand trial and was unable to appreciate the wrongfulness of his conduct at the time of the offense.

6. As a result, Judge Miller found that Defendant was not competent to stand trial and, on August 16, 2000, ordered that he be committed to the Indiana Department of Mental Health. Defendant was then transported to Logansport State Hospital.

7. On March 14, 2001, the Indiana Family & Social Services Administration, Division of Mental Health, filed in this Court the report of its doctor, Dr. Steven H. Berger, who believed Defendant had “attained the ability to understand the proceedings and assist in the preparation of his defense.”
8. On March 16, 2001, this Court, the Hon. Grant W. Hawkins presiding, ordered that Defendant be transported from Logansport State Hospital back to the Marion County Jail pursuant to the aforementioned report from the Division of Mental Health.
9. Counsel later suggested to the Court that Defendant was not competent to stand trial and asked that the Court hold a hearing to determine whether Defendant was, in fact, per the Division of Mental Health’s report, competent to stand trial. As a result, on August 1, 2001, the Court reappointed Dr. Masbaum and Dr. Schuster to re-examine Defendant.

10. Dr. Schuster filed his second report with the Court on October 9, 2001, and Dr. Masbaum filed his second report with the Court on October 17, 2001. After vacation of an earlier-set hearing, the Court set the matter for hearing on March 20, 2002, on the issue of competency to stand trial.
11. On March 20, 2002, the matter came before this Court, the Hon. Grant W. Hawkins, presiding, for hearing regarding Defendant’s competence to stand trial. Present and testifying at the hearing were Dr. Schuster, Dr. Masbaum, and Dr.

Trexler. The Court was asked to, and did take, judicial notice of prior proceedings and filings in this matter, including the pro se filings of Defendant, the prior and more recent reports of the doctors and the summary report from the Indiana Family & Social Services, Division of Mental Health. Additionally, the Court took the opportunity to observe the Defendant's behavior and demeanor in the courtroom. At the conclusion of the hearing, the Court asked the parties to tender proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law, and set the matter for hearing on April 16, 2002, at 9:30 A.M.

12. At the March 20 hearing, Dr. Schuster, M.D. testified that "Mr. Edwards has shown marked improvement since (his) examination of December 14, 2001. At this time he shows good comprehension of the charges, the legal proceedings hereon and he demonstrated the ability to communicate so that he could assist his own attorney in his own defense. His detailed accounting of events of July 12, 1999, indicates clear understanding of those events." Dr. Schuster further determined, "as a result of my examination it is my opinion with reasonable medical certainty that Ahmad Edwards is competent to stand trial and that he was

4

of sound mind, in the legal sense of that term, on or about July 12, 1999, in that he was not suffering from a mental disease or defect that impaired his appreciation of the wrongfulness of his conduct."

13. At the March 20 hearing, Dr. Masbaum, M.D. testified that “He understands the charges against him. He understands the charges are serious. He understands that if he is found guilty that he could receive a significant sentence. He understands the Criminal Proceedings. He was able to provide reasonable definitions of the roles of the Judge, Jury, Witnesses, Prosecutor and Defense Attorney.” Dr. Masbaum further determined “it is my opinion, based on reasonable medical certainty, that this individual, in spite of his disorder, does have comprehension sufficient to understand the nature of these proceedings. He is able to aid his attorney in his defense in accordance with I.C. 35-36-3-1. Furthermore, it is my opinion, based on a reasonable medical certainty that this individual was of sound mind at the time of the alleged offenses. He was able to appreciate the wrongfulness of his conduct at the time in accordance with I.C. 35-41-3-6.”
14. At the March 20 hearing, Dr. Trexler, Ph.D and Clinical Neuropsychologist, testified that he was hired by the Defense. He did not prepare a new report on the Defendant, but testified that the Defendant has an IQ of 91. His attention and concentration functions are within normal limits for short-term auditory attention span. His cognitive flexibility falls into the lower end of the average range. His memory is at the 81st percentile for immediate auditory recall and the 84th percentile for delayed recall. His immediate visual recall is at the 90th percentile and the 89th percentile for delayed visual recall.

15. Dr. Trexler indicated that the Defendant “is going to have considerable difficulty participating in his legal defense.”
16. Dr. Trexler made no reference to I.C. 35-36-3-1 or I.C. 35-41-3-6.
17. The Logansport State Hospital report of March 9, 2001, reports that the Defendant “appears to be psychiatrically normal.”

FINDINGS OF FACT

18. Defendant suffered a brain injury as a result of a car accident several years ago, the injury including frontal lobe damage.
19. Defendant has a learning disability classified as a Developmental Expressive Writing Disorder and Expressive Language Disorder.
20. Defendant’s thought processes are tangential, and he decompensates in the course of a conversation. His writings are hard to follow, not connected, and his thoughts not following a logical fashion.
21. Defendant may have hallucinations.
22. Defendant has a mental disease or defect that is a “delusional disorder, grandiose type.”
23. The Defendant has shown improvement since his initial examinations in December of 1999.
24. The Defendant has an IQ of approximately 91, and has short term and delayed memory above average for both auditory and visual stimulants.
25. The Defendant recognized Mr. Jones and Mr. Hill as his attorneys.

26. The Defendant understands the charges against him.
27. He understands that the charges are serious and that he may go to jail if convicted.

6

28. He understands the legal concepts of guilt and innocence and has filed his own motions, pro se, since the inception of the case.
29. The Defendant understands the criminal proceedings and further understands the roles of Judge, Jury, Witnesses, Prosecutor, and Defense Attorney.
30. Though the Defendant suffers from mental illness, he is able, within the dictates of law, to communicate satisfactorily with his attorneys in preparing his own defense.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

31. I.C. 35-36-3-4 requires the court to determine if the Defendant has the ability to understand the proceedings and assist in the preparation of his defense.
32. Based upon the findings above regarding the Defendant's understanding of criminal proceedings, the nature of the charges against him, and the roles of the parties, the Court finds that the Defendant is competent to assist his attorneys in his defense and stand trial for the charged crimes.

Dated: <<written>> 16 Apr 02

/s/ Grant W. Hawkins
Grant W. Hawkins

[cont- "ORDERS TO THE CLERK"]

[p.2]

stamped, self-addressed envelope so that this order may be provided.

"Thank you. As your office shall always be honored and respected."

"I affirm, under the penalties for perjury, that the foregoing representations are true.

4/18/2002

 /s/ Ahmad Edwards
Mr. Ahmad Edwards

file.c.c.

116a

MR. "AHMAD) IN THE MARION
EDWARDS") SUPERIOR COURT
V.) ROOM NO.5
THE STATE OF) CAUSE NO.
INDIANA) 496059907CF121975

<<stamped>> FILED APR 22 2002 <<signature>>

Sarah M. Taylor CLERK OF THE MARION
CIRCUIT COURT

"ORDERS TO THE CLERK"

[p.1]

[1.] Please furnish me Mr. Ahmad Edwards a filed
copy of this [four] 4 page petition you might have
received;

I have sent you an

[continued on page; 2 of; 2]

MR. "AHMAD) IN THE MARION
EDWARDS") SUPERIOR COURT
V.) ROOM NO.5
THE STATE OF)
INDIANA)

<<stamped>> FILED APR 23 2002 <<signature>>
Sarah M. Taylor CLERK OF THE MARION
CIRCUIT COURT

"ORDERS TO THE CLERK"

1. Please file and copy this 5 page petition and return a copy back to me;

Iv enclosed a stamped, self-addressed envelope so that a copy can be provided that Iv ordered

Thank you for you help under these circumstances

File.c.c.

"I affirm, under the penalties for perjury, that the foregoing representation is true.

/s/ Ahmad Edwards
Mr. Ahmad Edwards

“MR. AHMAD)	IN THE MARION
EDWARDS”)	SUPERIOR
V.)	COURT ROOM 5
THE STATE)	CRIMINAL DIVISION
OF)	CAUSE NO.
INDIANA)	496059907CF
)	12975

<<stamped>> FILED APR 23 2002 <<signature>>
Sarah M. Taylor CLERK OF THE MARION
CIRCUIT COURT
“ORDERS TO THE CLERK”

[p.1]

1. Please copy and file this motion for competnet dress code and return a copy back to me the defendant Mr. “Ahmad Edwards”

Thank you for your

[continued on page ;2of;3]

[cont-“ ORDERS TO THE CLERK”]

[p.2]

returning of fillings directly!”

I am not able to enclose an stamped self-addressed envelop, this filling

Therefore I request a special facillitators envelop return this “Motion for Competnet Dress Code”

Faithfully the young citizens of this state Iv work with on bus stops all wish for me to use. Your conscience for its proper an capable-

[continued on page ;2of;3]

[cont- “ORDERS TO THE CLERK”]

[p.3]

as your office importance is the final power that helps
one succeed by the trustworthyness it's bound with.

"I affirm, under the penalties for perjury that the
foregoing representations are true.

/s/ Ahmad Edwards
Mr. Ahmad Edwards
The Defendat

"MR.AHMAD EDWARDS" V. THE STATE OF INDIANA) IN THE MARION) SUPERIOR) COURT ROOM) DIVISION)) CAUSE NO.) 496059907CF) 12975) 99-121975
---	--

<<stamped>> FILED SEP 10 2002 <<signature>>
 Sarah M. Taylor CLERK

"ORDERS TO THE CLERK"

09/05/02

[p.1]

1. Please copy and file this motion to protect orders [by trial rule 26 [C][7] and return a copy back to me the defendant Mr. Ahmad Edwards

Thank you for your

[continued on page; 2 of; 2]
 cont-"ORDERS TO THE CLERK"

[p.2]

09/05/02

returning of fillings directly!"

I am able to enclose an stamped self-addressed envelop to help this motions fillings for the protection of orders under trial rule 26 [C][7.]

Thank you again as your offical office is "importance" an the final power to succeed"

I affirm, under the penalties for pejury that the foregoing representations are true

121a

 /s/ Ahmad Edwards
Mr. Ahmad Edwards
The Defendant

File c.c.

Notice:

9/05/02

Adding this file to my cause wins asto the project the agency required for an acquisition to file next one that is going to be a bit larger than I'd planed. So to synchronize this stamped envelope herein A.\S.\A.\P. should put my department in the fast lane to help the public as Im planning to recive this filing within three [3] working days.

“Please allow me to thank you and your office again;

 /s/ Ahmad Edwards
Mr. Ahmad Edwards

file c.c.

“MR.AHMAD) IN THE MARION
EDWARDS”)
V.) SUPERIOR
THE STATE) COURT ROOM 5
OF) CRIMINAL DIVISION
INDIANA) CAUSE
) NO:496059907CF121975

<<stamped>> SEP 16 2002 <<signature>> Sarah M.
Taylor CLERK OF THE MARION CIRCUIT COURT
<<written>> 17 Sep 02 <<signature>> GWH

“P/T” “MOTION TO PROTECT ORDERS”

[Agency Form [Trial Rule 26 [C]][7.]
[1500.]

The defendant Mr. Ahmad Edwards now exercises the right of the people to be secure in their papers and effects, against violation of the Fourth Article First Amendment of the United States Constitution of America with out the order or consent of the publisher contemporary publishing “polity”

[continued on page;2 of; 10]

~~the executive defene of securty should fairly have a man in the feild strong persuasive with communication skills such as an dupty sherrif or an eorection officer. Experience from creating an bachelor’s degree as an classified student in any area needing help. The tresure and the offical executive officer. Experienced~~

[p.2.] “P/T” MOTION TO PROTECT ORDERS –
[cont’]

[Agency Form [Trial Rule 26 [C.][7.]
[1500.]

Herein stated as the defendants request the order to secure the things to be within this cause number ; 496059907CF121975

A.] The defendant is not comfortable with the caution procuters of this states “parabola” or takeing as to the matters of interest to the defendant Mr. “Ahmad Edwards.” As he believes that if the interest are not carefully studied the performance of “economic loss” will yield the insight of “noblesse oblige” the defendant Mr. Ahmad Edwards coursed the best to reserve constitutional right of the First Amendment One Articale Four. Vision to the defence

[continued on page ; 3 of ; 10]

~~employees that are qualified or that can over the duration — under which an individual can perform become a measure to include at the time when they shell be needed publicly as well as socially for support. However we are going to try to become familiar with you and or your firm. As the board complets the last phase.~~

~~We know it may not be that simple to read or hear about some of your personal ideas or beliefs. Yet we are completely “all ears”! We also know you are very busy and or involved with other matters to habe~~

[p.3] “P/T” “MOTION TO PROTECT ORDERS” –
[cont”]

[Agency Form [Trial Rule 26 [C.][7.]

[1500.]

A.] as it is not ordering the state to deprive the liberty of it’s produced moderate position at this or any time. Yet the defendant Mr. Ahmad

Edwards as official party by an presidential proclamation: of the United States citizens of "high interest": to the power that has been vested upon Americans with prudence to propose to fill offices as chief executives within the United States based to stand with courage ; honorable from the duty self-restraint takes by a man or womans rank for the "due reward" to become officers for the right of men and wemen and children publicly to be moderate in an "business" position for the help that

[continued on page;4 of;10]

~~demonstrate complete emotional re-educations power of influence that's underestimated by one in society.....values are different in addition and association inherent social attitude of interest are the personal interest."~~

~~As this is someting to consider as an subject of serious study depravity heritage, religion, sex, is of course subject of serious civil function. Manage the people and innumerable laws shell start forcing for proper concern.....respectability in this generation~~

[p.4] "P/T" "MOTION TO PROTECT ORDERS" –
[cont"]

[Agency Form [Trial Rule 26 [C][7.]

[1500.]

A.] is need by every American citizen to do his or her part in actions to due away with the hassles of common law where the "value" of right shall and must be preserved wherein the public [or state] keeps government too become effectively added by right to not "loss"

in “plane view” be it economy as its “backbone” of “businesses” or any considered quorm a constitutional right may set-forth in this or any other state, city, or county, the party exist within when powerful regulators “assert large” in “business”

B.] From the copyright office the

[continued on page ; 5 of ; 10]

p.2—TIM PRESIDENT ATTORNTTY

Employees that are qualified or that can over the duration under which and individual can perform become a measure to includ ; at the time when they shall be needed publicly as well as socially for support. However we are going to try to become familiar with your firm dualy as the board completes the last phase

We know it may not be as simpl as some may think to read or hear about some of your personal ideas or beliefs. Yet we are completely “all ears”, and you will not be going against any social norms by becoming so busy or involved with other tings things to respond. Mr. Tim Eals has profoundly set us with the feeling that you simply have a great memory and very well could increase our chances of desire to for “wins.”

For the occasions ;

Ahmad Edwards

[p.5.] “P/T” “MOTION TO PROTECT ORDERS” – [cont”]

[Agency Form [Trial Rule 26 [C.][7.]

[1500.]

B.] Document needed for items in this cause number; 496059907CF121975 as the defendant Mr. Ahmad Edwards request to “receive” transmitted to order trial court procedure as all items have become a “work made for hire” [or a work prepared by an employee within the scope of his or her employment” [as an obligation] for contribution for motion to question where the United States is not a party. In “compilation test” such parties [employee] “anonymously” or “pseudonymous” that use such element with “square form” the need for such contribution is a work “pseudonymous” and dose so fictitiously name the employee to be

[continued on page ;6 of ; 10]

~~Melzar: common noun — steward of tutor Dan i, 11, 16.~~

~~Men a hem: (comforter) usurper of Israel’s throne. Idolatrous and cruel. Reigned B.C. 772-761, 2kigs. xv. 14-22~~

~~Me ne: first word of Belshazzar’s warning entire, “mene,” he is numbered ; tekem,” hois ho is weighed; “upharsin,” they are divided, Dan. v. 25-28.~~

~~Meph a ath: levitical town in Reuben, Josh. xiii. 18.~~

~~Merey seat: lid of the ark, ex. xxv . 17-22; hence , covering , or atonement for sin, Heb. ix. 5.~~

~~Me rono thite: designations in 1 Chr. xxvii 30; Nem. iii 2.~~

[p.6.] “P/T” “MOTION TO PROTECT ORDERS” –
[cont”]

[Agency Form [Trial Rule 26 [C.][7.]

[1500.]

B.] On the line “point blank”:[not to reveal bodies of proceedings with agents and or agencies administrative acts] however as any party may order that of the district court it is not the defendants [of the] “parabola” way seen fit, by standard;

C.] Nobility of any party may order that of the district court clerk to retain use preparing papers in event of the records faculty thus being filed within transmission partial the record as form or an copy may file a motion so shall it be ordered by the party than so shall it become a certificate of the clerk

[continued on page; 7 of ; 10]

D—Welfar: i

1.) ~~Public housing:~~

2.) ~~Public Housing:~~

3.) ~~Foruan countryies ; 11 after teens of the French assembly. Spoke constitutional laws r authorized educational associates nationaly~~

4.) ~~Nureeing homes :~~

5.) ~~School systims : 111 for a g in many ways technologiell technologic technological careers are difficult makeing booming options career options for students~~

6.) ~~Manfuruters~~

~~7.) Land owners : National nationaly sources of the indu pressure cradicating for seourge source seourg seouring normaly eff ends a year of \$19 million of pressure~~

~~8.) Human society :~~

~~9.) Natural (recoeres :~~

[p.7] "P/T" "MOTION TO PROTECT ORDERS" –
[cont"]

[Agency Form [Trial Rule 26 [C.][7.]
[1500.]

C.] of the district court showing the date as it was taken on the date on notice of filed expiration date for the motion filed as order "that helps the agent extending the time for transmitting the record shall he be permitted to respond at "purpose of signature" without requiring payment of the fee as order herein for the vision of administrative "agency board of commission"

D.] These orders must ordinarily be made in or at first instance, the United States district courts upon image to foresight of experience for the extraordinary

[continued on page ; 8 of ; 10]

p1. _____ June

~~I'm so I'm pretty near afraid of the jail escorting me across the street to the court. I got set on going to the house on down the road from the hospital. Across teh bed on my stomach with nothing but pain and sickness feeling that dont fo in my body. I'm and~~

~~supposed to go to the neighbors [the evil side] of of that hospital says the court, but those old on fools must think give up and died. In that six months I was in the hospital I can't express wai what your children meant to me during that six months before the end of my stay there and I finally came, back to the jail. The~~

~~_____ revealed _____~~

~~_____ The hospital said there nothing wrong with me. _____ Psychiatry help might have helped if psychiatrists could have penetrated the problems caused by the little girl whom now lives in the middle middle west [named Amber] east~~

[p.8] "P/T" "MOTION TO PROTECT ORDERS" –
[cont"]

[Agency Form [Trial Rule 26 [C.][7.]
[1500.]

D.] Civil courts within the prudence of the United States do not produced relief sought that is not practicable or should be denied once duty request what should benevolent within reason upon and/or given by the district court if it has failed to show reason by the facts relevant the motion shall be filed with the clerk panel or the division of the court impracticable or not yet it is due to this motions requirement.

E.] A division as an contemporary publishing company at;

[continued on page ; 9 of; 10]

P.7

~~Very few men would somehow as you are...only...the top banked émigrés of new the easts. Material with no questions asked. I've even heard you be called for "socially presentable." Enough to be worthy of close fellowship. By golden age I always put that statement wonder what they meant when I hear that. Non of C "manner", of course now that I'm shrewd and vinon how to calculate manner as an the securities — upper class hen should always use.~~

[p.9] "P/T" "MOTION TO PROTECT ORDERS" – [cont"]

[Agency Form [Trial Rule 26 [C.][7.] [1500.]

E.] 40 S. Alabama St. [Marion County] [Indianapolis] Indiana; 46204; in the United States request the record of this: cause number ; 496059907CF121975 : and items that have not been ordered by the defendant "Mr. Ahmad Edwards" to be filed with or with out the record to receive transmitted orders for trail court procedure and or as all items witch have become a "work made for hire" [or a "work prepared by an employee within the scope of his or her employment" for obligational contribution ; all rights reserved therefrom the year ninteen hundred and nindy nine.

[continued on page ; 10 of ; 10]

~~3 of~~

~~(Home) assocaries) ————— (copy)~~

- ~~— [100% cotton, combed cotton loops]~~
- ~~— goose down comforter [200 thread percal~~
- ~~— bed skirt~~
- ~~— bed shams~~
- ~~— towel and washcloth set~~
- ~~— flat fitted sheets [queen size]~~
- ~~— pillow queen oversized~~
- ~~— pillowcases oversized queen~~
- ~~— tommy for Logansport civil side~~

[p.10] “P/T” “MOTION TO PROTECT ORDERS” –
[cont”]

[Agency Form [Trial Rule 26 [C][7.]
[1500.]

Wherefor, the unity of the record by any form foresighted herein specifically to govern the record by “millgil “busines” the contemporary publishing company orders all rights reserved hereinafter of any an all parts of this record that is filed may be produced, reproduced or stored in retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any electronic mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior permission of the above stated [acting publishing company] publisher.

“ I affirm, under the penalties for perjury, that the foregoing is true

File:c.c.

/s/ Ahmad Edwards
Mr. Ahmad Edwards

© Thank you!!!!

copy

~~Grivence 9/3/2001/~~

~~Could you help me reach my goal as I require means to correct former mistakes with items such as spellcheck, gramereheak margruns, fou fonts, styles, and structure as they are truly needed in the programs of word perfect or lotus. Consider my leave to receive special permission with employing the courts as not needed the need is for an extra computer in the institution. As this is the only logical resolution to my exexisting problem for the bonding and mending that enables the assartainment for previously stated goals I've set yet need to reach now. Therefor I respectfully request your help.~~

133a

99121975

“Ambergress & Zenagencies”

[An orgainzational agency] for [1081

Responce to: Consist for order
to: the bord of directors vice president Mr. Tim Gales

<<stamped>> FILED SEP 25 2002 <<signature>>
Sarah M. Taylor CLERK OF THE MARION
CIRCUIT COURT

<<written>> ,ocvol <<signature>> GWH

“SATISFACTORY SERVICE LINE PROPOSED IN
TORT CLAIM EXTENT OF LOSS.”

“Explanations of citations to Clerk of the circuit
Marion County superior court division five [5] at 200
E Washington St. in; Indiana’s Indianapolis; 46204 of
the United States [as greater part of becomeing
dispositions of “fatpxtri” production and distribution;
for “a broad highway” for agencies boards,
commissions in a United States Court enforcement of
proceedings ordered to become the largest the federal
procedure].”

“I affirm that the forgoing is true

/s/ Ahmad Edwards
[Chief Executive Officer]
Mr. Ahmad Edwards

c.c. file

“Ambergress & Zenagencies”
[An orgainzational agency]

Cause: The order of fatpxtri; orders as
_responce:

Chapter Two p.1

Agency
Form
d095.]

“Mr. Tim Eales” the vice president oualified for the board of directors with full power over the order of the fatpxtri, witch is at the location; Logansport State Hospital ; 1098 S State Road 25 Logansport Indiana ; 46947-9699 thereafter is in need of conscience.

“Mr. Tim Eales,” is under an duty seasonably to respect any order in question directly addressed with respect that request duty to supplement. Yet Mr. “Tim Eales,” the offical excutive officer over the “board of directors” for the organizational agency titled “Ambergress & Zenagencies” of disabled members of “fatpxtri” to clerk for the court any appeals

[continued on page;2 of;9]

“THE ORDER OF FATPXTRAI”

REQUEST: AS ORDERS

<<stamped>> FILED SEP 25 2002 <<signature>>
Sarah M. Taylor CLERK OF THE MARION
CIRCUIT COURT

Agency
Form
[097.]

135a

<<stamped>> FILED SEP 25 2002 <<signature>>
CLERK

<<WRITTEN>>

Dear Amad,

This is not a social letter, its a buissness one.

Where are those copys of the contract, membership, club As well as the other stuff we drew up. By-laws, repairme clauses, ect.

Plese send them asap. I have some intrested people. And tell me the status of your introdution of the organisation in court. If any.

As to some news. Havis went back to his jail and Mr. Pitts and Mr. Rotman are downstairs right now.

Also plese let me know if you have sent that stat to my lawyer & my juge.

Plese write back assap.

(Plese send the stuff with it)

Sincerly
/s/ Tim Eales

“MR. AHMAD)	IN THE MARION
EDWARDS”)	SUPERIOR COURT
V.)	ROOM 5 CRIMINAL
THE STATE)	DIVISION
OF)	CAUSE NO.
INDIANA)	496059907CF12
)	1975

<<stamped>> FILED SEP 26 2002 <<signature>>
Sarah M. Taylor CLERK
<<written>> 1 Oct 02 <<signature>>

“MOTION FOR COMPETNET
DRESS CODE”

AGENCY FORM [9001]

[p.1]

The agent Mr. Ahmad Edwards by the agency powers of Ambergress & Zenagencies an orgainzational agency with the

[continued on page ; 2 of ; 19]

[cont-“MOTION FOR COMPETNET
DRESS CODE”

[p.2] AGENCY FORM [9001]

substantial rights of the United States Constitution ; as executive rule the means for young American citizens to use element, power and forsights for other young American citizens to take on penalties as to the orgainzational agencies foregoing conclusion drawn and found by young American citizens failing negligents thats classified as antiest-ablishment therefor the Ambergress & Zenagencies agents

[continued on page ; 3 of 19]

“MOTION FOR COMPETNET
DRESS CODE”
AGENCY FORM [9001]

[p.3]

shall or/is leaning not toward antiestablishment or their attitudes of standards that avoid authoritative apparel ; as it is congressional intent the agency has interpreted the following statutory permissible construction

9-14-1-2. Corporate image for executive instinct of agency dress code includes the following rights:

[continued on page ; 4 of; 19]

cont-“MOTION FOR COMPETNET
DRESS CODE”
AGENCY FORM [9001]

[p.4]

9-14-1-2, “Corporate Image.”

- [1] Representing the public in the public in the agency eye, agent should dress conservatively
- [2] Each branch division office is exempted from part or all of the dress code upon argument that are valid or suggesting other parts of the country and or offices in the world; or:

[continued on page ; 5 of; 19]

[cont-“MOTION FOR COMPETNET
DRESS CODE”

[p.5] AGENCY FORM [9001]

9-14-1-2. “Corporate Image.”—

- [3] Executives in charge of blue-collar workers should dress like the workers ; or:
- [4] Upon amateur operations of nonverbal business that sales products or services to different citizens;
- [5] The women and men in marketing as well as executives in corporate they shall follow the competent dress code for and/or

[continued on page ; 6 of; 19]

[cont—"MOTION FOR COMPETENT
DRESS CODE"
AGENCY FORM [9001]

[p.6]

9-14-1-2. Corporate Image."—

- [5.] Of comfortable traditional attire reflecting convention logical, conservative competent positive adulthood alone or by agency advocate guidance therefor this "dress code" is ~~valid~~ valid for classmates potential to use the powers of the United States Constitution Article IV, § 4. Thereof: or to proximate cause of its misdiagnosis that lead to executive

[continued on page ; 7 of; 19]

[cont-"MOTION FOR COMPETENT
DRESS CODE"
AGENCY FORM [9001]

[p.7]

9-14-1-2."Corporate Image."—

injury negligence or trial by err for;

[6] All cases affecting ambassadors, public ministers and consuls thereof all admiralty and maritime jurisdiction herein the United States of America”

[7] Dress code [9-14-1-2]; as follows:

[A] Winter any material from wool

[continued on page; 8 of; 19]

[cont-“MOTION FOR COMPETNENT

DRESS CODE”

AGENCY FORM [9001]

[p.8]

[7]

[B] Upper-class neck twist and or tie from silk;

[C] Longsleeve full-custom material for shirts oxford cloth and only therein end-on-end weave;

[D] Dark socks of business and or hoes and only over –the calf material silk

[continued on page ; 9 of;19]

[cont—“MOTION FOR COMPETNENT

DRESS CODE”

AGENCY FORM [9001]

[p.9]

[7]

[E] Belts and belt buckles for business material of leather

[F] Any well-fitting jackets ~~lightnig~~ lightweight and haveyweight material from tweed camel hair, leather

[G] Predominant patterned scarves material
from silk and wool

[continued on page ; 10 of; 19]

[cont—"MOTION FOR COMPETNENT

DRESS CODE"

AGENCY FORM [9001]

[p.10]

[7]

[H] Footwear functional formal and leisure

[I] Pockets watch and or fob gold

[J] Ladies, and gentle man's leather band watch
thin plain and gold

[K] "Blazers"

[L] Red petite [4] button

[continued on page ; 11 of ; 19]

[cont—"MOTION FOR COMPETNENT

DRESS CODE"

AGENCY FORM [9001]

[p.11]

[7]

[K]

[II] Rich than petite [4] button or;

[] Deep green petite [4] button or;

[] Deep maroon petite [4] button or;

[] Dark brown pettite [2] button or;

[continued on page;12 of;19]

[cont—"MOTION FOR COMPETNENT
DRESS CODE"
AGENCY FORM [9001]

[p.12]

[7]

[K]

- [] Chccal gray petite [2] button or;
- [] Patern red & green strip on blue background petite [4] button or;
- [] Patern window pain gray on black background petite [4] button [as suit] or;

[continued on page ; 13 of; 19.]

[cont—"MOTION FOR COMPETNENT
DRESS CODE"
AGENCY FORM [9001]

[p.13]

[7]

[K]

- [] Patern brown and green stripe on black background petite [suit][4] button or;
- [] Patern green and red on blue stripe with white back ground petite [suit][4] button or;
- [] White and blue strip on gray back – ground petite

[continued on page ; 14 of; 19]

[cont—"MOTION FOR COMPETNENT
DRESS CODE"

AGENCY FORM [9001]

[p.14]

[7]

[K]

[] Solid navy camel hair [blazer petite] and

[L] Handbag

[M] Diamond tennis bracelet under 10 ct.

[N] Anniversary ring only.

[O] Earrings [diamond]

[continued on page;15 of;19]

[cont—“MOTION FOR COMPETNENT

DRESS CODE”

AGENCY FORM [9001]

[p.15]

This is directed to the young American citizens of the United States with being created for the value of young Americans to call then to the offical offices delegations of business and thereof the United States

So in so far as to direct all others: a white shirt and

[continued on page;16 of; 19]

[cont—“MOTION FOR COMPETNENT

DRESS CODE”

AGENCY FORM [9001]

[p.16]

conservative neck twist [only from silk] or tie shall crosse all racial age socioeconomic and or sex: proestablishment associates whom may have dealing

with this cause number : 4960599C7CF121975 on a regular basis, in an traditional manner of business as executives thereof the courts delegation for or upon the continuals

[continued on page ; 18 of ; 19]

[cont—“MOTION FOR COMPETENT

DRESS CODE”

AGENCY FORM [9001]

[p.17]

manner of business as executives thereof the courts delegation for or upon the continuals of this court :

Their shall be an suit: made by any designer that does not suit the unusual clothing of revolutions for the serious businessman and or businesswoman : of beige and or brown in the summer

[continued on page ; 18 of ; 19]

[cont—“MOTION FOR COMPETENT

DRESS CODE”

AGENCY FORM [9001]

[p.18]

Wherefor, the agency Ambergress & Zenagencies may provide law to help the young American citizen as agents we as an agency when speaking declaring powers discharged under the United States Constitution Article [5] Five Section [1] One, and thereof Amendments Twenty Section [3] Three proposed and

[continued on page ; 19 of; 19]

MR. AHMAD) IN THE MARION
EDWARDS) SUPERIOR COURT
V.) ROOM NO. 5
THE STATE) CAUSE NO.
OF INDIANA) 496059907CF12
) 1975

“ORDERS TO THE CLERK”

[p.1]

[1] Please furnish me Mr. Ahmad Edwards a filed copy of this [nineteen] 19 page motion for competinet dress code [agency form]

you might have recived;

I have sent you an

[continued on page, of;]

40%\60%

Legers

1. Majors stock
2. Trinty project
3. Trinty pro.
4. Accoiate
- 5.] 9-liner [films 1,
- 6.] Donations construction to hospital
- 7.] Loud class [issue 1,
- 8.] ~~MI~~ “Enmity” divison 1.-4.
- 9] U.S. Dept. of Housing, and Urban Developments
- 10] Endorcements bodybilders champisionchips
- 11] Ive leguage

[cont—“MOTION FOR COMPETENT
DRESS CODE”
AGENCY FORM [9001]

[p.19]

ratified respectively in United States Conventions
historically on April 26, 1933 therein the United
States Constitution and therefore order shall be the
emphasised law herein.

“I affirm, under the penalties for perjury that the
foregoing representations are true.

/s/ Ahmad Edwards
Ahmad Edwards
The Defendant
[C.E.O]

“MR. AHMAD) IN THE MARION
EDWARDS”) SUPERIOR COURT
V.) ROOM NO. 5
THE STATE) CRIMINAL DIVISION
OF INDIANA) CAUSE NO.
) 496059907CA21975

<<stamped>> FILED OCT 01 2002 <<signature>>
CLERK

<<written>> 1 Oc 02 Denied. Must be filed by
counsel. <<signature>>

“MOTION FOR TRANSCRIPT
OF PRIOR TRIAL”

[p.1]

Now comes the Defendant, Mr. Ahmad Edwards, to
the extent asto move this court to grant a motion
herein to provide the defendant the trial transcript at
state expense for the following reasons:

[continued on page ; 2 of; 7]

“MOTION FOR TRANSCRIPT
OF PRIOR TRIAL”

[p.2]

1. The Defendant Mr. Ahmad Edwards is a party to
this cause No. 496059907CA21975 herein this
Court Room No.5 of the criminal division in the
county of Marion in the state of Indiana an he
therein except as otherwise required by the
Constitution of the United States or provided by
act of Congress or in rules prescribed by the
Supreme Court pursuant

[continued on page ; 3 of; 7]

“MOTION FOR TRANSCRIPT
OF PRIOR TRIAL”

[p.3]

1. to statutory authority has the privilege and or right to the vision thereof this causes tried before a judge principles trial transcripts of prior reasoned experience with respect to an element of a claim or defense.
2. The Defendant Mr. Ahmad Edwards sees plain errors

[continued on page; 4 of;7]

“MOTION FOR TRANSCRIPT
OF PRIOR TRIAL”

[p.4]

2. affecting substantial rights and designating the defence to service the plain to errors to the attention of the court.
3. Therein this above stated cause number the defendant Mr. Ahmad Edwards” by the court was declared an defendant of competency to circumference on April 23, 2002.

continued on page; 5 of;7

“MOTION FOR TRANSCRIPT
OF PRIOR TRIAL”

[p.5]

4. The Defendant Mr. “Ahmad Edwards” trial is set for September 30,2002.
5. The Defendant is indigent.

Therefor the defendant is entitled as a matter of right, to the complete transcript of the above cause No. 496059907CA21975

[continued on page ; 6 of; 7]

“MOTION FOR TRANSCRIPT
OF PRIOR TRIAL”

[p.6]

proceeding that the defendant deems necessary as he intends to urge the evidence as not the contrary. Yet relevant to such finding. As is to be included as to file and serve parts of the transcript, with a statement of the issues that deems a transcript to be necessary. To circumference as the fortitude of the court and by the defendants right to

[continued on page; 7 of; 7]

“MOTION FOR TRANSCRIPT
OF PRIOR TRIAL”

[p.7]

trials therein at state expense; Britt v. North Carolina [1971] 404 U.S. 226.

Wherefore, the defendant Mr. Ahmad Edwards requests this court to grant this motion.

“I affirm under the penalties for perjury that the forgoing representations are true.

 /s/ Ahmad Edwards
Mr. Ahmad Edwards
The Defendant

MR. AHMAD) IN THE MARION
EDWARDS) SUPERIOR COURT
V.) ROOM NO. 5
THE STATE) CAUSE NO.
OF INDIANA) 496059907CF12
) 1975

“ORDERS TO THE CLERK”

[p.1]

[1] Please furnish me Mr. Ahmad Edwards a filed copy of this [sevan] 7 page motion for transcript of prior trial you might have received;

I have sent you an

[continued on page; 2 of; 2]

~~“IVE LEAGUE RECORDS”~~

1 ——— ~~Travel diary~~

2 ——— ~~Itinerayy~~

“ORDERS TO THE
CLERK

[p.2]

stamped self-addressed envelope so that this order may be provided

Thank you. As your office shall always be honored and ~~represe~~ respected.”

“I affirm, under the penalties for perjury that the foregoing representations are true.

/s/ Ahmad Edwards
Mr. Ahmad Edwards

09/24/2002

File.c.c.

- 166. Unit
- 167. Unto.
- 168. Vainless
- 169. Valiant

[cont-“ORDERS TO THE CLERK”]

[p.2]

stamped self-addressed envelope so that this order may be provided.

“Thank you. As your office shall always be honored an respected;

“I affirm, under the penalties for perjury, that the foregoing representations are true

09/24/2002

File.c.c.

/s/ Ahmad Edwards

Mr. Ahmad Edwards

~~C] Allegation of jurisdiction :~~

~~H] SC~~

MR. "AHMAD) IN THE MARION
EDWARDS") SUPERIOR
V.) COURT
THE STATE) ROOM NO.5
OF INDIANA)
) CAUSE NO.
) 496059907C
) F121975

<<stamped>> FILED OCT 03 2002 <<signature>>
CLERK OF THE MARION CIRCUIT COURT
<<written>> 17 Oct 02 Denied <<signature>>

"ORDERS TO THE CLERK"
AGENCY FORM [5005]

[p.1]

[1] Please furnish me Mr. Ahmad Edwards the forms;

- [A] L.R.8.1 Pro se
- [B] 42 U.S.C.§ 1983
- [C] 42 U.S.C.§ 405[G]

[continued on page; 2 of; 3]

"ORDERS TO THE CLERK"
AGENCY FORM [5005]

[p.2]

I Mr. "Ahmad Edwards" could not receive an "indigent pre-request envelope" to send your office for an edition of ways to exceed appropriate...so please acknowledge my filing with an official clerk of the circuit court envelope.

"I affirm under the penalties for perjury that the foregoing representations are true.

/s/ Ahmad Edwards

152a

Mr. Ahmad Edwards
[party]

File c.c.

10\6\2002

120. Pictour

121 PLI. DOR. LYS.

122. Plural

123. Possessives
Contractions

124. Possible

“Once again I’m veryed honored to order the services
of your;..”Zeal;”...”So I’V Used a degree somewhat at
the end measure of this true foregoing representation
has its power “squire”: <<drawn>> ☹ ☺

) IN THE MARION
) SUPERIOR
MR. "AHMAD) COURT ROOM.5
EDWARDS")
V.)
) CAUSE NO.
THE STATE) 496059907CF
OF INDIANA) 121975

<<stamped>> FILED OCT 23 2002 <<signature>>
 CLERK OF THE MARION CIRCUIT COURT
 <<written>> 25 Oct 02 Denied <<signature>>

“ DEFENDANTS PLEA”

[p.1]

The compelling circumstances of immunity that entitled I the defendant, Mr. Ahmad Edwards to bifurcated trials such as the statements sought to be obtained and statements made by the product of defence directly; indirectly are tantamount, paramount in this criminal trial

[continued on page; 2 of, 2]

[cont – “MOTION FOR COMPETENT DRESS CODE”

AGENCY FORM []

[cont- “DEFENDANTS PLEA”

[p.2]

and plainly moves I the defendant Mr. Ahmad Edwards by counsel at this court conduct of a pre-trial hearing to basis the not responsible by reason of insanity, verdict to the plea of tempary insanity.”

Wherefore I the defendant Mr. Ahmad Edwards plea for “tempary insanity,” verdict not responsible by reason of insanity.”

“ I affirm under the penalties for perjury, that the foregoing representations are true.

 /s/ Ahmad Edwards
Mr. Ahmad Edwards
The Defendant

MR. "AHMAD)	IN THE MARION
EDWARDS")	SUPERIOR
)	COURT ROOM
)	NO. 5
V.)	
)	CAUSE NO.
THE STATE)	496059907C
OF INDIANA)	F121975

<<stamped>> FILED OCT 23 2002 <<signature>>
CLERK OF THE MARION CIRCUIT COURT

<<written>> 25 Oct 02 <<signature>>

"NOTICE OF DEFENSE OF
MENTAL DISEASE AND/OR
DEFECT"

[p.1] AGENCY FORM [5100]

The defendant Mr. Ahmad Edwards hereby gives notice pursuant to I.C. 35-36-2-1 that the defendant intends to interpose the defense of mental disease and\or defect as set out in I.C. 35-41-3-6, and hereby moves the court to appoint

[continued on page; 2 of; 2]

cont-"NOTICE OF DEFENSE OF
MENTAL DISEASE AND\OR
DEFECT"

[p.] AGENCY FORM [5100]

three [3] competent disinterested psychiatrists to examine the defendant ~~Mr. Ahmad~~ "Ahmad Edwards; and to notify counsel of and\or the defence of the time and place of said examinations in advance so that counsel may be present at said examinations.

156a

“ I affirm under the penalties for perjury, that
the foregoing representations are true.

/s/ Ahmad Edwards
Mr. Ahmad Edwards
The Defendant

impermissibly persuasion is laying upon the court to
support Christian v. State whether the lesser offense
triggered with such allegation charged to inquiry
resolution for human constitua

PSYCHIATRIC EVALUATION

Name: Ahmad Edwards **Date of Exam:** November 26, 2002

Date of Birth: 1/29/73

Social Security Number: 309-78-9239

Cause Number: 49G05-9907-CF-121975

Charges: Attempted murder, criminal recklessness, battery, and theft

Purpose of the Examination:

The purpose of the examination was to determine Mr. Edwards' competency to stand trial.

Qualifications of Examiner:

Please refer to my curriculum vitae.

Informed Consent:

Mr. Edwards was informed that I was asked by his attorney, Robert Hill, to perform a psychiatric evaluation to determine his competency to stand trial. He was informed that I would be taking a complete psychiatric history and a mental status examination. He was further informed that the examination was not confidential and a report would be sent to Mr. Hill. Finally, he was informed that anything said could be used against him. He agreed to proceed.

Identification Information:

Mr. Edwards is a 29-year-old single black male inmate of the Marion County Jail. At the time of his arrest he was unemployed. The examination occurred in an interview room and lasted approximately 2 1/4 hours.

Records Reviewed:

1. Charges
2. Affidavit of probable cause
3. Police reports
4. FBI reports
5. Writings
6. Voluntary statement
7. Testimony of Dr. Trexler
8. Reports
 - a. Dr. Trexler
 - b. Dr. Masbaum (2)
 - c. Dr. Schuster (2)
9. Videotapes
 - a. Parisian surveillance video
 - b. News clips from various TV stations (3)
10. Psychiatric records from Logansport State Hospital

Psychiatric History:

Mr. Edwards has very little past psychiatric history. During the early 1990's he lived in Tennessee and saw a his mother's psychologist friend, Helen Lilord, for a couple of free sessions.

Mr. Edwards was hospitalized at Logansport State Hospital from 12/12/01 until March, 2002 for restoration of competency to stand trial. While there, Mr. Edwards was given no psychiatric diagnoses and no psychotropic medication although there were

numerous notations in his chart concerning grandiose delusions.

Exactly when his grandiose delusional system started is unclear to me because of Mr. Edwards' lack of insight and the lack of a reliable collateral informant for me to interview.

Legal History:

Mr. Edwards said that he had no prior felonies but was arrested previously on a trespassing misdemeanor when he was homeless.

Mr. Edwards was arrested on 7/12/99 for attempted murder, criminal recklessness, battery, and theft. According to the affidavit of probable cause and a various police and witness reports, Mr. Edwards was observed via video-surveillance to take a pair of shoes, put them in a sack, and then rapidly walk out of the downtown Indianapolis Parisian Department store. He was apprehended by a store employee, a scuffle ensued on the sidewalk, and the store employee received a minor gunshot wound to the shoulder. A bystander was also wounded in the leg by Mr. Edwards. Following the shooting, Mr. Edwards fled and was apprehended in a downtown parking garage by an FBI officer. During the arrest, Mr. Edwards was shot in the leg because he refused to drop his gun.

The following is Mr. Edwards' account of his alleged crime. In June, 1999 Mr. Edwards had been living briefly in Phoenix, Arizona with his mother and sister. Both returned to Indiana and lived with their grandmother. Mr. Edwards stayed with his grandmother for a week and then began living in

various shelters. When his sister obtained an apartment, he moved in with her.

He denied drinking or using drugs on the day of his alleged crime. He arose at 4:00 AM, dressed, left the apartment, and walked around until the soup kitchen at North United Methodist Church opened in the late morning. After eating, he ran downtown. He said that he was to meet a hip-hop artist at Circle Center Mall but that the artist would find him. He wandered by a shoe store on the second level and said that the proprietor asked him to come in and show a prospective employee how to dress. He then went to the Parisian Department Store, felt "nauseated and sick," "saw stars and static," and "blacked out." He came to, continued through Parisian, blacked out again and then found "some employees who were doing a horrific sweep of the business. People moved into the core of true activity. Many with the spirit and fellowship of people were being called into the inner core of the department store." He blacked out again. He found himself on the street engaged in a tussle with a man. His firearm spilled into the street. He thinks that the man may have been the artist whom he was supposed to meet. "It was programmed to be spectacular." He said that the man tried to grab his firearm but that he was able to get it and fire a warning shot into the air to stop the traffic. "It caused pandemonium and I panicked." He attempted to return to the sidewalk but it was blocked so he fired another shot at the man's feet. He thinks that the shot struck an "innocent man." He crossed the street, ran down an alley and entered a parking garage when he was shot by "a U.S. marshal" and was apprehended.

Medical History:

Mr. Edwards denies medical illnesses, previous surgeries, allergies, and any current medications. He is TB and HIV negative. In about 1995 he received a closed head injury in a motor vehicular accident, but there are no known aftereffects. He started smoking at age 8 and used to smoke four of packs of cigarettes per day.

Mr. Edwards gave an improbable drinking history. He said that he used to drink "48 tall Budweiser cans of beer" per day along with one pint of hard liquor. He said that he would drink this all in about two hours. He started drinking at age eight and said that he has had one or two alcohol-related blackouts. He denies ever having DT's.

Mr. Edwards snorted heroin when he lived in Florida in 1999. He also smoked marijuana from age 12 to 23. He denied the use of amphetamines, cocaine, hallucinogens, or sedatives.

Review of Systems:

Mr. Edwards complained of headaches associated with nausea and blurred vision. These may last 4-5 days. He has been told that he has a heart murmur.

Family History:

Mr. Edwards' parents never married. He said that his mother has a doctorate in divinity and lives in Arizona. His father was a drug abuser and was murdered in the 1970's. He has one sister, age 33, who he claims has been diagnosed with AIDS and is "seriously mentally ill." His grandmother died of an brain aneurysm.

Personal and Social History:

Mr. Edwards was born in Indianapolis. His developmental milestones are unknown. He claimed that he was physically abused by his step-father, a martial arts instructor. He said that he had dyslexia in grade school. He dropped out of school in the 11th grade and has not obtained his GED.

Mr. Edwards has previously worked in security and has been fired "quite a few times." He claimed that he had been "self-employed" prior to his arrest and that he worked with "entertainment clients." When he was in Florida he worked as a cook.

Mental Status Examination:

Mr. Edwards is a muscular man with average height and weight. He had short hair, beard and mustache. He was cooperative. There were no abnormal motor movements. His mood was neither depressed nor elated but was somewhat restricted. His thinking process was loose, illogical, circumstantial, and at times quite irrelevant. He had evidence of grandiose delusions (i.e., he was going to write several books, his mother was a Black Panther and worked for the CIA. He also said that he was with his mother when she worked for the CIA in the late 60's. He denied auditory hallucinations but said that he had a visual hallucination when he was living with his sister (i.e., he said a cloud in the apartment and it rained inside but didn't get the floor wet.) He was oriented to person, place and time. He knew the president, past president, both Indiana senators, but not the governor. He remembered three of three objects at five minutes. His intelligence appeared somewhat above average by use of his vocabulary. He has poor insight and judgment.

Diagnoses:

Axis I (Psychiatric Diagnoses):

1. Schizophrenia
2. Alcohol abuse by history
3. Heroin and marijuana abuse by history
4. History of dyslexia

Axis II: Deferred

Axis III (Medical Diagnoses):

1. History of closed head injury
2. Headaches

Axis IV (Psychosocial Stressors):

1. Death of grandmother
2. Incarceration and awaiting trial
3. High school dropout
4. Unemployed
5. Homeless

Axis IV (Global Assessment of Functioning):

Mr. Edwards' GAF scale score is 15 which indicates very severe mental illness.

Tests Administered:

Georgia Court Competency Test: Mr. Edwards' score on the Georgia Court Competency Test was 76%. He believes that people watching a trial "give spirit and fellowship" to a trial. He did not understand what criminal recklessness meant. Most importantly, his description of the alleged crime was grossly delusional.

Psychiatric Opinions:

These opinions are rendered to a reasonable degree of medical certainty. Opinions may change as further discovery proceeds.

Psychiatric Diagnoses:

In someone with a delusional system, at least three psychiatric diagnoses must be considered: schizophrenia, bipolar disorder (manic type), and delusional disorder. Because Mr. Edwards lacks a euphoric mood, hyper-talkativeness, pressured speech, etc., he cannot be diagnosed with bipolar disorder. He cannot be diagnosed as simply a delusional disorder either, because his symptoms include more than delusions (His thought process is markedly impaired with loose associations, illogic, irrelevance, and marked incoherence. His writings, including his voluntary statement, are good examples of his impaired thought process.). Because of his grandiose delusional system and his marked thought disturbances, his primary psychiatric diagnosis best fits schizophrenia.

Competency to Stand Trial:

Mr. Edwards is not currently competent to stand trial. Although he mostly understands the charges against him, he is unable to cooperate with his attorney in his defense because of his schizophrenic illness. His delusions and his marked difficulties in thinking make it impossible for him to cooperate with his attorney.

Recommendations:

In my opinion, Mr. Edwards is incompetent to stand trial and should be remanded to the Division of

165a

Mental Health and hospitalized at Logansport State Hospital where his competency to stand trial can be restored. He cannot be restored to competency without treatment of his schizophrenic illness with antipsychotic medication.

/s/ Philip M. Coons, M.D.

Philip M. Coons, M.D.

Professor Emeritus of Psychiatry

Indiana University School of Medicine

5. That the writings submitted to the Court by Ahmad Edwards are indications of his thought disorder and his inability to communicate and the court is asked to take judicial notice of all the writings as well as the last court appearance by Ahmad Edwards and his interaction with counsel and the Court.
6. That Ahmad Edwards has in the presence of counsel, Dr. Trexler, Dr. Mausbaum and in open court indicated he has a “protrusion” extending from his head and the Court will recall he, in fact, does not have such. His description of a “protrusion” is in fact symptomatic of his thought disorder.
7. That Ahmad Edwards is not able to effectively communicate with counsel so as to assist in his defense.
8. That Ahmad Edwards does not have adequate understanding of the role of the parties to proceed to trial.
9. That the State has been notified of this filing.

WHEREFORE, Robert Hill request the Court to find Ahmad Edwards incompetent and have him treated for his schizophrenic disorder at Logansport State Hospital and for all other relief just and proper in the premises.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Robert J. Hill

Robert J. Hill #8165-49

168a

GILROY, KAMMEN &
HILL

One Indiana Square

Suite 150

Indianapolis, Indiana

46204

(317) 236-0400

(317) 236-0404 fax

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing Pleading was served upon the Marion County Prosecutor's Office, 560 City-County Building, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204 via hand delivery this 27th day of November, 2002.

/s/ Robert J. Hill

Robert J. Hill

Attorney for Defendant

“Ambergress & Zenagencies”
[An Organzational Agency]

AGENCY
FORM
[096.]

[p.1] “RESONABLE CALCULATIONS”

<<stamped>> FILED DEC 02 2002 <<signature>>
Sarah M. Taylor CLERK

I.]

Over the minimum years of thirty [30] to appear and under the maximum years of thirty two [32]: in nine states accurate to this agency as an concern of the various states in the United States with the greatest populations.

II.]

In order to achieve employees labor, faith in business; the process this agency has stated in filed commerical trade secrets facing the circumstances of incident in the event to avoid torts to be brought against the courts table of many faces; so

[continued on page ;2 of; 14]

“Ambergress & Zenagency”
[An Orgainzational Agency]

[p.2] RESONABLE CALCULATIONS

II.]

shall be the specific form of secrets to govern square collecting the four hundred and seventy five dollars [\$475.] stated as the registration fee; from five thousand young American [5,000], citizens within communities of society. Between the ages of nineteen [19] and fourty [40].

[see: trade secret
step three [3]].

III.] With only about tewnty percent [20%] of the
young American citizens from the [9] nine base states
as the agency

[continued on page;3 of; 14]

“Ambergress & Zenagencies”
[An Organzational Agency]

[p.3] RESONABLE CALCULATIONS

III.]
valued possible locations ~~five~~ for events [concluding
and] well-runing logically for a heavy twenty five
weeks [25] for the organization to advance one artist
and one group by eliminating all others.

IV.]
Infered by the expediency of this type of agency
event and by the registrations average fee [to not at
any time have an discounted additional rate] with
American multiplication and division as means;[are]
equal to the amount of five billion three hundred
million eight three and seven hundred fifty thousand

[continued on page;4 of;14]

“Ambergress & Zenagencies”
[An Orgainzational Agency]

p.4] [IV.] RESONABLE CALCULATIONS

Dollars : such an abundant equation;

[A.]	5.000
x	475
	25.000
	35000

172a

+	20000
=	2375000
x	25
	1.875.000
+	4750000
=	59375000
x	9
=	538.375.000
x	10
	000000000
+	538375000
=	5.383.750.000

“the maximum”

[continued on page;5 of; 14]

Ambergress & Zenagencies

[An Orgainzational Agency]

[p.5] RESONABLE CALCULATIONS

V.]

Not to compare the advantages where the young Americans might earn extra money by the same terms they'll hear our public notices. Yet they will see new advanced ways to become of an profession.

VI.]

As such information contains an element essentialy for an full-term employment to and for the United States

Illustrateing with the ideal ten percent [10%] of young Americans in five [5] base states as the agency valued also these possible locations for events concluding twenty five weeks [25] to advance by exact-

[continued on page;6of; 14]

“Ambergress & Zenagencies”
[An Orgainzational Agency]

[p.6] REASONABLE CALCULATIONS

VII.]
ing all but one artist and/or group.

VIII.]
which causes properly the funds in the follwing
admissions made in regions adequat in regards to the
population.

IX.]
Abundant equation valued: second to the greatest
mission of the agency yet with the same process
stated in filed trade secrets of the titled
orgainzational agency “Ambergress & Zenagencies”
and/or protected by orders requesting such agency
documents into existence

[continued on page;7 of; 14]

“Ambergress & Zenagencies”
[An Orgainzational Agency]

[p.7] REASONABLE CALCULATIONS

IX.]
with the tabled laws of multiplication and division as
means: [are] equal to the amount of two billion three
hundred million seventy five hundred thousand
dollars such an abundant equation supplemented
what we’v combined to bring the young Americans an
fastened and large result harmonious to unite, creat,
merged reson to help them obtain the agency new
needed varieties uniformed by their signaturred
contracted appending to affix, the [youth’s] or young
Americans loyalty. Supreme giveing perfect exposure
the basic example

174a

[continued on page;8 of;14]

“Ambergress & Zenagencies”
[An Orgainzational Agency]
[p.8] RESONABLE CALCULATIONS

IX.] of traditional equations we’v oranged:

[A.]	4000
x	475
	20000
	28000
+	16000
=	1900.000
x	25
	9500000
+	3800000
	47500.000
x	5
=	237500000
x	10
	000000000
+	237500000
=	2.375.000.000

“The Fundamental Less”

[continued on page;9 of;14]

“Ambergress & Zenagencies”
[An Orgainzational Agency]

[p.9] RESONABLE CALCULATIONS

X.]

This dramatic low-cost method for protecting the lives and health of young American citizens should not or textures must not be waisted as this pattern help choices to purpose the excess needs of career strongly as the following methods are described or composed as one of the smallest definitions of matter but is explained to fund originally a great quantitie of ideals for honore clubs, to start wiser and more tactful exalited memberships thereof society injudicious equal to the amount of choice as[or]at one billion

[continued on page;10 of; 14]
“Ambergress & Zenagencies”

[An Orgainzational Agency]

[p.10] REASONABLE CALCULATIONS

X.] Four hundred million forty three dollars;

	[A.]		2000
	x		475
		=	10000
			14000
		+	8000
		=	950.000
		x	25
			5050000
		+	1900000
		=	24050000
		x	6
		=	144300000
		x	10
			000000000
		+	144300000
			1.4443.000000
		=	1.443.000.000

“The Minimum”

[continued on page;11 of;14]

“Ambergress & Zenagencies”

[An Orgainzational Agency]

[p.11] REASONABLE CALCULATIONS

XI.]

This is the claim in the next region of the young American population; “that the agencies that come in to town waste to much time and violate, damage, and breach the good faith of the young American citizens.” “As they would”! A lot of agencies in this type of ~~fil~~ field; “obligations to many of them –“is-and-all-ways”- will be without remdy. We reject this. Within our determination to amount to something more to the young Americans witch is what will constitute their support as we remedy these individual goals they’v set-forth as the basis to produce as we will not refuse, curtail, or lack

[continued on page;12 of;14]

“Ambergress & Zenagencies”

[An Orgainzational Agency]

[p.12] REASONABLE CALCULATIONS

XI.]

abandon or preclude. “There is no reson to” fortitude, temperance prudence for justice is what we are about at thirty million four hundred dollars [A]; 1000

x	475
	5000
	7000
+	4000
=	475000
x	1
=	475000
x	32
	950000
+	1425000
=	15200000
x	2

= 30.400.000
"The Sufficient"

[continued on page ;13 of; 14]

"Ambergress & Zenagencies"
[An Orgainzational Agency]

[13.] RESONABLE CALCULATION

XII.]

The:

Sufficient;	30.400.000
Minimum;	1.443.000.000
Fundament;	2.375.000.000
Maximum;	5.383.750.000
Total:	9.232.150.000

The mathematical consistency to unite the young American citizens to create under the United States Constitution of America Amendment Twenty Seven presenting their right to not be denied or abridged Article Twenty Six Section One that helps us develop for the young Americans citizens the axis enactment of

[continued on page; 14 of; 14]

"Ambergress & Zenagencies"
[An Orgainzational Agency]

[p.14] RESONABLE CALCULATION

XII.]

merged respects and/or the combining conditions the not often enouf used to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their

MR. "AHMAD EDWARDS") IN THE MARION) SUPERIOR COURT) ROOM.5) V.)
THE STATE OF INDIANA) CAUSE NO.) 496059907CF) 121975

<<stamped>> FILED DEC 02 2002 <<signature>>

Sarah M. Taylor CLERK

"PRACTICE ROUTINE"

[RULE 406 RULES OF EVIDENCE [HEREIN THE UNITED STATE]

ARTICLE IV

AGENCY FORM [9005]

As the evidence of the habit of routine of "Ambergress & Zenagencies" an organizational agency

[continued on page; 2 of; 9]

[cont-] "PRACTICE ROUTINE"[p.2]

follows:

[1.]

Article IV:limits:courts and magistrates United States rules of evidence rule 406.

"Routine Organization Executives Practice";

[2]

Indiana's Indianapolis

: City and state of practice :

[3]

Marion County at : 40 South Alabama.St [2-T]

: Place of practice :

[continued on page;3of; 9]

[cont-] "PRACTICE ROUTINE"]

[p.3]

[4]06/03/2002 06/ 11 /2002

Date of practice :

[5]

3;hours and 50;min

: Time of practice :

[6] "Equestra" "Ambergress & Zenagency
Zenagencies"; "Trinity Project"

: Groups that conducted organization :

[7]

Mr "Jason Majors"

Mr. "Ahmad Edwards"

[continued on page; 4 of;9]

[cont-] "PRACTICE ROUTINE"][p.4]

[7]

: Chief executive officers :

[A]

Determination of parties, consideration asto
conducted work to resolve ~~tradem~~ trademark groups ;

[B]

Amalgamation to reading truncated affidavit of
"trinity pro." Litigants amenable dispute ;

[C]

District process procedure to present third party
descrip-

[continued on page; 5 of; 9]

[cont-] “PRACTICE ROUTINE”]

[p.5]

[C]

tions to further, about stage of opportunity whole

[1]

“Third-party practice

is the trial rule 14-B” dialogue of Mr. “Ahmad
Edwards” [C.E.O]

[2]

Process unanimous asto deliberate upon the “face”;
before judge to open split recall thereof lawyers ;

[continued on page; 6 of;9]

[cont-] “PRACTICE ROUTINE”]

[p.6]

[C][3]

Petition parties file under or opening provision by
private orders to be partner ;

[D]

Sitting split up task recall by mentioned before
imagination seen relatively on; 06\03\2002 ; more in
language of court listing or the listing of another
court in the state maintaining willing to serve;

[continued on page; 7 of; 9]

[cont-] “PRACTICE ROUTINE”]

[p.7]

[E]

Remaining cross-claim to enter into as written to be filed therein with signatures concerning non-binding and or binding preferred yet clearly the end of time common to the law submitted by location ;

[8]

“Where no jurisprudential fall backs are; refinement shall help us resolve such an award”\

[continued on page ;8 of;9]

[cont-] “PRACTICE ROUTINE”]

[p.8]

[8] Mr. “Ahmad Edwards”:

“Cooperation of bearing powers asto uncertain situation thins liability-” there a phone is privileged the matter to discusse actions cause.”

: Mr. “Jason Majors”:

: Comments of chief executive officers within part [8] of this

[continued on page; 9 of;9]

[cont-] “PRACTICE ROUTINE”]

[p.9]

[8] this routine practice;

[9] 8:10;AM and\or;0810;HR

: quarm : ajurned : .

“We affirm, under the penalties for perjury, that the foregoing representations are true.

185a

/s/ Mr. Jason Majors
Mr. Jason Majors
[C.E.O]

s/ Ahmad Edwards”
Mr. Ahmad Edwards
[C.E.O]

186a

Dwight William Schuster M.D.

1016 TUCKAHOE
INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA 46260
(317) 259-1584

The Honorable Grant Hawkins, Judge
Marion County Superior Court
Criminal Division, Room Five
City-County Bldg.
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

December 31, 2002

Re: Ahmad Edwards
Cause Number 49G05-9907-CF-121975
Dear Judge Hawkins:

Pursuant to your appointment I have re-examined the above named defendant as to his competency to stand trial and as to his soundness of mind at the time of the alleged offense. My examination was carried out in a semi-private area of the Marion County Jail under satisfactory conditions. It was supplemented by a review of the Probable Cause Affidavit, a review of my two previous examinations of Mr. Edwards which included information from Logansport State Hospital with Psychological assessment in December, 2000.

Mr. Edwards recognized me from our previous meetings and understood the purpose of our meeting. He was agreeable to the exam and the report being sent to the Court. When questioned as to how he was at the time of the examination and what had happened since our last meeting on September 20, 2001 he told me that he had been experiencing headaches and shortness of breath and fainty

feelings. These sensations “come and go”. He said he had been taken to Wishard Hospital in November, 2002 and examined. I reviewed a report from Wishard Hospital which said Mr. Edwards had been seen in the Emergency area and diagnosed with tension headaches on November 25, 2002. Their examination was negative for a serious condition and he was prescribed Ibuprofen for pain relief.

When questioned as to his present mental state, Mr. Edwards told me that “I’m able to do whatever is necessary to complete but quality is deteriorating and the light headedness comes on”. He told me that he had seen a psychologist, Dr. Trexler and had been taken to Wishard Hospital on two occasions for testing. I know that Dr. Trexler does do neuropsychological testing which it appears that Mr. Edwards received. I have not

Ahmad Edwards – Cause # 9907-121975

seen the results of those tests. Mr. Edwards is in educational classes at the Jail and he was not in protective custody as he was when seen in September, 2001.

Mental status examination on December 16, 2002 revealed a well nourished man who did not appear to have any overt physical difficulties. He was alert, coherent and cooperative. He spoke easily and in great detail. His mood and affect were appropriate for the content of his thought and his situation. There were no unusual verbalizations or behavior during the examination which was one hour and a quarter in length. He went into obsessive detail about his life and actions in July, 1999. His accounting of his actions on July 12, 1999 was very much the same as

he related it to me on September 20, 2001. He stated that he knew that what he did that day was "illegal". In his words, " On the way out (of the store) I stole a pair of men's shoes. It was out of character for me to disvalue the authority of a major store and destroy or take their property.". He went on to describe the details of being chased and eventually being shot.

When questioned as to his understanding of legal procedures and his ability to stand trial he spoke in some detail about the adversarial nature of a trial and he said "I know the statements in the Probable Cause Affidavit to be the truth". He alleged he had not seen his attorney or anyone from his office for the past six months and he said that he, Mr. Edwards, had written out a request to be re-examined. He admitted that nothing in his life had changed since he had last talked with me. He expressed understanding that "the acts I committed that day were wrong" in referring to July 12, 1999.

I did not carry out a neurological exam of Mr. Edwards but my observations of his physical behavior and his ability to communicate and verbalize his thoughts and feelings did not suggest any gross impairment of his nervous system. He did make reference to his having been in an auto accident in 1995, "or maybe 1993", and his description sounded like he had had a scalp laceration which required sutures, but he was not an in-patient in a hospital nor did he receive any follow up treatment. By history he does have a Learning Disability but I have no school records or other objective reports on that.

Diagnostically Mr. Edwards presents as having a Personality Disorder, NOS. which means essentially that he has mixed personality traits such as

189a

obsessiveness and histrionics. I found no indication of delusional ideation or psychotic thinking or of Organic brain disorder.

Ahmad Edwards – Cause # 9907-121975

OPINION:

AS a result of my examination it is my opinion with reasonable medical certainty that Ahmad Edwards is competent to stand trial at the is time and that he was of sound mind, in the legal sense of that term, on or about July 12, 1999 in that he was not suffering from a mental disease or defect which impaired his appreciation of the wrongfulness of his conduct.

Sincerely,

/s/ Dwight W. Schuster
Dwight W. Schuster M.D.

190a

NED P. MASBAUM, M.D.

Forensic Psychiatry

P.O. BOX 3010

CARMEL, INDIANA 46082 USA

TELEPHONE (317) 846-7727 FAX (317) 575-1898

TOLL FREE (888) 203-7746

Web Site: www.FORNPSYCH.com

December 9, 2002

<<stamped>> FILED JAN 10 2003 <<signature>>
Doris Ann Sadler

Honorable Grant Hawkins, Judge
Marion Superior Court Criminal 5
W-305 City County Building
200 East Washington Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Re: Ahmad Edwards B/M 1/29/73 Cause No.
49G05-9907-CF-121975

Dear Judge Hawkins:

In accordance with your order, the above individual
was seen for a Psychiatric Examination.

PURPOSE OF EXAMINATION:

Provide an opinion regarding soundness of mind at
the time of the alleged offense(s).

Provide an opinion regarding Competence to Stand
Trial.

CHARGES AGAINST THIS INDIVIDUAL:

Count I: Attempt Murder, Class A Felony, 7-12-99

Count II: Battery, Class C Felony, 7-12-99

Count III: Criminal Recklessness, Class D Felony, 7-
12-99

Count IV: Theft, Class D Felony, 7-12-99

QUALIFICATIONS OF EXAMINER:

Enclosed please find a copy of my resume that states my qualifications to provide a psychiatric opinion regarding this individual.

DATE OF EXAMINATION:

12-9-2002

LOCATION OF EXAMINATION:

Marion County Jail, under satisfactory conditions.

DURATION OF EXAMINATION:

Approximately two (2) hours.

RECORDS AND INFORMATION AVAILABLE FOR REVIEW:

- 1.) Copy of the Probable Cause Affidavit and Charging Information.
- 2.) Copy of this individual's Criminal History.
- 3.) Copies of my previous Court Ordered Forensic Psychiatric Examinations dated, 12-22-99 & 10-3-2001.

Re: Ahmad Edwards B/M 1/29/73 Cause No.
49G05-9907-CF-121975

IDENTIFICATION DATA:

This individual provided the following information:

NAME: Ahmad NMN Edwards

AGE: 29

DOB: 1-29-73

SSN: 309-78-9239

This individual was advised that this was a court ordered non-confidential psychiatric examination and agreed to proceed.

ACCOUNT OF THE ALLEGED OFFENSE(S) BY THIS INDIVIDUAL:

He said, "That morning, I started to see delusions...I seen (sic) a black cloud above me that began to rain inside the apartment...I knew something was wrong...my sister (with whom he lived in an apartment) was abusing drugs...have you heard of second degree smoke...(my) sister had a habit with Cocaine...I didn't use any...(my) sister had a one room apartment...I left the apartment that morning...I had to deal with financial problems...I was extremely hungry...I went to the church (soup kitchen) at 38th and Meridian...I got a small bowl of soup and bread...I had no money. I had to walk. I walked straight down Meridian...I was to meet this guy between 10 AM and 12...I ran non stop downtown to the Circle Center Mall...I was a track runner in high school...I couldn't find the guy...in the general area of the food court...I was to talk to him about a full time career in entertainment...I have knowledge and experience in the entertainment industry...his name was Carlos or something like that...Carlos said that he was an illegal alien from Cuba...I couldn't find him...I was so tired from the walk...run there...it was kind of like sleep walking before I would fall asleep...I had my firearm on me...I always carried it...Carlos didn't show up...I waited around the food court 4-5 hours...I was in the process of leaving...I went through the Parisian exits...I picked up some property...I picked up a pair of shoes...I probably

subconsciously wanted them but I was coming in and out of a spell.”

When asked if he knew it was wrong at that time to take the shoes, he said, “At the time I had no opportunity to consider it...I had enough thinking power to stop myself...I was extremely weak...in the beginning of the day I felt so weak...I couldn’t get out the door (Parisian)...I was not breathing correctly...I wanted to lay down...I caught my breath...I got outside...I was attacked in the middle of the street...I was grabbed by this guy who worked for the Parisian...doing his job...after this crazy man...maniac trying to run off with shoes...we wrestled in the street...I believe I shot him.”

When asked about his present status regarding the alleged offenses, he said, “It is a question of my insanity. I’ve been having trouble with competency...it may be...the reason...of mental illness in my family...I mean physically competent...staying awake and alert...I feel a lot of stress and strain of what’s going on in the Court Room...I’m not understanding some of the charges...I don’t know how to explain it...I don’t know how to defend myself...I know what murder is and I know all the things alleged were definitely wrong...I know trying to murder someone should never be. I know property belongs to a person and not another. I don’t know how a person handles it in Court. At the hospital in Logansport, I wasn’t comfortable...in the quality of the courses there...I was there 3 months...one of the instructors there said it takes 6 months to get a person to become competent. My new trial date is January 15th...I’m looking at

Re: Ahmad Edwards B/M 1/29/73 Cause No.
49G05-9907-CF-121975

attempted murder, battery, criminal recklessness and theft. I was taught right from wrong. I don't understand how to get out of the situation. Is there some way for a man to defend himself to get out and receive some kind of mercy for the act...I don't know if a man has a natural instinct to defend himself...the charges are putting me in danger of my right to liberty. I know it was wrong. If I could just have a chance to learn from someone...I want some help...I'm having a pain in my forehead where I was scared there...an accident in 1995...an auto crash...a windshield lodged in my forehead...(treated) in ER visit only...I had a case of amnesia...didn't remember who I was a few years...that went into depression."

PAST MEDICAL HISTORY:

See report of prior exam. He is receiving no psychotropic medication at this time in jail. He said that he had been seen at Wishard last week due to headaches.

PERSONAL HISTORY:

See report of prior exam.

MENTAL STATUS EXAMINATION:

He was a black male who said that he was 5 ft 4 in tall and weighed 150 pounds which he said was down from a prior weight of 190-195 pounds before incarceration. He had a short haircut; he was neat in appearance, clean shaven and wearing clean orange jail garb. He was not in handcuffs. He was friendly, extremely polite, alert, cooperative and recognized me from past exams and testimony. He had no

disorganized speech. However, he rambled and provided much extraneous information spontaneously about his mother's medical problems, family "SMI" which he defined as "serious mental illness...in the blood...they say I am pretty delusional...I feel like some things...I can't think straight...effectively due to stress and depression...I believe I might drop dead...fall into coma...I was in a comatic stage...in and out of coma on the day of the crime." His demeanor was consistent with a personality disorder. He had no hallucinations at this time. He was able to apply abstract interpretations to proverbs. He was oriented. Although he said that he experienced memory problems, he demonstrated no memory deficit of recent nor remote events. When asked to perform some simple calculations, he tapped the left side of his forehead and said, "I've been having jerking right before a headache." He was able to determine the correct change from a dollar for a purchase. He could subtract only serial one 7 from 100 but subtracted 3 serial 3's from 20. He was able to name our President Bush. He was able to draw simple geometric designs that demonstrated no neurologic deficit.

Although he said that he did not understand the charges, his discussion of the charges demonstrated that he did understand the charges against him. He understands the charges are serious. He understands that if he is found guilty that he could receive a significant sentence. He understands the Criminal Proceedings. He understands a Plea Agreement and that it is a guilty plea. He was able to provide reasonable definitions of the roles of the Judge, Jury, Witnesses, Prosecutor and Defense Attorney.

DIAGNOSTIC IMPRESSION:

- 1.) Delusional Disorder, Grandiose Type 297.1, improved
- 2.) Personality Disorder NOS 901.9, Probable Malingering V65.2

Re: Ahmad Edwards B/M 1/29/73 Cause No.
49G05-9907-CF-121975

PSYCHIATRIC OPINION:

It is my opinion, based on reasonable medical certainty, that this individual, in spite of his disorders, does have comprehension sufficient to understand the nature of these proceedings. He is able to aid his attorney in his defense in accordance with I.C. 35-36-3-1.

Furthermore, it is my opinion, based on reasonable medical certainty that this individual, in spite of his disorders, was of sound mind at the time of the alleged offenses. He was able to appreciate the wrongfulness of his conduct at that time in accordance with I.C. 35-41-3-6.

Sincerely,

/s/ Ned P. Masbaum,
M.D.

Ned P. Masbaum, M.D.

NPM/em

MR. "AHMAD EDWARDS"
V.
THE STATE
OF INDIANA

) IN THE MARION
) SUPERIOR COURT
) ROOM NO. 5
) CAUSE NO
) 496059907
) CF12975

<<stamped>> FILED MAR 21 2003 <<signature>>
CLERK OF THE MARION CIRCUIT COURT

"ADMISSION OF FACTS
AND NOTICE OF DEFENSE
OF MENTAL DISEASE AND
OR DEFECT"

[p.1]

The defendant, Mr. "Ahmad Edwards" by counsel,
does hereby freely and voluntarily admit that the
following facts are true:

[continued on page;2 of ;7]

cont-"ADMISSION OF FACTS
AND NOTICE OF DEFENSE
OF MENTAL DISEASE AND
OR DEFECT"

[p.2]

1. Evidence exists and the court should not deny and observe its results as scientific.
2. That for a judge the defendant biological systems are possible to conceive by testimony highly intelligent witch also draws a conclusion written.
3. The complexity of the

[continued on page;3 of; 6 7]

cont-“ADMISSION OF FACTS
AND NOTICE OF DEFENSE
OF MENTAL DISEASE AND
OR DEFECT”

[p.3]

3. simplest known type blood cell is so great in the defendant it is not impossible to accept such blood cells of molecular chemical composition has been the reason for his conduct.
4. The element of the functional gene would be complex beyond a juries capacitie of intelligence.

[continued on page; 4 of; 7]

cont-“ADMISSION OF FACTS
AND NOTICE OF DEFENSE
OF MENTAL DISEASE AND
OR DEFECT”

[p.4]

5. The complexity of the defendant Mr. Ahmad Edwards blood systems are not the only manifested issue, Independently a function of his inability that result in behavior reasoning, judgment deterioration “obvious” or impairment “substantial” and needs of human essential shelter, clothing, food, he is unable to provide for he is in danger of coming

[continued on page;5 of;7]

cont-“ADMISSION OF FACTS
AND NOTICE OF DEFENSE
OF MENTAL DISEASE AND
OR DEFECT”

[p.5]

5. to harm as a result of mental illness the means of a condition in which an individual, is gravely disabled.”

The defendant further says and hereby gives notice pursuant to Indiana Code [I.C.] sole defense is that he is not responsible under Indiana Code [I.C.] 35 41-3-6 for his conduct because he lacked the

[continued on page;6 of;7]

cont-“ADMISSION OF FACTS
AND NOTICE OF DEFENSE
OF MENTAL DISEASE AND
DEFECT”

[p.7]

5. Substantial capacity to appreciate the wrongfulness of his conduct and\or to conform his conduct to the requirements of t law, as the result of a mental disese and or defect.

[Attorney]

We affirm, under the penalties for perjury that the foregoing representations are true.

Date 03/19/2003

/s/ Ahmad Edwards
Mr. Ahmad Edwards

200a

Mr. "Ahmad Edwards"
GA #494657
Marion County Jail
40 South Alabama Street
Indianapolis, Indiana
46204

March 19, 2003

Clerk of Court
Criminal Division 5
200 East Washington
Street Indianapolis
Indiana 46204

Re: "ADMISSION OF FACTS
AND NOTICE OF DEF-
ENSE OF MENTAL
DISEASE AND OR
DEFECT "CAUSE NO.
496059907CF12975

[continued on page;2 of;2]

[p.2]

Dear Clerk:

Enclosed you will find the original of this "ADMISSION OF FACTS AND NOTICE OF DEFENSE OF MENTAL DISEASE AND OR DEFECT." Please, cause this document to bear the courts seal and present it to the court for its consideration returning a file marked copy to myself.

Thank you for your time and attention to this filing.

Sincerely, /s/ Ahmad Edwards

Mr. Ahmad Edwards

201a

cc: file

~~cont "ADMISSION OF FACTS
AND NOTICE OF DEFENSE
OF MENTAL DISEASE AND
OR DEFECT"~~

~~[p.6]~~

~~—— 5. duct which took the life of~~

) IN THE MARION
) SUPERIOR
MR. "AHMAD) COURT ROOM
EDWARDS") 5 CRIMINAL
) DIVISION
PETITIONER.)
V.) CAUSE NO.
)496059907
THE STATE OF) CF121975
INDIANA)
RESPONDENT.)

<<stamped>> FILED MAY 14 2003 <<signature>>
 CLERK OF THE MARION CIRCUIT COURT

<<written>> 15 May 03 Denied <<GWH>>

"PETITION FOR HEARING
 UNDER IC 12-26-12-2"

[AGENCY FORM [M-Z]

[p.1]

[continued on page; 2 of;5]

"PETITION FOR HEARING
 UNDER IC 12-26-12-2"

[AGENCY FORM [M-Z]

[p.2]

A therapy order has been issued on the petitioner Mr. Ahmad Edwards is entitled to a review of the order for the petitioner to enter a therapy program under § 1 [IC 12-26-14-1]

At the review of the order the petitioner is entitled to present evidence concernig his mental condition under [I C 12-26-12-6]

[continued on page;3 of;5]

“PETITION FOR HEARING
UNDER IC 12-26-12-2”

[AGENCY FORM [M-Z]

[p.3]

If a hearing is not held within twenty [20] days of the filing of this petition the court shall discharge the petitioner Mr. Ahmad Edwards under [I.C. 12-26-12-5]

The petitioner or the patient Mr. Ahmad Edwards therein the Marion County Jail has given identifying information to the health officer or agent of the health officer or superintendent that witch determines the petitioner

[continued on page ; 4 of; 5]

“PETITION FOR HEARING
UNDER IC 12-26-12-2”

[AGENCY FORM [M-Z]

[p.4]

The petitioner alleged to be mentally ill has the right to be present at the review hearing relating to the petitioners mental health or well-being under [IC 12-26-2-2]

The petitioner has been the subject of commitment orders and judgment proceeding on April 29, 2003

[continued on page; 5 of; 5]

“PETITION FOR HEARING
UNDER IC 12-26-12-2”

[AGENCY FORM [M-Z]

[p.5]

The petitioner Mr. Ahmad Edwards has the right to exercise the rights described in the 42 § 10841 without reprisal including reprisal in the form of denial of any appropriate, available treatment.

WHEREFORE the petitioner commands this court to set this matter for hearing.

“I affirm under the penalties for perjury, that the foregoing representations are true

/s/ Ahmad Edwards”

Mr. Ahmad Edwards

[petitioner]

205a

“ORDERS TO THE CLERK”

Dear : Clerk Please

- 1] Copy and file this petition for hearing under I.C. 12-26-12-2 ;
- 2] and return a filed stamped copy to me the petitioner Mr. Ahmad Edwards

“Thank you” and have a happy Mother’s Day!

/s/ Ahmad Edwards

Mr. Ahmad
Edwards
[Petitioner]

STATE OF INDIANA) IN THE MARION
COUNTY OF MARION) COUNTY SUPERIOR
STATE OF INDIANA) COURT
VS.) SS: CRIMINAL
AHMAD EDWARDS) DIVISION, ROOM 5
) CAUSE NO. 49G05-9907-
) CF-121975

<<stamped>> FILED NOV 24 2003 <<signature>>

FINDINGS OF FACT

A hearing on the competency of defendant, Ahmad Edwards, was held on April 29, 2003.

1. Three (3) psychiatrists and one (1) psychologist testified at that hearing, namely Dr. Dwight Schuster, Dr. Ned Mausbaum, Dr. Phillip Coons and Dr. Lance Trexler.
2. All of the doctors indicated that Ahmad Edwards had a delusional disorder.
3. Dr. Schuster testified that Ahmad Edwards has a delusional disorder and that he had the delusional disorder before the original finding of incompetency at a prior hearing in this case. Following that hearing Ahmad Edwards was found incompetent and transferred to the Logansport State Hospital for evaluation and treatment.
4. Dr. Schuster testified that upon reexamination for the hearing, Ahmad Edwards still has a delusional disorder, but it was improved. Dr. Schuster was unable to comment on the treatment received by Ahmad Edwards while placed at

Logansport State Hospital. Dr. Schuster thought Ahmad Edwards competent to stand trial.

5. Dr. Mausbaum likewise diagnosed Ahmad Edwards on having a delusional disorder before his first finding of incompetency. According to Dr. Mausbaum that disorder persists to the present. Dr. Mausbaum testified that Ahmad Edwards received no medication and no formalized therapy while at Longansport State Hospital.
6. Both doctors Schuster and Mausbaum described Ahmad Edwards communication skills as loose and convoluted. Dr. Mausbaum recalled Ahmad Edwards describing a “protrusion” from his head that Dr. Mausbaum observed did not exist.
7. Dr. Coons, Professor of Psychiatry at Indiana University Hospital, examined Ahmad Edwards prior to this hearing and reviewed Ahmad Edwards’ medical records from Logansport State Hospital.
8. Dr. Coons indicated that within a reasonable degree of medical certainty a delusional disorder could not be corrected without intervention involving medication.
9. While at the Isaac Ray Unit, Logansport State Hospital, Ahmad Edwards received no medication that would address the delusional disorder.
10. Dr. Coons testified that found Ahmad Edwards to have a schizophrenic disorder, delusional type. This disorder is evidenced by loose, convoluted thinking, perhaps hallucinations and, in this case, delusions.

11. Dr Coons stated that Ahmad Edwards manifests all such symptoms of this disorder and that Ahmad Edwards' condition is not likely to improve without medications and therapy. Ahmad Edwards' condition prevents him from being able to understand and meaningfully function in the legal system. Ahmad Edwards' condition prevents him from being able to understand and meaningfully communicate with his attorney about this case.
12. Dr. Coons further stated that review of the record of Ahmad Edwards, while at Logansport State Hospital, Isaac Ray Unit, disclosed:
 - a. That there was no therapeutic intervention with medication or otherwise; and
 - b. That the records were filled with notes from professional staff people at the Isaac Ray Unit of bizarre, convoluted, loose and delusional thoughts and communications.
13. Dr. Lance Trexler, a neuropsychologist interviewed Ahmad Edwards before and after his placement with the Isaac Ray Unit at the Logansport State Hospital. He also tested Ahmad Edwards for brain damage. Dr. Trexler agrees that:
 - a. That Ahmad Edwards is incompetent in that he cannot communicate meaningfully about his case;
 - b. That he certainly has a delusional disorder and is most likely schizophrenic;
 - c. That Ahmad Edwards also has possible brain damage that needs to be tested after

therapeutic intervention. This needs to be done to rule out brain damage as a possible cause of his incompetency; and

- d. That Ahmad Edwards did show signs of a neuropsychological deficit.
14. Mark Jones, an attorney and public defender in Marion County and formally one of Ahmad Edwards' appointed counsel, testified that:
- a. He felt Ahmad Edwards was not competent to stand trial;
 - b. He never had been able to hold a meaningful conversation with Ahmad Edwards about the case;
 - c. He agreed with the description of Ahmad Edwards' communication and thoughts being loose, convoluted, delusional and generally not making any sense; and
 - d. He felt Ahmad Edwards is incapable of meaningful communication about his legal situation.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

STATE OF INDIANA) IN THE MARION
COUNTY OF MARION) SUPERIOR COURT
) SS:
) CRIMINAL DIVISION,
STATE OF INDIANA) ROOM V
VS.) THE HONORABLE
<<written>>) <<written>> GRANT
AHMAD EDWARDS) HAWKINS JUDGE
) CAUSE NO. <<written>>
) 99121975

<<stamped>> FILED NOV 24 2003 <<signature>>

COMMITMENT ORDER
INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL
HEALTH

TO THE MARION COUNTY SHERIFF:

This cause came to Court for hearing on Court's own Motion for Psychiatric Examination alleging the Defendant has insufficient comprehension to understand the nature of the criminal action against him and the proceedings therein. Evidence was submitted on the oral testimony and written reports of two competent disinterested psychiatrists. Court did find that the Defendant does not have sufficient comprehension to understand the nature of the criminal action against him and the proceedings therein and to make his defense.

IT IS THEREFORE, ORDERED, AJUDGED, AND DECREED, that the Defendant, <<written>> Ahmad Edwards, be committed to the care and custody of the Indiana Department of Mental Health for evaluation and treatment, and the Indiana Department of Mental Health is hereby directed to file a written

report to this Court within a period of ninety (90) days stating therein its findings as to whether or not there is substantial probability that he will attain the capacity to understand the proceedings in the foreseeable future.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED by the Court that Indiana Department of Mental Health continue to evaluate <<written>> A. Edwards, and if he is unable to understand the proceedings and assist in the preparation of his defense within six (6) months after the date of his admission to a psychiatric institution, the Department of Mental Health shall institute regular commitment proceedings under IC 16-14-9.1.

/s/ G Hawkins

Honorable <<written>> G.
Hawkins, Judge
Marion County Superior Court
Criminal Division, Room Five

DATE: <<written>> 11-24-03

212a

<<masthead>>

Indiana Family & Social Services Administration
"People helping people help themselves"

Joseph E. Kernan, Governor
State of Indiana

Logansport State Hospital
Division of Mental Health and Addiction

1098 S. STATE ROAD 25
LOGANSPO, IN 46947-9699
574-722-4141
FAX: 574-735-3414
TDD: 574-732-0069

<<stamped>> FILED JUN 01 2004 /s/ Doris Anne
Sadler

IMPORTANT MEDICAL INFORMATION
ENCLOSED

May 28, 2004

Honorable Grant W. Hawkins
Marion Superior Court, Criminal Div. #5
200 East Washington St., Room W-305
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Dear Judge Hawkins:
Re: Ahmad Edwards
Cause # 49G05-9907-CF-121975

Attached please find a copy of Ahmad Edwards'
Comprehension to Stand Trial Report completed by
Robert J. Sena, M.D.

213a

After three months hospitalization, Mr. Edwards has not been found competent to stand trial, but the possibility of his becoming competent does exist. Therefore in accordance with IC 35-36-3-3, we have not petitioned the court for commitment proceedings, but will submit a report six months from the date of his admission to this hospital.

Sincerely,

/s/ Jeffrey H. Smith
Jeffrey H. Smith, Ph.D.
Superintendent
Cc: Steve Sarris, IDMH, Legal

Enclosure

I swear and affirm, under the penalties of perjury, that the foregoing statements are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

<<written>> 5-28-04
/s/ Jeffrey H. Smith

<<written>> 1 Jun 04
Copy to all
counsel record!
GWH

www.IN.gov/fssa
J.C.A.H.O. Accredited
Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer
<<Seal of the State of Indiana>>

Indiana Family and Social Services Administration
Logansport State Hospital
Logansport, IN

Comprehension To Stand Trial Report

5-28-04

IDENTIFYING DATA:

Ahmad (NMN) Edwards is a 31 year-old single black male from Marion County (Indianapolis, IN), who was admitted here to the Isaac Ray Treatment Center (IRTC) of Logansport State Hospital (LSH) on 1-27-04, after being found to have Insufficient Comprehension to Stand Trial on 11-24-03 in the Marion Superior Court, Criminal Division Room 5, under Cause No. 49G05-9907-CF-121975.

He has the following 4 pending charges arising from this reported behavior on or about 7-12-99:

- Attempt Murder (Class A Felony)
- Battery (Class C Felony)
- Criminal Recklessness (Class D Felony)
- Theft (Class D Felony)

SOURCES OF INFORMATION:

1. My face-to-face interviews of Ahmad Edwards at LSH/IRTC lasting 1 hour 45 minutes on 5-27-04 and 40 minutes on 5-8-04.
2. His medical records at LSH/IRTC, including his hospital chart of 1-27-04 to 5-28-04.
3. The Commitment Order dated 11-24-03.
4. The Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law in Marion Superior Court, Criminal Division, Room 5, dated 11-17-03.

5. The Confinement Authority Order of the IFSSA dated 12-8-03.
6. The Information sheet for the charges dated 7-15-99.
7. The Affidavit for Probable Cause dated 7-12-99.
8. The Criminal History report dated 7-13-99.
9. The Neuropsychological Examination report by Lance E. Trexler, Ph.D. dated 2-23-00.
10. The competency to stand trial report by Dwight W. Schuster, M.D. dated 10-2-01.
11. The Psychiatric Examination report by Ned P. Masbaum, M.D. dated 12-9-02.
12. The Psychiatric Evaluation by Philip M. Coons, M.D. dated 11-26-02.
13. Ahmad Edwards' LSH/IRTC records from his admission of 12-12-00 to 3-27-01 under the psychiatric care of Steven H. Berger, M.D.

STATEMENT OF NON-CONFIDENTIALITY:

Mr. Edwards was advised that the purpose of the interviews of 5-27-04 and 5-28-04 was to determine whether he now has sufficient comprehension to stand trial. He understands and agrees that any relevant information obtained would not be confidential because it would be shared with the court.

PRESENT CONDITION:

Mr. Edwards is presently calm and cooperative. He is able to participate appropriately in lengthy forensic interviews today and yesterday. However, he is

manifesting psychotic symptoms of hallucinations and

Ahmad Edwards, #3915

DOA: 1-27-04

DOB: 1-29-73

5/28/2004

Page 1

disorganized thought processes. Despite his mental disorder, he responds positively to psychoeducation and pharmacologic recommendations.

PHYSICAL HEALTH:

No serious physical health problems at this time. He reports a history of severe pain in his left frontal scalp area after head injury in a motor vehicle accident, and neurological pain in his left leg after a gunshot injury. Both of these pain areas have improved significantly under treatment with Trileptal and Motrin in recent months.

COURSE OF TREATMENT:

Mr. Edwards has been under active treatment here since his admission on 1-27-04, and he is receiving the full program of pharmacotherapy, individual and group psychotherapy, counseling from the professional staff of the various disciplines, milieu therapy, and educational classes in Legal Education, Coping Skills, Anger Management, Social Skills, ICST Groups, Men's Issues, and Recreational Therapy.

He has been treated here for the past 4 months for the following problems:

- Schizophrenia, with symptoms of disorganized thought processes, delusional ideation,

hallucinations, and ideas of reference. These symptoms responded well to treatment with Zyprexa 20 mg per day. However, Zyprexa was stopped after he developed side effect problems. Then he was prescribed Abilify starting on 4-23-04. In the past 2 weeks, he has been experiencing a recurrence of frequent and bothersome visual hallucinations, and occasional auditory hallucinations.

- Depression, with symptoms of suicidal ideation, low self esteem, irritability, and sadness. These symptoms have been substantially relieved by Wellbutrin SR 300 mg per day.
- Neuropathic pain in the scalp and left leg (he reports a history of severe pain in his left frontal scalp area after head injury in a motor vehicle accident, and neurological pain in his left leg after a gunshot injury). Both of these pain areas have improved significantly in recent months under treatment with Trileptal 600 mg twice per day and Motrin 800 mg twice per day.
- ICST status. He is progressing in his comprehension of his charges and the court proceedings in his case. On 5-26-04, he passed the final written examination in Legal Education II on the 4th attempt, answering 61 questions correctly out of 75.

Concerning his behavior in the past 4 months, he has received only 1 restriction for a rule violation, which occurred on 2-9-04 and which was likely triggered by his mental disorder. He has not been physically aggressive here. He is generally described as polite and cooperative.

PRESENT MEDICATION:

- 1). Abilify 15 mg each morning for Schizophrenia.
- 2). Prolixin 5 mg twice per day, added on 5-28-04 for Schizophrenia.
- 3). Wellbutrin SR 150 mg twice per day for depression.
- 4). Trileptal 600 mg twice per day for neuropathic pain in the scalp and left leg.
- 5). Motrin 800 mg twice per day, added on 4-12-04 for left leg pain.
- 6). Benadryl 50 mg each day at bedtime for insomnia.

MENTAL STATUS EXAMINATION:

Appearance: He appears to be a black male in his early thirties, who is 64" tall and weighs 165 lbs. He has very short (1/8 inch) black hair, brown eyes, 1 or 2 day beard stubble, good grooming, and good eye contact.

Ahmad Edwards, #3915

DOA: 1-27-04

DOB: 1-29-73

5/28/2004

Page 2

Attitude: Cooperative.

Behavior: Unremarkable.

Speech: His speech is easy to hear and understand. He is talkative, and will elaborate extensively (if permitted to do so) when answering questions, becoming circumstantial and tangential in the process.

Thought processes: His speech reveals disorganized thought processes of a mild to low-moderate degree. For example, when I asked him will he be able to assist his attorney, he answered “The communication is still not there, for accuracy. It will be an overwhelming prejudice (sic) case for me and my attorney.”

Thought content: He voices some delusional ideation, such as (1) “I used to manage country music” (2) “The charges were dismissed” and (3) “The bone shifts (referring to the left frontal area of his scalp)”.

Perceptual abnormalities: He reports having bothersome, frequent “visions”, i.e. visual hallucinations, and occasional auditory hallucinations. He admits having a history of ideas of reference, thinking that people on television were talking to him or about him.

Mood/affect: Mood appears to be level (normal). His affect is appropriate to thought content. He shows no tearfulness, no anger, and no laughter. He smiles occasionally.

Impulse control: No problems in this area during the interview.

Suicidal and/or homicidal behavior/ideation: He denies having any present suicidal or homicidal ideation, and there is no evidence that he has any present desire, plan, or intention to harm himself or anyone else.

Cognitive functioning examination: He did not know the month or day, but knew the year. He recalled the exact date 5 minutes later after one prompt. He pays good attention. His memory is intact in all spheres

(immediate, recent, and remote). He states his exact charges and their felony levels.

Intellectual functioning: Low-average range.

Insight and judgment: Fair. He realizes that he has a mental illness, and he is agreeable to continue taking prescribed medications.

DIAGNOSES:

Axis I: Schizophrenia, Undifferentiated Type,
295.90 Depressive Disorder Nos, 311

Axis II: No diagnosis

Axis III: Posttraumatic neuropathic pain in the scalp
and left leg

Axis IV: Pending legal problems

Axis V: Present Global Assessment of Functioning
(GAF): 40 (indicating some impairment in reality
testing and communication) Highest GAF in past
year: 40.

McGARRY CRITERIA:

The following are the McGarry criteria for competence, and my determination of whether he fulfills each criterion. My determination is based upon my judgment regarding the information gathered during my interview with him, and information found in his psychiatric record.

Ahmad Edwards, #3915

DOA: 1-27-04

DOB: 1-29-73

5/28/2004

Page 3

1. Does he have the ability to appraise the legal defenses available to him? Yes. He is able to name his attorney, and acknowledges that he needs the attorney's help for his criminal case.
2. What is the level of his unmanageable behavior? Absent.
3. What is the quality of the anticipated manner in which he will relate to his attorney? He will likely be willing to assist his attorney, but due to his present impairments of disorganized thought processes, delusional ideation, and bothersome hallucinations, his ability to discuss important and necessary matters with his attorney, and to remain focused on those matters, will likely be compromised to a significant degree.
4. Does he have the ability to plan a legal strategy? Yes, in cooperation with his attorney, but subject to the same impairments explained in #3.
5. Does he have the ability to appraise the roles of the participants in the courtroom proceedings? Yes, to a fairly good degree.
 - a) For example, when asked to explain the role of the prosecuting attorney in the courtroom, he responded "He is to get the conviction of the defendant, to represent the state. He introduces evidence against me."
 - b) The role of the defense attorney is "He represents the defendant, he objects, introduces evidence."
 - c) The role of the judge in the trial is: "To preside over the court. He works with the sentences at the end. He rules on objections."

- d) Will you get a fair trial? “No.” Why? “Due to security.”
 - e) He shows a good understanding of the role of a jury.
6. Does he understand the procedures of court? Yes, to a fairly good degree. He understands that the attorneys will call witnesses and question them in the trial. He understands about the cross-examination of witnesses, the raising of objections, and the rulings on objections. He understands when he should speak in the courtroom, and when he should not speak. He understands the meaning of a plea bargain.
 7. Does he have an appreciation of the charges against him? Yes. He correctly states his exact charges and their severity levels. He understands the seriousness of the charges.
 8. Does he have an appreciation of the range and nature of the possible penalties he faces? Yes. He cites an accurate sentence total if he is convicted of all charges.
 9. Does he have the ability to appraise the likely outcome of the charges against him? Yes.
 10. Does he have the capacity to disclose to his attorney available pertinent facts surrounding the offense? Yes, but subject to the same impairments explained in #3.
 11. Does he have the capacity to challenge prosecution witnesses realistically? Yes, but subject to the same impairments explained in #3.

12. Does he have the capacity to testify relevantly?
Yes, but subject to the same impairments explained in #3.
13. Does he manifest self-serving motivation or self-defeating motivation? Self-serving motivation.

SUMMARY:

Ahmad Edwards is a 31 year-old single black male from Marion County (Indianapolis, IN), who was admitted here to the Isaac Ray Treatment Center (IRTC) of Logansport State Hospital (LSH) on 1-27-04, after being found to have Insufficient Comprehension to Stand Trial on 11-24-03 in the Marion Superior Court, Criminal Division, Room 5. He is charged with Attempt Murder (Class A Felony), Battery (Class C Felony), Criminal Recklessness (Class D Felony), and Theft (Class D Felony), arising from his reported behavior on or about 7-12-99.

Ahmad Edwards, #3915

DOA: 1-27-04

DOB: 1-29-73

5/28/2004

Page 4

He has been treated here for the past 4 months for Schizophrenia, depression, neuropathic pain in the scalp and left leg, and ICST status. His symptoms of Schizophrenia, which started before or during this teenage years, include disorganized thought processes, impairment in verbal communication, delusional ideation, hallucinations, and ideas of reference.

He continues to experience bothersome visual hallucinations and occasional auditory hallucinations. He continues to manifest disorganized thought processes, which impair his ability to communicate verbally. He voices some delusional material. His behavior is appropriate. He passed the final examination in Legal Education II on 5-26-04, answering 61 questions correctly out of 75.

Concerning his present comprehension to stand trial, my conclusions are as follows:

- 1). He understands his charges, their severity, and the possible sentence range if he is found guilty.
- 2). He has a fairly good understanding of the legal proceedings in his case.
- 3). He is demonstrating multiple problems with his mental status (including hallucinations, delusional ideation, and disorganized thought processes) which would likely significantly impair his ability to assist his attorney in the defense, and to render requisite attention in the courtroom proceedings.

OPINION:

Therefore, in my opinion, to a reasonable degree of medical certainty, Ahmad Edwards continues to manifest insufficient comprehension to stand trial. I estimate that there is a 65% probability that he will attain the ability to understand the proceedings and assist in the preparation of his defense within the next 2 months of treatment here.

/s/ Robert J. Sena
Robert J. Sena, M.D.

225a

Staff Forensic Psychiatrist
Indiana Physician License
#01055412A
Diplomate, American Board
of Psychiatry and
Neurology, 1991
Logansport State
Hospital/Issac Ray
Treatment Center
5-28-04, rjs

Ahmad Edwards, #3915

DOA: 1-27-04

DOB: 1-29-73

5/28/2004

Page 5

226a

<<masthead>>

Indiana Family & Social Services Administration

“People helping people help themselves”

Joseph E. Kernan, Governor
State of Indiana
Logansport State Hospital
Division of Mental Health and Addiction
1098 S. STATE ROAD 25
LOGANSPOORT, IN 46947-9699
574-722-4141
FAX: 574-735-3414
TDD: 574-732-0069

<<stamped>> FILED JUL 29 2004 /s/ Doris Anne
Sadler
IMPORTANT MEDICAL INFORMATION
ENCLOSED
July 27, 2004

Grant W. Hawkins
Marion Superior Court, Criminal Division #5
200 East Washington Street, Room W-305
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Dear Judge Hawkins:

Re: Ahmad Edwards

Cause #: 49G05-9907-CF-121975

By my signature below, I certify that according to the report filed by Robert J. Sena, M.D., Mr. Edwards has attained the ability to understand the proceedings and assist in the preparation of his defense.

227a

Pursuant to IC 35-36-3-2, we would respectfully request that your court enter an order directing the sheriff to return the defendant to your county jail, along with his personal belongings, at your earliest possible convenience. Please direct your county sheriff to notify the Isaac Ray Treatment Center no less than twenty four hours prior to the anticipated transport of this defendant. This notice will allow appropriate money, clothing, etc. to be ready upon arrival of county personnel.

Sincerely,

/s/ Robert E. Clover

Robert E. Clover
Authorized Designee for
Jeffrey H. Smith, Ph.D.
Superintendent
cc: Steve Sarris, IDMH
Legal

I swear and affirm, under the penalties of perjury, that the foregoing statements are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

/s/ Robert E. Clover

<<written>> July 28, 2004

www.IN.gov/fssa

J.C.A.H.O. Accredited

Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer

<<Seal of the State of Indiana>>

Indiana Family and Social Services Administration
Logansport State Hospital
Logansport, IN

COMPREHENSION TO STAND TRIAL REPORT

7-27-04

IDENTIFYING DATA & HISTORICAL RECAP:

Ahmad (NMN) **Edwards** is a 31 year-old single black male from Marion County (Indianapolis, IN), who was admitted here to the Isaac Ray Treatment Center (IRTC) of Logansport State Hospital (LSH) on **1-27-04**. He was sent here under Confinement Authority of the IFSSA after having been found to have Insufficient Comprehension to Stand Trial (ICST) on **11-24-03** in the Marion Superior Court, Criminal Division Room 5, under Cause No. 49G05-9907-CF-121975. He is charged with committing the following crimes on or about **7-12-99**:

- Attempt Murder (Class A Felony)
- Battery (Class C Felony)
- Criminal Recklessness (Class D Felony)
- Theft (Class D Felony)

SOURCES OF INFORMATION:

1. My face-to-face interviews of Ahmad Edwards at LSH/IRTC lasting 70 minutes on 7-27-04, 1 hour 45 minutes on 5-27-04, and 40 minutes on 5-8-04.
2. His medical records at LSH, including his hospital chart of 1-27-04 to 7-27-04.
3. The Commitment Order dated 11-24-03.
4. The Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law in Marion Superior Court, Criminal Division, Room 5, dated 11-17-03.

5. The Confinement Authority Order of the IFSSA dated 12-8-03.
6. The Information sheet for the charges dated 7-15-99.
7. The Affidavit for Probable Cause dated 7-12-99.
8. The Criminal History report dated 7-13-99.
9. The Neuropsychological Examination by Lance E. Trexler, Ph.D. dated 2-23-00.
10. The competency to stand trial report by Dwight W. Schuster, M.D. dated 10-2-01.
11. The Psychiatric Examination report by Ned P. Masbaum, M.D. dated 12-9-02.
12. The Psychiatric Evaluation by Philip M. Coons, M.D. dated 11-26-02.
13. Ahmad Edwards' LSH/IRTC records from his admission of 12-12-00 to 3-27-01 under the psychiatric care of Steven H. Berger, M.D.

Ahmad Edwards, #3915

DOA: 1-27-04

DOB: 1-29-73

Page 1

STATEMENT OF NON-CONFIDENTIALITY:

He was advised of the purpose of the interview of 7-27-04, which was to determine whether he now has sufficient comprehension to stand trial. He agrees that any relevant information obtained would not be confidential because it would be shared with the court.

PHYSICAL HEALTH:

No serious physical health problems at present.

COURSE OF TREATMENT:

He has been under treatment here for the **problems** of:

- (1) Psychosis (with symptoms of disorganized thought processes, delusional ideation, hallucinations, and ideas of reference)
- (2) Neuropathic pain in the scalp and left leg (he reports a history of severe pain in his left frontal scalp area after head injury in a motor vehicle accident, and neurological pain in his left leg after a gunshot injury)
- (3) ICST status.

His **treatment** includes medications, individual and group psychotherapy, counseling from the professional staff of the various disciplines, and educational classes. His medications have been adjusted several times to achieve optimal symptom improvement without causing side effect problems.

His present **medications** include:

- **Seroquel** 300 mg per day at bedtime for psychotic symptoms
- **Benadryl 50** mg per day for insomnia
- **Trileptal** 600 mg twice per day for neuropathic pain in the scalp and left leg
- **Motrin** 800 mg twice per day for left leg pain.

Currently, he attends **classes** in Legal Education, Psychology Education, ICST Groups, Men's Issues, Anger Management, Communication, Art, Social Skills, Coping Skills, Independent Living Skills, and Recreational Therapy.

Progress: He has made excellent progress in the past 2 months:

- His mental symptoms have greatly improved. As of 7-27-04, he reports that he no longer has hallucinations, delusions, and ideas of reference. His thought processes are no longer disorganized.

Ahmad Edwards, #3915

DOA: 1-27-04

DOB: 1-29-73

Page 2

- The pain in his scalp and left leg is under good control under treatment with Trileptal 600 mg twice per day and Motrin 800 mg twice per day.
- On 5-26-04, he passed the final written examination in Legal Education II on the 4th attempt, answering 61 questions correctly out of 75. He would likely score higher now if he took the test again.

Behavior: His behavior has been outstanding in recent months. He was cited for only 1 rule violation, which occurred on 2-9-04 and which was likely triggered by his mental disorder. He has not been physically aggressive here. He is polite and cooperative.

PRESENT CONDITION:

I interviewed him today (7-27-04) for 70 minutes. During the interview:

- He reports no ongoing serious problems.
- His mood is level (normal). He knows the exact date, place, and circumstances. He shows good attention. His memory is good in all spheres (immediate, recent, and remote). He cooperates well.

- He communicates very well. His speech is easy to understand.
- His thought processes are coherent.
- There is no evidence of present or recent hallucinations or delusions.
- He agrees to continue his medications.
- He would like to leave here and proceed to trial.
- I questioned him about forensic issues, and his answers appear below under McGarry Criteria.

PSYCHIATRIC DIAGNOSIS:

- **Schizophrenia, Undifferentiated Type 295.90***
- The number refers to the diagnosis in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-IV-TR)

McGARRY CRITERIA:

The following are the McGarry criteria for competence, and my determination of whether he fulfills each criterion,

1. Does he have the ability to appraise the legal defenses available to him? YES. HE IS ABLE TO NAME HIS ATTORNEY AND ACKNOWLEDGES HIS NEED FOR COUNSEL.
2. What is the level of his unmanageable behavior? NONE.
3. What is the quality of the anticipated manner in which he will relate to his attorney? HE WILL LIKELY BE WILLING AND ABLE TO DISCUSS NECESSARY AND IMPORTANT MATTERS WITH HIS ATTORNEY.

Ahmad Edwards, #3915

DOA: 1-27-04

DOB: 1-29-73

Page 3

4. Does he have the ability to plan a legal strategy?
YES, IN COOPERATION WITH HIS ATTORNEY.
5. Does he have the ability to appraise the roles of the participants in the courtroom proceedings?
YES. When asked to explain the roles of various courtroom personnel, his answers were as follows:
 - Prosecuting attorney: **He is to introduce evidence for the State and to get a conviction.**
 - Defense attorney: **To introduce evidence for my defense, and to help me. He objects also to anything improper.**
 - Judge: **To preside over the hearing. He rules on objections. He protects my rights and the victims' rights. He also gives the sentence if I'm found guilty.**
 - Will you get a fair trial? **Yes.**
 - He voiced no delusional ideation concerning any courtroom personnel.
6. Does he understand the procedures of the court?
YES. DURING OUR DISCUSSION, HE DEMONSTRATED AN EXCELLENT UNDERSTANDING OF COURTROOM PROCEDURES.
7. Does he have an appreciation of the charges against him? YES. HE CAN RECITE HIS EXACT CHARGES AND THEIR FELONY LEVELS, AND THE MEANING OF THE CHARGES.

8. Does he have an appreciation of the range and nature of the possible penalties he faces? YES. HE STATES ACCURATE RANGES OF POSSIBLE SENTENCES FOR EACH CHARGE IF HE IS FOUND GUILTY.
9. Does he have ability to appraise the likely outcome of the charges against him? YES.
10. Does he have the capacity to disclose to his attorney available pertinent facts surrounding the offenses? YES.
11. Does he have the capacity to challenge prosecution witnesses realistically? YES.
12. Does he have the capacity to testify relevantly? YES.
13. Does he manifest self-serving motivation or self-defeating motivation? SELF-SERVING MOTIVATION.

SUMMARY:

Ahmad (NMN) Edwards is a 31 year-old single black male from Marion County, who was admitted here to the Isaac Ray Treatment Center of Logansport State Hospital on **1-27-04**, after having been found to have Insufficient Comprehension to Stand Trial on **11-24-03** in the Marion Superior Court, Criminal Division Room 5, under Cause No. 49G05-9907-CF-121975. He is charged with committing the following crimes on or about **7-12-99**: Attempt Murder (Class A Felony), Battery (Class C Felony), Criminal Recklessness (Class D Felony), and Theft (Class D Felony).

He has shown excellent **progress** in the reduction/elimination of his psychotic symptoms in

the past 2 months of treatment here. His behavior has been excellent.

Ahmad Edwards, #3915

DOA: 1-27-04

DOB: 1-29-73

Page 4

Concerning his present **comprehension** to stand trial, my conclusions are as follows:

- He demonstrates very good comprehension of his charges and possible sentence ranges if he is found guilty as charged.
- He demonstrates very good comprehension of the legal proceedings in his criminal case.
- He is demonstrating the abilities necessary to assist his attorney in his own defense, including good communications skills, cooperative attitude, average intelligence, and good cognitive functioning.

OPINION:

Therefore, in my opinion, to a reasonable degree of medical certainty, **Ahmad Edwards has attained sufficient comprehension to stand trial.**

/s/ Robert J. Sena

Robert J. Sena, M.D.

Staff Forensic Psychiatrist

Indiana Physician License

#01055412A

Diplomate, American Board
of Psychiatry and

Neurology, 1991

236a

Logansport State Hospital/
Issac Ray Treatment
Center

Ahmad Edwards, #3915

DOA: 1-27-04

DOB: 1-29-73

Page 5

MR AHMAD) IN THE MARION
EDWARDS) SUPERIOR COURT
V.) ROOM NO. 5
) CAUSE NO.
THE STATE OF) 49G059907CF
INDIANA) 121975

<<stamped>> FILED SEP 13 2004 <<signature>>
CLERK OF THE MARION CIRCUIT COURT
<<written>> 13 Sep 04 GWH

“ORDERS TO THE CLERK”

P.1]

Please furnish me Mr. Ahmad Edwards a filed copy of this [five] 5 page report you might have received;

I have sent you an stamped, self-addressed envelope so that this order my be provided.

“Thank you, as your office shall always be honored an respected.”

<<written>> Copy sent 9-13-04 Deputy clerk /s/ Pam S

CONTINUED ON PAGE; 2 OF; 2

Cont - “ORDERS TO THE CLERK”

P.2]

I affirm, under the penalties for perjury, that the foregoing representations are true.

9/3/2004

/s/ Ahmad Edwards
Mr. Ahmad Edwards

File. c.c.

238a

MR. AHMAD) IN THE MARION
EDWARDS) SUPERIOR COURT
VS.) OF MARION
THE STATE) COUNTY
OF INDIANA) CAUSE NO. 5
49G059907CF
121975

<<stamped>> FILED SEP 13 2004 <<signature>>
CLERK OF THE MARION CIRCUIT COURT
<<written>> 13 Sep 04 GWH

NOTICE OF CRIMINAL RULE 4.C.

Mr. Ahmad Edwards the accused must be brought to trial under subdivision C of the trial rule 4 of the criminal procedure in one year or so held be discharged. A charge against him filed July 15, 1999 a period of two years passed befor he filed a motion to dismiss criminal charges and discharge the defendant by criminal rule 4.C on May 29, 2001 now he is requesting the court to take notice of his motion to dismiss and discharge, three years later.

/s/ Ahmad Edwards
Ahmad Edwards

<<written>> Copy sent 9-13-04 deputy clerk /s/ Pam S.

Dear Clerk of the Court,

Please file this notice and send me a copy.

Thank you,

Ahmad Edwards

MR. AHMAD) IN THE MARION
EDWARDS) SUPERIOR COURT
V.) ROOM NO. 5
THE STATE OF) CAUSE NO.
INDIANA) 49G059907CF
) 121975

<<stamped>> FILED SEP 13 2004 <<signature>>
CLERK OF THE MARION CIRCUIT COURT
<<written>> sent for hrg 17 Sep 04 @ 9:00 AM /s/
GWH
<<written>> copy sent 9-13-04 Deputy Clerk ps

PETITION FOR HEARING

P1

1. I Mr. Ahmad Edwards the defendant have administered by a clerks service to the court the Indiana rules of trial procedure trial rule 1 witch confers a right to a speedy determination.
2. Therefor I Mr. Ahmad Edwards applicant to claims an interest to : a fast and speedy trial request to be permitted to an action to correspond with that of the rules provided in criminal rule 4.C. for a hearing;

CONTINUED ON PAGE; 2 OF; 3

CONT - PETITION FOR HEARING

P2

2. witch states the defendant shall be entitled to discharge if so held to answer a criminal charge for a period more than a year.
3. I the defendant for action wish to not be withheld from order to such as the trial rule 1., and have become certain of the rules to prejudice if this

request falls the established association under the criminal rule 4.C caused conclusion.

4. The right of the petition is deemed to be the defendants and acquires jurisdiction over the court.

The defendant prays this petition will be fairly and adequately

CONTINUED ON PAGE; 3 OF; 3

CONT - PETITION FOR HEARING

P.3

Protected in interests of the courts association.

"I affirm, under the penalties for perjury, that the foregoing representations are true.

/s/ Ahmad Edwards
Ahmad Edwards

Dear Clerk of the court,

Please file this petition for hearing and send me a copy.

Thank you,
Ahmad Edwards

241a

<<stamped>> FILED SEP 22 2004 <<signature>> /s/
Doris Ann Sadler

<<written>> noted <<initials>> 9-24-04

Dear Grant Hawkins:

For days I have remained alert for the honor to be released for the execution of right a 2001 discharge claim drew. Thank you for the moment.

Ahmad Edwards

242a

<<written>> noted <<initials>> 9-24-04

<<written>> 99121 75 <<signature>>

Dear Honorable Judge,

Hopeless! Is there an honest person in the court, loyal to law? My court ask for fools to be freed and confidently not hear me.

Listen to this case; the foundations of my cause, the criminal rule 4. Courts territory acknowledged May 29, 2001 abandon for the young American citizen to bring a permissive intervention. Acting as the forces! To predict my future disgraced by the court to motion young Americans to gather against crime.

My courts failure humiliated introductions kindly of right reason, and hope.

Court Room 5
Criminal Division,

Ahmad Edwards
Director for

243a

<<stamped>> FILED SEP 22 2004 <<signature>>

Doris Ann Sadler

<<written>> noted <<initials>> 9-24-04

Dear Honorable Nancy Broills

For days I have remained alert for the honor to be released for the execution of right A, 2001 discharge claim drew. Thank you for the moment.

Ahmad Edwards

AHMAD EDWARDS) IN THE MARION
PLAINTIFF,) SUPERIOR COURT
V.) OF MARION COUNTY
STATE OF INDIANA) CAUSE NO.
RESPONDENT,) 49G059907CF12
) 1975

<<stamped>> FILED OCT 21 2004 <<signature>>
CLERK OF THE MARION CIRCUIT COURT
<<written>> Completed and sent 10-21-04 Deputy
clerk Pam S.
<<written>> 21 Oct 04 <<signature>> GWH

MOTION FOR COURT TO FURNISH DOCKET
SHEETS

Comes now the defendant in the above stated cause of action and respectfully requests this court to issue an order mandating the court clerk to furnish a complete copy of the docket sheets in the above stated cause to the petitioner. The petitioner pursuant to trial rule 72[A]. He is entitled to have the court open. The defendant is an inmate incarcerated in the Marion County Jail in Indiana and access to the court is only available to him through mail. The obstruction by the courts denial of a furnishment of said docket sheets effectively closes the courts for timely review of motions. Johnson v. Avery: 393 U.S. 483.485[19G]; Demallor v. Cullen: 855 F.2d.442,448 [7th cir. 1988].

Wherefore, the defendant prays this court will grant the order requiring the furnishing of the requested docket sheets as in just and proper in this case.

CONT - MOTION FOR COURT TO FURNISH
DOCKET SHEETS

245a

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Ahmad Edwards

PETITIONER: PRO SE

Dear Clerk

Please copy and file this motion for court to furnish docket sheets and send me a filed copy for my own records. I've sent a self-addressed stamped envelope for this request can be honored.

/s/ Ahmad Edwards

<<stamped>> SEP 15 REC'D
<<stamped>> FILED NOV 1 2004
<<signature>>Doris Ann Sadler
<<written>> 5 NOV 04 Denied <<initials>> GWH

MR. AHMAD) IN THE MARION
EDWARDS) SUPERIOR
VS.) COURT OF
THE STATE) MARION COUNTY
OF INDIANA) CAUSE NO.
) 49G059907CF
) 121975

MOTION TO DISMISS AND DISCHARGE

P.1

Comes now the defendant Mr. Ahmad Edwards with the following good and sufficient request for the dismissal and discharge of the defendant Mr. Ahmad Edwards

CONTINUED ON PAGE; 2 OF; 4

MOTION TO DISMISS AND DISCHARGE

P.2

The representations the defendant affirms under for the cause number: 49G059907CF121975 to be dismissed and discharge the defendant.

The defendant states the criminal procedure rule 4.C; is in denial of its duties to dismiss and the Constitution of the United States Article. 1 § 12 of his right is being intimidated. Mr. Ahmad Edwards has been for well over four 4 years applicable for the presumption of prejudice.

The defendant request the court to control and keep safe the rules and rights he accepts for the events and by comprehensive

CONTINUED ON PAGE; 3 OF; 4

MOTION TO DISMISS AND DISCHARGE

P.3

Injunctions purpose: for the detection, and solution of crime produced as a movement of supporters the defendant also states rule 4.C.; for courts speedy trial and that if within one 1 year the defendant motion to dismiss criminal charges and discharge is not recognizanced the life and liberty of the defendant Mr. Ahmad Edwards must be enforced by laws of the United States Contitution for the dismissal and discharge.

The defendant was not brought to trial for one 1 year and in 2001 determined to expedite the Marion Superior Court to be discharged.

CONTINUED ON PAGE; 4 OF; 4

MOTION TO DISMISS AND DISCHARGE

P.4

The defendant herein the Marion Superior Court Room Five 5 Criminal Division respectfully request the dismissal and discharge of this cause above.

“I affirm under the penalties for perjury that the foregoing representations are true.”

/s/ Ahmad Edwards

248a

Dear Clerk of the Court,
I have always honored and respected your office.
Please copy this four 4 page motion and furnish me
the copy filed stamped.

Thank you,

/s/ Ahmad Edwards

249a

<<stamped>> FILED NOV 1 2004 <<signature>>
Doris Ann Sadler
<<written>> 5 Nov 04 <<initials>> GWH
<<written>> 49 59907CF121975

Dear Honorable Judge

Hopeless! Is there an honest person in the court, loyal to law? My court ask for fools to be freed and confidently not hear me.

Listen to this case; the foundations of my cause, the criminal rule 4. Courts territory acknowledged May 29, 2001 abandon for the young American citizen to bring a permissive intervention. Acting as the forces! To predict my future disgraced by the court to motion young Americans to gather against crime.

My courts failure humiliated introductions kindly of right, reason, and hope.

Court Room 5
Criminal Division,

Ahmad Edwards
Director

<<stamped>> FILED NOV 1 2004 <<signature>>
Doris Ann Sadler
<<written>> 5 Nov 04 Denied <<initials>> GWH

MR. AHMAD) IN THE MARION
EDWARDS,) SUPERIOR
GROUPS:) COURT CIVIL
TURNING) DIVISION
POINT, PUR-,) ROOM 5
POSE, BOARD) 49G059907CF121975
OF DIRECTORS, CAP) CAUSE NO:
ITAL COMMITTEE)
V.
THE STATE OF)
INDIANA)

PETITION FOR HEARING

1. For hearing correspondence;
2. Substantially, Article V; IV; II§3; and 1.§8.8 of the U.S. Constitution;

[CONTINUED ON PAGE, 2 OF; 3]

[CONT - PETITION FOR HEARING]

3. The groups stated above desires considerations of the court proper for legislation to intervene with the matters above limited by the U.S. Constitution.
4. Mr. Ahmad Edwards would also as an agent\director urge the court to consult, the best position to advise the groups of any, recourse that may be available established and to be action of law, certain of the rules admissions not to fail responsibilities of other officials,

counterproductive resolved in the court system therein any action that might be construed as interference.

CONTINUED ON PAGE, 3 OF; 3

[CONT - PETITION FOR HEARING]

5. Therefor I sincerely regret if this petition cannot be of more direct assistance to the group upon this courts hesitation to set it's matters involving the Congress of the United States approved acts on June 19, 1968.

"I affirm, under the penalties for perjury, that the foregoing representations are true.

/s/ Ahmad Edwards
Mr. Ahmad Edwards
Director

Dear Clerk,

Please have this 3 page petition for hearing classified for a hearing and accorded, with a cause number; copyed and filed stamped and have a filed stamped copy mailed to me for my records.

I have provided clerk a self-addressed stamped envelope so that the filed stamped copy may be returned.

Thank you,
Mr. Ahmad Edwards

STATE OF INDIANA) IN THE MARION
) COUNTY SUPERIOR
COUNTY OF MARION) COURT
STATE OF INDIANA) SS: CRIMINAL
 V.) DIVISION, ROOM NO.
AHMAD EDWARDS) FIVE
) CAUSE NO.
) 49-G05-9907-CF-121975

<<stamped>> FILED AUG 01 2005 <<signature>>>>
CLERK OF THE MARION CIRCUIT COURT
<<written>> 16 Aug 05 Dr Schuster will make
himself available <<GWH>>
<<written>> 17 Aug 05 Dr. Masbaum will make
himself available <<GWH>>

**NOTICE OF INTENT TO INTERPOSE
DEFENSE OF INSANITY**

Ahmad Edwards (“Defendant”), by Dirk Cushing of the Marion County Public Defender Agency (“Counsel”), pursuant to Indiana Code 35-36-2-1, hereby notifies the Court and the State that he intends to interpose the defense of insanity in this cause.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Dirk A. Cushing
Dirk Cushing
Deputy Public Defender, C-
1782
Attorney for the Defendant,
11533-49

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that a copy of the foregoing has been served upon the Marion County Prosecutor's Office, either by personal service or by placing a copy of the same in the Prosecutor's box of this Court, this same date of filing.

/s/ Dirk A. Cushing
Dirk Cushing
Marion County Public Defender
Agency
200 East Washington Street, Suite
560
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204
(317) 327-5762

AHMAD EDWARDS) AGENCY FORM 1.16.2
PETITIONER,) CAUSE NO. 49G05-9907
VS.) CF-121975
THE INDIANA) IN THE MARION
DEPARTMENT OF) SUPERIOR COURT
MENTAL HEALTH) CRIMINAL DIVISION,
LOGANSFORT) ROOM 5
) THE HONORABLE
) GRANT
STATE HOSPITAL) HAWKINS JUDGE
ISAAC RAY) _____
RESPONDENT)

<<stamped>> FILED AUG 30 2005 <<signature>>
CLERK OF THE MARION CIRCUIT COURT

Comes now the defendant to petition the end of the
made violations therein the Logansport State
Hospital-Isaac Ray

1. The petitioner is restless and troubled in the
areas of the following:
 - A. To practice his own religion;
 - B. To consult with a doctor
 - C. Be free from discrimination
 1. Of his ancestry handicap
 2. Of sex maximums purpose
 3. Of creed of case execution
 - D. Be at consent education.

The respondent has no way to give the
commencement of these actions; service or a process
above the petitioner is pleading

2. Petitioner actions: 42 USCA§10841
3. The petitioner has filed a complaint with the United States district court for the southern district of Indiana and/or at the “allegation jurisdiction”
4. The petitioner was commitment order on Nov 24 2003 under IC 16-14-9.1. and returned 7 months after his admission date to a psychiatric institution the violation of the court order.

The petitioner hereby files the written petition to have this matter and others taken into evaluation open court and if the court is found to be disinterested - find the respondent a recommendation the petitioner object to

I swear under penalty of perjury 1.C.35-44-2-1 the foregoing representations are true.

/s/ Ahmad Edwards
Ahmad Edwards

UNITED STATE)
DISTRICT COURT)
SOUTHERN)
DISTRICT OF NEW)
NEW YORK)
AMBERGRESS)
ZENAGENCIES)
PLAINTIFFS,)
VS.)
THE UNITED STATES)
OF AMERICA)
DEFENDANT)

B. DEFENDANT:

STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION AND PREVIOUS
LAWSUITS

A. JURISDICTION:

B. PREVIOUS LAWSUITS:

1:04-CV-1508-LJM-WTL

1:04-CV-1732-DFH-VSS

CAUSE OF ACTION:

“JURY TRIAL DEMANDED”

AGENCY FORM[5]148 C

CAUSE OF ACTION:

GROUND : U.S. Const. Art. 1. Secretary cooperation
considered.

GROUND : Haggard vs. State, app 2002.771 N.E.
608 reciprocal

GROUND : Anirim vs. State, app.2001.745 N.E.2d
246. Punishment

STATEMENT OF FACT:

Defendants damage is mitigator ballistics shave
Donald Rumsfeld instrument discount rates at the
Neo-Geo seriousness of European Unions vaid at war
free to utilize compelled lex to find pleading
argument of responsibility absence of a day within a
full year of corroboration the plaintiff class
acceptance of a pragmatism result deviate in conduct
as possible/properly record.

Relief

We the plaintiffs is in the afforemention cause do
affirm that we have read all of the statements
contained in the complaint and that we beleve them
to be to the best of personal knowledge true and
correct.

/s/ Ahmad Edwards
Ahmad Edwards

<<stamped>> FILED AUG 30 2005 <<signature>>
CLERK OF THE MARION CIRCUIT COURT

THE GROUP [FATPXTRL])	
AHMAD EDWARDS)	AGENCY P/T [4
IN HIS OFFICAL)	
CAPACITY AS)	
DIRECTOR OF THE)	PETITIONER
GROUP –)	IN THE MARION
VS.)	SUPERIOR COURT
LOGANSFORT)	CRIMINAL DIVISION,
STATE HOSPITAL)	ROOM 5
RESPONDANT,)	CAUSE NO. 4946G05-
) 990
<u>PETITION</u>)	<u>7CF-121975</u>

1. Harassment for 6 [six] months evented therein the defendants location and is responsible for an act was adequate to damage the petitiones
2. The petitioner was attacked and became victim with the circumstances inferred from a 33-year old man found as mentally ill/dangerous to his-self and recommended from service provider from a record to be at all times measured from others for the security fact to not be at injury.
3. The group [FATPXTRL] filed act in form of request as responce to distribution respondant could not take part in dispositioning loss to group-. [File Date Sep 25, 02]
4. Defendant could not violate contracts a petitions groups at all instances was merged. Then the set defendant achieved to become stronger at the

259a

trial courts post trial rules yet could not offer
habilitation or attribute to the courts request for
petitioners relief thereof its veil of trust

Petitioner request no such order be to defendant
method defendants corporate defendant is obviously
frivolous and or absurd. Vexation was caused on the
petitioner after defendants therapeutic treatment.

P.L.2-1992,Sec.21.

“I affirm, under the penalties for perjury that the
foregoing representations are true.

/s/ Ahmad Edwards
Ahmad Edwards
Petitioner

United States
District Court
Southern Dis-
trict of

Ahmad Edwards
in his official
capacity

V.S.

Daniel Lest
in her official
capacity as

The/communication and depends analyzer
hypnoanalysis discovered are narcosynthesis then
~~un~~ theories thust penetrated awake matter
conception prenatal experience terror full of holes
rapes

99121975

<<stamped>> FILED SEP 12 2005 <<signature>>
CLERK OF THE MARION CIRCUIT COURT
<<written>> 12 Sep 05 <<GWH>>

“Like the guide book says, it can be done!....I’m doing Europe on \$5 a day!....The other \$45 is being spent by my wife!”

<<drawing>>

Dear official,

Lawyers take more time to build up modernization and have your needs deliberate, collaborated and put first on the list of ought to do than judges. I suppose that’s the reason the law suggests looming the dominance of the courts first love the judge given any other reason referred revelations potentially, I would not feel like this letters hearing could cite flexible system policy that could amount one of your great letters so my charges are tightly linking vehicles to talk about the doing fine.

The court room 5 justice “the hon” he united trial month before last...got split verdict or more like a repugnant verdict. My lawyer being drunk on duty saying I ought to be punished just before trial showed me a new age of human wisdom lost and below it all I can’t stop looking to the man above the law “God” for a new lawyer judge and court room...Is there a way that I’m entitled to those? I than as a citizen, “O forget-it-no matter how much I pray, I wont ever get any of thoes things!

Ok I’v layed down my routine “old girl” It’s time to lift your spirt...

262a

Things said in the dark;

“I can’t wait to find out if I’m going to be a boy or a girl!”

“Now will you let me call a electrician.”

“Let me read your letter.”

Thanks to talk
Ahmad Edwards

STATE OF INDIANA) IN THE MARION
COUNTY OF MARION) SUPERI-
STATE OF INDIANA) OR COURT CRIMINAL
V.) DIVISION,ROOM 5
AHMAD EDWARDS) CAUSE NO. 49G059907-
) CF121975

<<stamped>> FILED OCT 05 2005 <<signature>>

“NOTICE OF REQUEST MADE”

Oct. 3 ,2005

Dear, clerk file this and send copy

The counsel Kevin McShane logical requested a typed copy of all testimony given orally at this cause 494G05-9907CF121975 or had this fact spoken open court of this attorney have anything or seen a motion from state of adopted work from this or that cause here above.

F.C.C.

“I served the above and following commission by placing properly in a envelope of postage depositing the same in the hands of a U.S. Mail person at the Marion County Jail authorized as notary.

/s/ Ahmad Edwards
Ahmad Edwards

Subscribed and sworn to before me a notary public in and for Indianapolis Indiana County of Marion, this 3rd a day of Oct. 2005.

/s/ Brian Rodgers
<<written>> (Brian Rodgers)
Notary Public<<written>> 11-5-2006 Marion, IN

264a

Date: 9/27/2005 5 : USER

Time: 9:23:16 AM
USER

STAT OF INDIANA) IN THE MARION
COUNTY OF MARION) SUPERIOR CRIMINAL
~~STATE OF~~) DIVISION, ROOM 5
STATE OF INDIANA) CAUSE NO. 49G059-
V.) 907CF121975
AHMAD EDWARDS)

<<stamped>> FILED OCT 27 2005 <<signature>>
<<written>> 31 Oct 05 <<GWH>>

Oct/14 /05 Clerfk

File and send copy |

PETITION FOR HEARING

The rate of the attorney Kevin McShane rule not to avoid the cost of references for the accused to have evidence against the alleged victim and offers of the state at trial rule: now has a charactered look of the most piloted extrinsic act that has ever outweighed the defence to time unfair at admonition as to not have seen the defendant in private for 60 days governed to do so by the court standard of 90 days of continuances or rest in sound discretion of trial relevancy, Rule 53.5.

The defendant claimed an error would be on the grounds that if an attorney could not rise his staff to analyze the law before him in private for more than 90 days what attorney could relate to at open trial or when instructing a jury for defence to find and jurisdiction beyond reasonable doubt : would be failed or disproved of by the defendant/petitioner Mr.Ahmad Edwards and would cause error absent attorneys [Kevin McShane] might to vist the petitioner in private for ~~more than~~ 6 hours or 3 hours abuse is: granting this petition for defence

266a

continuances and to deny a hearing for continuance rest in the abuse of discretion that will be found as violation of the U.S. Const. Amend. 6 if a hearing is not set before 6 weeks vacated against the expander date of courts protecting right acts date of : 12/19/05.

/s/ Ahmad Edwards
Ahmad Edwards
Petitioner

F.CC

Served to me by postage of U.S. Mail subscribed and sworn to before me a notary public in and for Indiana.
10- -05.

/s/ Brian Rodgers
<< written>> 11-5-2006
Notary Public
<<written>> Brian Rodgers
Marion, IN

267a

MARION COUNTY JAIL INMATE MESSAGE
CARD

DATE:CELL:4-TGAL#:

INMATE'S NAME:

MESSAGE TO: (NAME) 10/27/05

MESSAGE (PLEASE BE SPECIFIC)

Dear: clerk I have not been able to find you name. For
if I hade it it would be in my prayers <<drawing>>.
I've recived your help more times than I can re-call
thanks

Ahmad

JALS

EPITHUMIA, EROS, PHILIA,
STORGE AGAPE

<<stamped>> FILED OCT 27 2005 <<signature>>

AHMAD)	
EDWARDS)	IN THE MARION
PLAINTIFF,)	SUPERIOR COURT
V.)	CRIMINAL DIVISION
STATE OF INDIANA)	ROOM 5.
COUNTY OF MARION)	THE HONORABLE
STATE OF INDIANA)	GRANTW. N
RESPONDENT)	HAWKINS
)	AND THE HONOR-
)	ABLE NANCY
)	BROYLES
)	AND THE HONOR-
)	ABLE GARY
)	MILLER
)	CAUSE NO.49G05
)	9907CF121975

<<stamped>> FILED DEC 09 2005 <<signature>>
 <<written>> 99121975
 <<written>> 13 Dec 05 <<GWH>>

Continued ~~on~~ page,
 5, of 5. request
 pro se

This request is proper above and should be ruled as such.

A copy of the forgoing request of 5, pages befor me placed in a envelope with a self-addressed stamp pre postage then placed in the hands of a U.S. post person plaintiff appeared and signed the foregoing request on this th day of Dec, 2005.

Notary Public/s/ Brian Rodgers <<written>>
(Brian Rodgers)
 <<written>> Comm: 11-5-2006 Marion, IN

269a

/s/ Ahmad Edwards
Ahmad Edwards
Plaintiff pro se

“I affirm, under the penalties of perjury, that the foregoing representations are true.”

Agency file

Page: 05

U.S. Government
Initiative: Regulatory

AHMAD EDWARDS) IN THE MARION
PLAINTIFF,) SUPERIOR COURT
V.) CRIMINAL DIVISION
STATE OF INDIANA) ROOM.5
COUNTY OF MARION) THE HONORABLE
STATE OF INDIANA) GRANT W.
RESPONDENT.) HAWKINS
) AND THE HONOR-
) ABLE NANCY
) BROYLES
) AND THE HONOR-
) ABLE GARY
) MILLER
) CAUSE NO. 49G05
) 9907CF121975

Continued as page,
1 of 5 .request
pro se

To the clerk of the court, ~~he~~ defendant hereby notifies the parties of the court room 5, that the defendant to the cause above and on the right that he trust that your office will have the following forms certified, filed copy stamped and prepared for the judge completing this cause

Enabling the plaintiff to come pro se is the followg extents immersed of the laws power and energy and the U.S.Const.Amend.6. to the people;

Performing after the U.S. Const.Amend.6. ~~the~~ the plaintiff, hereby in emergency exercises rations of the U.S.Const.Art.1. for our America.

/s/ Ahmad Edwards
Ahmad Edwards

271a

Plaintiff pro se

“I affirm, under the penalties of perjury, that the foregoing representations are true.”

Agency file U.S. Government
Page:01 Initiative;regulatory

AHMAD EDWARDS)	IN THE MARION
PLAINTIFF,)	SUPERIOR COURT
V.)	CRIMINAL DIVISION
STATE OF INDIANA)	ROOM.5.
COUNTY OF MARION)	THE HONORABLE
STATE OF INDIANA)	GRANT W.
RESPONDENT.)	HAWKINS
)	AND THE HONOR-
)	ABLE NANCY
)	BROYLES
)	AND THE HONOR-
)	ABLE GARY
)	MILLER
)	CAUSE NO. 49G05
)	9907CF121975

Continued on page,
2, of 5 .request
pro se

Self-representation and hybrid representation.

The U.S.Const.Amend.6.exercised as right of
plaintiff.

Ineffective attorney or trial assistance be struck.

/s/ Ahmad Edwards
Ahmad Edwards
Plaintiff pro se

“I affirm, under the penalties of perjury, that the
foregoing representations are true.”

Agency file	U.S. Government
Page:02	Initiative;regulatory

AHMAD EDWARDS)
PLAINTIFF,) IN THE MARION
V.) SUPERIOR COURT
STATE OF INDIANA) CRIMINAL DIVISION
COUNTY OF MARION) ROOM.5
STATE OF INDIANA) THE HONORABLE
RESPONDENT.) GRANT W.
) HAWKINS
) AND THE HONOR-
) ABLE NANCY
) BROYLES
) AND THE HONOR-
) ABLE GARY
) MILLER
) CAUSE NO. 49G05
) 9907CF121975

Continued on page;
3, of 5 .request
pro se

Plaintiff not be required to demonstrate competence
for self-representation: Godinez v. Moran, 509 U.S.
389, 125 L.Ed.2D 321, 113 S.Ct.2080 [1993]

Request seen unequivocally asserted as 10 days
before trial.

Hunt v. State, 459 N.E.2D 730 [Ind. 1984].

/s/ Ahmad Edwards
Ahmad Edwards
Plaintiff pro se

“I affirm, under the penalties of perjury, that the
foregoing representations are true.”

Agency file U.S. Government
Page;63 Initiative;regulatory

AHMAD EDWARDS)
PLAINTIFF,) IN THE MARION
V.) SUPERIOR COURT
STATE OF INDIANA) CRIMINAL DIVISION
COUNTY OF MARION) ROOM.5
STATE OF INDIANA) THE HONORABLE
RESPONDENT) GRANT W.
) HAWKINS
) AND THE HONOR-
) ABLE NANCY
) BROYLES
) AND THE HONOR-
) ABLE GARY
) MILLER
) CAUSE NO. 49G05
) 9907CF121975 .

Continued on page;
4, of 5. request
pro se

A required delay of proceedings for case direct conclusion.

Interference with this U.S.Const. law is:obstruction of justice.

Plaintiff pro set
Ahmad Edwards
/s/ Ahmad Edwards

“I affirm, under the penalties of perjury that the foregoing representations are true.”

Agency file	U.S. Government
Page;64	Initiative;regulatory

<<stamped>> FILED DEC 12 2005 <<signature>>
CLERK OF THE MARION CIRCUIT COURT
<<written>> 14 Dec 05 <<GWH>>

AHMAD EDWARDS) IN THE SUPER-
AMBERGRESS &) IOR COURT OF
ZENAGENCIES) MARION COU-
PETITIONERS,) NTY CRIMINAL
V.) DIVISION ROOM.
INDIANA) 1.
PUBLIC SAFETY &) CAUSE NO.
) CLERK OF COURT
CRIMINAL JUSTICE) PLEASE FILE AND
COPY
RESPONDENT.) 'PEITION'

Affidavit to of indigency that petitioner Mr. Ahmad Edwards is incarcerated at the Marion County Jail and indigent entitled to I.C. 34-1-1-3.

Now comes the petitioner wherein this petition to state:

1. The agency above presented at trial controls a childrens program voting the respondents exports to place program among public.
2. A hearing should be held in room 200 of city county blog. Therein Marion County

Petitioner as agency Ambergress & Zenagencies by director Ahmad Edwards a hearing for industrial customers prejudiced of this record of agency program strategy to fight crime, world wide.

/s/ Ahmad Edwards
Ahmad Edwards
[Director]

276a

Petitioner for the group
of class actions

To postman before me, the undersigned notary
public, in and for said state of Indiana County of
Marion, this th day of December, 2005 petitioner
appeared and signed the foregoing petition

Notary public /s/ Brian Rodgers <<written>>
(Brian Rodgers)

<<written>> Comm : 11-5-2006 Marion, IN

Send copy to plaintiff/petitioner at
40.S.Alabama St. Indianapolis, IN 46204

Agency file U.S. Government
Page;60 Initiative:regulatory

277a

<<stamped>> FILED DEC 13 2005 <<signature>>

ORDERS TO CLERK : RETURN THIS ORDER
COPIED.

1. Please filestamp the foregoing petition for pro se actions and send a copy back to me for my files.

Thank you
and the American
citizens thank you

file.c.c.

/s/ Ahmad Edwards
Ahmad Edwards

6:38.A.M.
Dec.9.05.

Re: Acknowledge the U.S.Amend.6. as right!!

Dear clerk:

Liberally this action will become an official act of government that will fundamental a philosophy about Indiana employess, regarding the perfection that is ideal among the United States. This expression of pro se is becomed, principle herein the trial court room, 5 and the conscious, superconscious of such philosophy and it's refers.

/s/ Ahmad Edwards
Ahmad Edwards

In the Supreme Court of _____

_____)

The _____) Case No. _____

_____)

_____) At : Agent.6.16.2.11

_____) 33.34.35.32.31.13

_____) Agency Form/gun

_____)

Petitioner [s]/)

relator/plain-)

tiff[s][class])

corporation)

party/defendant.)

V.)

THE _____)

_____)

_____)

_____)

RESPONDENT[S])

EMERGENCY WRIT OF MANDAMUS

<<stamped>> FILED DEC 13 2005 <<signature>>

STATE OF INDIANA) | IN THE SUPERIOR
COUNTY OF MARION) | COURT OF MARION
STATE OF INDIANA) | COUNTY
RESPONDENT,) | DIVISION 5.
V.) | "PETITION" |
AHMAD EDWARDS) | FOR PRO SE CAUSE NO.
PETITIONER.) | ACTIONS. | 99121975

"This cause comes to court for a hearing on petitioners U.S.Const.Amend.6. right to pro-se actions and he is alleging the below:
Petitioner waivers right to attorney.

Petitioner Ahmad Edwards has sufficient comprehension to understand trial.

Petitioner of an agency and a action to have established, eliminating cause-public office.

Hearing compliance not done issued malice with intent with knowledge of this petition.

Petitioner placed in the hand of U.S.postperson.

"I affirm, under the penalties of perjury, that the foregoing, representations are true."

/s/ Ahmad Edwards_____

Ahmad Edwards

Petitioner #494657-4-T

40.S.Alabama.St.Indianapolis, IN 46204

file.c.c.

Before me, the undersigned notary public, in and for said state of Indiana County of Marion, this 9th day of December, 2005 petitioner appeared and signed the foregoing petition.

280a

/s/ Brian Rodgers <<written>> (Brian Rodgers)
Notary Public
Comm:11-5-2006/ Marion, IN

CONTINUED EMERGENCY WRIT OF
MANDAMUS

At:agent.5.15.2.11.20. 33.34.35.32.31.13 Agency Form/gun.

<<stamped>> FILED DEC 13 2005 <<signature>>

STATE OF INDIANA) | IN THE SUPERIOR
COUNTY OF MARION) | COURT OF MARION
STATE OF INDIANA) | COUNTY
V.) "PETITION" |
AHMAD EDWARDS) FOR PRO SE DIVISION
5.
) ACTIONS. |
) | CAUSE NO.
) | 99121975

This cause comes to court for a hearing on petitioners U.S.Const.Amend.6. right to pro-se actions and he is alleging the below:

Petitioner waivers right to attorney.

Petitioner Ahmad Edwards has sufficient comprehension to understand trial.

Petitioner of an agency and a action to have established, eliminating cause-public office.

Hearing compliance not done issued malice with intent with knowledge of this petition.

Petitioner placed in the hand of U.S.post person.

"I affirm, under the penalties of perjury, that the foregoing, representations are true.

/s/ Ahmad Edwards
Ahmad Edwards
Petitioner #494657-4-T

40.S.Alabama.St.Indianapolis, IN 46204
file.c.c.

Before me, the undersigned notary public, in and for said state of Indiana County of Marion, this 9th day

282a

of December, 2005 petitioner appeared and signed the foregoing petition.

/s/ Brian Rodgers <<written>> (Brian Rodgers)

Notary Public

Comm:11-5-2006/ Marion, IN

CONTINUED EMERGENCY WRIT OF
MANDAMUS

At:agent.5.15.2.11.20.

33.34.35.32.31.13

Agency Form/gun.

<<stamped>> FILED DEC 19 2005 << signature>>
CLERK OF THE MARION CIRCUIT COURT
6:30 A.M.
12-15-05

Judge, Hawkins

I want to expend the courts power for training for this enormously wide defence I've to exercise also the U.S.Const. Amend 5 that as it becomes more advanced parts directly to structure the 1st Amend.

Try to do your best old man to isolate the young boy in me at this. This defence helps me face my lodge for our 35th degree we call it the passing of the hands to the thumb. And it is very important to me to work again for my family lodge

You looked good doing it your-self when the state starts offsetting the court and you show them to keep the rule and thereby the record their heads-up.

And when you are before the new examples of law I might show you at pro se remember what was once said by the great Alexander Hamilton, in the sound Federalist Papers at the point when the body of trials became cold and thereof was only therein form –

“The complete independence of the courts of justice is peculiarly essential to a limited constitution.

– Alexander Hamilton,”
Federalist Papers

Thank you for
your pursued
degrees affects,
The Defendant
Ahmad Edwards

<<stamped>> FILED DEC 19 2005 << signature>>
 IN THE MARION
) SUPERIOR COURT
 AHMAD EDWARDS) CRIMINAL DIVISION,
) ROOM.5
 V.) CAUSE NO. 49G05
 STATE OF INDIANA) 9907CF121975
 COUNTY OF MARION)
 STATE OF INDIANA) ONE OF TWO
) PAGES FORM:S.S.
 WORKING

PETITION OF SETTLEMENT

Comes petitioner Ahmad Edwards the defendant in hopes that this court completes the order/writ to dismiss misjoinder of this causes indictment counts, I and II there seemed special risen duplicity thereof allegation. Therein misjoined. on, 12-12-05

The petitioner, signed, placed, in U.S. mail

Public notary /s/ Brian Rogers
<written> Brian Rogers Comm: 11-5-06

1. Orders to the clerk the above petition and below motion to dismiss misjoinder have but one other hand written copy you now have the original please have them verified by your office and recored by the offical file mark copied five times sending a copy to me at the address below and presenting a copy to the judge for decision and/or further instructions.

Your hard work and history of your office is the chemistry, needed to have everything take great dynamic culture for young American citizens this year and years, to come. Consider your office the

test for our goals dimension, and Americas traditional court preparations.

“I the petitioner have also enclosed an self-addressed stamp envelope for your official re-sending. And magnified identity among the United States Americas post offices.”

The motion: “In the United States of America the motion to dismiss misjoinder” should have arrived hereon the next page of this “working petition of settlement.”

4:00.A.M.
AGENT.8
33.10.

/s/ Ahmad Edwards
Ahmad Edwards
Defendant

Director of group class action
40.S.Alabama.St.Indianapolis,IN.46204

AHMAD EDWARDS)	
)	IN THE MARION
)	SUPERIOR COURT
v.)	CRIMINAL DIVISION
)	ROOM.5.
STATE OF INDIANA)	
COUNTY OF MARION)	CAUSE NO.
STATE OF INDIANA)	49G059907CF12-
)	1975

ORDER

Defendant having filed its motion in the United States of America the motion to dismiss misjoinder in the following words and figures, to wit :“duplicity of indictment.”

And the court having read and carefully considered same, now finds that said motion be granted.

It is therefore ordered, adjudged and decreed that the indictment of this cause above be dismissed.

Judge of the
Marion Superior Court
Criminal Division, Room.5

file.c.c.

copies to:
Mark Hollingworth, Deputy Prosecutor

On 12-12-05

The defendant, signed, placed in U.S. mail

Public notary/s/ Brian Rodgers <<written>>

COMM:11-5-0

<<written>> Brian Rodgers Marion, IN

6:35 A.M

Agent.20

287a

“I affirm under the penalties for perjury that the foregoing is true”

/s/ Ahmad Edwards

Ahmad Edwards

Defendant

Director of group class action

40.S.Alabama.St.Indianapolis,IN.46204

3:07 A.M.

Agent.10.

33

AHMAD EDWARDS) IN THE MARION
 V.)) SUPERIOR COURT
STATE OF INDIANA)) CRIMINAL DIVISION
COUNTY OF MARION) ROOM 5
STATE OF INDIANA) CAUSE NO. 49G05
) 9907CF121975

In the United States of America

the motion to dismiss misjoinder

The movant, signed, placed in U.S. mail, on, 12-12-05

Public Notary /s/ Brian Rodgers /written/ Brian
Rodgers Comm: 11-5-06

Comes the defence, to dismiss, by I.C. 35-34-1-4[2]
state:

1. A prosecution is barred if there was a former prosecution of the defendant based on the same facts and for commission of the same facts and for commission of the same offense if the defendant on objection does not waive this right;

I.C.35-41-4-3

Chapter4.Standard of proof
and bars to prosecution
when prosection barred for
same offense.

2. Several acts relate to the same transaction, and together constitute but one offence, they may be charged in the same count, but not otherwise.

289a

204,Ind.59,62-63,
1813 N.E. 33, 34
[1932]
Glaser v. State.
241 Ind. 1,4-7.108
N.E.2d 199, 201-202
[1900] Smith v. State.

Two of two page
form:S.S.

Wherefore, the defence moves this court to dismiss
charges of this cause.

“I affirm under the penalties for perjury, that the
foregoing is true

/s/ Ahmad Edwards
Ahmad Edwards
Defendant

Director of group class action

40.S.Alabama.St.Indianapolis,IN.46204

v.
State and local
Administration
Law enforcement
Criminal Intelligence
Information in Indiana
Respondents.

291a

4:20. A.M. KEY:) IN THE MARION
405 ALABAMA) SUPERIOR COURT
INDIANAPOLIS, IN) CRIMINAL DIVISION
46204 # 4946574-T)
AHMAD EDWARDS)
v.)
STATE OF INDIANA) CAUSE NO.
) 49G059907CF121975

Agency

Form

/s/ Ahmad Edwards

Defendant Ahmad Edwards motion to dismiss
Joinder duplicity. Defendant moves the ground of this
court to dismiss this cause orders:

Clerk please file and send a copy to the key above
[Defendant]

The charge count one demonstrated facts that
supported conviction of count three of cause as I.C.35-
41-5-1 and I.C.35-42-2-2/attempt murder and
criminal recklessness. I.C. 35-41-5-1; joined to double
jeopardy and not recited of other powers warrants
this count one at cause be dismissed.

Defendant prays Psalm 49,3; understanding this
cause dismissed wherefore, so shall it be done.

Defendant affirms under perjury

Judgment

The court, having this day made it's entry,

It is now adjudged that this cause of action is
dismissed without prejudice.

292a

Date: _____

Sandler, Clerk

Marion Circuit Court

Movant, signed, placed, in U.S. mail, 12-21-05

Public Notary /s/ Brian Rodgers (Brian Rodgers)

Comm: 11-5-2006

Superior Court Judge

<<stamped>> FILED DEC 22 2005 <<signature>>

Doris Ann Sadler

KEY: 405 ALABAMA) IN THE MARION
Indianapolis, IN) SUPERIOR COURT
46204 #494557 4-T) CRIMINAL DIVISION
AHMAD EDWARDS)

v.

STATE OF INDIANA) CAUSE NO.
) 49G059907CF121975

Agency

Form /s/ Ahmad Edwards

Defendant Ahmad Edwards motion to dismiss.

Defendant moves the grounds of this court to dismiss this cause.

File c.c. Orders:

Clerk please file and send a copy to the key above [defendant].

Evade ruling-amend trial cannot file: Davenport v. State. 1228-30[IND 1997.

Defendant prays Psalm, 2.2 set this cause dismissed wherefore, so shall it be done.

Defendant affirms under perjury

Judgment

The court, having this day made its entry

It is now adjudged that this cause of action is dismissed without prejudice.

Date: _____

294a

Sandler, Clerk

Marion Circuit Court

Movant, signed, placed, in U.S. mail, 12-20-05

Public Notary /s/ Brian Rodgers (Brian Rodgers)

11-5-2006

Marion, IN

295a

KEY: 405 ALABAMA) IN THE MARION
ST. INDIANAPOLIS,) SUPERIOR COURT
IN 46204.) CRIMINAL DIVISION
AHMAD EDWARDS) CAUSE NO. 49G05
v) 9907CF121975
STATE OF INDIANA)

Agency

Form /s/ Ahmad Edwards

Defendant Ahmad Edwards motion to dismiss: true bill defendant moves the grounds of this court to dismiss this cause:

If any notation of grand avoids a bill immunity proceeding at criminal information true-bill grounds

Defendant prays Psalm, 15.5, for innocent of court property to be dismissed wherefore, so shall it be done.

“Defendant affirms under perjury,

Judgment

The court, having this day made its entry,

It is now adjudged that this cause of action is dismissed without prejudice.

Date: _____

Sandler, Clerk

Marion Circuit Court

Movant, signed, placed, in U.S. mail, 12-14-05

Public Notary /s/ Brian Rodgers (Brian Rodgers)

Comm: 11-5-06

Superior Court Judge

AHMAD EDWARDS) IN THE MARION
v.) SUPERIOR COURT
STATE OF INDIANA) CRIMINAL DIVISION
COUNTY OF MARION) ROOM 5
STATE OF INDIANA) CAUSE NO. 49G05
) 9907CF121975

In the United States of America the motion to dismiss
insufficiency

The Movant, signed, placed, in U.S. Mail, on, 12-19-
05

Public Notary /s/ Brian Rodgers (Brian Rodgers)
Comm: 11-5-2006

Comes the defence, to dismiss, by I.C.35-41-4-3 State:

Any challenge to the
sufficiency of an information must be made by motion
to dismiss prior to arraignment or any error in that
regard is waived.

534 N.E.2D 229, 232 [Ind.1989]
Stwalley v. State

637N.E.2D 1369,
1374 [IND. APP. 4th
Dist. 1994
Wine v. State

602 N.E. 2D 144, 147
[IND. APP. 5th
Dist. 1992
Marshall v. State

297a

689 N.E2d 756 785
[IND. APP.1997
Kirts v. State.

Wherefore, the defence moves this court to dismiss
charges of this cause

I affirm under the penalties for perjury that the
foregoing is true

/s/ Ahmad Edwards”

Ahmad Edwards/Defendant
Director of group class
action
40. 5. Alabama. St.
Indianapolis, IN. 46204

298a

AHMAD EDWARDS) IN THE MARION
v.) SUPERIOR COURT
STATE OF INDIANA) CRIMINAL DIVISION
COUNTY OF MARION) ROOM. 5.
STATE OF INDIANA) CAUSE NO. 49G05
) 9907CF121975CF
) 121975

ORDER

Defendant having filed it's motion in the United States of America the motion to dismiss in the following words and figures, to-wit

And the court having read and carefully considered same, now finds that said motion be granted.

It is therefore ordered and decreed that the indictment of this cause above be dismissed,

Judge of the
Marion Superior Court
Criminal Division Room 5

File c.c.
Copies to
Mark Hollingworth, Deputy Prosecutor.

On 12-19-05

The defendant, signed, paced in U.S. Mail.

Public Notary /s/ Brian Rodgers
Comm: 11-5-2006 Brian Rodgers

Marion, IN

"I affirm under the penalties for perjury, that the foregoing is true

299a

/s/ Ahmad Edwards”

Ahmad Edwards/Defendant

Director of Group Class

Action

40. S. Alabama. St.

Indianapolis, IN 46204

<<stamped>> FILED DEC 28 2005 <<signature>>
Doris Ann Sadler

AHMAD EDWARDS) IN THE MARION
PLAINTIFF,) SUPERIOR COURT
v.) CRIMINAL DIVISION,
STATE OF INDIANA) ROOM 5
COUNTY OF MARION) CAUSE NO.
STATE OF INDIANA) 49G059907CF121-975
RESPONDENT.)

Page 1; of; 4

Orders to the Clerk:

File the below 4 5 page petition titled U.S. Const.
amend. 6.5 Petition to practice pro-se. Present a copy
to the judge and return a filed stamped marked copy
to the petitioners office addressed below.

U.S. Const. Amend. 6.5. Petition to Practice Pro-se

On 12-21-05 Movant, signed, placed, in U.S. Mail this
petition of four [4] pages

Public Notary /s/ Brian Rodgers
Comm: 11-5-2006 Brian Rodgers

We hereby affirm under the penalties for perjury that
the foregoing statements are true and correct.

/s/ Ahmad Edwards
Ahmad Edwards
Defendant, Pro-se
Ahmad Edwards gallery:

494657 Cell: 4-T
Leading publisher of
ethnically diverse director of
religious faith base groups
40. S. Alabama. St.
Indianapolis, IN, 46204

Page 2; of 4;

U.S. Const. Amend. 6.5
Petition to Practice Pro-se

1. Petitioner has requested pro-se actions, by choice of a popular vote of class members.
2. Petitioner has debated forthright, in fiery only one task, of the goal driven work movements with over, 33 strokes, communications needed for coordinating trial, as petitioners defence is not seen eye to eye particularly by equaled attorney not prominent to international law sustenance to this cause.
3. Petitioner is the Founder of a faith-based group and director of 60 multimillion-dollar multistate class actions.
4. Petitioner a self-taught scholar, of criminal, federal, civil, international, constitutional, family, entertainment, cooperation, memorandum and landlord law measuring, 6 years
5. Petitioners opening legislation bill 72-26 in to a defence at multistate class action, 1968 orders local congress public law 90-351 act of omnibus crime control safe streets

6. Petitioner moves the court within motion for its community representation to have established a board for legal information in the distributors/brokers sections world wide

“We hereby affirm under the penalties for perjury that the foregoing statements are true and correct.

 /s/ Ahmad Edwards ”

Defendant, Pro-se
Ahmad Edwards
Leading publisher of
ethnically diverse art,
director of religious faith
base groups
40. S. Alabama. St.
Indianapolis, IN, 46204
Page; 3 of; 4

U.S. Const. Amend. 6.5
Petition to Practice Pro-se

8. Tained and as pleadings for pro-se fact;
 - A. Pretrial release proceedings
 - B. Preliminary hearings
 - C. Formal and informal discovery
 - D. Decisions to file pretrial motions
 - E. The contents of negotiations
 - F. Entry of pleas before the court
 - G. Voir dire and jury selection
 - H. Confronting the prosecutions
 - I. Closing Arguments
 - J. Obligations of confronting prosecutions cause

K. Obligations of Sentencing sentencing options,
consequences and procedures

L. Official presentence report

M. Defence memorandum

N. Motions for new trials

O. Bail pending appeals

Wherefore petitioner duress pro-se acts

“We hereby affirm under the penalties for perjury
that the foregoing statements are true and correct.

 /s/ Ahmad Edwards ”

Defendant, Pro-se

Ahmad Edwards gallery:

494657 Cell: 4-T

Leading publisher of

ethnically diverse art

director of religious faith

base groups

Page; 4 of; 4

U.S. Const. Amend. 6.5
Petition to Practice Pro-se

7. Petitioner entrance of court pressures released
stay relations arming petitioner/president of the
group ambergress & zen agencies to become of
income ~~needs not~~ needs not having unusual
stress stating intention of company matters at a
model penal codes test, as editor at large director
managing artist and executive publisher inference
duty, or being required to prepay fees, costs or
give security Therefor, I petitioner states for class

groups and unable to pay costs that poverty is upon civil coexistence of defence one and believed of trial preparation is petitioner entitled to redress and that the issues desired to present on defence one are not involved or discussed when together with attorney Kevin Mc Shane at: 235 N. Delaware In; Indianapolis, Indiana -46204 Fax 317-221-0900 and he at the below acts is altering real used genuine documents and false to state the below jurisdictions of law as this attorney branche one hour visit to petitioners office within the course of three months and responsibilities all take 9 months attorney organization skills are waived heretofore.

8. Petitioner fashions, social justice against injustice to thoes of his class action as ground extended as stay main-

We hereby affirm under the penalties for perjury that the foregoing statements are true and correct.

 /s/ Ahmad Edwards ”
Ahmad Edwards gallery:
494657 Cell: 4-T
~~Leade~~ Leading publisher
of ethnically diverse art,
director of religious faith
base groups
40. S. Alabama. St.
Indianapolis, IN, 46204

305a

Warning: This report is confidential according to Ind.
Code 35-3-1-13 and may only be released
with specific authorization.

Date Ordered December 21, 2005
Date Completed January 13, 2006

<<stamped>> FILED Jan 13 2006 <<signature>>
Doris Ann Sadler

**STATE OF INDIANA
PRE-SENTENCE REPORT**

FACE SHEET

COURT INFORMATION

MARION SUPERIOR COURT, CRIMINAL DIVISION 6

Judge: The Honorable Grant Hawkins
Prosecutor: Mark Hollingsworth
Defense Attorney: Kevin McShane
Probation Officer: Diane Nickleson
Marion County Superior Court, Criminal Division, Probation
Department
Tel. 317-327-5850
200 East Washington Street, Suite 641, Indianapolis, IN 46204

OFFENDER INFORMATION

Case No.(s): 49G059907CF121975 Gallery No. 494657
Charging Name(s): Ahmad Edwards
True Name: Ahmad Edwards
Alias(es): N/A
Address: Homeless
City: Indianapolis State: IN Zip: N/A
Ph: N/A SSN: 309-78-9239
DOB: January 29, 1973 POB: Indianapolis, IN
Age: 32 Sex: Male Ht: 5'04" Wt.: 140 Eyes: Brown Hair: Black
Race: Black
ID Marks: Upper Right Shoulder "Z AMD E"
U.S. Citizen: Yes No Alien Status: N/A
Driver's License No.: 2330-31-8286 State of Issue: IN
Status: Expired

306a

Criminal Involvement (Check all that apply)

Charge(s) Pending Jail Felony Probation Comm. Corr.
 Juvenile Res. Placement
 Detainer(s) Prison Misdemeanor Parole Violation(s)
 Juvenile Detention IBS/IGS

OFFENSE INFORMATION

Present Offense(s): Ct. I, Attempted Murder (A); Ct. II, Battery (C); Ct. III, Criminal Recklessness (D) Ct. IV, Theft; Receiving Stolen Property (D)

B.A.C. N/A

Arrest Date: 7-12-99 Type of Release: None

Sentencing Date: January 17, 2006 Jail Credit: ~~2193~~ 2,381 Days

Co-Defendant(s): N/A

[2]

Ahmad Edwards

49G059907CF121975

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Guilty by Jury trial: The defendant was found guilty during a Jury Trial as to Ct. I, Attempted Murder as a Class A Felony; Ct. II, Battery as a Class C Felony; Ct. III, Criminal Recklessness as a Class D Felony and Ct. IV, Theft as a Class D Felony.

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

CHARGEBACK OFFENSE: Y N CHARGEBACK IF

SENT TO DOC: Y N

FACILITY/PROGRAM AT CAPACITY: Y N

STAFFED BY COMM. CORR.: Y N

OTHER INFORMATION:

MARITAL INFORMATION

S M D W Sep

Spouse/Other: N/A

Address: N/A

City: N/A State: N/A Zip: N/A Ph: N/A

Number of Dependent Children: 0

307a

Court-ordered Support: \$0.00 per Mo. Other: No Court ordered support

EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT, HEALTH

High School: Broad Ripple High School – 11th Grade

Graduated: Y N G.E.D. Y N

Verified: Y N

College/Vocational: N/A

N/A

Employer: Unemployed

Position: N/A \$N/A/hr.

Hire Date: N/A Hrs per wk.: N/A

Mental Health Referrals Y N

Physical Problems: Y N Alcohol/drug Use: Y N

CONTACT PERSONS

1) Name: N/A Relation: Ph:

Address:

2) Name: N/A Relation: Ph:

Address:

3) Other: N/A

N/A

SENTENCING INFORMATION (Probation Use Only)

CONVICTED BY: _____ PLEA _____ BENCH

_____ JURY DATE:

CONVICTED OF:

EXECUTED TIME: SUSPENDED: LENGTH OF PROBATION:

SPECIAL CONDITIONS:

[3]

Ahmad Edwards

49G059907CF12195

PRESENTENCE INVESTIGATION

I. SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Ahmad Edwards, defendant
 IPD Juvenile and Adult records
 Marion County Prosecutor files
 Marion Superior Court, Criminal Court Room 05,
 files
 Indiana State Police, records
 National Crime Information Center, records
 Indiana Bureau of Motor Vehicle Records

II. PRIOR LEGAL HISTORY**A. Juvenile Record**

The defendant has no known juvenile history in
 Marion County

B. Adult Record

<u>Date</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Offense</u>	<u>Disposition</u>
9-16-95	IPD	Public Intoxication (B/m) 95-133864	9-17-95; Charges Not Filed.
8-26-95	Thorntown, IN	Operating Vehicle While Intoxicated (A/m) 061019508CM1961	12-3-96; Guilty

No further information was available

3-19-97	Oklahoma City, OK	Boarding Bus with Deadly Trans to Other LE Agency or Dangerous Weapon Felony)	Unknown Disposition
7-30-98	MCSO	Criminal Trespass (A/m) 49F109807CM126385	9-9-98; Guilty, 365 days with suspended and 10 days executed

According to the Affidavit for Probable Cause, on
 7-30-98 at approximately 0240 hours, Deputy Nguyen
 was on duty in full uniform when he received a radio

dispatch call to assist security officer on a report of suspicious persons at 1501 E. 38th Street at the Villager Lodge. Upon arrival, Deputy Nguyen was informed by the officers that they had observed two suspicious black males subjects later identified as Ahmad Edwards and Christopher Mayfield. The subjects were observed standing outside Suite #1 by

[4]

Ahmad Edwards
49G059907CF12195

the security office as he drove pass the area during a routine patrol. The security officer then saw one of the subjects forced open the window to the vacant hotel room. By the time the officer came closer to investigate, he found subjects already inside the room. One of the subjects, Ahmad Edwards, was found to be armed with a Lorcin .380 caliber semi-automatic pistol.

Both subjects admitted to Deputy Nguyen that they were inside the hotel room and that they had not paid for the use of the room. They did not have any consent from the Villager Hotel to use the room and were placed under arrest for Criminal Trespass. The pistol belonging to Mr. Ahmad was confiscated by Indianapolis Police Department officers.

7-12- IPD Ct. I, Attempted Murder (A) INSTANT OFFENSE
99 Ct. II, Battery (C)
Ct. III, Criminal
Recklessness (D)
Ct. IV, Theft (D)
49G059907CF121975

National Crime Information Center Records reflected an out of state arrest in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. This Officer sent a fax request to Oklahoma County Probation Department in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. However, as of the date of this writing, there has been no response from the Oklahoma County Probation Department.

See attached IPD Criminal History.

C. CRIMINAL ORIENTATION

The defendant has not known juvenile history in Marion County. As an adult, the defendant has experienced five (5) arrests. These arrests include: Boarding Bus with a Deadly Trans to other LE Agency or Dangerous Weapon; Public Intoxication, Criminal Trespass, Attempted Murder, Battery, Criminal Recklessness, Operating Vehicle While Intoxicated and Theft. He has prior misdemeanor convictions for Criminal Trespass and Operating Vehicle While Intoxicated. He has never been afforded the benefit of probation supervision and has never served an executed sentence with the Indiana Department of Correction.

According to the Indiana Bureau of Motor Vehicle records, the defendant's Indiana Driver's License under number 2330-31-8286 expired in January of 2000.

D. SUMMARY OF LEGAL HISTORY

See above Criminal History information.

[5]

Ahmad Edwards
49G059907CF12195

III. PRESENT OFFENSE

A. Official Version

The defendant was found guilty during a Jury Trial as to Ct. I, Attempted Murder as a Class A Felony; Ct. II, Battery as a Class C Felony; Ct. III, Criminal Recklessness as a Class D Felony and Ct. IV, Theft as a Class D Felony.

Count I, reads, Ahmad Edwards, on or about July 12, 1999, did attempt to commit the crime of Murder, which is to intentionally kill another human being, namely: Ryan Martin, by engaging in conduct, that is: intentionally shooting a deadly weapon, that is: a handgun, at and toward Ryan Martin, with the intent to kill Ryan Martin, which conduct constituted a substantial step toward commission of said crime of Murder.

Count II, reads, Ahmad Edwards, on or about July 12, 1999, by means of a deadly weapon, that is: a handgun, did knowingly touch Robert LeClerc in a rude, insolent, or angry manner, that is: shot at and against Robert LeClerc with said handgun.

Count III, reads, Ahmad Edwards, on or about July 12, 1999, while armed with a deadly weapon, that is: a handgun, recklessly performed an act that created a substantial risk of bodily injury to other persons, namely pedestrians in the vicinity of Washington and Meridian Streets, by drawing and discharging said handgun at and toward the person of Ryan Martin, when said pedestrians were in close proximity to Ryan Martin.

Count IV, reads, Ahmad Edwards, on or about July 12, 1999, did knowingly exert unauthorized control

over the property, that is: shoes of Parisian, Inc, with intent to deprive Parisian, Inc, of any part of the value or use of said property.

According to the Affidavit for Probable Cause, on July 12, 1999, at approximately 12:20 PM, Indianapolis Police officers were called to the intersection of Washington and Meridian Street, an area heavily populated by pedestrian traffic during the lunch hour, on a person shot. Officer Bies was one of the first officers on the scene and spoke to one of the victims, Robert W. LeClerc, who stated that he was walking down the sidewalk when a black male, later identified as Ahmad Edwards, ran past him from the Parisian's Department Store. He stated that a white male, later identified as Ryan Martin, followed him and then tackled the black male, jumping on to his back.

The two began to struggle and wrestle and ended up in the street where LeClerc observed Edwards pull a gun out and fire one shot towards the street while they continued to struggle. Then, as Martin disengaged and began rolling away from him, Edwards fired another shot, which struck Martin in the back. At this time, Edwards jumped up and took two steps away, as if to cross the street and leave, then turned back towards Martin, raised the gun and aimed towards him. The shot, instead, struck LeClerc in the leg. At this time, Edwards fled with the weapon.

[6]

Ahmad Edwards
49G059907CF12195

Officer Bies spoke with Martin, who is a loss prevention officer for Parisian's. He stated that, just prior to the shooting, he saw Edwards take a pair of shoes and place them in a bag and pass all points of payment and exit the store. Martin followed him from the store and attempted to stop him and that is when the scuffle began. The next thing he knew, Edwards fired two shots, one of which struck Martin in the back. There were several witnesses to the incident. Both victims wish to prosecute.

Please see the attached Affidavit for Probable Cause.

B. Defendant's Version

The defendant is aware of and appears to understand the terms of the plea agreement reached in this case. Further, he is aware of the possible penalties the Court could impose in this matter.

The Probable Cause Affidavit was reviewed with the defendant. The defendant made the following handwritten statement: "the appointed motion of permissive intervention filed therein the Court Superior on 6-26-01, caused a stay of action and upon it's expiration or thereafter three years the plan to establish a youth program to and for the coordination of aspects of law enforcement to prevent and reduce crime among young people in Indiana became a diplomatic act. As under the safe streets act of 19(unknown), "an omnibus considerate agent: I membered clients within the public and others that at production of the Courts actions showcased causes. The costs of the stay, (Trial Rule 60), has a derivative property that is: my knowledge events as not unexpended to contract the membered clients is the commission of finding a facilme for this plan or

projects to become organization of administrative recommendations conditioned by governors.”

Please see the attached Defendant’s Statement.

IV. VICTIM’S IMPACT STATEMENT

This Officer sent a Victim’s Right’s and Restitution Information package to the victim, Ryan Martin, informing him of his rights and the date and time of sentencing. This package has not been returned.

On 1-13-06, this Officer attempted to contact Mr. Martin at his listed telephone number. However, there was no answer and no answering machine to which to leave a message.

On 1-13-06, this Officer sent a GroupWise e-mail message to Marion County Prosecutor, Mark Hollingsworth, informing him of the lack of response from the victim and the inability to make contact with the victim.

This Officer sent a Victim’s Right’s and Restitution Information package to the victim, Robert LeClerc, informing him of his rights and the date and time of sentencing. This package has not been returned. However, this Officer spoke with Mr. LeClerc

[7]

Ahmad Edwards
49G059907CF12195

concerning the Instant Offense. Mr. LeClerc stated he does not have any input to make and he did not suffer any losses. He stated he was just a bystander in the wrong place at the wrong time. He reported no animosity towards the defendant. He indicated everything was covered by his insurance and his company. He stated he believes the Judge knows best

when it comes to the defendant's sentencing and he will not be attending the sentencing hearing but would like to know what sentence the defendant receives.

V. FAMILY/PERSONAL BACKGROUND

A. Family

The defendant was born on January 29, 1973, in Indianapolis, Indiana. The defendant's parents, Alonzo Weathers and Beverly Curtis were most likely married at the time of the defendant's birth. However, he stated he is unsure if they were ever really married or not. The defendant related his father was murdered before he was two years old and he does not have any further information concerning his father. The defendant reported he was raised by his mother and stated he had a happy childhood. He reported no abuse or neglect by his mother and stated she did not abuse alcohol or illegal substances. The defendant's sister, Amber Weathers committed suicide in 2005.

The defendant reported he lived in Nashville, Tennessee for approximately 10 years. He indicated he resided in Chicago, Illinois for a couple of months prior to moving to Nashville. He also has resided in Phoenix, Arizona and most recently Miami, Florida. He stated he had only been back in the Indianapolis area for approximately 6 months after returning from Miami, Florida, before his arrest on the Instant Offense.

B. Marital/Dependent Status

The defendant has never been married and has no children.

C. Education

The defendant stated he attended Broad Ripple High School completing the 11th grade. He stated he was enrolled in Special Education Classes but also was in magna arts classes. He reported this made it difficult for him because his friends would tease him about being in “special” classes. He stated he quit school he stated because “approximately two hours of travel noted purses weakening.” He also related he was suspended from school for “privileged communications.” The defendant further stated he would like to pursue in the future “decision to reform public servant honors to legislator’s official office of education degree at political science.”

According to records from Broad Ripple High School, the defendant was enrolled at Broad Ripple High School from September 1986 until September 1987. He did not receive any credits and received mostly failing grades during that time period.

[8]

Ahmad Edwards
49G059907CF12195

D. Employment

The defendant reported past employment with Burns Security and Allied Security although he could not remember the dates of employment. He stated prior to his arrest, he was self-employed trying to start a youth program to steer kids away from crime. He also stated while in Miami, Florida prior to moving back to Indianapolis, he was self-employed trying to work with the inner city youth. He stated he would like in the future to be self employed cultivating city and public works.

E. Military

N/A

F. Financial

The defendant has no known source of income at the present time. He reported no assets and no outstanding debts.

G. Religion

The defendant indicated he is both Christian and Baptist and last attended church services in 1999.

H. Interests and Leisure Activities

The defendant enjoys doing research in prevention of crime.

VI. HEALTH

A. Physical

The defendant related he is in excellent physical health at the present time. However, he stated he does suffer from high blood pressure but is not currently taking any prescription medications. He stated he suffered a gunshot wound on the date of the Instant Offense stating "Federal Officer in this case deposed fired and hit left leg."

The defendant has no known allergies and does not suffer from asthma.

According to records from Indiana University Medical Group, the defendant reported in September of 1995, he was in a motor vehicle accident with a loss of consciousness. At the time of arrival at Methodist Hospital he has a Glasgow Coma Scale of 14 out of 14. It was noted that according to medical records he had an approximate five minute loss of consciousness

and he was incontinent of urine.” He was diagnosed with a closed head injury and acute alcohol intoxication and scalp laceration with repair. It was reported his scalp laceration was in the right frontal region. It was also reported the defendant was hit as a pedestrian (by his report) but he did not know the date of the accident. He reported

[9]

Ahmad Edwards
49G059907CF12195

after this accident his “right leg drew up.” He stated he lost his job at that time because of increased fatigue and decreased range of motion in his leg. He further reported he also broke his left collarbone in this accident.

B. Mental

The defendant rated his emotional health as excellent. He stated he does not suffer from depression, anxiety, nervousness and has never been diagnosed with a mental health problem. He related he was hospitalized for a short period of time and received a “Court examined state of available mental support finding liability to stand trial” in the past.

According to records from Indiana University Neuropsychological Group, the results of the neuropsychological examination “point towards a patient who clearly has a compromise of brain functions.” “He has decreased motor speed on the the left upper extremity for fine motor dexterity and coordination and he is extraordinarily impulsive, disinhibited and has impairments of his ability to maintain cognitive set.” “He has difficulties learning new cognitive strategies and is extremely slow in this

respect.” “These findings are consistent for patients who have frontal lobe injuries, particularly orbital and mesial surfaces of the frontal lobes.”

Further, it was reported the defendant “clearly presents with a delusional disorder, grandiose type and he does endorse olfactory hallucinations.” Lastly, “these are neurobehavioral changes that are seen with frontal lobe brain damage. Additionally, Dr. Trexler, suspected the patient also has a major thought disorder, such as schizophrenia.

Further, Dr. Trexler indicated “it is also obvious that he was under a great deal of stress at the time this offense occurred, and it seems likely that he was psychotic at the time of the offense secondary to the interactive effects between frontal lobe damage and significant environmental stresses. He uses his delusional system to cope with profound feelings of inadequacy and his very strong family history of psychiatric illness certainly provides for a predisposition towards a major psychiatric illness that is now made even worse by frontal lobe dyscontrol.

It should be noted, the defendant has been involved in counseling and treatment at Logansport State Hospital during the pendency of the Instant Offense.

C. Substance Abuse

The defendant stated he does not really consume alcohol but will drink “table” wine on occasions when having diner with a friend. He reported one arrest for Public Intoxication prior to turning 21. It should be noted, the defendant was convicted of Operating Vehicle While Intoxicated in 1996 in Thorntown, Indiana.

The defendant reported he “experimented” with marijuana back in 1990 and used less than a year or two. He stated he then would use off and on until finally he quit smoking marijuana in 1992.

[9]

Ahmad Edwards
49G059907CF12195

The defendant stated he “experimented” with cocaine while in high school but only used two or three times. He denied any use of any other illegal substances and reported no prior substance abuse treatment.

VII. EVALUATION/SUMMARY

Ahmad Edwards, a black male, age 32, is before the Court after being found guilty during a Jury Trial as to Ct. I, Attempted Murder as a Class A Felony; Ct. II, Battery as a Class C Felony; Ct. III, Criminal Recklessness as a Class D Felony and Theft as a Class D Felony.

Under I.C. 35-50-2-2, it appears the Instant Offense is non-suspendable.

Aggravating Circumstances:

To be determined by the Court.

Mitigating Circumstances:

To be determined by the Court.

VIII. RECOMMENDATION

The sentence is left to the Court’s discretion.

Should the Court impose any period of probation supervision, it is recommended the following fees be assessed:

Administrative Fee: Felony = \$100

Fine: to be determined by Court.

Court Costs: \$156.00.

Probation User Fees: Felony = \$100.00 Initial Fee,
\$30.00 Monthly Supervision Fee

Public Defender Fee: to be determined by the
Court.

Urinalysis Fee (Non-Alcohol and Drug Cases):

Class A, B, or C Felony = \$200.00 flat fee.

[10]

Ahmad Edwards
49G059907CF12195

It is further recommended that the defendant be
ordered to pay any additional applicable fees.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Diane Nickleson

Diane Nickleson
Probation Officer

Amended

AFFIDAVIT

FOR PROBABLE CAUSE

STATE OF INDIANA, COUNTY OF MARION, SS:

Det. Tony Brown swears (affirms) that:

On July 12, 1999, at approximately 12:20 P.M., Indianapolis Police Officers were called to the intersection of Washington and Meridian Street, an area heavily populated by pedestrian traffic during the lunch hour, on a person shot. Officer Anna Bies was one of the first officers on the scene and spoke to one of the victims, Robert W. LeClerc, who stated that he was walking down the sidewalk when a black male, later identified as Ahmad Edwards, ran past him from the Parisian's Department Store. He stated that a white male, later identified as Ryan Martin, followed him and then tackled the black male, jumping on to his back.

The two began to struggle and wrestle and ended up in the street where LeClerc observed Edwards pull a gun out and fire one shot towards the street while they continued to struggle. Then, as Martin disengaged and began rolling away from him, Edwards fired another shot, which struck Martin in the back. At this time, Edwards jumped up and took two steps away, as if to cross the street and leave, then turned back towards Martin, raised the gun up and aimed towards him. The shot, instead, struck LeClerc in the leg.

At this time, Edwards fled with the weapon.

I spoke with Martin, who is a loss prevention officer for Parisian's. He stated that, just prior to the shooting, he saw Edwards take a pair of shoes and place them in a bag and pass all points of payment and exit the store. Martin followed him from the store and attempted to stop him and that is when the scuffle began. The next thing he knew, Edwards fired two shots, one of which struck Martin in the back.

There were several witnesses to the incident.

Both victims wish to prosecute.

All of events occurred in Marion Co., IN.

I swear (affirm), under penalty of perjury as specified by IC 35-44-2-1, that the foregoing representations are true.

Dated <u>July 12, 1999</u>	<u>/s/ Tony L. Brown</u> AFFIANT
<u>/s/ J [illegible]</u> DEPUTY PROSECUTING ATTORNEY NINETEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT	<u>JUDGE</u>

**DEFENDANT'S VERSION OF THE
INSTANT OFFENSE**

IF YOU WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT
CONCERNING YOUR CONVICTION PLEASE DO
SO BELOW (THIS STATEMENT WILL BE
ATTACHED TO THE PRESENTENCE REPORT
FOR REVIEW BY THE COURT.)

YOU MAY USE ADDITIONAL PAPER, IF
NECESSARY.

IF YOU DO NOT WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT,
WRITE "NO STATEMENT." PLEASE SIGN AND
DATE THIS PAGE.

"The appointed motion of permissive intervention
filed therein the court superior on, 6-26-0001, caused
a stay of action and upon it's expiration or thereafter
three years the plan to establish a youth program to
and for the coordination of aspects of law enforcement
to prevent and reduce crime among young people in
Indiana became a diplomatic act as under, the safe
streets act of 1968, "A omnibuc considerate agent: I
membered clients within the public and others that
at/production of the courts actions showcased causes.
The costs of the stay [Trial rule 60] has a derivative
property that is: My knowledged events as not
unexpended to contract the membered clients is the
commission of finding a facilitie for this plan or
project to become organization of administrative
recommendations earry conditioned by governors

THE ABOVE INFORMATION IS CORRECT TO
THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE.

PLEASE SIGN AND DATE THIS PAGE

Signed /s/ Ahmad Edwards Date 12-22-05

325a

Name _____
Printed Name Ahmad Edwards _____

326a

IN THE
INDIANA SUPREME COURT

<<stamped>> FILED JAN 23 2006 <<signature>>
Doris Ann Sadler

AHMAD EDWARDS
AMBERGRESS & ZENAGENCIES
PLAINTIFF/PETTIONER,

vs.

STATE OF INDIANA
AND THE HONORABLE GRANI
HAWKINS,
AS JUDGE
THEREOF,

RESPONDENTS.

PETITION FOR WRIT MANDAMUS

This act comes herein now before Supreme Court of Indiana on the application of petition at Writ of Mandamus against respondent.

Petitioner alleges preliminary injunction in cause number 49G059907CF121975 that court or respondent conducted a hearing on petitioner in 2005.

Accordingly, it is that respondents are to as thereof, stay of petitioner at the criminal rule 4's verbatim recital of plaintiff/petitioner rule §1203[6] of Title 1 of the omnibus crime control and safe streets act of 1968 is: to stimulate the research and development of methods for prevention and reduction of crime that the regulation of the Rule 62 [E] missions, agents no obligation.

IN THE
INDIANA SUPREME COURT

5.49 A-10.2

AHMAD EDWARDS

PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER,

vs.

THE MARION SUPERIOR COURT, AND THE
STATE OF INDIANA

RESPONDENT.

PETITION FOR WRIT MANDAMUS

This act comes herein now before Supreme Court of Indiana on the application of petitioner at Writ of Mandamus against respondent.

Petitioner alleges respondent shall not hold a party to enter its' location on the court to answer a criminal charge for a period in aggregate embracing more than one year from date criminal charge against such party is filed.

Respondent promulgated petitioner in aggregated embracing for more than six years from date criminal charge against plaintiff/petitioner was filed.

Respondent affirmed the criminal rule 4[C] on May 29, 2001. Plaintiff filed a motion in regard to petitioner being discharged and at respondent's failure entered a notice on effect of criminal rule 4[c] on September 13, 2004. Plaintiff/Petitioner held by superior circuit court will be freed in nine years or limited to a discharge of the cause number: 49G059907CF121975 by the Respondent.

329a

Respondent then denies the law and petitioners relief is a order of release.

/s/ Ahmad Edwards

Ahmad Edwards

Plaintiff Petitioner

Form/

5.47 A-10.1

330a

<<stamped>> JAN 23 2006 <<signature>>

Doris Ann Sadler

IN THE
INDIANA SUPREME COURT

AHMAD EDWARDS

PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER,

vs.

THE MARION SUPERIOR COURT, AND THE
STATE OF INDIANA,

RESPONDENT.

PETITION FOR WRIT MANDAMUS

This act comes herein now before Supreme Court of Indiana on the application of petitioner at Writ of Mandamus against respondent.

Petitioner alleges respondent shall not hold a party to enter location on the court to answer a criminal charge for a period in aggregate embracing more than one year from date criminal charge against such party is filed.

Respondent promulgated petitioner in aggregated embracing for more than six years from date criminal charge against plaintiff petitioner was filed.

Respondent affirmed the criminal rule 4[C] on May 29, 2001 Plaintiff filed a motion in regard to petitioner being; discharged and at respondents failure entered a notice on effect of the criminal rule 4[C] on September 13, 2004. Plaintiff/petitioner held by superior circuit court will be freed in nine years or limited to a discharge of the cause number 49G059907CF121975 by the respondent.

331a

Respondent then denies the law and petitioners relief is a order of release.

/s/ Ahmad Edwards

Ahmad Edwards
Plaintiff Petitioner

Form/

5.47 A-10.1

IN THE
INDIANA SUPREME COURT

AHMAD EDWARDS
AMBERGRESS & ZENAGENCIES

PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER,

vs.

STATE OF INDIANA
AND THE HONORABLE GRANT HAWKINS,
AS JUDGE THEREOF,

RESPONDENT.

PETITION FOR WRIT MANDAMUS

This act comes herein non before Supreme Court of Indiana on the application of petitioner at Writ of Mandamus against respondent

Petitioner alleges preliminary injunction in cause number 49G059907CF121975 that court or respondent conducted a hearing on petitioner in 2005.

Accordingly, it is that respondents are to as: thereof stay of petitioner at the criminal rule 4.[6] verbatim recital of plaintiff/petitioner §1203 [6] of title of the omnibus crime control and safe streets act ~~act~~ of 1968 is: To stimulate the research and development of methods for prevention and reduction of crime: provide for organizing the the regulation of the rule 62[E] The missions agents no obligation.

Respondent then denied the law and petitioners relief is a order of release.

333a

/s/ Ahmad Edwards
Ahmad Edwards
Plaintiff Petitioner

5.49 A-10.2

Edwards Exhibits

A Pome by: "Ahmad Edwards"

"Triglycerides Osmotic"

"Render unto me the due benevolence: that thine hands have made me and fashioned me together again with by those who walk in the law and has commanded us to keep diligently statutes so that I shall not be ashamed, or forsaked utterly: and caused me to multiply increased excellent judgment by effect that may consider all my works. You are my help and my shield worketh your righteousness I know that it is great and above all as you are my saviour from ignorance: who shall change my vile body other than you working whereby all things able

335a

“ORDER DRESS CODE”
AGENCY FORM [8007]

[continued on page : of:]

336a

O how I wish you could have been my father a
witness of me in the wilderness, speaking unto me,
“Go make yourself according to the fashion of her so
that you may be seen.”

“Triglycerides
Osmotic”

by : Ahmad
Edwards

337a

“MOTION FOR COMPETNET
DRESS CODE”
AGENCY FORM [8006]

[continued on page: of:]

Dear: Mr. Trexler: A patient

“Everything stands with what you have discovered so far in court and I hope it will include much more. I’m extremely happy to learn these things they have made me a bright, and more practical young man and surprisingly more creative.”

“You are like the father I’ve looked for for years but could never find. You are genuinely helpful. How can I become a career man - a person like you that makes such good sense” and is so useful to anyone? You are truly not indispensable, in my life. I wish I could always get your advice, and learn some of your tricks of the trade. I thank you: for contributing generous hours helping, with your assistance and encouragement as our work progressed and I offer my gratitude to you and a special thank you to your staff and their supporters.

Sincerely:

 /s/ Ahmad Edwards

Mr. “Ahmad Edwards”

339a

“DAYS OF TRAVIL”:

“APRIL”-2005

1. U.S. - New Zeland, 3;days
2. New Zeland - U.S. 3;days
3. U.S. - England 3; days

Total

9 days

Brilliance of assessment to demonstrate right by the Attorney General conditions for mental illness of the gravely disabled to be eligible persons at ports of entry or debarkation; temporary care; arrangements with state or other public or nonprofit agencies; payment or reimbursement for care and treatment.”

“Could being in need for hospitalization as mentally ill make me a national for foreign countries? § 321. say’s so under “eligible person” is there a foreign country with regulations you have prescribed? And will the ~~seerea~~ Secretary of Health transfer me? The finest of provocation;”

/s/ Ahmad Edwards
Ahmad Edwards

to them that tran

“Being appropriate: and just at the right time I stand able to place myself at the date of a hearing in the jurisdiction to ~~enfore~~ enforce federal law providing for the treatment of persons with developmental disabilities. To order a plan of treatment to be followed, and to order officials to seek funds for this development of plan which would provide the best means of success. “For this I will, need a display of its procession that can clearly and particular in form for forum of a judicial conseration not reach failure for a release thats compelled with the the U.S. Military or defense contractors

Pending a regular commitment hearing, absent this indication dismissal of proceedings will not be ordered. Therefore a mental institution maybe where I need to go, yet not to one: however the courts endeavors to aid me: that stands in bad faith.”

“At one of the hearings you made a statment that was “tainted,” when the trial court tryed to order an commitment to “Logansport State Hospital” [and the latest stated.....I was not effectively treated during the last stay at Logansport filed on Nov 26, 2002] allied

Mr. Adam C. Collins is the c

Dear: "Mr. Trexler"

"As a petitioner for habeas corpus who was insane at the time when I was detained and sit herenow at the county jail , I'm not entitled to be wholly discharged until cured. Yet a petition in habeas corpus proceedings is or will be held insufficient for not alleging facts that the petitioner is or was sane at the time of commitment or at the time the petition for habeas corpus is filed."

"A dismissal of the proceedings protects not my due process rights as an individual who is mentally ill and detained: as such a individual could seek a habeas corpus for release

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF INDIANA

Cause No. 49S02-0705-CR-202

AHMAD EDWARDS,) Appeal from the Marion
) Superior Court, Criminal
) Division 5,
Appellant (Defendant)
Below),) No. 49G05-9907-CF-
vs.) 121975,
)
STATE OF INDIANA,))
)
Appellee (Plaintiff) The Hon. Grant Hawkins,
Below)) Judge.

<<stamped>> FILED JAN 30 2008

<<SIGNATURE>>

Kevin S. Smith

CLERK OF THE INDIANA SUPREME COURT
COURT OF APPEALS
AND TAX COURT

**Verified Notice of Submission of Additional
Transcripts**

The State notifies this Court of its submission of five additional transcripts for transmission to the Supreme Court of the United States pursuant to the Writ of Certiorari granted on December 7, 2007. These transcripts have not previously been submitted to the Clerk of this Court. Each of these transcripts is from pre-trial proceedings in this case and has

been transcribed and certified by an official court reporter of the Marion County Superior Court:

1. Transcript of the Competency Hearing held on February 2, 2000. Certified by the court reporter on March 26, 2003.
2. Transcript of the Competency Hearing held on February 16, 2000. Certified by the court reporter on March 23, 2003.
3. Transcript of the Competency Hearing held on March 20, 2002. Certified by the court reporter on April 2, 2003.
4. Transcript of the Competency Hearing held on April 29, 2003. Certified by the court reporter on January 7, 2008.
5. Transcript from a pre-trial hearing immediately prior to Defendant's first trial on June 27, 2005. Certified by the court reporter on January 28, 2008.

The State is submitting original transcripts with original certifications. These transcripts have not been altered by the State.

While not previously reviewed by the Supreme Court of Indiana or the Indiana Court of Appeals, these transcripts are already part of the appellate record pursuant to Indiana Appellate Rule 27. That Rule states that the record on appeal includes "all proceedings before the trial court . . . whether or not transcribed or transmitted to the Court on Appeal."

Respectfully submitted:

STEVE CARTER
Attorney General of Indiana

345a

Atty. No. 4150-64

By: /s/ Justin F. Roebel
Justin F. Roebel
Deputy Attorney General
Atty. No. 0023725-49

Verification

I affirm under the penalties for perjury that the foregoing representations are true, correct, and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief.

/s/ Justin F. Roebel

Justin F. Roebel

Certificate of Service

I do solemnly affirm under the penalties for perjury that on the 30th day of January, 2008, I served upon the Defendant, by counsel, in the above-entitled cause one (1) copy of Appellee's Notice by depositing the same in the United States mail first-class postage prepaid, addressed as follows:

Michael R. Fisher
151 N. Delaware St.
Suite 200
Indianapolis, IN 46204

/s/ Justin F. Roebel

Justin F. Roebel

Deputy Attorney General

Office of Attorney General
Indiana Government Center South, Fifth Floor
302 West Washington Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-2770
Telephone (317) 233-2459

STATE OF INDIANA)
) SS:
COUNTY OF MARION)

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF MARION COUNTY
CRIMINAL DIVISION, ROOM FIVE

STATE OF INDIANA,)
Plaintiff,)
VS.) CAUSE NO. 49G05-9907-
) CF-121975
AHMAD EDWARDS,)
Defendant.)

TRANSCRIPT OF COMPETENCY HEARING

BEFORE THE HONORABLE
GARY L. MILLER, JUDGE
CRIMINAL DIVISION, ROOM FIVE
ON FEBRUARY 2, 2000

*Shelly D. Glore, Official Court Reporter
In The Superior Court of Marion County,
Indiana
Civil Division, Room Two*

STATE OF INDIANA)
) SS:
COUNTY OF MARION)

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF MARION COUNTY
CRIMINAL DIVISION, ROOM FIVE

CAUSE NO. 49G05-9907-CF-121975

STATE OF INDIANA,)
Plaintiff,)
vs.)
AHMAD EDWARDS,)
Defendant.)

A P P E A R A N C E S

FOR THE STATE OF INDIANA:

Donald Pitzer
MARION COUNTY PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE
200 East Washington Street
Suite T560, City-County Building
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

[FOR THE DEFENDANT, AHMAD EDWARDS:]

Diane Abel
MARION COUNTY PUBLIC
200 East Washington Street
Suite 1260, City-County Building
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

*Shelly D. Glore, Official Reporter
In the Superior Court of Marion County,
Indiana*

349a

Civil Division, Room Two

350a

[4]

WITNESS APPROACHES WITNESS STAND

The Court, in order to maintain the issues in its behalf, offered and introduced the following into evidence, to-wit:

D R. D W I G H T S C H U S T E R

a witness called on behalf of the Court, who, after first having been sworn to testify the truth, testified as follows, to-wit:

DIRECT EXAMINATION,

[5]

Direct Examination of Dr. Schuster

Q Doctor, have you had the opportunity, at the request of this Court, to examine the defendant in this case, Ahmad Edwards?

A I did, sir.

Q Will you summarize your findings and conclusions for us, please.

A I examined Mr. Edwards in the -- in a private room in the Marion County Jail on December 14, 1999. The examination consisted of a standard psychiatric evaluation of eliciting history and observing the defendant, history particularly relevant to the present charges and past history of possible nervous or mental conditions. Carried out a mental status evaluation.

I also did talk with his mother and his grandmother. And I reviewed lengthy letters

which Mr. Edwards had written to both the prosecutor and to his attorney.

As a result of my examination, it was my opinion that Mr. Edwards has two rather distinct conditions: The first, a learning disability, which is classified as a developmental and expressive writing disorder and expressive language disorder, and the second diagnosis is that of a delusional disorder, grandiose type.

[6]

As a result of my examination, it's my opinion that Mr. Edwards does have understanding that he's charged with a crime and he has a general common understanding of the legal procedures thereon, and he is able to communicate with his attorney, although his delusional ideas may create some problems at times. But I do believe that he's competent to stand trial at this time.

Further, I believe that he was of unsound mind, in the legal sense of that term, on or about July 12, 1999, in that he was suffering from a mental disease which impaired his appreciation of the wrongfulness of his conduct.

Q Did you summarize your findings and conclusions to us in a letter dated December 31, 1999?

A Yes.

Q This document entitled -- or marked Court's Exhibit 2 (indicating)?

A Yes, that is my report.

THE COURT: Any objection from the State to the admission of Court's Exhibit 2 for the purpose of this hearing?

MR. PITZER: No, Judge.

THE COURT: Miss Abel?

[7]

MS. ABEL: No, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. Court's Exhibit 2 will be admitted without objection from the State or the defense. Would you care to cross-examine, Mr. Pitzer?

MR. PITZER: Thank you, Judge.

[13]

CROSS-EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MS. ABEL:

Q Doctor, you talked about Mr. Edwards and his difficulty in communicating, in that he had

[14]

these grandiose delusions and about himself and his role in the community and with his lawyers.

A Well, yes, to some extent, his grandiose delusions; probably more his learning disability that may create some difficulties in communication.

Q Okay. So his learning disability and the delusions, in combination. How much time did you spend with Mr. Edwards over at the jail?

A It was over an hour.

Q And during that hour of conversation with Mr. Edwards, was he able to stay focused on your questions?

A Focused, except with the idea that he went on and on in considerable detail and in a disconnected fashion.

Q Did you have difficulty in getting direct answers from Mr. Edwards when you asked him questions?

A Yes.

Q And was he easily -- did he easily change the subject and want to talk about his -- the journal that he keeps in jail, his -- his idea of solving the world's problems, getting the prosecutor's ideas about how to take care of

[15]

crime from the city, things of that nature?

A Yes, he did go off on tangents.

Q And, Doctor, did you also review some letters that Mr. Edwards had written, both to the prosecutor and myself?

A I did.

Q And would you classify those as coherent, concise, directed letters, or letters of a very sort of bizarre, undirected, delusional sort?

A Well, the letters certainly -- certainly were not concise or direct, in that they were full of grammatical errors, spelling errors, word choices that were inappropriate, sentences that actually amounted to three or four sentences at a time --

Q Okay.

A -- which is in -- in keeping with the expressive writing disorder.

Q Okay. Did the contents -- we were just talking about the structure, basically, there. But did the content also play out with his grandiose delusional disorder, in the sense that he was talking about, again, ways to save the world and plans for the prosecutor to stop crime, and things like that, in the letters?

[16]

A As I recall, they did.

Q Okay. And, Doctor, would these -- the learning disability, the delusional disorder are going to affect the way Mr. Edwards is going to be able to communicate with his attorneys.

A Well, yes, they do influence it.

Q Influence it, okay. Influence it in the sense that his attorneys are not going to be able to get straight answers from him?

A Well, no, more that it takes more time to redirect him to answering and to sorting out some of the chaff.

Q Okay. But he's not going to be focussed on the important facts of the case, perhaps?

A I'm not certain about that. He's pretty well-acquainted with the facts of the case.

Q Okay. But he's going to go off on tangents? He goes off on tangents when we try to communicate with him?

A Yes.

Q Okay. He is going to talk and speak in a disconnected fashion when we try to communicate with him?

A Yes.

Q And all of this would impair the ability of his
[17]
attorneys to communicate with Mr. Edwards and get this case together?

A To some extent.

[19]

THE COURT: Thank you, sir. You may step down. Call Dr. Masbaum.

WITNESS APPROACHES WITNESS STAND

The Court, in order to maintain the issues in its behalf, offered and introduced the following into evidence, to-wit:

D R. N E D M A S B A U M

a witness called on behalf of the Court, who, after first having been sworn to testify the truth, testified as follows, to-wit:

THE COURT: Please be seated.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY THE COURT:

Q Would you give us your name for the record, please.

A Dr. Ned Masbaum.

Q What is your business or occupation?

A Physician, specializing in psychiatry.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MS. ABEL:

Q Dr. Masbaum, just briefly, do you -- does Mr. -- did Mr. Edwards have problems communicating with you, difficulty communicating in a direct -- in a directed way?

A He would answer my initial questions that I would ask him. And then I follow up with questions of clarification. He would then ramble and avoid answering the questions.

Q Did he also go off on tangents and different sorts of issues, other than what you were there to discuss with him?

A At times he did. He went into detail about writing the prosecutor and -- to compliment the prosecutor in what a good job he had done, and how he had wanted to assist the prosecutor in

his future political campaigns, and offered himself as an agent for the prosecutor.

Q And did Mr. Edwards talk about, or did you read in the letters that I sent to you, about his goal for saving the world, and things of this nature, and how he was going to help the youth and -- and --

A Yes, I read that.

STATE OF INDIANA)
COUNTY OF MARION) SS:

IN THE MARION SUPERIOR COURT
CRIMINAL DIVISION, ROOM FIVE
THE HONORABLE GARY MILLER
PRESIDING JUDGE

STATE OF INDIANA)
AHMAD EDWARDS)

TRANSCRIPT OF THE RECORD
COMPETENCY HEARING
AUGUST 16, 2000

[3]

L A N C E E. T R E X L E R, having been duly sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth in said cause of action; testifies as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MS. ABEL, ATTORNEY FOR THE DEFENDANT

Q Dr. Trexler, please state your name and spell your last name for the Court Reporter.

A Lance Emerson Trexler, T-R-E-X-L-E-R.

Q And Dr. Trexler, how are you employed?

A I am employed by Community Hospitals of Indianapolis as the Clinical Director for the Center for Neurolog Rehabilitation, and I'm a clinical assistant professor, [4] Department of Physical Medicine, Rehabilitation at I.U. School of Medicine, and assistant professor in

the Department of Psychology at I.U.P.U.I., and adjunct assistant professor at Purdue University Department of Psychology.

Q And your specialty is neuropsychology, is that correct?

A That's correct.

[5]

Q And have you met with and know Ahmad Edwards?

A Yes, I have.

Q And he's the Defendant whose sitting here at the table with us, correct?

A That's correct.

Q And how much time did you spend with Mr. Edwards?

A I spent about an hour and a half or an hour and forty-five minutes interviewing him.

Q Did you also look over medical records and documents provided by Mr. Hill and I in relationship to Mr. Edwards?

A Yes.

Q And was Mr. Edwards given some neuropsych exams, as well?

A Yes. He was given a rather extensive battery of neuropsychological tests to look at a range of human abilities and personality functions.

[8]

Q Now, you've just recited five or six things where he's average, but your final conclusion is that he's not competent and was not seen at

the time of the event, so what leads you to those conclusions, what tests and what countervailing evidence do you have?

- A Well, of course, let me preface my answer by saying that brain functions, there are many of them, and these functions are complex and so that's why we have a whole battery of tests because measuring one function doesn't tell you about somebody's brain. Mr. Edwards was also found to be impaired however on his coordination, on his left hand it was noted to be impaired compared to the right. He was severely impaired with respect to cognitive [9] control and impulsivity and was severely impaired on a measure of what I would describe as working memory, meaning keeping focused and regulating what it is that you are thinking about, and trying to do at any one time. And as an example of that on a particular test that's called the Past Auditory Serial Addition Test, the score comes out in a variety of ways, but the main way is in what are called T-scores, where a T-score of fifty is average, and a T-score of seventy would be better than average, and a T-score of thirty would be lower than average and potentially impaired. And Mr. Edwards' score on that test was a minus thirty-two (-32) T-score. He was noted to be very perseverative during learning and memory tasks, which means that he repeats himself without being aware that he's repeating himself. On problem solving tasks, he would develop the right strategy to solve a problem and then spontaneously forget or lose where it was he was going and end off in a

different direction. And lastly the results point towards the presence of a significant learning disability. Despite average IQ's his reading percentile was noted to be at the 12th percentile, but spelling was at the 1st percentile and mathematics was at the 2nd percentile.

Q Doctor, so after taking these tests and finding these impairments what would your diagnosis be as to the cause?

[10]

A The results clearly point towards brain impairment and the best explanation I can find for that in context of an individual who grew up with a rather marked learning disability, in addition, it appears to be the motor vehicle accident and the traumatic head injury that he had in I believe it was 1994, my apologies, 1995.

Q So part of his impairment is due to the head injury that he sustained is your diagnosis?

A I would argue that all the impairments noted on neuropsychological examination except with respect to the learning disabilities are the result of the head injury.

Q Doctor, have you reviewed Dr.Schuster and Masbaum's reports that have been filed with the Court, is that correct?

A Yes.

Q And they both found that Mr. Edwards suffered from delusional disorder, grandiose type; do you also concur in that?

A I think that's a very accurate diagnosis.

Q And how does that diagnosis, the grandiose, delusional disorder play into these impairments?

A Well, when you're talking about neurologic and psychiatric functions, they are, at least in terms of how they affect our ability to behave they are not merely additive, they are exponential and so I guess I believe [11] that Mr. Edwards not only has learning disabilities, but has a significant thought disorder, and thirdly then has neurologic discontrol, that is, is unable to regulate the way he organizes plans and monitors his own behavior for neurologic reasons, and so that combination makes it extremely difficult for him to adapt.

Q And Doctor, as to Mr. Edwards' competence to stand trial, and the legal definition of competence to stand trial is can he participate and assist in his defense; do you have an opinion as to whether he can participate effectively in assisting his defense?

A I do have an opinion.

Q And what is your opinion?

A I think that he cannot assist in his own defense.

Q And what leads you to that conclusion?

A Well, all of the aforementioned diagnoses and their implications.

Q Well, let's talk about implications because that's what we're having the difficulty with here. In your opinion after talking to Mr. Edwards and his attorneys. Do you think he

can stay focused and talk to his attorneys about presenting a defense?

A Not at all. I don't believe that Mr. Edwards can hold together one line of thinking for more than a few minutes.

[12]

Q Now, he can certainly sit up here and say this is the Judge, that's the prosecutor, we're his attorneys, but what does that mean in relationship to his ability to communicate effectively and be focused?

A I think the data--the objective data clearly shows that Mr. Edwards can learn and he can remember wrote factual information. But the way in which he's able to use that decompensates very rapidly in anything less than a highly structured situation.

Q And have you seen some of the letters that Mr. Edwards has written that I've provided to you?

A Yes

Q And how would you describe those letters?

A They are identical to his verbal behavior, and that is they are extraordinarily tangential, disorganized, randomly organized, grandiose and reflective of a thought disorder.

Q And , Doctor, you also made an opinion as to whether Mr. Edwards was sane or insane at the time of the offense, and what is your opinion in that regard?

A I think he was clearly insane at the time of the offense.

Q And legally that means he could not appreciate the wrongfulness of his actions; is that correct?

[13]

A I think---that's correct. I think at that time Mr. Edwards was wholly absorbed in a delusional framework and was as he always is neurologically disregulated.

Q And that's an important point, I mean, you're sitting here today, Mr. Edwards is listening and is quiet, but, I mean, is that any indication of his ability to assist his lawyers and prepare his defense?

A Oh, I don't think so. I think as I said in highly structured situations where there's a very specific task at hand, that those are the circumstances under which Mr. Edwards functions at his optimum.

Q And he's charged with two counts of attempted murder. In your opinion do you think that he can adequately stay focused through a trial and more importantly stay focused with his lawyers to prepare that defense for those two very severe charges?

A Absolutely not.

Q Again, I would like to call your attention to Dr. Masbaum's and Dr. Schuster's reports. One of the---both Doctors found him competent to stand trial. You obviously disagree with those opinions, can you tell us why and why what you do would give you more credence in disagreeing with theirs and the Judge holding your opinion?

A Well, I agree with both of the Psychiatrist's who came to the conclusion of a delusional disorder, grandiose type, [14] and I think their

assessment in that respect is quite accurate. I think though that the neuropsychological data provides additional information beyond just a psychiatric disorder. And people can have a delusional disorder and have a perfectly normal brain from a cognitive standpoint, and so I don't think this represents any challenge to the findings of the other Doctors in that respect. But I do think that the cognitive aspects and the neurologic aspect of Mr. Edwards' condition adds additional perspectives into whether he is competent or not.

[34]

THE COURT: Ms. Abel or Mr. Hill, do you want to have brief comment?

MR. INMAN: Let me say one thing then I'm going to turn it over to Ms. Abel. While I personally like my client and I hope he understands that, and I hope he doesn't think I'm talking about him as if he's not here. It's extremely difficult to do anything from a legal perspective on this case with his assistance, almost impossible.

THE COURT: And that was going to be my question. Without disclosing attorney/client confidential material whether you are able to communicate with your client well enough to prepare a defense?

MR. INMAN: My answer to that question is absolutely no. What Doctor Trexler makes sense, puts this into perspective as to what

problems we have. And frankly, if I were to repeat you the things he was saying, I'm not sure I'd be breaking a privilege because it makes no sense, you can't focus long enough to cut through to the root of the legal matter. And I would defer to Ms. Abel to make her comments on that, I don't want to speak for her.

THE COURT: Briefly.

MS. ABEL: Yes, Judge. The same thing, we cannot keep Mr. Edwards focused enough, we can't talk about the case, we can't do anything as far as preparing a defense [35] because the manifesto and the other things seem to take precedent. And I think by reading his writings that he cannot stay focused, which is what the doctor testified to. I feel we cannot adequately prepare a defense to these very serious charges, and so I would ask that you find him incompetent at this time.

THE COURT: The Court finds based all the evidence presented that Mr. Edwards is not competent at this time to stand trial. We will send a transport order sending him to a State facility for evaluation and treatment and hopefully within ninety days we'll get word back that he's been given the appropriate treatment and then becomes competent.

MS. ABEL: Thank you, Judge.

MR. EDWARDS: Thank you, Your Honor.

AND THAT WAS ALL THE EVIDENCE AND
ARGUMENT PRESENTED IN THIS CAUSE ON
THIS DAY

366a

<<masthead>>

Indiana University

IU

MEDICAL

GROUP

Specialty Care

Department of Physical
Medicine and Rehabilitation

Clinical Building 368
541 North Clinical Drive
Indianapolis, Indiana
46202-5111

317-278-0200

Fax: 317-278-0206

NEUROPSYCHOLOGICAL EXAMINATION

Patient Name: Edwards, Ahmad

Date of Examination: February 23, 2000

Referral Source: Diane Abel and Robert Hill,
Attorneys at Law

MEDICAL HISTORY:

This is a 27-year-old, right handed man who reports that he is ambidextrous. The accuracy of this is unclear. He also reports that he stopped at the 11th grade, and that he has a history of being diagnosed with dyslexia in approximately the 7th grade. It should be noted at this point that the reliability of this patient in terms of reporting this history is quite suspect. He appears to be consistently confused, and it also is entirely possible that he confabulates secondary to memory loss. For example, in one interview he reported a different name for his

girlfriend that he had immediately prior to the crime for he is currently incarcerated, and in another interview he gave an entirely different name. This does not appear to be purposeful or intentful, but reflective of either a significant neurologic, psychiatric, or combination of both. He does have some consistent reports, however, which may be more reliable. He has been seen by Dr. Dwight Schuster and Dr. Ned Masbaum, both of whom felt he had a delusional disorder, grandiose type.

The patient also has a history of a motor vehicle accident with a loss of consciousness on September 13, 1995. Apparently he was, according to the patient, en route to elope with his girlfriend, when his car went under a semi-tractor trailer and then the trailer rolled over the car. Again, the reliability of this report is unclear, but he was taken to Methodist Hospital Trauma Center. At the time of arrival at Methodist he had a Glasgow Coma Scale of 14 out of 14. It was noted that according to medical records he had an approximate five-minute loss of consciousness and he was incontinent of urine. He was apparently unrestrained. His head struck the windshield. Interestingly, medical records report that it was a head-on collision with the semi-tractor trailer. It was noted that in the emergency room he was alert and oriented times three, but had a wandering gaze when not focusing on the examiner's finger on visual examination. He had a scalp laceration apparently in the right frontal region. CT studies of the head showed soft tissue and scalp swelling of the right frontal region with negative midline shift or bleed. He had a diagnosis of closed head injury and acute alcohol intoxication and scalp laceration with repair. He also had a fracture of his ribs. He was seen in

follow-up with Methodist Hospital approximately 13 days later for removal of sutures and it was noted that he also had significant difficulties with range of motion with his neck.

Page 1

Ahmad Edwards

Neuropsychological Examination

This patient was also apparently hit as a pedestrian, by his report. It is impossible to determine in interview with him when this occurred. He reports that after this accident his “right leg drew up.” He also reports that he lost his job at that time because of increased fatigue and decreased range of motion in his leg. He reports that he broke his left collarbone in this accident. He reports that there was no loss of consciousness.

By way of history, he apparently has a mother who is living in Phoenix. His father died in approximately 1974 to 1976. He apparently was shot in a drug deal, according to Mr. Edwards’ report. He has a sister who was apparently recently diagnosed with AIDS and is schizophrenic. There is apparently a long family history of major psychiatric illness. School records from Broad Ripple High School suggest that at least in 1987 his grades were mostly Fs with two Cs. Testing done with apparently the Iowa Test of Basic Skills in March 1988 shows that he was mostly in the 3rd to 5th grade for all levels of academic functioning, and at that time he was in the 9.6th grade.

NEUROPSYCHOLOGICAL FINDINGS:

In consultation with this patient, it is noted that he is quite tangential, expansive, and disorganized in his

verbal output. He initially starts off with some structure, but then quickly decompensates. It is noted in the file that he has written extensive and disorganized letters to a variety of people which are delusional in nature and as previously diagnosed certainly grandiose.

With respect to his pedestrian accident, Mr. Edwards reports that he was hit at 71st and Michigan Street when he was crossing the street. He said that he broke a collarbone and his hip and back. He is unable to reliably tell where he was hospitalized. At this time, he reported that this was in 1993 or slightly before. He also reports a motor vehicle accident, again in 1993. He reports that he had a loss of consciousness and hit the windshield. He reported that he was with his girlfriend and they were eloping. Mr. Edwards reports that he was unconscious until he was hospitalized, although this may have represented posttraumatic amnesia rather than loss of consciousness. He reports that he was in the hospital for four to five hours and then released. He spontaneously reports that he often gets these two accidents confused.

Mr. Edwards goes on to say that after these two accidents "nothing was going right." He reports that he became very depressed and was very concerned about his sister, who was apparently using drugs and prostituting in his apartment. He said that life had been going well prior to the accident, and that things were "spectacular." When questioned about his arrest, he said that life prior to this time "was mind-boggling." He apparently had set certain goals for himself, which probably reflected some grandiose delusion, and then his sister had been diagnosed with

AIDS and a “mental illness.” Apparently his sister relocated to Indianapolis and was living with him intermittently and also was using drugs. She also apparently lived with his grandmother, who then according to Mr. Edwards had a stroke secondary to stress one week prior to the robbery. His sister apparently had significant financial difficulties and he was trying to help her pay some of her bills. He reports that she began prostituting to make money. Apparently he then started to break up with his girlfriend secondary to the stress. He was “trying to be a man in life for the first time” with his girlfriend and help with her three children, but things were falling apart by his report. He indicated, “her pimps were trying to get him to do things to pay her debts” with

Page 2

Ahmad Edwards

Neuropsychological Examination

reference to his sister. In the meantime, Mr. Edwards also indicated, exemplary of his delusional system, that he had decided to build three to four “dream homes.” Then he goes on to say that he was considering suicide the day before the offense for which he was arrested. He apparently locked himself in his apartment and held his gun to his head while he was talking to his ex-girlfriend on the phone. He reports that he hung up and loaded the gun and sat down on the couch, and the gun went off and apparently the bullet went through the couch and the wall, according to his report. He reports that he began crying, and that his ex-girlfriend showed up at his door. He reports feeling very confused at that time. In interview he also reports that his sister was

dating a man who was apparently involved in his father's murder and that he was watching his sister have sex with his father's murderer prior to this event. He reports seeing her naked with five to six men in his apartment, and reports that this was "totally confusing" to him. Mr. Edwards also reports that since he has been in jail he has encountered one of the individuals who shot his father and apparently in his mind this individual told him that if he sought revenge the same thing would happen to him.

When asked about the crime, he begins talking about his role as an agent for entertainment stars and that he was going to the mall to sign a contract with a talent. He was, according to Mr. Edwards, going to meet him in the mall in the morning and when this individual did not appear he became distraught. He reports that he was feeling ashamed. He reports that he was going to use money from this contract to pay off his sister's debts. He reports that he does not remember stealing the shoes. It is interesting to note in some previous records, that this patient had some obsession with shoes, incidentally. He reports that he had purchased some other things at another store with his girlfriend's credit card, although this is again confusing because he previously indicated that he had broken up with his girlfriend. He indicates that he remembers next people jumping on him and he thought it was related to the fact somehow that this famous artist had not shown up at the store. He remembers saying, "please let us get out of this busy street." Interestingly, he said the feeling or emotion was like "I was a virgin and the heat and I couldn't see." He reports that he was blanking in and out and at this time when the crime was occurring he felt as if he saw only black. He said, "I hated that I was out of

control – a third party saying to myself – Ahmad, what are you doing.” He said everything thereafter was “in slow motion.” He also reports some out-of-body experiences, in particular after the pedestrian accident, and he endorses some olfactory hallucinations, although again the reliability of this report is unknown.

On examination, this patient demonstrated very good persistence and put forth a good effort. He seemed to comprehend directions. His mood was appropriate and in fact was outgoing and friendly. A valid determination of his neuropsychological status was obtained.

<<written>> tests green

This patient was given the Reitan-Klove Sensory Perceptual Examination, the Finger Tapping Test, the Grooved Pegboard Test, the Controlled Oral Word Association Test, the Aphasia Screening Test, the Paced Auditory Serial Addition Test, the California Verbal Learning Test, the Rey Complex Figure Test, the Ward Short Form of the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale – R, the Wide Range Achievement Test-3, the Wisconsin Card Sorting Test, the Stroop Test, and the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2 as well as the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory – 3.

Page 3

Ahmad Edwards

Neuropsychological Examination

On measures of gross motor speed of the upper extremities, it is noted that this patient is within normal limits to slightly above average on the dominant right upper extremity as well as on the left,

nondominant upper extremity. Fine motor dexterity and coordination, however, is noted to be slightly slower than might be expected on the right upper extremity, although within normal limits. However, he was noted to be mildly impaired for the left, nondominant upper extremity.

On the Wide Range Achievement Test –3, this patient obtained a reading score of the 12th percentile or a grade score of 7, a spelling percentile of the 1st percentile or a grade level of 4, and arithmetic percentile of 2 with a grade score of 4. These are consistent with his previous academic levels of performance. On examination for sensory and perceptual functions, it is noted that he is within normal limits for tactile, auditory and visual sensory confrontation examination. Examination for aphasic symptomatology is within normal limits. He did have some significant difficulties with mental calculations. Generative phonemic naming is noted to be at the 89th percentile. On the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale – Revised, he obtained a Verbal Intelligence Quotient of 88. This places him at the low end of the average range. On the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale – Revised he obtained a Performance Intelligence Quotient of 99. This resulted in a Full Scale Intelligence Quotient of 91.

On examination for attention and concentration functions, he is within normal limits for short-term auditory attention span. His general cognitive speeds are intact, although it is noted that he is extremely impulsive with an inability to inhibit prepotent responses. This would seem to represent a disinhibition and an inability to maintain cognitive set. Consistent with this finding, he had significant

difficulties and was markedly impaired on a measure of his ability to serially add digits under the constraints of time. His performance in this respect was markedly and severely impaired. On measures of cognitive flexibility that are less sensitive, he falls into the lower end of the average range which is probably consistent with his premorbid level of intellectual functioning. On measures of memory, it is noted that he is at the 81st percentile for immediate recall of short paragraph-length material read to him auditorially and at the 84th percentile for delayed recall. Similarly, his immediate visual memory is at the 90th percentile and at the 89th percentile for delayed recall. When given a task of new verbal learning in the form of a 16-word list to recall over five trials, he was ultimately able to acquire 14 out of 16 in immediate recall, but he also began significantly perseverating. He was not aware that he was perseverating. On immediate recall he was able to retain 14 of the items that he had learned, and on long delay free recall he was able to retain 12. He still showed some mild propensity towards perseveration. Cueing did not facilitate his recall and interestingly recognition memory was perhaps mildly impaired. On a more complex task of spatial learning and memory, it is noted that his immediate recall was at the 65th percentile and his 20-minute delayed recall was at the 65th percentile. On a measure of ability to generate hypotheses to solve novel problems, it is again noted that he is perseverative and had some difficulty maintaining cognitive set.

This patient was given the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory – 2 as well as the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory – 3. On both of these inventories he demonstrated a “fake good” profile

where he denied any kind of psychological difficulties whatsoever. Therefore, these inventories were not helpful with clinical diagnosis.

Page 4

Ahmad Edwards

Neuropsychological Examination

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The results of the neuropsychological examination point towards a patient who clearly has a compromise of brain functions. He has decreased motor speed on the left upper extremity for fine motor dexterity and coordination and he is extraordinarily impulsive, disinhibited and has impairments of his ability to maintain cognitive set. He has difficulties learning new cognitive strategies and is extremely slow in this respect. He is perseverative on a variety of measures, again demonstrating his impairment of cognitive set. These findings are consistent for patients who have frontal lobe injuries, particularly orbital and mesial surfaces of the frontal lobes.
2. He clearly presents with a delusional disorder, grandiose type. He does appear to be hypergraphic, and he does endorse olfactory hallucinations, so it might be important to rule out partial complex seizures.
3. As noted from clinical interview, this patient is extremely tangential and decompensates in the course of a conversation. He is going to have considerable difficulty participating in his legal defense. These are neurobehavioral changes that are seen with frontal lobe brain damage. Additionally, I suspect this patient also has a

major thought disorder, such as schizophrenia, and it should be noted that he has a very strong family history in this regard. Additional psychological testing is required to make this differential diagnosis.

4. This patient clearly needs neuropsychiatric treatment that should be inpatient. He needs pharmacological treatment as well as group psychotherapy to help with his behavioral disturbances. Clearly the penal system does not provide this kind of intervention and he is likely to at least not benefit from incarceration and probably will deteriorate.
5. With respect to the crime for which he has been arrested, it would appear that his behavior reflects the effects of frontal lobe brain damage, including impulsivity with decision-making. It is also obvious that he was under a great deal of stress at the time this offense occurred, and it seems likely that he was psychotic at the time of the offense secondary to the interactive effects between frontal lobe damage and significant environmental stress. He uses his delusional system to cope with profound feelings of inadequacy, and his very strong family history of psychiatric illness certainly provides for a predisposition towards a major psychiatric illness that is now made even worse by frontal lobe dyscontrol.

Thank you for asking me to evaluate this most complex patient.

/s/ Lance E. Trexler, Ph.D.
Lance E. Trexler, Ph.D., H.S.P.P.

377a

Clinical Neuropsychologist,
Director of Neuropsychological Services and
Clinical Assistant Professor;
Clinical Director,
Center for Neurological Rehabilitation
Community Hospitals Indianapolis

Page 5
Ahmad Edwards
Neuropsychological Examination

378a

DWIGHT WILLIAM SCHUSTER M.D.

1016 TUCKAHOE

INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA 46260

(317) 259-1584

The Honorable Gary L. Miller, Judge
Superior Court of Marion County
Criminal Division, Room Five
City-County Bldg.
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

December 31, 1999

RE: Ahmad Edwards

Cause Number: 49G05 9907 CF 121975

Dear Judge Miller:

Pursuant to your appointment I have examined the above named defendant as to his competency to stand trial and as to his soundness of mind at the time of the alleged offense. My examination was carried out in a private room at the Marion County Jail in Indianapolis under satisfactory conditions and it was supplemented by a review of the Probable Cause Affidavit , an interview with his mother and grandmother and a review of lengthy letters written by the defendant.

The defendant was informed of the nature of the examination and he was told that his statements were not confidential. He expressed understanding of those facts and he was willing to continue with the examination. He identified himself and stated that he was 26 years of age with a birth date of January 29,

1973. He gave me his home address including the correct zip code.

Mr. Edwards went into great detail about events in July, 1999 but nothing about what happened at the Parisian's Department Store on July 12, 1999, other than to say that he did have "the shoes" when arrested. He stated that he had been apprehended by "a store detective" outside the store which caused him to react and that he shot his gun "because "he had attacked me and was hitting me". He stated that he was licensed to carry a gun because he worked in the field of law enforcement, namely, security work.

Past History and Family history given by Mr. Edwards included that his general health has been free of serious illnesses and accidents. He said his father had died in 1976 after being "mugged and shot 15 times". His mother and sister now live in Phoenix, Arizona and he alleged that his sister has "an addiction to drugs". He told me he was accepted in a magnet program in a local High School and went for three years. Then his mother moved and he decided to get a GED. He did not give details about his time in school and what problems he might have had. He said he returned to Indianapolis in 1992 and had worked for different Security companies since then. He denied having had any mental illness or any treatment . He said he used to drink for recreation and that he had one arrest for Public Intoxication. He denied any drug problems and said he had never experimented with drugs. He gave a convoluted accounting of his arrest in July, 1998 for Criminal Trespassing and said he thought he should have been placed on Probation so that he would have had a mentor, "some one mature to relate to". He reported

that he was not receiving medicine in Jail although he did receive pain medicine after being shot in the leg on July 12, 1999.

Mental Status examination on December 14, 1999 revealed a well nourished and developed man who was alert, coherent and cooperative. He spoke clearly and was very polite. His thinking was organized but obsessively detailed with stilted use of words and phrases. A number of his statements were unusual and appeared grandiose. For example he said "I'm keeping a Journal (in Jail). I believe I have some solutions for the World's problems". Also he stated "my being shot by a Federal agent will keep me from participating In the Olympics in Judo". There were no bizarre delusional statements or any unusual affect as are found in Schizophrenia. His intelligence was judged to be good but hampered by what appeared to be a learning disability. This was particularly noted in reading his lengthy letters to his attorney and to the Prosecuting Attorney. They were filled with spelling and grammatical errors as well as convoluted sentence structures. Mr. Edwards displayed good understanding of Court room officials and their duties and basic concepts of a trial and its consequences. He was well oriented and did not show any gross defects in attention span and memory.

I spoke with his mother in Phoenix, Arizona who described her son as "high strung". She said he had a high IQ. but that he did have a Learning Disability. She said he had never been examined or treated for any mental illness. She said he had been turned down for Social Security Disability. She did not provide me with much detail about his family life and early development. She did say that his sister is

receiving Haldol for emotional problems and that Ahmad might have interpreted the Haldol as his sister being "addicted". I also talked with his grandmother in Indianapolis who referred me and my questions to Mr. Robert Hill, one of his attorneys.

In summary my examination of Ahmad Edwards led me to two diagnostic impressions. I believe that he does have a mixed Learning Disability classified as a Developmental Expressive Writing Disorder and Expressive Language Disorder as shown by his patterns of using erroneous and inappropriate sentences both verbally and in writing, but more marked in writing. A second diagnosis is that of Delusional disorder, Grandiose type. This condition is manifested by the individual believing he or she has great, but undiscovered talents with delusions of inflated worth, power and knowledge. These delusions are not bizarre and in general the individual does not show disorganization of personality. These conditions may make it difficult for Mr. Edwards to communicate satisfactorily with his attorney, but he does know he is charged with a crime and he understands the legal procedures associated with his trial. His delusional disorder impairs his judgment such as in his selection of Security work and carrying a gun.

I believe Mr. Edwards is in need of psychiatric treatment although his condition is difficult to treat. He is potentially dangerous to others.

OPINION:

As a result of my examination it is my opinion with reasonable medical certainty that Ahmad Edwards is competent to stand trial at this time. I believe he was of unsound mind, in the legal sense of that term, on or about July 12, 1999 in that he was suffering from a mental disease which impaired his appreciation of the wrongfulness of his conduct.

Sincerely,
/s/ Dwight W. Schuster
Dwight W. Schuster M.D.

384a

* * *

[7]

THE COURT: All right then. I see we have a report from Family and Social Services from March of 2001.

MR. JONES: That's when he was certified competent.

THE COURT: I understand. Which, I guess in terms of process, is our starting point for now. I'm suspecting that primarily we want to hear information from the health-care professionals regarding his competency since that date in the alternative unless you are trying to say that Family and Social Services is wrong in their diagnosis in the first place.

MR. HILL: I don't think they made a diagnosis. I think their conclusion –

THE COURT: Well, I'm sorry. Not in their diagnosis but in their conclusion about competency.

[8]

MR. HILL: I think they were wrong.

* * *

[10]

WHEREUPON, THE WITNESS WAS SWORN BY THE COURT.

DWIGHT SCHUSTER,

a witness, called on behalf of the Plaintiff, who, after first being sworn to testify the truth, testified as follows, to-wit:

THE COURT: Please have a seat, sir. State your full name and spell your last name for the court reporter.

THE WITNESS: Dr. Dwight Schuster,
S-C-H-U-S-T-E-R.

* * *

[11]

THE COURT: Thank you. Dr. Schuster, on at least one occasion as a result of this Court's request, did you examine or have conversation with or examine records relating to Mr. Ahmad Edwards?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir, I did.

THE COURT: On how many occasions have you done that, sir?

THE WITNESS: I've examined him twice.

THE COURT: Did either of those examinations occur after March of 2001?

THE WITNESS: Yes. The last one. [12] I'm sorry. December? No. I examined him on September –

THE COURT: March of 2001?

THE WITNESS: September 20th of 2001.

THE COURT: Okay. I don't – we're getting kind of crowded in here. The regular Court Five calendar is going to occur in the

courtroom if that's what anyone is here for. Doctor, of what did your examination consist?

THE WITNESS: The examination consisted of interviewing and observing Mr. Edwards to elicit history of his present condition and his past history with particular reference to what had happened since I had examined him in 1999. I then carried out a mental status evaluation and reviewed the reports that I had received from Logansport Hospital where he told me he had been at Logansport. I reviewed the records there in addition to other records which had been supplied to me.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir. As a result of your interview with him, your – the [13] survey you conducted on him and your review of records pertaining to his treatment at Logansport and other materials provided to you, were you able to come up with a conclusion regarding his competency to stand trial in this matter?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I was.

THE COURT: And what is that conclusion, sir?

THE WITNESS: It is my opinion that he is competent to stand trial.

THE COURT: Okay. And just for the record, sir, what attributes must someone have in your mind to be competent to stand trial?

THE WITNESS: He must have understanding that he is charged with a crime. He must have understanding – a common

understanding of the legal proceedings thereon. In other words, the roles of the various personnel involved in the trial, purpose of a trial and general – as I say, common knowledge in terms of his role, his position in a trial. The [14] third area is his ability to communicate and assist his attorney in his own defense.

THE COURT: Is there a degree of ability or effectiveness which a person must exhibit in terms of helping his or her counsel?

THE WITNESS: Well, in my opinion, if the individual is able to communicate with me in sufficient clarity that I understand what he is saying, that he is able to answer my questions sufficiently and to demonstrate that he is aware of the three elements that I previously mentioned, I think that is my determination in regards to the degree.

THE COURT: Thank you very much, sir. Mr. Hill, do you have questions, sir?

MR. HILL: I do.

CROSS EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MR. HILL:

Q You – in your original report, you indicated you thought he was not responsible at the time of the offense, [15] is that correct?

A At the time of the offense, yes.

Q Is that still your opinion?

A No. It's changed since that time because on this last examination, Mr. Edwards was much more alert, coherent and was able to talk in great detail giving all the details of the events which occurred so that my opinion changed.

Q In your original report, you said that he has a delusional disorder?

A Yes.

Q Grandiose, I think?

A Yes. I thought he did have it.

Q Do you still feel that way?

A He didn't show any indications of that when I examined him last September.

Q Did you see any evidence of Schizophrenia?

A No.

Q Okay. Did you see any evidence of any distorted thinking or disjointed thoughts?

A Yes, I did.

[16]

Q Okay. Did you see any evidence of disjointed speech patterns?

A Some, yes.

* * *

[24]

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, out of all due respect, Your Majesty, I –

THE COURT: Hold on, sir.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Majesty, I –

THE COURT: Mr. Edwards, hold on.

THE DEFENDANT: True.

THE COURT: There's a process for you to become co-counsel and you really haven't followed that process yet. So right now only your attorney can speak for you. [25] So what you might want to do is bump him on the elbow or write him a note when you want to be heard instead of just speaking out.

MR. HILL: Let the record reflect he just grabbed my elbow.

THE DEFENDANT: Can I speak to him for a second?

MR. HILL: I want to thank the Court for that.

THE DEFENDANT: Can I speak to him for a brief second?

THE COURT: Let's do things kind of one stage at a time, Mr. Edwards. Let's let him – let's let your client – your attorney finish talking to the doctor.

* * *

[27]

THE DEFENDANT: Excuse me?

MR. HILL: You want me to ask him if he has a license to practice medicine. We've already stipulated to that.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm asking you. Do you have a license?

MR. HILL: Do I?

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.

MR. HILL: No, I don't. I don't have one.

THE DEFENDANT: (UNINTELLIGIBLE)
object to that question.

MR. HILL: My client wanted to know if I had
a medical degree, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Everybody who knows him
will tell you he doesn't.

MR. HILL: I don't.

* * *

[36]

Q You described his thought process as long-winded or speech process as long-winded? He talks a lot?

A Yes.

Q It doesn't always make sense and doesn't always hold together?

A Well, in regard to the first examination that was true. On the second examination, he was much different.

Q Okay.

A Markedly different in the sense that his thought processes were not loose at that time. They were very organized, goal directed and certainly did not show indication of delusional ideation.

Q Okay. You wouldn't say that he was malingering then?

A I would say –

Q Would or would not say?

A I did not say. I did not – I just had noted that he was much different, that he was mentally clear.

[37]

Q Well, let me rephrase the question. He wasn't faking as if he was insane?

A On the –

Q Second examination.

A – second examination, I did not find indication of any faking.

Q And if you were to review letters that he has written to the Court or pleadings that he's filed with the Court that were – have disjointed thoughts, unclear thoughts, don't make a lot of sense, would that have any impact on your opinion?

MR. PITZER: Judge, I'm going to object to the form of the question. Whether or not they contain unclear thoughts is a conclusion.

THE COURT: I'll sustain the objection.

Q If the Court – if you reviewed letters where the Court thought or another expert thought that they contained unclear thoughts and disjointed thoughts, would that have any impact on your decision?

A The best way I can answer that is it [38] appears to me that Mr. Edwards does fluctuate in his presentation; that he certainly has the ability to be very clear and direct and so forth

and at other times that he is more disorganized and has more indication of what I had indicated in the first examination of his having a type of learning disability.

* * *

[51]

CROSS EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MR. PITZER:

* * *

[53]

Q When you asked him questions at the second interview, did he give you any indication – I am referring to your report – as to whether or not he was seeming to do better with his, I guess, [54] physical and mental condition? Did he say he was feeling better?

A I don't know that he used that expression specifically. He did indicate that he felt that he had a problem and that he thought that he needed to be in the hospital for a long time. And he said maybe a year.

Q Did he indicate that he knew Mr. Jones to be one of his lawyers?

A Yes. He gave me his name.

Q Did he indicate that he was able to communicate with his lawyer who he believed to be Mr. Jones? I'm referring to page two of your report.

A Yes.

Q In the third paragraph you indicate that on that examination he appeared to be alert, coherent and cooperative, is that correct?

A Yes.

Q His thinking and speech was more organized than when you had seen him before?

A Yes.

[55]

Q And you did not detect any of the grandiose statements and ideas which he had expressed previously, is that correct?

A Correct.

Q Following up on that, you indicate he was well aware of the situation and the possibility that he might be found guilty and given a long sentence. Is that accurate?

A Yes.

Q So he indicated that he – according to you, knew the difference between being found guilty and being found not guilty in a criminal proceeding?

A Yes.

Q He understood that if you were found guilty in a criminal proceeding you could be given a sentence or a term of imprisonment. Is that accurate?

A Yes.

Q He also seemed to be, according to your report, having decent memory for both recent and past events and he was able to give detailed

accounts of the events [56] leading to his arrest as well as events in the recent past that he had had in jail. Is that accurate?

A Yes.

Q You didn't elicit any delusional ideas and hallucinations, his mood and affect were appropriate for the content of his thought in a situation, correct?

A Yes.

Q You don't appear to indicate that he is mentally retarded in any way, is that correct?

A Not mental retarded. I think that he's had a learning disability.

Q Would you say that his intelligence is well within the average range?

A Yes.

Q You indicated that he had shown marked improvement since your first examination, is that correct?

A Yes.

Q An that he shows good comprehension of the charges, correct?

A Yes.

Q The legal proceedings and he [57] demonstrated the ability to communicate so that he could assist his own attorney in his own defense, is that correct?

A Yes.

Q He understood at least his own opinion of what took place of the events on the date of the offense that he's charged with, is that correct?

A Yes.

Q And you believe that he's currently competent to stand trial, is that correct?

A Yes.

MR. PITZER: Thank you, Judge.

* * *

[59]

WHEREUPON, THE WITNESS WAS SWORN BY THE COURT.

NED MASBAUM,

a witness, called on behalf of the Defendant, who, after first being sworn to testify the truth, testified as follows, to-wit:

THE COURT: Please have a seat, sir. State your full name and spell your last name for the Court.

THE WITNESS: Dr. Ned Masbaum,
M-A-S-B-A-U-M.

* * *

[60]

THE COURT: And as a result of those examinations and the examination of other records, were you able to come up with a conclusion regarding his competency to stand trial in this cause at this time?

[61]

THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And what is that conclusion, sir?

THE WITNESS: It's my opinion based on reasonable medical certainty that in spite of his mental disorder he does have comprehension sufficient to understand the nature of these proceedings. He is able in spite of his disorder to aid his attorney in his defense.

* * *

CROSS EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MR. HILL:

* * *

[69]

Q Information from a mental health professional describing delusional thought processes while in a hospital, incarcerated at Logansport in the state hospital there, would that be of importance to you?

A Well, I diagnosed him with a delusional disorder. I don't disagree with the fact that he has a delusional disorder.

Q Can a delusional disorder impact his ability to assist his attorney?

[70]

A In this case, it is not impacting his ability.

Q My question was can it?

A In a hypothetical situation in a very disturbed individual with a disorder, it could. Yes.

Q Describe how that process would work.

A Well, if an individual is totally preoccupied with his delusions that he cannot look at the issues, the charges, and have an understanding of what's going on and be able to assist you, then it could impact situations but it doesn't apply in this situation.

Q Okay. Now you've not witnessed our inter – my interactions or Mr. Jones' interactions with Mr. Edwards, have you?

A Only here in the courtroom.

Q Only here in the courtroom. You've not – this stack of 12 inches or whatever it is high of papers that Mr. Edwards carries around, you've not read through that?

A No, I haven't.

Q Okay. Or his – these notes he's [71] trying to pass to me.

A THE DEFENDANT: Actually, I have a plea here that I would like for you to read if you would like to test the – whatever it may be, Doctor.

MR. HILL: For a bifurcated trial?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. I beg your pardon?

MR. HILL: You have a plea for a bifurcated trial. That's what that document says. Have you –

THE DEFENDANT: Counts –

Q Have you read that document, Doctor?

A I don't believe so. I've read a lot of his writings.

Q Would you agree his writings are disjointed:

A They're rambling.

Q The – one thought doesn't always clearly lead into the next thought?

A At times; however, they seem to follow a certain process. He's trying to make a point. He's trying to make legal points. They're goal directed with his filings and motions to the Court and all. There's a certain method in all of [72] this.

Q And you see that he has a method in, for example, writing a document – I'm picking one at random – that talks about a bifurcated trial. It talks about statements by the product of the defense directly. "Tantamount, paramount in this criminal trial." I mean –

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, could –
Judge?

THE COURT: Mr. Edwards –

Q Do those thoughts seem to be directed towards any goal?

A Yes. I think they're all directed towards a goal.

Q What's his goal?

A Well, he's – in simplest terms it's a big smoke screen.

Q You think he's faking?

A Well, I think he's creating a lot of diversions here and he's overwhelming the system by all of this and very capable of this.

Q Okay. The entries in the Logansport [73] record from various mental health professionals where they describe his delusional thought process, do you have any reason to doubt those entries?

A I think he does have delusional disorder. I don't doubt that he's delusional.

* * *

[88]

CROSS EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY RM. PITZER:

Q You did your second evaluation, I'm sorry, on October 3rd, is that correct?

A Yes.

Q And that was in the jail?

A Yes.

* * *

[90]

Q When you met with him on October 3rd you indicated he was not being treated with any psychotropic medication, is that correct?

A Yes.

Q What would psychotropic medication be used for?

A It's used for mental illness in the generalist term.

Q Would it be used for somebody who has Schizophrenia?

A Yes.

Q He was not receiving psychotropic medication when you met with him in the jail on October 3rd, is that correct?

A Yes.

Q Referring to your report under Mental Status Examination you indicated that he was alert and reasonably cooperative when you talked to him, is that correct?

A Yes.

[91]

Q He was less hyperactive than the prior exam?

A Yes.

Q He was also less grandiose?

A Yes.

Q You indicated that his speech was not disorganized, is that correct?

A Yes.

Q And that he had no delusions nor hallucinations when you spoke with him on October 3rd?

A Yes.

Q You indicated that he was oriented, is that accurate?

A Yes.

Q And his memory for recent remote events was reasonably intact, is that correct?

A Yes.

- Q Would you have had conversation with him about the charges that he was facing?
- A Yes.
- Q And did he indicate that he understood what the charges were against him?
- A Yes.
- Q Did you discuss with him whether these [92] were serious or not so serious charges?
- A Yes.
- Q And did he give any indication with regard to that?
- A Yes.
- Q What was that?
- A That they were serious and he – his understanding was that he could receive 135 years if he was found guilty on all the charges.
- Q So he understood the concept of guilt and not guilty?
- A Yes.
- Q He understood the concept of going to jail and serving a sentence for being found guilty?
- A. Yes.
- Q It was your opinion that he understands basic criminal proceedings, is that correct?
- A Yes.
- Q And he generally, in your opinion, understood the roles of judge, jury, witness, prosecutor and defense attorney?

A Yes.

Q Mr. Hill asked you some questions with regard to Mr. Edwards' communication with the Court and some of the thing he has written, did he not?

A Yes.

Q And you indicated that in your opinion, while they were perhaps just rambling, there tended to be some focus to what the documents said, is that accurate?

A Yes.

Q I'm going to show you what's been marked as State's Exhibit Number One which I believe by judicial notice has already been entered into the Court's record and ask you to look at that. Would that appear to be the handwriting of the type of document that you received while you were evaluating Mr. Edwards?

A Yes. This is my top document, same as the exhibit.

Q For purposes of the record, I would appreciate it if you would just read the front page of that.

THE COURT: The title or the front page?

MR. PITZER: I'm sorry?

THE COURT: The title or the front page?

MR. PITZER: I'd like for him to just reading the – starting with “Motion to Dismiss Criminal” –

A “Motion to Dismiss Criminal Charges and Discharge the Defendant on Criminal Rule 4[IC]. The Defendant, Mr. Ahmad Edwards, hereby notifies the Court and respectfully request the dismissal and discharge of the Defendant on the grounds of the following good and sufficient reasons. Continued on page two of eight.”

* * *

[95]

A “[Continued page eight. Motion to Dismiss Criminal Charges and Discharge the Defendant [CR4[C]]. The Defendant [96] moves the Court of this cause to order the dismissal and discharge of the Defendant, Mr. “Ahmad Edwards” on the grounds that it is in violation of the jurisdiction of this state’s constitution and laws of the criminal procedure rules. Criminal Rule 4 [C] Defendant discharged. With cooperated incorporated under the laws of the United States Constitution of America, Amendment One, Article 6.”

Q Does there appear to be a signature on that document?

A Yes, there is.

Q And that appears to be a person purporting to be Ahmad Edwards, is that correct?

A Yes. That’s correct.

* * *

[98]

CROSS EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MR. HILL:

Q Doctor, right here, see the period? It says Defendant discharged. With –" Do you see that?

A Yes.

Q It says, "with" and you said it cooperated when you read it the first time. Isn't that word really "corporation?"

A Yes. It says "corporation."

Q And then the next word says "incorporation?"

A Yes.

Q "With a corporation incorporated?"

A "Under the laws of the united States Constitution." Yes.

MR. HILL: That's all I would have on [99] that, subject to recalling him.

* * *

[101]

THE COURT: The Court's witnesses have testified. Mr. Hill, do you have any evidence you want to present, sir?

MR. HILL: We would call Dr. Trexler.

WHEREUPON, THE WITNESS WAS SWORN BY THE COURT.

The Defendant, in order to maintain the [102] issues in its behalf, offered and introduced the following into evidence, to-wit:

LANCE TREXLER,

a witness, called on behalf of the Defendant, who, after first being sworn to testify the truth, testified as follows, to-wit:

THE COURT: Please have a seat, sir. State your full name and spell your last name for the court reporter.

THE WITNESS: Lance Emerson Trexler,
T-R-E-X-L-E-R .

* * *

[103]

CROSS EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MR. HILL:

and so the State would agree to stipulate that

* * *

[110]

Q Okay. In Mr. Edwards' history, do you have history of a motor vehicle accident with a head injury?

A Yes.

Q When did that occur?

A Apparently, it was September 13th of 1995.

Q And as a neuropsychologist, you would conduct tests to determine whether or not there was permanent brain impairment from such a head injury?

A Yes.

Q That's something you would do?

A Yes.

Q Did you do that sort of testing here in the neuropsychological battery?

A Yes.

[111]

Q Okay. And what were your conclusions after the testing concerning his prior head injury?

A Well, he clearly presents with cognition of impairment. As noted in the previous testimony, he does have evidence of a learning disability prior to any of this history. His reading grade level, for example, at that time, word reading – excuse me – spelling was at the first percentile. Mathematics is at the second percentile. So –

THE COURT: At what age, sir?

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry?

THE COURT: At what age?

THE WITNESS: You're asking about what the age equivalents are on those scores?

THE COURT: You said that before the head injury he was at the first percentile but that doesn't tell me if he was at first grade level or the tenth grade level.

THE WITNESS: Oh, my apologies. The way that that statistic is based is four individuals that are of that age that I [112] tested have. Ninety-nine percent of the population would have a higher reading level or spelling level than Ahmad did at the time.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. Then I misunderstood your comment because I thought you said that there is evidence of a learning disability even before the collision.

THE WITNESS: Yes. That's correct.

THE COURT: And I got the impression that the percentiles you were giving us were from before the collision.

THE WITNESS: My apologies.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE WITNESS: No. These are data gathered through the testing.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Q Okay. What other results did you determine from the – that testing?

A Mr. Edwards had signif – a very severe impairment of attention and concentration, that he was very impulsive, that as he responded to things without thinking through them and [113] that his left had had some coordination impairment.

Q Would that be consistent with a head injury?

A Yes.

Q Okay. Did you conduct any other testing of Mr. Edwards at the first phase of your evaluation?

A No.

Q Okay. You testified previously that you thought he was not competent.

A That's correct.

- Q And could you review – quickly review for the judge your reasons for saying he was not competent to stand trial at the first hearing when Judge Miller was on the bench?
- A It was very simply a matter – a combination of neurologic problems, of learning disabilities, and a significant psychiatric illness.
- Q And would you describe that in just a little more detail, the psychiatric illness?
- A At that point I felt that it was likely [114] a delusional disorder as well, consistent with the previous two witnesses and that he presented with a significant delusional disorder and that, in combination, that made it very difficult for him despite his effort to assist counsel effectively.
- Q Okay. And you said there was a combination of a learning disability in some of these other deficits he has. Could you explain how the combination of factors works together to render him incomplete?
- A Well, if someone has, for example, a psychiatric disturbance but in tact cognitive functions, then they can use those to help them compensate well or cope with the psychiatric problems to an extent any way and vice versa but when you have a combination of those factors, they're not just additive, they're multiplicative. And so I think Mr. Edwards' intent is he genuinely wants to help but the illness and the injuries that he presents with very much impair [115] his ability to organize his behavior.

Q You've seen this stack of papers?

A Yes.

Q Have you – has he shared any of his writings?

A Mr. Edwards has shared his – every time I have asked him for his writings he has given them to me.

Q We're going to go through some specifics here, but in general would you classify those writings? How would you classify them? Are they logical, illogical, do they hold together, are they inconsistent, what? How would you describe them?

A They are very disorganized and incoherent.

Q Okay. Some of the writings are about his case?

A Yes.

Q Some of the writings are about another plan or plans he has to –

A Yes.

Q Do any of them seem realistic?

A No.

[116]

Q Do they seem – do they seem to relate to the reality of his current circumstance?

A No.

Q And this was the circumstance at the first – when you first testified, is that – have we summarized that succinctly?

A Yes.

Q Okay. He goes away to Logansport and comes back and then you've seen him since he's been back, is that right?

A That's correct.

Q Have you reviewed the same records I sent to Dr. Masbaum, these notes?

A Yes.

Q Have you reviewed Dr. Berger's report?

A Yes.

Q Have you also since then conducted interviews with Mr. Edwards?

A I conducted interviews and additional testing with Mr. Edwards.

Q Okay. Let's talk about the additional testing for a minute if we could. What additional testing did you conduct with [117] Mr. Edwards?

A On the 27th of December, as I previously mentioned, I did the Word Memory Test which is a measure of malingering and I also did the Rorschach Ink Bloc Test with him.

Q Okay. And to rehash briefly, the Word Memory Test indicates to you he is not malingering?

A That's correct.

Q He's not faking good or faking bad?

A The – that's correct.

Q Okay. So, you would say it's a valid result?

A That's correct.

- Q You gave a Rorschach Test. What is a Rorschach Test? Briefly describe it.
- A It is – in comparison to the other tests I was talking about which are objective tests, the Rorschach is subjective and you can score it but it is nonetheless somewhat more subjective and reliant on the interpretation of the psychologist. But it is a test of personality functioning in the oldest [118] sense and used to provide a more ambiguous stimulus, if you will, or a stimulus that – a situation that brings out ones psychological functioning more easily than just a standard question and answer kind of situation.
- Q Okay. That test is the Ink Blot Test?
- A That's correct.
- Q Okay. Would you tell the judge what the results of this Rorschach test would be? Describe how it was administered. Describe what was said and what your opinion is.
- A Well, I have to put a caveat in there to say that it was a very noisy and distracting environment and so I think that inhibited Mr. Edwards somewhat from feeling free to respond to the test. But certainly the findings are consistent with a formal thought disorder.
- Q With a thought disorder?
- A That's correct.
- Q Would you explain why you say that?
- A I can give you examples of the responses [119] if that would be of assistance to you.

Q Yes.

A In showing one card to Mr. Edwards his response was quote, "Looks like poultry, a riddle. It's poetic. The expressionistic part that is a riddle like a canvas bearing the paint. This can take the form of an expression of a riddle, a light form. Looks like a locust. Locust. Looks like poultry and human lungs." The next card was —

Q And that was in response to one card?

A That's correct.

Q Okay. Go ahead.

A "This is naughtic merchantry. This is extraordinary. This neptune victorious." The next card, "I am seeing mortality. I am seeing solar energy or solar mass. This is a god, a sun god praying, kneeling. This is a goddess. It's immortality. It's a goddess at war with infection. No, not infection. Affection. It's a goddess at war."

Q That was in response to another card?

[120]

A That's correct.

Q All those responses which were another card, the second set?

A That's correct.

Q Okay.

THE COURT: The second set or the second card?

MR. HILL: The second card. The second set of responses to a second card.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Q Is that right?

A Yes.

Q Did you show him another card?

A Oh, there were ten altogether.

Q Could you just go ahead and go through the responses and give us a flavor of what he was saying at the time.

A On all of the other cards:

THE COURT: That's not going to help me a whole lot. If the doctor wants to say that the responses are nonstandard, that would help me.

Q Were the responses nonstandard?

A The responses were suggestive of a formal thought disorder.

[121]

THE COURT: Thank you.

Q And there were other cards where the response was equally bizarre?

A Yes.

Q Okay. When you say a formal thought disorder, what does that mean?

A That means that Mr. Edwards at that point was having trouble differentiating reality from

non-reality from his own internal ideas and beliefs.

Q Is that something that would render him incompetent to stand trial?

A Yes.

Q Okay. Would that be something that would render him unable to communicate with Mr. Jones or with me?

A Yes.

Q You also conducted interviews with Mr. Edwards in addition to that formal testing at that time?

A That's correct.

Q Could you describe the interview?

A Sure. Mr. Edwards is always pleasant. He is, I believe, genuinely trying to cooperate. He, for example, will even [122] do things as we have seen today. He has a paper clip on a document. He took the paper clip off of the document and handed it to the sheriff. He is attentive to trying to be cooperative and solicit us.

Q Did you see him trying to organize my papers for me here earlier?

A Yes. Absolutely. That's characteristic of Mr. Edwards' behavior.

Q Something that's probably incapable of being done is organizing my stuff but he was trying to do that. Did he – how else would you describe him in that interview?

A He – he’s doing his best to hold his thinking together but he has a formal thought disorder and despite his efforts, he therefore is usually incoherent and unable to hang on to one topic for longer than three to five seconds.

Q Did he talk to you about his mandation?

A I’m sorry?

Q Mandation? Not mandate but mandation.

[123]

A I believe I remember hearing that word.

Q Did he talk to you about his writings here?

A Yes. I’ve asked him to complete some of them.

Q Okay. Do you have examples of his writings there that cause you concern?

A Yes.

Q Okay. If you could reference these, please. Do you have the writings there?

A I have some of them, not all of them.

Q Okay. And these are writings you’ve reviewed in preparation for your rendering your opinion today?

A Yes.

Q Okay. And you – and before we go into that, I’ve shown you various writings that Mr. Edwards has filed with the Court?

A Yes.

Q Okay. As a psychologist, do you have – if you could quickly summarize what your impression

of those writing is, the ones that have been filed with the court.

[124]

A I think they're all quite consistent. I think that his written behavior is very much like his verbal behavior and that is that they are tangential and disorganized and have bizarre delusions inherent in them.

Q You've – do you – you have some documents there that you wanted to share with the Court as expression. Could you take the first one and express to the Court what was said and what your concerns are about it?

A I simply asked the – my clinical assistant to just give me a document about what his plan for his defense was and how would that be successful and he produced this document for me.

Q Okay. And that document is entitled?

A It's not entitled. It's just – yeah. There's no title.

Q Okay. What did he say in that document?

A He says, "Return. Come to see me for more cash flow because I recently zoomed an eight to six-year plan to last. Rather state such factors, I group for [125] the largest mixed complaint; to become an observer of an free agent of series where he can raise my hand as support for an team with absolutely no Indiana-In's but myself to blame for the win."

Q Okay. Now, I want to show you –

THE COURT: Do you want this marked?

MR. HILL: Yes.

(WHEREUPON, DEFENDANT'S EXHIBIT A
WAS MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

Q Now, how many pages is that document?

A Eight.

Q I want to show you what I've marked as
Defendant's Exhibit A and ask you if you
recognize that.

A Yes. It's the document I was just referring to.

Q Is that a photocopy of the document you had
him –

A Yes.

Q — reproduce for you?

A Yes.

[126]

Q And –

A No. He did not reproduce it for me. He
produced it for me.

Q Produce it. I'm sorry. I had photocopied it for
this purpose. This is – this include this entry
halfway through which just reads "select body
as the best?"

A Yes.

Q And is that a true copy of the document that
you have in your file that was given to you that
–

A I believe it to be.

Q -- as his plan for his defense?

A That's correct.

* * *

[127]

(WHEREUPON DEFENDANT'S EXHIBIT A
WAS ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE
WITHOUT OBJECTION.)

Q Now you've read just a couple of passages out
of there that would seem unusual?

A Yes.

Q The document needs to be read to get the full
flavor for that, would you agree?

A Yes. I mean, it's -- that's simply one page of
eight but it -- it's representative of the overall
content.

Q Okay. And your opinion then about his
thoughts concerning his ability and his plan to
defend himself is based on that [128]
document?

A My thoughts?

Q Was it the purpose of that document for him to
explain to you what his thoughts on how to
defend himself would be or the best course of
action?

A That's correct.

Q And your reaction to that? Does he have a --
I'm sorry. Your reaction to that?

A My reaction to that is that it reflects Mr.
Edwards' thought disorder and that it is a
reflection of the diagnosis that he has.

Q Okay. And –

A And that he is unable to assist his counsel.

Q Now, do you agree with your original diagnosis that he has a delusional disorder?

A After completing the Rorschach and reviewing, you know, the whole clinical presentation of the situation, I feel like there was another diagnosis that's probably more applicable and that is Schizophrenia.

* * *

[131]

Q What's the diagnosis and how does it keep my client from being competent? That's my next question.

A It's Schizophrenia, disorganized type, which is characterized by disorganized behavior and disorganized speech. It [132] keeps him from being competent because he can not track and stay with proceedings and participate in it nor organize his thoughts or even provide a consistent recall of the crime and the events surrounding it. And so I think that it interferes in absolutely every way with his ability to participate in that. I think it's – I'll take the liberty to say that it's quite tragic for Mr. Edwards that he has not even had the opportunity to receive appropriate medications that might help which I find difficult to accept.

Q Okay. Let me follow up on that last part. You reviewed his record from Langsport?

A Yes.

Q You reviewed what they did with him while he was there?

A That's correct.

Q Did they offer him any treatment?

A No, nothing pharmacologic that would have been appropriate for his symptoms.

Q Okay. There are medications that are [133] routinely given by mental health professionals to treat thought disorders?

A That's correct.

Q These were not administered?

A That's correct.

Q You've reviewed the file from Logansport, his medical record?

A That's correct.

Q Did they send him to class to try to teach him what the roles of the various parties were?

A Yes.

Q Now, that class consists of going over and over what Mr. Pitzer's role would be?

A That's correct.

Q And my role, judge's role and training these individuals as to how to answer questions about those roles?

A That's correct.

Q Is that reflected in the record?

A Yes.

Q Let me ask this question. If he, in fact, has a problem that's interfering [134] with his ability to assist counsel, does attending that class do anything to correct that problem?

A No.

Q If he has a thought disorder that's impairing his ability to assist Counsel, there are treatments that would help in that regard?

A That's correct.

Q Those treatments would be, if you could briefly outline them?

A There are – very simply, there are a class of two or three different medications that would likely be rather helpful to Mr. Edwards. They're anti-psychotics. Probably the best one is Zyprexa with the fewest side effects which has – is important to use with Mr. Edwards since he does have a history of head injury and you have to be careful about what drugs you use in people with a neurologic history. So, Zyprexa would be the ideal drug of choice but he has not been – he has not received that.

[135]

Q Okay. You had occasion to meet with – after December 27th, meet with Mr. Edwards, did you not?

A That's correct.

Q How many times?

A I met with him on December 27th of 2001. I have not met with him since.

- Q Well, did you see him today?
- A Yeah, sure.
- Q Okay.
- A Sorry.
- Q And you saw him before our hearing?
- A Yes.
- Q Did he—was he describing a brain protrusion to you?
- A Yes.
- Q Were you curious about this prior to your conversation with him, brain protrusion?
- A I'm not sure I understand the question.
- Q Did you have information about Mr. Edwards complaining about a brain protrusion before today?
- A My clinical assistant saw him yesterday and expressed that and Mr. Edwards had [136] expressed that concern to her as well.
- Q Okay. Did you go and try to communicate with him about this?
- A Today?
- Q Yes.
- A Yes.
- Q Tell the judge about the conversation and what that conversation means to you as a neuropsychologist.
- A Mr. Edwards reported to me that he felt that he was having a brain protrusion and that it

was – and that he saw it and that it looked like veins and that it was – obviously it was stressful for him. This is a somatic delusion. That's what it's called. It's called a somatic delusion and it is going to occur whenever he is stressed, anxious or feeling threatened because that's when people have those sorts of symptoms is when he is afraid and scared. And so it's manifest as somatic delusions in this kind of disorder.

Q Okay. Would that be – how would that relate to having a thought disorder?

[137]

A It's part of a thought disorder. That's part of the Schizophrenia. The difference between Schizophrenia versus a delusional disorder is a delusional disorder is for events that could be the case; that is, like I am being followed or my spouse is cheating on me. Those could occur. The criteria for Schizophrenia are bizarre delusions. These are not common place delusions that Mr. Edwards is having. They are bizarre delusions as typified by this that we see today.

Q Like his report to you that he could see his brain protrusion?

A And feel it.

Q And feel it?

A Yes.

Q And he described how the protrusion would yank on him?

A Yes.

Q That –

A He described that it would pull on him and pull his musculature down.

Q And he was animated in describing that?

[138]

A Yes.

Q Do you think that that is further evidence of your belief that he's Schizophrenic?

A Yes.

Q If, in fact, he's Schizophrenia untreated what's the likely impact of facing the rigors of trial? Is it likely to get better or worse?

A He will deteriorate.

* * *

[139]

Q Is it clear to you that Mr. Edwards is able to assist us?

A Frankly, I don't really know that you would have to be a psychologist but it seems prima facie to me.

Q Okay.

A It seems to me that, yes, it's very clear.

Q What is clear? Is it that he's –

A That it's very clear to me that he's not able to effectively assist his counsel.

Q Okay. And your recommendation, if you were recommending treatment, would be what?

A He – when I recommended in the previous evaluation that he receive – I recommend specific treatments and I did that for a reason and that’s because those are know to be beneficial in these kinds of condition. So my recommendations are still the same as they were the previous occasion

Q And if he is, in fact, treated with drugs like the one you referenced or that class of medicine, is it likely he would respond?

A Sure. He would respond. It’s not going to go away, the underlying illness or disorder, but he would certainly have a much better chance for him to be able to collaborate with counsel, let alone relieve the issue of the quality of his life aside.

[141]

Q It’s not the purpose of this hearing but you, too, as Dr. Schuster did, have an opinion as to whether or not he could sort right from wrong at the time of this offense and whether or not he was of sound mind at the time of this offense.

A Mixed-type Schizophrenia does not go away and so he has had that since adolescence. So he was – had that condition at the time the crime occurred.

Q Okay. You also reviewed some family history?

A Yes.

Q His family history is consistent or inconsistent with your opinion?

A It's consistent with my opinion. He has a family history of Schizophrenia. How pervasive, I'm not sure but I know there are several members that have been diagnosed with it.

Q And is that something that's important to people in your field to understand and learn?

[142]

A Sure. It's a risk factor.

Q Likewise, is it important if you have medical records to review those records and find out what mental health professionals, whether they be social workers, nurses, orderlies, whomever, what they are saying about the patient?

A That's correct.

MR. HILL: Hang on one second. That's all the questions I have, Judge.

THE COURT: Mr. Pitzer, if you don't mind, could I ask some questions before you begin your cross?

MR. PITZER: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: Doctor, in my prior life I had occasion to talk with mental health experts on these very same types of issues with an eye towards competency and sanity, luckily for a client rather than myself usually. It occurred to me that some doctors had placed the bar different places in terms of how aware a person had to be in order to be competent and I need to have an idea of your framework because I'm

not as [143] familiar with you and your work as I am with Doctors Masbaum and Schuster. First, can a person suffering a delusional disorder be competent to stand trial?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Can a person suffering disorganized Schizophrenia – and I'm not sure if I said it the right way – but can that person be competent to assist his or her counsel?

THE WITNESS: Yes. It's – yes. It's a little less likely but yes.

THE COURT: When you were indicating that Mr. Edwards was a poor historian, is he a poor historian or an inconsistent historian?

THE WITNESS: Excellent question. He is an inconsistent historian and a poor historian. Some information he –

THE COURT: Let me expand on the question then.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

THE COURT: Some poor historians simply can't remember facts. They're not smart [144] enough to or they weren't aware during the events, that sort of thing. Some inconsistent historians don't have a grasp of all of the same facts all of the time. They might remember certain events at one time, certain events at another time. They're never being untruthful but they sometimes don't have the entire package together at one time. Where are we in terms of Mr. Edwards' ability to be a historian?

THE WITNESS: Mr. Edwards is very much the latter case that you articulated.

THE COURT: Okay. Is there, in your mind, any doubt now that by virtue of this force feeding of the judicial system he does understand the roles of the players?

THE WITNESS: Yes. I believe he can recite those.

THE COURT: Understanding is a matter of degree and depth sometimes but he could pass the test?

THE WITNESS: That's correct.

THE COURT: Okay. So a lot of your [145] comments are qualitated rather than quanitated. He could pass the test but the depth of his understanding is really at issue?

THE WITNESS: And his ability to use that information to his or his counsels' benefit.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Proceed with the cross unless – Did I inspire a lot of questions in you that we should resolve before Mr. Pitzer starts cross or just wait for you to do redirect?

MR. HILL: I don't think so, Judge.

THE COURT: Mr. Pitzer?

MR. PITZER: Thank you.

CROSS EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MR. PITZER:

* * *

[149]

Q Doctor, I was asking you whether or not his reading score indicates that he has a seventh grade reading ability?

A Yes. A grade level, yes, of seventh grade.

Q And his spelling grade level is of [150] fourth grade?

A Yes.

Q Mathematical grade of a fourth grader?

A That's correct.

Q You indicated that his sensory and perceptual functions were noted within the normal limits for tactile, auditory and visual sensory confrontation examination?

A Yes.

Q So he touches things and understands what he's touching?

A Not quite that sophisticated. That's simply a test of whether you feel light stimulus to your fingerprints, that you see visual stimuli or that you hear very simple auditory stimuli. It's not even perception or discrimination. It's really just for recognition, that you recognize that you're being touched or you recognize that there's something – that you're seeing something.

Q You said that he had a verbal intelligence quotient on the Wechsler of 88?

[151]

A Yes.

Q And that would put him, albeit in the low end, it would put him the average range, is that accurate?

A That's correct.

Q And you indicated that you believed his IQ to be 91?

A That's correct.

Q Is that an average IQ?

A Yes.

Q You indicated and Mr. Hill asked you some questions about his ability to recall and so forth and so on. You indicated that he does have an attention and concentration function within normal limits for short-term auditory information?

A Yes.

Q So when he hears things, he has a normal ability to be able to remember what was said to him and recall it later?

A If it's very simple. These are just digits that's being read to him. You know, a series of digits of five, three, eight. He can hold that in store and [152] repeat it back within normal limits.

Q Would you have – you've read a lot of the documents that he's prepared?

A Uh-huh.

Q Would you say that he has at least an average vocabulary?

A I think his – No, I wouldn't. I would say that his – that he has many neologisms – what are

called neologisms in there which are non-words and I think that many of the words are simple – pretty basic, simple words, the ones that are accurate. So, I think it's consistent with his reading level of about the seventh grade. Yeah.

Q Do you think disqualification is a word that's an average person?

A Well, I think maybe or maybe not. We can debate that. But I think the overriding issue is that I'm not sure he always knows the meanings of the words that he is using.

Q Do you think average people sometimes don't know the meaning of the words they're using?

[153]

A I don't know. I've never researched that issue. I don't know that I can answer that.

Q You wouldn't have an opinion as to whether or not average people sometimes use words when they really couldn't give you a definition of the word?

A Periodically perhaps, I suppose.

Q You indicated that his cognitive flexibility falls into the lower end again of the average range on your third paragraph of page four.

A I'm not sure which line you're referring to. I'm sorry.

Q I've got it as –

A Oh, yeah. I got it. I found it.

Q Is that accurate?

A Yes.

Q And you indicated with regard to his memory that he was in the 81st percentile for immediate recall. Is that 81st percentile for all people?

A Yes. He did very well on that test.

Q And 84th percentile, even higher, for delayed recall?

[154]

[154]

A That's recall.

Q So, do you think – do you have an opinion as to whether or not he has – in fact his visual memory is the – it looks like 90th percentile and 89th percentile for delayed recall?

A That's correct.

Q So very, very high. Would you agree?

A That's correct. Absolutely.

Q And this has to do with his ability to remember?

A That's correct.

Q And you did some tests to find that out, correct?

A Yes.

Q But yet you indicated that he – one of the reasons he has an inability to help his attorneys is because he can't remember what took place on the day that he's charged with the crime?

- A No. I said that he gives inconsistent reports about what happened on the day of the crime.
- Q Is it not possible that he's simply lying about his memory of the day of the [155] crime?
- A I don't believe so.
- Q It's not possible that he's simply lying?
- A Of course it's possible.
- Q So the answer is yes, it is possible that he's simply lying about what took place on the day of the events?
- A It is possible.
- Q He's got a pretty good darn memory based on your tests?
- A He has – under those conditions, he can remember both verbal and visual information quite accurately for at least 20 minutes.
- Q He knows who he is, does he not?
- A Yes.
- Q He knows what his birth date is?
- A Yes.
- Q He knows that he has family members?
- A Yes.
- Q Does he know where he lives?
- A I don't know that I've asked that question.
- Q Do you have any reason to believe that [156] he does not have also long-term memory?

A Oh, I think he does have preservation of some long-term memory.

Q Do you believe that he knows that Mr. Hill is one of his lawyers?

A He knows that Mr. Hill is one of his attorneys. Yes.

Q Does he know that Mr. Jones is one of his lawyers?

A I believe so.

Q Does he believe that – do you believe that he knows that you are a psychologist who's been asked to evaluate him?

A I think he has some sense of what that's about. Yeah.

Q Do you think he understands that the man up here in the robe is the judge?

A I'm sure he understands that.

Q I mean, in fact, he's been making his own motions at times during the course of the proceeding and referring to either Your Honor or Your Majesty or whatever it is he says?

A Yes. That's correct.

[157]

Q Do you think that indicates that he understands that this is the man who is in some way the referee of the court proceedings?

A Yes.

- Q Do you think that he understands that Mr. Hill, as a lawyer, has certain responsibilities associated with being a lawyer?
- A I don't know if he has that down. That's a bit abstract. He may have it but I'm not sure.
- Q You've seen him when he's punching on Mr. Hill's arm and asking him to say certain things to the judge?
- A Yes.
- Q And you've seen him write notes to Mr. Hill and asking him to say certain things to the judge?
- A Yes, but I've also seen what those notes say and so they're often quite out of context and irrelevant to what's going on.
- Q Is it possible that Mr. – do you think that Mr. Edwards appreciates how much [158] time he's looking at if he's convicted of this crime?
- A He can state that.
- Q Do you think he understands time?
- A Yeah.
- Q Do you think he understands the passage of a day?
- A Yes.
- Q A month?
- A Yes.
- Q A year?
- A I suspect so.

Q So that if he understands that he's looking at 135 years, he probably understands that a human doesn't live that long?

A Yes.

Q You were not asked by the Court to prepare any reports or do an evaluation of Mr. Edwards, is that correct?

A No.

Q You were asked by defense counsel to do that?

A That's correct.

Q And did they also pay your fee?

[159]

A Not yet but I'm hopeful they will.

MR. PITZER: Those are all the questions I have.

MR. HILL: I do have a few.

THE COURT: I think I did too. Doctor, sometimes lawyers reserve matters for argument and we have a unique situation here. It occurs to me that no one has asked you what you mean when you say competent to stand trial. What do you mean, sir?

THE WITNESS: You know, that's a really interesting question. What I mean by that is his ability to represent and to participate in that process in a way where he can number one, comprehend and use that information in a meaningful way and then kick it back with his attorney and participate actively. And I really don't think that Mr.

Edwards gets – I mean, as this gentleman articulates, he knows the specific roles but he cannot organize his behavior in a way to give Mr. Hill information that Mr. Hill could use in his defense.

[160]

THE COURT: Assuming –

THE WITNESS: He's going to give lots and lots –

THE COURT: Assuming that information exists.

THE WITNESS: He's going to give lots and lots of information, none of which is of utility.

THE COURT: Has anyone ever had discussion with you of case law or statutory definitions of the competency threshold?

THE WITNESS: I've looked at the legal definitions for competency.

THE COURT: Looking at that definition, would you repeat it back to me in your own words? What does it mean to you?

THE WITNESS: Oh, yeah. I mean, I didn't commit it to long-term memory.

THE COURT: I understand. Just do your best.

THE WITNESS: What I understand it to mean is that the person is competent to the extent to which they can supply information or receive information in a [161] way that they

can actively participate in the process of their trial.

THE COURT: So an accused can work with counsel to receive a fair trial?

THE WITNESS: That's correct.

THE COURT: Fair representation in the criminal justice system?

THE WITNESS: That's absolutely right. If you're cognitively or emotionally or in any other way impaired to an extent that then it interferes substantially with your ability to do that, then I guess I would head that towards incompetence on a sliding scale, you know, from –

THE COURT: And sometimes talented advocates have to work a little bit harder with clients with limitations than an advocate who has a client who's not suffering his limitations?

THE WITNESS: Oh, absolutely.

THE COURT: All right then.

THE WITNESS: All the way – yes.

* * *

[164]

CROSS EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MR. HILL:

Q In your opinion, no matter how hard I would work, do you think Mr. Edwards would be able to effectively assist me [165] or Mr. Jones in his own defense?

A No.

- Q And that's because?
- A The pervasivity of his illness.
- Q He is not – is he making a choice to be – to borrow a phrase from Mr. Pitzer – an ass?
- A No. He is not making that choice.
- Q He has a mental disease or defect?
- A Yes.
- Q That mental disease or defect includes either a delusional diagnosis –
- A Yes.
- Q – or Schizophrenic diagnosis?
- A Yes.
- Q But with thought disorder?
- A Yes.
- Q That prevents him from being able to assist?
- A Yes.
- Q Okay. It's not volitional?
- A Absolutely not.
- Q Okay.
- A In fact, I think Mr. Edwards would very much prefer to feel quite otherwise [166] about himself.
- Q And your objective testing indicated that?
- A That's correct.
- Q Mr. Pitzer also asked you the – to speculate on the possibility of whether he's lying, of course he's lying, could be, right?

A He could be.

Q Given the fact that he has been diagnosed as either having a delusional disorder or Schizophrenic disorder, do you think he is lying?

A No. I do not think he's lying.

Q And I'm talking about his ability to recall details of the facts?

A No. I do not think he's lying. In fact, his tendencies want to please others rather than to lie to them.

Q Okay. Do you – in response to questioning by Mr. Pitzer, you indicated that his writings were quite rambling?

A Yes.

(WHEREUPON, DEFENDANT'S EXHIBIT B WAS [167] MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

Q Okay. I want to show you what has been marked as Defendant's Exhibit B and ask you if you're familiar with that.

A Yes.

Q What's the title of that document?

A It's the "Instinctive Method for Glandular."

Q Is this a document where Mr. Edwards was writing his thoughts about his circumstances?

A Yes.

Q Okay. Does this document underscore your and highlight your opinion about his ability to write and communicate and think?

A Yes, it does.

Q Is this reflective of a thought disorder?

A Yes.

Q Is it also perhaps reflective of a delusional disorder?

A Yes.

MR. HILL: I'll move to admit Exhibit A [168] in 19 pages.

THE COURT: Any objection, Mr. Pitzer?

MR. PITZER: It's probably Exhibit B.

MR. HILL: B. I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Exhibit B.

* * *

(WHEREUPON, DEFENDANT'S EXHIBIT B WAS [169] ENTERED INTO EVIDENCE WITHOUT OBJECTION.)

Q And this document just underscores what you were saying about his thought disorder and his inability to communicate?

A That's correct.

Q And his rambling thoughts?

A That's correct.

Q This document doesn't need to be read carefully, does it, but it needs to be read?

A That's correct.

Q Okay. The Court asked you questions concerning your understanding of the law?

A Yes.

Q As it pertains to Mr. Edwards, does he currently – and if we look at the second prong of the competency issue, the second prong being the ability to assist issue, your opinion you've stated is he doesn't have the ability to assist?

[170]

A Yes.

Q You think he does understand the roles of the other parties as to prong one?

A Yes. I mean, he can state the roles of the people involved. Yes.

Q Do you understand he has to do – be able to do both?

A Yes.

Q Understand our roles and be able to assist counsel meaningfully?

A Yes.

Q And if he, for example, had appendicitis and was unable to assist at trial, he would not be able to go to trial at that time?

A Yes.

Q Okay. And this is an illness; it's just an illness of the brain?

A Yes.

MR. HILL: Okay. That's all the questions I think I have at this time.

* * *

[172]

MR. HILL: I may have omitted a question. I – Mr. Jones pointed out that I didn't clear something up and I may ask leave to ask an omitted question.

THE COURT: Certainly.

CROSS EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MR. HILL:

Q You testified earlier as to treatment?

A Yes.

Q Do you have an opinion if he receives treatment as to whether there's a reasonable likelihood that he would remain incompetent or his competency could be restored or is it too early to tell?

A Well, I think there's certainly a reasonable chance that his functioning could improve enough that he could become competent but I can assure you that if it's not tried, he will not become competent.

Q The treatment?

[173]

A That's correct.

Q The neuroleptic treatment?

A That's correct.

Q And the medication and therapy?

A That's correct although I would not recommend neuroleptics because those are another class of anti-psychotics that he should not take but –

Q Okay.

A But the A typical anti-psychotics like Zyprexa should certainly be tried. I think Mr. Edwards might also feel much better.

Q The neuroleptics he couldn't take – shouldn't take because of his prior head injury?

A That's correct.

MR. HILL: That's all I have.

* * *

445a

STATE'S EXHIBIT ONE

prosecutions shell enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial,

[CONTINUED ON PAGE 3 OF 8]

[CONT – PAGE 4]

“MOTION TO DISMISS CRIMINAL CHARGES”

AND DISCHARGE THE DEFENDANT

ON C.R. 4 [C]

- 2] Assignment for a defendant in jail extensive discretion and exercised by the defendant of this cause Mr. “Ahmad Edwards”. The rules of criminal procedure Rule 4 [C] defendant discharged. No person shall be held on recognizance or otherwise to answer a criminal charge for a period in aggregate embracing more than one year from the date the criminal charges, against such defendant is filed, or from the date of his arrest on such charge, whichever is later; rules of criminal procedure. Criminal Rule 4 [C] designated as initial classification by the defendant, Mr. “Ahmad Edwards” whome arrived at the Marion County jail in Indianapolis, Indiana on

[CONTINUED ON PAGE 4 OF 8]

[CONT – PAGE 5]

“MOTION TO DISMISS CRIMINAL CHARGES”

AND DISCHARGE THE DEFENDANT

ON C.R. 4 [C]

- 2] 07-21-99 untill 09-29-00 thereon for more than one year. For a total number [428] days in general. By written stipulation of the justice information system of Indianapolis. Awaiting trial – held for authority verdict thereon for more amended circumstances as effect by judgment, on 3-27-2001 where no continuance was had on the defendant, “Mr. Ahmad Edwards” motion, so held on recognizance for [53] added days of the courts calendar as to date 05-25-2001.

[CONTINUED ON PAGE 5 OF 8]

[CONT – PAGE 6]

“MOTION TO DISMISS CRIMINAL CHARGES”
AND DISCHARGE THE DEFENDANT

ON C.R. 4 [C]

- 3] Any extensive additional proceedings of law by the right of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Contitution witch states “no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges of citizens of the United States nor deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. Witch sequenced the convenience of justice by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 71A.[A] applicability of other rules. Such as Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 83.[B] procedures when there is no controlling law. To subscribe the dismissal

[CONTINUED ON PAGE 6 OF 8]

[CONT – PAGE 7]

“MOTION TO DISMISS CRIMINAL CHARGES”
AND DISCHARGE THE DEFENDANT

ON C.R. 4 [C]

3] of the defendant, “Mr. Ahmad Edwards” exesting criminal charges and discharge the defendant from the Marion County Jail in Indianapolis Indiana at 40 South. Alabama Street. In an cell housing numbered block [4-B]. Under the gallery number [494657] as his exclusive right as the accused to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State of Indiana which District haveing been previously ascertained by law of the Criminal Procedure Rule 4. [C] discharge for delay in criminal trials not sufficient in time to try him.

[CONTINUED ON PAGE 7 OF 8]

[CONT – PAGE 8]

“MOTION TO DISMISS CRIMINAL CHARGES”
AND DISCHARGE THE DEFENDANT

ON C.R. 4 [C]

The defendant, moves the Court of this cause to order the dismissal and the discharge of the defendant Mr. “Ahmad Edwards”. on the grounds that it is in violation of the jurisdiction of this States Constitution

450a

and laws of the criminal procedure rules. Criminal Rule 4 [C] defendant discharged. With corporation incorporated under the laws of the United States Constitution of America Amendment One Article Six.

cc:

/s/ Ahmad Edwards
Ahmad Edwards

451a

DEFENDANT'S EXHIBIT A

452a

Letter of Dec 20, 01

This is Ahmad's response to the question: What is your plan/defense that you feel will be successful?

Return come to see me for more cash flow because I recently zoomed an eight to six year plan to last.

Rather state such factors I group for the largest mixed complaint; to become an observer of an free agent of series where he can raise my hand as support for an team with absolutely no Indians-Ins but myself to blame for the win

Beginning tomorrow being I'm crazed with nothing todo I'm going to kill — time and become an overachiever city general in a sport just for the feeling until I can thank you for a good day "Christina Spannan", and the treatment you gave me: coaching

"Coach" – "Baby" – "Coach"

You are the precautions I need to take when I become a freshman as another traveler first class

Waite the second when I ask you to meet me from malicious will — and say only justices clearly in, Court caseing Chiefs for how I can joine the majority of the best

June 15 is when I'm celebrating an picking you to earn points now they'll read about me one day in books at ~~library~~ library's on ~~bonu~~ bonus list as the pool room power from Indy

select body as the best

Basesing new game on brarriers I made Mobi

[illegible]

As [illegible] year from [illegible] broken back from book writeing will cover me however reacted with skepticism

Currently I have been writeing a book about ____ [illegible] is in a addition [illegible]

I will not take the stand as an weapon in trial on behalf of a man standing trial with collections of any day caused by madness as to an crowd that included saying "Wo" – he imposed us. And told fellows publicly "Hi – Mom".

Board members were ready to use unnecessary fee policys that covered just raised request to post my members superintendents roll call

High school student walked out of the goals they presencely felt saying "Please" with the way this man see it!

But now it's-all-over and I want to be an freshman in class myself if the judge lets me go to the Indiana Family and Social Services Administration on Logansport State Hospital civil side called "Dodds" or "C.L. Williams" or "Carson," "Central" or one of the four whome are not just going to sit back and let the rights as advocates of those in need of special learning: conditions campus serving these type of young adults seen policed hand down "Christina" the substance that make people positive is options – see they'll never, ever, know unless you diligently give to virtue for the knowledge temperance shows mindul of kindness for this world's charity to ready the great one's by and such choosing is whats right.

/s/ "OUA"

Ahmad Edwards

454a

DEFENDANT'S EXHIBIT B

[Pages 19 p.1 of 19]

“INSTINCTIVE METHOD FOR GLANDULAR”

When an adequate supply of oxygen is not ensuring a particular regulation of blood pressure in the circulation of support, the many billions of interconnecting cells of the brains larger more dominating general cerebral; as well as the – draining resulting in ventricles full or in the filling of the central canals of witch becomes blocked of relief or cut off as this should be treated with a mild sedative that will not cause embryo to form in an early pregnancy of [Ahmad Edwards Asto] futcher family plaing, As such an sedative might cause his children tobe born deformed takeing the responsible limb formation by effecting it’s cortex in the thalamus as an transmission of impulses to and from a child [Mr. Ahmad Edwards] should allow descendants by helping in the giveing birth process therefore the used drugs should not effect the cerebral

[p.2 of 19]

“INSTINCTIVE METHOD FOR GLANDULAR”

Solutions of Qxide witch could cause anemia cytochromes are constituents occurring naturally in the human body yet with-in “Mr. Edwards” [Ahmad] iron has become deficient as Hematite [20°] rapid puls is reached with a low capacity of blood that pumps abnormally in “Ahmad”

Previosly, recognized by doctors – an neurosis of witch caused by an auotomile crash – began a hemorrhageing in his [Ahmad] cerebral confirming patters previous developed as social learing. Psychotherapy for fears of inappropriate everyday adult life disorders. Phobia caused the compulsive

disorder “Hysteria”. of witch should receive adequate social contact and education with a minimum strategie to help the hysteria between behavior therapy as the two treatements – will benefit both degrees of learning and social competence.....

[p.3 of 19]

“INSTINCTIVE METHOD FOR GLANDULAR”

Asto the neurosis conforming an unconscious conflict with-in the peripheral nervous system is the rule of the damage to his upper left forebrain which interferes with sensation of his [Mr. Edwards] nerve control of the body such rule of damage has caused an infectus allergic reaction due to heavy metals, an vitamin deficiency and an organ failure .. esseentially in the same areas advanceing aphasia disorder in his brain represented as an learning disability of his [Mr. Ahmad Edwards] ability primari auditory recognition mode located in the dominating general cerebral

The conventional planes of brain surface apart from heart energy for motion couples with the atrium

[p.4 of 19]

“INSTINCTIVE METHOD FOR GLANDULAR”

Draining of heart thus empirically subjecting the prevention of the brain surface to express a stable releases exaggerated by the blocking in drainage of skull in to the brains hydrocarbons atoms alkynes as they are used as fuels for lubricat deriving formally to or this closest mother of various branches – treatment may very well be by-standing in compounds made of aliphatic alicyclic hydrocarbons

substituting, accepting carbon's hormone in organic chemistry.

Chemically solutions according to certain rules for subtraction multipleing dividing E.C.T. [Mr. Ahmad Edwards] simply – when useing his imaginary commissions – is throwing – a – way the higher ariseing of blood from the lower hart by the brains

[p.5 of 19]

“INSTINCTIVE METHOD FOR GLANDULAR”

Unusual blood-vessel strength at the surface of cortex damage halve zone of his [Mr. Ahmad Edwards] brain. As the basal ganglia and pituitary gland. Stems the dyslexia. Represented in the development of this organic period; hormones considerably are ceased with an excess amount of hyperventiction an fertilization of iron in the begaing looks like the pre-affects of his vessel of blood damage

The anxiety that is inevitable calling to attention stresses simulating. An Qygen correcting with [Fe SO⁴ 7H²O] or green vitriol, or copperas green crystalline solid; when “iron ore” is treated; with sulfuric acid it “gains the table” – as a mild solution for one wanting results if economicly privileged to periodicly effect this disorder in response to attention –

[p.6 of 19]

“INSTINCTIVE METHOD FOR GLANDULAR”

seeking behavior to stop.

Extremities of the nerves [or neuron] asto the procedure or results; at first affect the brains basic

unit nerves that or deprived. There balance and strengt is crucial in the tranpositioning of sensoryes that control predominatly the cortex, and are concerned because of the special diffusing in the forebrain, which connect small but important centers of the brain stem. As it contains it's posture of and in each hemisphere of the cerebral the motor cortex sensationaly must be assimilated for better spand of controle, due to the surface layer damage capillaries in actively are in convers of.

The reading process, assimilating written languge Mr. Edwards [Ahmad] primar

[p.7 of 19]

“INSTINCTIVE METHOD FOR GLANDULAR”

Auditory phonetic component is isolated as words and, sentences when written on normal auditory levels seem tobe patterns of an disorder with [out-put] visual mode, the dependence on letters in words for the forming of sentences is the development of the transition of the auditory to the visual mode. Thust ~~Amad~~ Ahmads written form substantially is effected represented initially in a dyslexia that once subdivided into conception and articulation is noted associates with probably the essential acquisition of Ahmad [Mr. Edwards] comprehension disorder.

Indivisible by the surface of released thyroid hormone gland levels lowering concerning particularly

[p.8 of 19]

9

“INSTINCTIVE METHOD FOR GLANDULAR”

with the exclusive phenomena that due to growth nearby pituitary optic nerves affecting the vision of Mr. Edwards [Ahmad] producing syndromes some may be in the center brain blood release of hormones causing tumors in hypothalamus vessels consisting of several situated oxygen elements and chemical compounds of stone, rubber, metal substances from posing the automobile to alternate in the collision in the recession of an object powerful inflicting with graphic force. closing the now visually seen head blow Mr. Ahmad Edwards received from the front seat of the driver side of the totaled-out automobile by the engine reaction the reciprocating engine parts; upon impact of Mr. "Ahmad Edwards" upon forehead, very low by

[p.9 of 19]

"INSTINCTIVE METHOD FOR GLANDULAR"

The second law of gravity about two [2] to three [3] tons can emit its weight and term of settling in as to the effect of bacteria penetrating the surface of first nervous system of neurosis impulse transference associations to deal with this interest of [Ahmad] Mr. Edwards health is now in the crucial state, that replacement therapy with thyroid hormone be diagnosed to prevent, slow responses. Usually if replacement therapy has been delayed [large tongue E.C.T.] apparent speech development. Vocalization of syllables. Acquisition of verbs adjectives whereas as the person that therapy has been minimized would appear as mental retarded with a low intellectual capacity arising from impairment of the brain and nervous

[p.10 of 19]

“INSTINCTIVE METHOD FOR GLANDULAR”

Resulting in genetic defect systems. Psychosis of withdrawn behavior which mood characteristically is flat or auditory hallucinations delusions of identity, or nonlogical sequence of ideas as [his] conversation would lack substance. Witch are particularly disorders of human thought. Mr. “Ahmad Edwards” experiences of importance in school and admission socially, his [Ahmad] mental magnetism of people with high intellectual conpasties shows he possess none of the border line features classified by the last stated psychosis.

Yet there is a moderation of the minimized crucial transpositioning of sensorys connected to the centers of the extensions to tendons of normal

[p.11 of 19]

“INSTINCTIVE METHOD FOR GLANDULAR”

Joints and there activity inherited physically that needs tobe examinaed. As the basis of syptoms occupationally causing vascular functional ~~disoed~~ disorders. Deficiency of blood theoreticy could cause Mr. Edwards [Ahmad] too lose weight because of the fast becoming common regulation of his [Ahmad] phical system by witch he sweats leaving any of his [Mr. Edwards] efforts of building an healthy dayly diet that witch amounts to the proper servings of sodium dietary and proteim carbohydrate and fiber as they all become saturated in calories value. His [Ahmad Edwards] nutrition needs must be percented daily as they may have tobe much higher than the basic dependance of two thousand dayly calorie intake

.....
.....

[p.12 of 19]

“INSTINCTIVE METHOD FOR GLANDULAR”

..... may be even higher than the dietary needs; totaling two thousand five hundred – [2500] when the diet of Mr. Ahmad Edwards reaches an deficiency the results are nervousness, weight loss and increased rate of his heart beat leading to myxedema with an skin disorder of the lymph node [sweat gland].

Vaporizing directly also is a profuse scented substance fume from the characteristic effect hyperhidrosis activity is abnormally surfaceing the skin with the resolution the secretion at a high rate evaporates the subsequent hot body temperature to cool to atmosphere levels normal

[p.13 of 19]

“INSTINCTIVE METHOD FOR GLANDULAR”

on the autonomic nervous system hypothalamus immediately revenues the orchestra, of a sour composing like fume containing the skin's vascular water between the nerves system of hyperhidrosis and the inflammatory neutrally participating with the faint discharge of vapor measuring that the fight proportionally in degree of convectional deodorants Mr. “Ahmad Edwards” seems to be losing against the un-attracting smell people at the very least find this smell acceptable that is created by his body's epithelium. The disorderly fashion of the man's [Mr. Ahmad Edwards] secreting sweat glands diagnosis on a physical examination is an [or as] inflammatory disorder. Causes are certain due to the

[p.14 of 19]

“INSTINCTIVE METHOD FOR GLANDULAR”

Cularlation of blood into the internal body organs from the heart material chambers to the brains systemic analysis is not or should not be classisfied as an skin manifestation.

Energy thyroid pituitary gland cause at levels that are to low are hormone defiency in Mr. Ahmad Edward’s hypothroidism and cool dry and or puffy skin nervousness may result in iodine deficientis increasing Mr. Ahmad Edwards heart rate. Oversecretion of this deficiency traumatizes certain exocrine glands which are the usual secreting materials via ducts into internal organs of the heart the epithelium of the sweat glands secrete watery fluid or perspiration and sebaceous sebum and the epithelium of internal membranes discharges outside of the lubricats that alleged protect the

[p.15 of 19]

“INSTINCTIVE METHOD FOR GLANDULAR”

Surface of the skin were the most sensitive areas are connected that project the body from abnormal conditions of profuse sweating – as stress to the hypothalamus and autonomic nervous system glands activity [hyperidrosis] witch its abnormal sweating profusely conditions a excessive loss of cystic fibrosis witch and abundantly is caused by Mr. Ahmad Edwards loss of vascular legion. An diagnosis on secreteing sweat glands as to a physical examination causes are an inflammatory and due to the cularlation of blood internal organs. The heart and its materal chambers abnormality effects the brain systemic organs; analysis for Mr. Edwards [Ahmad]

skin manifestations characterized as profuse sweating of the subsequent autonomic nervous system.

[p.16 of 19]

“INSTINCTIVE METHOD FOR GLANDULAR”

Released thyroid hormone pituitary optic nerves exclusively are effected by need. The brain [Asto Mr. Ahmad Edwards] must produce releasal of several hypothalamus vessels so that gland levels lowering syndromes recive the proper blood.

Asto the control of muscles metal infection caused by damage to the peripheral nervous system. An antbyotic and psychotherapy for hemorrhaging characterized by previous diagnosis an educational disability learning phobias of life effecting neurosis disorder must receive adequate social contact helping peripheral nervous system causeing sensation conflict behavior competence consciously should restore.

[p.19 of 19]

“INSTINCTIVE METHOD FOR GLANDULAR”

of a low capacity of blood thats abnormal failing in the [Mr. Ahmad Edwards] body constituent to a normal suficient amount of iron, plu puls an effective secondary subsequent amount. Graphicly is in need to become adequat when impulses are affected by the cortex for the needed sake of any children Mr. Ahmad Edwards may have ; “avoid” any and all sedatives used to cure, that may cause embryo to expereince; congenital problems in such effects oxide when it comes discharging, in some sedatives”.

**STATE OF INDIANA VERSUS AHMAD
EDWARDS**

CAUSE NO. 49G05-9907-CF-121975

COMPETENCY HEARING – APRIL 29, 2003

HONORABLE VAN BARTEAU

MS. CRAWFORD FOR STATE

MR. HILL FOR DEFENSE

* * *

[4]

DWIGHT SCHUSTER, having been sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth now testifies in this cause as follows:

COURT QUESTIONS WITNESS

Q Doctor Schuster, first let me point out to you that the purpose of the hearing today is to determine Mr. Edwards's competency to stand trial as of right now.

A Yes, sir.

Q Not as of two years ago or a year ago or even three months. I guess the question is right now, okay? Now, you originally filed a report with this court – do you have your original report? What was the date of that, Doctor Schuster?

A Which report are you referring to?

Q Your original report that you filed in this case. That would have been back in...

A The date of the original report was December [5] 31st, 1999.

Q And what was your conclusion in that report as to the then-competency of Mr. Edwards to stand trial?

A It was my opinion at that time that he was competent to stand trial.

Q And then did you subsequently testify in a competency hearing held by the Honorable Gary Miller? Or was it just your report?

A I'm sure I probably did.

Q Okay. Doctor Schuster, you filed a later report with the court I believe, is that correct?

A Yes, sir.

Q And that was dated October 2nd, 2001, is that correct?

A That is correct.

Q And this was a re-examination of the defendant after his return from Logansport. Is that correct?

A Yes, sir.

Q And at that time in that report, which is part of the record –

[6]

THE COURT: And I assume both counsel have seen that report?

MS. CRAWFORD: Yes, Judge.

MR. HILL: Yes, sir.

Q It was your opinion that Mr. Edwards had shown a marked improvement since your original examination and that it was your opinion that with reasonable medical certainty that he was competent to stand trial for the

crimes with which he is charged. Is that correct?

A That is correct.

Q Is that still your opinion, sir?

A That is still my opinion.

THE COURT: You may cross examine, Mr. Hill.

MR. HILL: Okay.

[7]

**CROSS EXAMINATION
QUESTIONS BY MR. HILL**

Q Doctor Schuster, your original diagnosis of Ahmad Edwards was what?

A At that time I had two diagnostic impressions, the first he had a mixed learning disability classified as a developmental expressive writing disorder and expressive language disorder and the second diagnosis was that of delusional disorder grandiose type.

Q Okay. Now, in your second examination, did you have a diagnosis of Ahmad Edwards?

A At that time I thought that he still had a learning disability but not as evident as in December of 1999. I don't believe in my report that I put in a diagnostic impression other than just a general statement that there was nothing to suggest psychotic ideation or loss of reality.

Q Okay. Would he still have been suffering under the delusional disorder grandiose type at that time, then?

A No, I didn't find indication of it on the [8] second examination.

Q So you found no indication on, in regards to delusional disorder grandiose type on the, at the time of your second report?

A That's correct.

Q In the, from the time of your first report to the time of your second report, what had happened to Ahmad Edwards? Medically what had happened to him?

A He had been at Logansport State Hospital.

Q Okay. Did you review the records from Logansport?

A No, I, or at least I don't any copy of the reports now. I had a, I have just a, what is titled a psychological assessment, but in reality it, later on it's termed a comprehensive bio-psycho-social assessment. It wasn't, I didn't think it was truly a psychological assessment, certainly not a psychiatric evaluation.

Q Okay, so it's some sort of hybrid sort of report, would that be fair?

A Primarily sociologic.

Q Okay. And subsequent to Ahmad Edwards being, [9] back in our last hearing, have you examined him again?

A Yes, I examined him the last time December 16th, 2002.

Q And at that time did you still think he had a learning disability?

A It was not, I didn't make a diagnosis of a learning disability at that time. I think I

indicated, I said by history he does have a learning disability but I have no school records or other objective reports on it.

Q So you did not make that diagnosis again then at the time of your third report?

A No.

Q Okay. At the time of your third report, did you make any further diagnosis concerning delusion disorder grandiose type?

A I did not make such a diagnosis, no.

Q At the time of, in between your second and third report and at the time of writing your third report, were you aware of any medical intervention for Ahmad Edwards between those two time periods?

A No.

[10]

Q Okay. To the best of your knowledge, from the original time that you encountered Ahmad Edwards until present, has he been on any medication?

A Not any psychotropic-type of medications.

Q That you're aware of.

A That I'm aware of.

Q The – at the time, from your original meeting with Ahmad Edwards to the present, are you aware of any therapy that he's been through, psychiatric therapy?

A No.

Q Okay. The, have you had occasion then to meet with Ahmad Edwards on three, at three times during the course of this case?

A Yes.

Q Okay. That would be right before your first report; right before your second report; and right before your third report?

A Yes.

Q Okay. Have you had occasion to read any of the writings that Ahmad Edwards has delivered to the court?

A Back originally in 1999.

[11]

Q Okay, and was that what caused your mixed learning disability, having problems expressing himself?

A Yes.

Q I'm sorry, I know I didn't say that properly but —

A Yes, that was the basis of the diagnosis.

Q Okay. You said also he had problems communicating, not just in writing but also orally?

A Difficulty due to his obsessive, repetitive pattern at that time.

Q Okay, and that would be both oral and in written form?

A Yes, referring to 1999.

Q Yes.

A Yes.

Q Okay. At the, at the time of your most recent report, is it your understanding that Ahmad Edwards is not under any psychiatric care at

the current time or under any medications, psychiatric medications at the current time?

A That's my impression, yes.

[12]

Q Okay.

MR. HILL: That's all the questions I have.

THE COURT: Let me ask a missing thing.

COURT QUESTIONS WITNESS

Q Doctor Schuster, did you prepare a written report following your third examination?

A Yes, sir.

Q Did you submit it to the court?

A Yes, sir. Under the date of December 31st of 2002.

Q I don't see that report in the file.

MS. CRAWFORD: I have a copy of it, Judge.

MR. HILL: I have a copy as well. Is there any —

MS. CRAWFORD: December 31st, 2002?

A Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Is there any objection to my entering that into the record?

[13]

MR. HILL: Oh, no.

MS. CRAWFORD: Oh, no, Judge.

THE COURT: And I want to read it before we're done with Doctor Schuster.

MS. CRAWFORD: Judge, may I be permitted to ask a couple of questions of Doctor Schuster?

THE COURT: Sure, go ahead.

**CROSS EXAMINATION
QUESTIONS BY MS. CRAWFORD**

Q Morning, Doctor.

A Good morning.

Q You indicated that there, that the defendant had some problems expressing himself verbally and in written form back in 1999 and that took the form of, of, and that was the basis of your opinion for the delusional disorder diagnosis, is that correct?

A Well, the basis, more the basis for that diagnosis was his, some of his grandiose statements which appeared to be delusional in [14] content.

Q Okay, and you said that he had a learning disability and he had trouble expressing verbally and orally, and what was your diagnosis in relation to that?

A Well, that's when I made the diagnosis of developmental expressive writing disorder and expressive language disorder.

Q Okay, and what did you mean exactly by that? What do you mean by that?

A Well, that was just to be the diagnostic nomenclature given in the, in our DSM 4 (phonetic) that basically it indicated that the, he had difficulty in both writing and in speaking orally, expressing himself because of

his verbosity, his obsessive detail, repetitive nature of it, that type of expression which was coupled with a lot of grammatical and syntactical problems.

Q Did he fall into that pattern of communication during either of the second two examinations that you did of him in 2001 and 2002?

[15]

A To some degree he continued to be what I termed excessive in giving convoluted, detailed explanations of things.

Q Okay. Did you find that his falling into that same pattern was to such an extent that he was unable to communicate his ideas? That you had an absolute lack of being able to understand what he was saying?

A No, not on any of the three examinations as I, in answer to the judge I found that he was competent all three times that I examined him.

Q I noticed that each time that you talk about it, he gave an explanation of his account of what happened in July of 1999, is that right?

A Yes.

Q And was it, were you able to understand consistently what his story was each time?

A Yes, and it was very consistent.

Q Okay.

MS. CRAWFORD: I don't have any further questions. Thank you.

* * *

[17]

RE CROSS EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MR. HILL

Q You said he gives convoluted detailed [18] explanations of, when you start asking him questions.

A Yes.

Q And that was something that was consistent throughout his presentations to you?

A Yes.

Q Ahmad Edwards can be asked what he's charged with and he can answer that question. Would you agree with that?

A Yes.

Q Okay. And he can parrot back yes, I'm charged with crime A, crime B, crime C? Would you agree?

A Yes.

Q Okay, and if you tell him and if he's aware of what the allegation of probable cause affidavit would be, he's aware of that, he can repeat that. Would you agree with that?

A Yes.

Q Since your first examination, have you read any of the writings Ahmad has forwarded to the court?

A Um, I'm not aware of any after the original examination, they're all in 1999.

* * *

DIRECT EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MR. HILL

MR. HILL: Okay, let's — may I call Doctor Coons?

THE COURT: Please do. Mr. Coons? Doctor Coons, excuse me.

PHILLIP COONS, having been sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth now testifies in this cause as follows:

Q Okay, would you state your name, please?

A It's Philip M. Coons.

Q You are a psychiatrist?

A I am.

Q That means you're a medical doctor.

* * *

[42]

Q Okay. Now, there are indicators, indications in the medical record that trained medical personnel at Logansport, social workers, psychologists, orderlies, people that work [43] with the patients there, did observe delusional behaviors and communication from Ahmad Edwards.

A Yes. I, in looking through the progress notes, I counted somewhere between eight and 12 times where the record indicated that he was still delusional or still having trouble communicating and yet that wasn't reflected in Doctor Berger's report to the court.

Q That didn't come through in the report to the court at all.

A Not at all.

Q Okay. The, it's not valid, is it, to assume that someone's been to Logansport and that they have received treatment. That's not a valid assumption, is it?

A No.

Q Would you, I mean you would hope that would occur.

A Yes.

Q But in this case it did not occur.

A That's correct.

Q And there were indications from trained medical people that there was an ongoing [44] delusional mindset here with Ahmad.

A Yes.

Q You did interview Ahmad, face-to-face?

A I did.

Q And when did you do this?

A That was November 26th of 2002.

Q Now, in, in the interview with Ahmad, this was for the purpose of determining competency?

A Correct.

Q Would you describe to the court what you want to accomplish and what you want to do in that sort of interview? Just set the scene for that kind of interview.

A In determining competency, basically what I want to do are, to do several things. One would be to take a thorough psychiatric history and come up with a psychiatric diagnosis. Number two, I want to examine the defendant particularly regarding his knowledge of the charges against him, plus his knowledge of

courtroom procedure and terminology and finally I want to come to some kind of an opinion about whether he's [45] able to cooperate with his attorney.

Q Okay. The best way to do that is through reviewing the records and then conduct the interview.

A Well, yeah. One must review the records if they're available, do a psychiatric examination and ask questions about courtroom procedures.

Q And did you conduct that sort of psychiatric examination?

A I did.

Q And did you conduct that sort of records review in this case?

A Yes.

Q You have a diagnosis of Axis I, do you know?

A Yes.

Q What is Axis I, what does that mean to lay people, what should it mean?

A Well, in psychiatric diagnoses we have five different axes and on Axis I we list the main psychiatric diagnoses.

Q Did you come to a psychiatric diagnosis in this case?

A I did.

Q Would you describe your diagnosis of Ahmad?

[46]

A Yes. My diagnosis was schizophrenia in this case. There were a couple of secondary diagnoses. He's abused alcohol and heroin and marijuana before and he also has a history of a

reading problem, but the main diagnosis that we ought to be concerned with is schizophrenia.

Q Okay. What is schizophrenia?

A Well, schizophrenia is a psychiatric disorder which is characterized by both a disturbance in thinking plus a flight from reality and generally that manifests itself with either delusions or hallucinations.

Q It's not unusual then for someone who's schizophrenic to have grandiose delusions?

A That would, would be typical of one form of schizophrenia.

Q Would it be inconsistent with someone who's schizophrenic to distort reality?

A Oh, no, somebody that's schizophrenic, when they're psychotic they always distort reality.

Q For example, if I said I had something growing out of my head, that might be a [47] distortion of reality?

A Exactly.

Q If I didn't have it actually growing out of my head.

A Yes.

Q Okay. If a person were to describe an event in a convoluted manner, would that also be – an event that actually occurred, would that also be representative of schizophrenic disorder, distortion of reality?

A Yes. The, that would come under what we call the thought disorder part of schizophrenia and there are many different kinds of thought

disturbances that we can see in schizophrenia. Mr. Edwards exhibited what we call loose associations, to me meaning that it was hard to follow his train of thought from A to B to C, you know. He would skip A to F to Z. Sometimes he couldn't answer the question, he would either be tangential, which means he kind of gave an answer but it was peripheral to what I was talking about. At times his answers were completely irrelevant to the question. Just didn't make [48] any sense.

Q Okay. Would convoluted be a way to describe that, in simple terms?

A It could be.

Q If, if, and I'm going to jump ahead to another witness coming in a few minutes, but if an attorney were to describe Mr. Edwards as not being able to logically communicate about the events of a particular crime that a person's accused of, would that be consistent with schizophrenia?

A Yes.

Q Would that surprise you if someone were to say that Ahmad Edwards was unable to do that?

A No, you know, he couldn't do it with me and if he had a lot of trouble with me, I'm sure, and I'm a trained professional, I'm sure he would have trouble with an attorney.

Q Okay, this schizophrenic disorder, how in, I take it he has delusions that go along with this?

A That's correct. When I saw him they were predominantly what we call grandiose

delusions. He had plans to write several [49] books, he felt, said his mother was a Black Panther and worked for the CIA, he said that he worked with his mother for the CIA in the 1960's and that was, of course, before he was born. At the time I saw him he didn't have auditory hallucinations or visual ones.

Q When Ahmad Edwards would try to describe something you say he would jump from A to F to Z and then back, not being logical. Was this a consistent manner of communication for him with you?

A Not exactly. I found that when I asked him very concrete questions like what is your name, what is your age, where were you born he could handle that and I would get a relative answer. But, you know, if I asked why questions or asked him to describe something, especially when I got into areas of his psychotic condition, that's, that's when he, he broke down and got very loose and had trouble communicating.

Q Okay. So if I were to ask him what's a judge do, could he handle a question like that?

A He was able to do that with me, I would [50] expect so.

Q If I asked him to explain why a judge does those things, the reasoning underneath the rule or the rules that govern a courtroom or why we need to know certain information as a defense lawyer, do you think he would be able to understand and comprehend the harder questions?

A He might or might not. Those are the kind of questions where he might have trouble.

Q Okay. All right. In looking at this, looking at his psychiatric diagnosis, what would your recommendation be as a doctor for someone like Ahmad?

A Well, as a psychiatrist I would recommend that he be placed on antipsychotic medication which would treat his, both his thought disorder and his delusional system.

Q Okay. Would he be a person who would benefit from a period of time at Logansport Hospital?

A Yes.

Q How long of a period of time, and I know I'm looking at a crystal ball here, but professionally can you give us some guidance [51] as to what we're talking about?

A Well, it's hard to say. Most people with a delusional disorder, when they're first treated they will respond in two, three, four months. The longer it's allowed to go on, generally the longer time it takes to respond to antipsychotics.

Q The longer the delusional disorder has been persistent, you mean?

A Correct.

Q And it would appear that if Doctor Schuster and Doctor Masbaum are correct that in '99 Ahmad had a delusional disorder, is that the kind of longstanding period of time without treatment that you've described?

A That's a fairly long period of time. I've seen people that have gone much longer, you know, five, ten, 15, 20 years, but...

Q The delusional disorder becomes entrenched then in his thought process.

A Yes.

Q Okay, and it just takes time, the longer it's gone on the longer it's going to take to fix that.

[52]

A Correct.

Q Okay. You do not anticipate then a quick turnaround from Logansport if he is committed to the hospital?

A Well, I would expect a minimum of two to four months.

Q Okay. All right. Have we covered all your significant findings here as it pertains to Mr. Edwards?

A One other finding I had was he gave me a really improbable drinking history. He said he could drink 48 tall Budweiser cans of beer per day and one pint of hard liquor. Probably not. That could be delusional. I chose to diagnose him as schizophrenic rather than delusional because of his thought disorder. If you have a thought disorder like that you really automatically get into the schizophrenic category of diagnoses.

Q And you are confident of your diagnoses within a reasonable degree of medical certainty?

A That's correct.

Q Your – just a couple of other questions. [53]
Have you reviewed his writings?

A Yes.

Q Do his writings reflect the same convoluted
pattern of communication he expresses
verbally?

A Very much and in fact, I think the video tape of
his voluntary statement reflect what I saw.

Q Okay. Did you see the video tape, one of the
news crews where he was being arrested and
he was on a gurney after being shot and he
indicated to the news crew that he wanted to,
that he appreciated the good service he
received at the store?

A I can't recall that specific comment.

Q All right. I believe, if we covered all your
findings that's all the questions I have.

A Okay.

THE COURT: Ms. Crawford?

[54]

**CROSS EXAMINATION
QUESTIONS BY MS. CRAWFORD**

Q Have you worked at Logansport, Doctor? Are
you intimately familiar with Logansport and
how they operate?

A I've visited there on a number of occasions, I've
never worked for money there.

Q Okay, so you've been there to visit patients
who were there?

A I've been there a couple of times to consult with patients and I've also been there two or three times to give talks.

Q To medical personnel?

A To primarily the psychiatrist staff.

Q Okay. All right. You indicated that there were no auditory or visual hallucinations. Did I understand that correctly?

A At the time I saw him I did not see any.

Q Okay, and would you have, is that something that's very common in schizophrenia, people suffering from that disorder?

A Um, in some forms of schizophrenia auditory hallucinations are and in some forms they aren't.

[55]

Q Okay. When you indicate there's a flight from reality as a characteristic of schizophrenia, what do you mean by that?

A A flight or break, a misperception of reality.

Q Uh-huh.

A That's, you know, as evidenced by hallucination or delusion.

Q You were describing his communication with you when he was being asked questions and giving you answers that sometimes the answers to the question would be peripheral and then at other times he would give answers that made no sense.

A Correct.

Q I know people like that, so can you tell me what it is that would differentiate the kinds of

answers you were getting from the defendant from the kind of answers that you would expect to get from someone who was schizophrenic that's suffering from this disorder?

A Yes. Well, I know people too that can be very circumstantial, they can be tangential [56] like the defendant but I think the things that differentiate him from other more normal people are his delusions, predominately grandiose delusions, that he has this protrusion that he talks about. I'm not sure whether that's a delusion or a hallucination. And then the extreme form of thought disorder that he has where, you know, he just skips all over the place and it doesn't relate at all to what you're talking about.

Q Okay.

A Something else is that, and this has been described with schizophrenia is his, his affect, his feeling tone. While it's not flattened, it's very constricted. You don't see highs, highs or lows.

Q Okay. And was that true in both – you had two interviews with him, right?

A I had one interview.

Q One interview with him, and that was when, in November –

A December 26th of 2002.

Q Okay. All right. And it's your testimony that psychotropic medications are a necessary [57] part to his improvement, that if he is schizophrenic and has this delusional disorder, is that what you're saying?

A Absolutely. You know, whether he's schizophrenic, as I've testified or he has a delusional disorder as Doctor Masbaum and Doctor Schuster have testified, both conditions require antipsychotics to improve.

Q And the only place that he can get those is from Logansport?

A Well, if he's found incompetent to stand trial, in all likelihood that's where he will go. He, he could get the same kind of treatment anywhere if somebody was willing to treat him.

Q Okay. Did you find, you obviously gathered quite a bit of information from him, biographical information as well as information about the incident that happened in July of 1999. Would that be accurate?

A Correct.

Q Okay, and so you were able to communicate with him to the extent that you were able to get that information, is that right?

[58]

A Correct.

Q Thank you.

MS. CRAWFORD: I don't have anything further.

THE COURT: Let me ask a few questions and then you –

MR. HILL: Sure.

COURT QUESTIONS WITNESS

Q Doctor Coons, is there any indication in his history that you've seen or that he's expressed of an onset of schizophrenia at some time in the past?

A I was unable to determine from him exactly when his illness had its onset because of his lack of insight. I would have liked to talk to, you know, somebody that really knew for a long time but, you know, I didn't know of anyone that was reliable. I do know that he saw a, I think it was a psychiatrist friend of his mother's in the early 1990's, a psychologist and I don't know exactly what [59] that entailed, but that apparently happened in Tennessee.

Q Now Doctor Coons, auditory or visual hallucinations in schizophrenics come and go, don't they? They're not constant.

A In some cases they come and go and some cases they are constant.

Q Now the new atypical antipsychotic drugs have done great things, have they not?

A Yes.

Q I'm talking about Zyprexa and some of those other new drugs that have only been on the market a few years.

A Correct.

Q Assuming that your diagnosis is correct and he is a schizophrenic, you feel that with the proper course of medication this would return him to a status where he would be able to assist in his trial?

A Yes.

THE COURT: And I want to point out something to both counsel just so that again to keep the record straight, I have a son who [60] is schizophrenic and I spend a lot of time worrying and sweating this issue and my son is on Zyprexa, I guess it is now. It does wonderful things but it's no, it doesn't cure him, it keeps him under control and that's about all it does. Anything else?

MR. HILL: Just a couple of questions.

**REDIRECT EXAMINATION
QUESTIONS BY MR. HILL**

Q You heard Doctor Masbaum's answer to the question about Doctor Berger no longer being at Logansport. Is that your understanding?

A Yes.

Q Okay. And the, the letters that I asked you about earlier, I don't know if I asked you this question. If I did, I apologize. But the content of those letters, would you describe the content of those letters as convoluted?

A Some of them very much convoluted.

Q Okay. Is that typical of his oral communication as well?

A Yes.

[61]

Q Okay.

MR. HILL: That's all.

THE COURT: I have one more I think.

COURT QUESTIONS WITNESS

Q Doctor Coons, if Mr. Edwards were sent back to the Department of Mental Health, what guarantee is there that he would receive any medication?

A I suppose there's no absolute guarantee but I would hope that if Logansport got him back a second time, the physician in charge would scratch his head and wonder why and, you know, and closely read examinations and treat.

Q Until your report there's been no indication of schizophrenia in this case.

A I'm sorry?

Q Until your report there's been no indications of schizophrenia as a diagnosis in this case.

A Well, I think Doctor Trexler's report mentioned a possibility.

[62]

Q Okay, you're right. It was kind of an aside in there.

* * *

[63]

LANCE TREXLER, having been duly sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth now testifies in this cause as follows:

THE COURT: Would you state your name for the record?

DR. TREXLER: Lance Emerson Trexler.

* * *

[64]

DIRECT EXAMINATION
QUESTIONS BY MR. HILL

* * *

[65]

Q Are you familiar with the competency restoration class at Logansport?

A I've never participated in it; I have reviewed some of the literature describing that process and so I have that level of familiarity with it.

Q Would you agree it's a class where they take someone like Ahmad and explain to him what Ms. Crawford would do as the prosecutor, what I would do as the attorney, public defender, what judge would do, what the witness's role – or jury's role?

A Yes.

Q And in fact they do playacting, role playing?

A Yes.

Q And through this process someone like Ahmad [66] would be able to learn to respond to what's a defense lawyer do, he helps me, that kind of stuff?

A Yes.

Q What's Ms. Crawford do, she tries to put me in jail, that type of thing.

A Yes.

MS. CRAWFORD: That's what they tell him?

MR. HILL: Well, that would be his answer.

MS. CRAWFORD: Oh.

- Q I mean, that would be his, and he would answer those questions in that manner.
- A Mr. Edwards can learn and can recite and can retrieve basic non-complex facts.
- Q Now, um, in examining Ahmad Edwards, could you describe your neuropsychological findings of him as it pertains to a possible head injury?
- A Mr. Edwards is very tangential and unable to stay focused on a topic when it relates to any information that is not about simple facts or as Doctor Coons indicated, with respect to any, just simple demographic information about himself, and even that becomes infused and tangential, particularly as it relates to his own history at times. So obtaining a good history is very difficult from a medical, from a neuropsychological perspective. He is very perseverative. That is, that means that we go over things over and over and over again. He is, has intelligence and Mr. Edwards is not stupid. He actually has some good intellectual capacities, but they are disrupted significantly by what I would call a discontrol, or an inability to regulate his own thinking according to the circumstances at hand.
- Q Okay. Now, did he have a head injury?
- A Yes.
- Q Do you think, or do you know whether or not this head injury has caused any interference with his logical thought process?
- A It would appear to be the case that it has. Of course patients with schizophrenia can have cognitive and often do have cognitive [69]

impairment. So how much of this is his head injury and how much of this is his diagnosis of schizophrenia is very difficult to determine, and if this were simply a clinical matter, what we would recommend is, is that he receive the appropriate medication as I recommended in my examination of 2000 and that then he be re-evaluated neuropsychologically to determine if he still has cognitive impairment that would be associated with a head injury. That's how we would manage this in a good clinical situation.

Q Okay. Is he likely to get a good neuropsychological examination at Logansport Hospital?

A I don't believe they have neuropsychologists on staff. That doesn't mean it's not a good psychiatric facility, it just means they don't have that available.

Q But you would recommend that as, after he's gone through the medication process, you would recommend that as something that should follow-up to determine whether or not there's [70] any interference from this head injury?

A That's correct.

Q What was the nature of the head injury that was described to you?

A The one was a car accident in 1995 and the patient did have loss of consciousness at that time and there was also a second injury when the patient was hit as a pedestrian. It was impossible to determine the exact date of that and I was unable to obtain medical records on

that and so the veracity of that report is unclear to me.

Q The first injury, the car accident, were you able to obtain medical records on that?

A Yes. Yes, I was.

Q And there was, in fact, a documented, medically documented head injury?

A That's correct.

Q With loss of consciousness.

A That's correct.

Q And that was as a result of a motor vehicle accident approximately when?

A September 13, 1995.

Q Which would predate all of this?

[71]

A That's correct.

Q Okay. In your report you agreed originally, and in your follow-up report that he has a delusional disorder?

A That's correct.

Q Do you think he's schizophrenic?

A I would concur with Doctor Coons' opinion, after reviewing that at the time of initial evaluation in 2000, I said that I suspect this patient has a major thought disorder such as schizophrenia and it should be noted that he has a very strong family history in this regard. Additional testing is required. I made that diagnosis.

Q Strong family history of schizophrenia?

A Schizophrenia, that's correct.

- Q Would that come through his sister?
- A That's correct.
- Q And his mother?
- A That's correct.
- Q Meaning that they are diagnosed as being schizophrenic.
- A That's correct.
- Q At the time you've conducted – how many [72] evaluations or how many times have you seen Ahmad Edwards?
- A At least three and perhaps four.
- Q Okay. Describe his ability to communicate with you in these meetings.
- A It's extremely difficult to communicate because Mr. Edwards is, as I said earlier, often tangential and very disorganized or disregulated in his thinking and therefore, while he can answer simple questions, he is unable to relate to me any complex concepts or ideas of beyond basic information, and the same is true for the written material in its content.
- Q The written material, and we have volumes of that.
- A Yes.

THE COURT: Excuse me.

MR. HILL: Do we need to take a recess?

THE COURT: No.

Q Okay. The written materials, how would you characterize the written materials?

[73]

A They are analogous. They are disorganized, they're incomprehensible.

Q Okay. In fact, he, after your, you examined him last night.

A That's correct.

Q And you examined him awhile back?

A In February of 2000 and then again in, I believe early 2001.

Q Okay. And then recently he forwarded letters to you?

A That's correct.

Q And these have been identified as Exhibits A, B and C.

A Okay.

Q Are these the, copies of the letters you received from Ahmad Edwards?

A These are the original letters.

Q Original letters?

A Yes.

Q Okay. Did you examine those?

A Yes.

Q Okay, are they, as they came to you in the mail?

A Yes.

[74]

Q Okay, and they were sent to your clinical office?

A Yes.

Q Okay.

MR. HILL: I would move to admit A, B and C.

THE COURT: Ms. Crawford, have you seen these?

MS. CRAWFORD: I have now, yes, Mr. Hill gave me a copy of these this morning.

THE COURT: Do you have any objection?

MS. CRAWFORD: No, I don't, Judge.

WHEREUPON, DEFENSE EXHIBIT NUMBERS, A, B, C ARE NOW ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE WITHOUT OBJECTION.

MR. HILL: These are being offered, Your Honor, to demonstrate what's been demonstrated through the other writings that are in the court file. These are just the most recent examples.

[75]

Q Is that a fair characterization?

A Yes.

Q Okay. You would describe the communications, those letters, as being consistent with his oral communication?

A That's correct.

Q Convoluting?

A That's a common way to describe that, yes.

Q Okay. The, in all the times you've actually spent with Ahmad Edwards, has his ability to communicate changed in any appreciable way?

A No.

Q You read the Logansport records.

A Yes.

Q Your, and you heard what Doctor Coons said the entries in the records from medical personnel indicating delusional thoughts, delusional disorders, convoluted communication. Would you agree that you've also reviewed those entries in the Logansport records?

A Yes.

Q Would you agree that no reference to any of those entries made it into Doctor Berger's [76] report?

A Yes.

Q Would you agree that Ahmad Edwards needs to go to a facility where he can receive care and treatment, medication?

A Yes.

Q And that you would also recommend neuropsychological evaluation upon, what would you say, after the medication had a chance to work?

A That's correct, after some reasonable attempt to treat, appropriately treat this disorder through medications and psychotherapy, then he should be re-evaluated to examine the possibility that he still has cognitive impairments secondary to the head injuries.

Q I believe that's – have we covered all your significant findings?

A Yes.

Q Okay. And you saw him again last night in preparation for this hearing.

A That's correct.

Q Has his ability to communicate or his thought process changed in any appreciable way?

[77]

A No.

Q You think he has a thought disorder?

A Yes.

Q Okay.

MR. HILL: That's all the questions I have.

* * *

[86]

COURT QUESTIONS WITNESS

* * *

[87]

Q Doctor Trexler, were Mr. Edwards to be returned to the custody of the Department of Mental Health and given antipsychotic drugs, they would in no way affect him if he has a traumatic injury to the brain? They're not going to cure that.

A That's correct, Your Honor.

Q They might clean up some of the disordered thinking and affect and some of these other things of schizophrenia, however?

[88]

A That's correct, Your Honor, but my concern is, is that on examination, and this was noted last night as well, and that is that Mr. Edwards continues to have some difficulties with motor functions of his left hand, and that was noted in my very initial examination and the asymmetry between use of one hand and the other is not a symptom of schizophrenia. That is a symptom like you would expect to see in a stroke patient, for example, where they are paralyzed on one side. Certainly Mr. Edwards is in no way that severe, but when you give him tests where you look at coordination of his hands, he shows an asymmetry that I don't think is easily explained by schizophrenia but we can be hopeful that appropriate treatment for his schizophrenia will at least ameliorate the majority of his symptomatology.

* * *

[92]

MR. HILL: I have just a couple questions.

THE COURT: Sure.

**REDIRECT EXAMINATION
QUESTIONS BY MR. HILL**

Q I forgot to ask you about this discussion about the protrusion.

A Yes.

Q Did Ahmad Edwards tell you that he had a protrusion coming out of his head that he could see in a mirror?

A Yes.

[93]

Q And were you present in court when he was explaining that not only to you but to Doctor Masbaum?

A Yes.

Q And he had explained that to you prior to the hearing?

A Yes.

Q Okay. Did he describe it as being associated with stress?

A Yes.

Q And stress tends to improve or aggravate his ability to communicate?

A It aggravates it.

Q So as trial approaches, one would anticipate what?

A That he will deteriorate.

Q Okay. He did not have a protrusion, did he?

A He did not.

Q Okay. And he showed you where it was sticking out and how he, described how he could see it?

A Yes.

Q Okay.

* * *

[94]

MARK JONES, having been sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth now testifies in this cause as follows:

THE COURT: Thank you.

[95]

**DIRECT EXAMINATION
QUESTIONS BY MR. HILL**

Q Would you state your name, please?

A Mark A. Jones.

Q Mr. Jones, I know you and I believe the court knows you to be an attorney working for the Public Defender Agency here in Marion County?

A That's correct.

Q At one point you were assigned to Criminal Court Five, were you not?

A Yes.

Q As part of that assignment, did you have occasion to help me represent Mr. Edwards?

A Yes, I did.

Q You no longer are in that assignment, are you?

A That's correct.

Q Okay, you've changed jobs, you're supervising younger attorneys, training them, that kind of thing.

A Yes, sir.

Q And you are no longer able, because of that, to represent Ahmad.

A That's correct.

[96]

Q And you've withdrawn your appearance.

A I don't know that a formal withdrawal has been filed. There was supposed to be a substitution of counsel that would take my name out of the file and put someone else's in, yes.

Q Bottom line is you are no longer his attorney?

A That's correct.

Q And I'm counsel of record.

A That's my understanding, yes.

Q Okay. You've had numerous occasions then in the – let me back up. How long did you represent him?

A I believe I, well, I started representing him when he came back from Logansport. The case had been with you and Ms. Diane Abel who was previously the supervisor in Court Five.

Q That's true.

A She left, I took over that supervisory responsibility and so I automatically became his lawyer when he came back from Logansport.

Q Okay. So for a number of months, a couple of years you were his attorney?

[97]

A Yes.

Q In the, I want to have you address one issue. Can you – and that is the issue of communication, whether or not he can effectively communicate with us or with you as his attorney. Do you think he is able to effectively communicate with you?

A No.

Q In your opinion does his lack of ability to communicate make him not competent to stand trial?

A That's correct.

Q Okay. Could you characterize a couple of things. First of all, if you're talking to Ahmad about simple things, who the judge is, where the jury sits, that we're supposed to present evidence on his behalf, that kind of thing, does he understand those kinds of concepts?

A He can tell you what the judge does in a very brief way and what defense attorney does and what prosecutor does. Does he understand it? No.

Q Okay, so the understanding that underlies [98] that kind of concept is absent?

A Correct.

Q Have you ever had an effective conversation with him, a meaningful conversation with him about the core facts of this case?

A No.

Q Have you attempted?

A Yes.

Q Guesstimate how many times you've attempted.

A Fifteen.

Q Okay.

THE COURT: How many was that? I'm sorry.

A Fifteen.

THE COURT: Fifteen?

Q You've been present with me when I've attempted to have that sort of conversation with him.

A Yes, I have.

Q Have you ever been able to recognize that he's been able to communicate with me?

A No.

[99]

Q You've read the letters –

A Let me correct that. He can communicate but not relevant conversation.

Q I'm sorry, thank you. He cannot communicate effectively about the core facts of the case.

A That's right.

Q He cannot impart the knowledge that's necessary to defend him.

A Right.

Q If – you've read the letters, these various writings that we've provided to the court.

A Most of them, yes.

Q Okay. You would – how would you characterize those letters?

A Well, I've been present obviously in court this morning. I think convoluted is almost a nice term but I would say definitely convoluted. They're not on topic, they are not related to anything in court. He wants to file pleadings in court that are completely unrelated to anything. For instance, his motion for dress code, talked about a dress code in various parts of the state, but he was insistent with both you and [100] me that they be filed with the court,

even though we tried to explain to him that they weren't relevant to anything.

Q Okay, and is that the one where he also detailed code for when he was going to go to different parts of the country?

A Yes.

Q And how he would have to have a different outfit that the court should provide for him.

A I don't recall even being clear that he limited that just to him, but certainly he talked about dress codes in different parts of the country, yes.

Q Okay. His writings, do they represent his oral communication?

A Yes. I would actually say that his writing almost seems better than a lot of his oral communication because he at least stays on task a little bit, although completely irrelevant in written, but he is very, in words used earlier, tangential when you're trying to have verbal communications with him.

Q You heard Doctor Coons describe how Ahmad [101] would start on a topic and go from point A to point F to point Z and then back to a point somewhere in the middle.

A Right.

Q Would you agree with that?

A Yes.

Q He, has he ever refused to talk with you?

A Not that I can recall. He's not refused to talk to me, he has refused, I wouldn't, he has not answered my questions, he's not been

responsive when I've asked questions specifically about the instances at issue here. Whether that's a refusal or whether that's inability I can't say, but he has not answered my questions.

Q Okay. As an officer of the court, is it your opinion that he is not competent to stand trial now?

A That's my opinion, yes.

* * *

[102]

COURT QUESTIONS DEFENDANT

Q Mr. Edwards? Mr. Edwards?

A Yes, sir.

Q Do you know Mr. Jones here?

A Yes, sir.

[103]

Q Do you know what we're doing here this morning?

A Yes, sir.

Q What are we doing here this morning, sir?

A Reviewing my health status, reviewing me.

Q Mr. Jones has testified that he finds it impossible to communicate with you. You feel the same way?

A I guess I, it's hard for me to communicate with anybody. I just, I'm not, I can't concentrate, I come out of concentration so easy. It's just not, nothing makes sense when I do, you know.

Q Mr. Edwards, there's been some suggestion here this morning that you may suffer from a

disease known as schizophrenia. Have you ever heard that name before?

A Yes, sir. I probably do. I've seen it in some of the papers.

Q Now Mr. Jones – er, Mr. Edwards, there's also been some testimony that there's some new medications on the market that are very helpful to people with this disease if, in fact, you have it. Would you be willing to

[104]

take that medication?

A Yes. I would certainly be willing to take anything that would help me back to health or help me out of this, help me out of this pain that I feel.

* * *

**STATE OF INDIANA VERSUS AHMAD
EDWARDS**

CAUSE NUMBER 49G05-9907-CF-121975

JURY TRIAL – JUNE 27, 2005

HONORABLE GRANT W. HAWKINS

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH FOR STATE

MR. CUSHING FOR DEFENDANT

**EXCERPT REQUESTED BY ATTORNEY
GENERAL'S OFFICE ON JANUARY 28, 2008
AND TYPED BY COURT REPORTER DONNA
BOYLE, CRIMINAL COURT FIVE:**

JUNE 27, 2005

THE COURT: This is State of Indiana versus Ahmad Edwards, cause number 99-121975. Mr. Edwards is here with Mr. Cushing, State by Mr. Hollingsworth. This matter is set for trial by jury. Mr. Cushing, you ready for trial by jury?

MR. CUSHING: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: State ready?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yes, sir.

MR. EDWARDS: Objection, Your Honor. I would like to say something, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Who was talking?

MR. EDWARDS: You was, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Who was talking.

MR. EDWARDS: You was, Your Honor. I would like –

THE COURT: Tell me why it's a smart thing to interrupt me when I'm talking.

MR. EDWARDS: Your Honor, it's not, it's not appropriate –

THE COURT: It's not, okay, then don't, okay?

MR. EDWARDS: I definitely want to say something.

THE COURT: Well, wait your turn, okay?

MR. EDWARDS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Any preliminary issues, Mr. Hollingsworth?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Not at this particular second in time, no.

THE COURT: Do you expect any between now and when we get the jury?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Depends on what comes from the defense side. I have no issues at this moment.

THE COURT: Any preliminary issues, Mr. Cushing?

MR. CUSHING: Your Honor, I spoke with my client and my client wishes to address the court with regard to proceeding pro se.

THE COURT: Is that what you were trying to interrupt about?

MR. EDWARDS: Yes sir, yes sir. I just, I wanted to get it off, get it off of on the record, actually.

THE COURT: Make your record.

MR. EDWARDS: Your Honor, I actually do have a statement. Your Honor, the, determining the value of the property of the discovery that I received, a general judgment has come across for me to make and it's actually needing to be made upon the court, the court needs to make the decision. The specific findings and the control of the discovery is, is able for me to handle but there's an exception, it's a noble one and it applies to the review of the information and however it may seem, it is a standard to me. It's real important because it deals with my life, Your Honor, and it, it seems as if for the past six years preparing for this case, attorneys have isolated me from the material or from the discovery and it troubles me to think that I won't make a good case or I won't have a good trial of this. Your Honor, basically it's, it's, either you can give me a, another attorney or I'll have to go pro se with this because I'm, I'm believing that the changes that need to be made with the case are going to cause for me to suffer with the lawyer, Dirk Cushing.

THE COURT: What is he not doing?

MR. EDWARDS: Well, we, we've only had strict tests with the discovery for about 40 minutes. Now, that's, that's –

THE COURT: What do you mean by strict tests?

MR. EDWARDS: Well, the tests to, to review the, the, some of the laws, memorandum (sic) warnings, some of the evidence, some, the difference forms of evidence, the, the contradicting statements, the cross examinations, the affidavits, some of the, the –

THE COURT: Mr. Cushing, you spent more than 40 minutes talking about the case with this man?

MR. CUSHING: Your Honor, I have. It just –

THE COURT: Okay, thank you. Anything else, Mr. Edwards?

MR. EDWARDS: Well, Your Honor, it's been, we've had a 90-day period to prepare but I've only had three visits from Mr. Cushing in the past, in the past three days. I've seen him Tuesday, I've seen him, uh, or I've seen him Wednesday, I've seen him Friday and then a little bit Saturday and Sunday. All of the meetings together were about 20 minutes long so we're looking, I'm looking at about 40 to maybe a little bit more, maybe 50 minutes with him with such a large case, and this case is, it's just too enormous for 40 minutes to go forth with a trial today.

THE COURT: Spent more than 40 minutes with him, Mr. Cushing?

MR. CUSHING: Your Honor –

THE COURT: Yes, sir – is that a yes?

MR. CUSHING: One day alone I spent an hour and a half over there.

MR. EDWARDS: Well, Your Honor –

THE COURT: Anything else, Mr. Edwards?

MR. EDWARDS: I still don't believe that I would like Mr. Cushing to be on my counsel. I don't, I, I object to him being on my counsel, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Hollingsworth, what's the standard for a defendant going pro se?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: As we speak Mr. Poindexter's reviewing the *Sherwood* case which sets out the standards.

THE COURT: Mr. Poindexter, if you could summarize.

MR. POINDEXTER: I might be of some assistance. There, if he has made the court aware of his desire to proceed pro se, and I think the record's clear he has, at this point in time it's beholden upon the court to inform Mr. Edwards and ask him some questions that illustrate the complexity of the case, the relative training and skills of the lawyers present, see about his familiarity with, like the rules of evidence, courtroom procedures. I don't know if your particular bench book has like the *Faretta* script or the *Sherwood* script –

THE COURT: It does not.

MR. POINDEXTER: Okay. Well, then I think we can work on putting that together but our federal district court has previously sent back a case that was tried by Judge Young in the absence of such a hearing and, for him to, and that was after trial and conviction, so to make it a little more clear for the court, we will have to hold a hearing, we will need to make an inquiry and I believe that the court will probably have to read the *Sherwood* case. There's several operative paragraphs or pages in there of areas of inquiry. Then make those areas of inquiry which are designed to illustrate for the defendant perhaps the relative skill or training and experience that might be necessary to adequately represent himself. Inquire of his familiarity with courtroom proceedings, rules of evidence and those type of things, as well as to inform that should he proceed to trial, in essence he will be bound by the rules of evidence, the rules governing courtroom behavior and that in doing so, he could place himself at a

disadvantage. And I'm sorry for not being able to give the court any further assistance at this time, other than I think given a few minutes I might be able to find someone's script from the bench book if you haven't found it.

THE COURT: Well, I have the bench book. I don't have the, well –

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: This is *Sherwood*, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I'm giving counsel a copy –

MR. POINDEXTER: And I apologize, I don't know what, if judges have supplemented theirs in other courts or not.

THE COURT: Well, let me see if what I have –

MR. POINDEXTER: Okay.

THE COURT: - seems satisfactory. If not, we'll take a short recess. Mr. Edwards, you have the right to waive counsel and appear pro se. There used to be a requirement that you knowingly and voluntarily waive your right to represent counsel. I think you've done that. There's a further requirement that you be advised of the dangers of representing yourself. You see the deputy prosecutor over there, Mr. Hollingsworth?

MR. EDWARDS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Okay, Mr. Hollingsworth, how long you been practicing?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Thirteen years.

THE COURT: And you've been assigned to this major felony court on, you've had two tours?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I've been in this particular court for eight years.

THE COURT: Okay. And you've also worked in Grand Jury?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yes, which also brought me back and forth to this court on occasion.

THE COURT: How many jury trials have you had?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: About 110.

THE COURT: Okay. Pretty decent conviction rate?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Pretty decent.

THE COURT: How many trials have you attended, Mr. Edwards?

MR. EDWARDS: Well, I've actually attended, counting the first phrase, I'm speaking of pre-trial –

THE COURT: No, how many jury trials have you attended?

MR. EDWARDS: I've only attended one jury trial.

THE COURT: Okay, were you counsel at that trial?

MR. EDWARDS: No, I was not.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. EDWARDS: I don't have a license to practice law, no, sir.

THE COURT: Well, you didn't, you weren't pro se last time is what you're telling me.

MR. EDWARDS: No, sir. I haven't, I haven't had a felony or I haven't been convicted of any offenses.

THE COURT: Now, let's discuss a little bit about your familiarity with the rules of evidence.

MR. EDWARDS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: How much experience do you have with those rules?

MR. EDWARDS: Rules of evidence, I have about three and a half years experience.

THE COURT: Have you ever read them?

MR. EDWARDS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: How are they organized these days?

MR. EDWARDS: The rules of evidence are organized systematically.

THE COURT: Okay, are they organized numerically?

MR. EDWARDS: Metric system is used, yes, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. The 400 series of rules applies a lot in criminal cases. Are you familiar with the 400 series, Rules 400, 401, 402, 403, of the rules of evidence?

MR. EDWARDS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: What generally do those rules address?

MR. EDWARDS: Uh, dealing with, let's see, 404, not 404 but 401, they're dealing with the defendant's opinions, so I've seen organizations and associations, I've seen the 404 addressed to credit, the credit of the witness and then –

THE COURT: Okay, you're absolutely wrong, do you understand?

MR. EDWARDS: Well, Your Honor –

THE COURT: Do you understand? You're wrong about the 400 series, do you understand?

MR. EDWARDS: What part of the 400 series –

THE COURT: Do you understand?

MR. EDWARDS: Yes, sir. I have understanding, have understanding.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, the 800 series also has an application in court. What does the 800 series have to do with a criminal court?

MR. EDWARDS: Your Honor, I honestly would need a little bit of time to study that. Today I can't prepare –

THE COURT: Well, today, today's your ready for trial –

MR. EDWARDS: Well, Your Honor –

THE COURT: So you're not familiar with the 800 series is what you're telling me?

MR. EDWARDS: Well, Your Honor, I would actually need to take a minute to review the information because today I didn't even expect for Mr. Cushing to push forward the trial. We talked about it, the visits, and I asked him for more time, I said we have just gotten the discovery, we need to review. And if, if I had an inkling of an idea that I would have to walk through the woods alone on this one, I would have studied intensely. I have a copy of the federal rules of procedure –

THE COURT: You understand this is not a federal court?

MR. EDWARDS: Yes, sir, but I have a copy of the trial rule procedures that give the, evidence, rules of evidence as a reference.

THE COURT: Okay, now, we're having a pre-trial motion. What's the first step in the trial itself?

MR. EDWARDS: Well, before, before any form can be produced in trial, a person or party would have to file the information with the clerk on the face of the document so that it could be presented. So to me that would be the first thing to do, was to put orders upon the clerk.

THE COURT: Okay, you're wrong again.

MR. EDWARDS: Under Trial Rule 71.

THE COURT: You're wrong again.

MR. EDWARDS: Yes, sir, because the court is always open?

THE COURT: Mr. Poindexter, Mr. Hollingsworth, Mr. Cushing, I'm satisfied that we have a knowing waiver, which is different from an intelligent waiver. I am satisfied also that the defendant has absolutely no concept of what has to be done to present a defense or to defend himself against the charges brought, the evidence intended to be introduced and the like.

MR. EDWARDS: Objection.

THE COURT: Was that you interrupting again?

MR. EDWARDS: Your Honor, objection, I put an objection out.

THE COURT: Okay. Based on *Sherwood*, what's the next step as you understand it, Mr. Poindexter?

MR. POINDEXTER: In *Sherwood*, I think before we reach the court's going to make a conclusion, and I apologize when you use these particular prints, I can't give you a page number, it's the third page in from the end of the opinion titled advisements to pro se defendant and it also indicates that that caption was not part of the original case, it's been done by probably West, there are a series of other questions. A competent hearing, it talks about asking if he's responsible for conducting voir dire, it's all in bold.

THE COURT: Third page from the end?

MR. POINDEXTER: Yes, and I apologize, I –

THE COURT: That's all right.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: If I may interject, there's also the issue of unfortunately, and I disagree with this but this is the law, *Sherwood* case holds that the competency to stand trial is the same as the competency to waive representation by counsel. I am concerned, based upon what the defendant said today, that he hasn't a clue as Your Honor, I've rephrased it, but as to how to proceed. But if he has been determined to be competent and if he is still competent to try this case, once all the advisements are done, I see the issue, though, he is knowingly waiving but is he intelligently waiving? I don't have a case that defines the standard –

THE COURT: That's a finding I'm reserving.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yeah, that's, I don't know the standard that guides that.

MR. EDWARDS: I'm prepared with documentation...

THE COURT: How do, how do you do voir dire?

MR. EDWARDS: Beg your pardon?

THE COURT: What's voir dire, what is voir dire?

MR. EDWARDS: Voir dire is the selection of jury.

THE COURT: And how do we do that?

MR. EDWARDS: Well, there's, it's a striking process. We select the jurors by ten strikes apiece.

THE COURT: How many, how do you exercise those strikes, those challenges?

MR. EDWARDS: Well, speaking with the juries we pose, we impose questions that won't interrogate the jurors, for one. Won't allow them to pre-justice the case for two. And we ask them questions that will relate to the case but won't, won't put, won't put a burden on the court for selecting them.

THE COURT: Are you prepared to make an opening statement?

MR. EDWARDS: Yes, sir. But not, not today. I would have to prepare for the opening and closing statements.

THE COURT: So as we sit here today, you're not ready to make an opening and closing statement, is that right?

MR. EDWARDS: Not today, I would have to move, I would at least have, or I would, I'm begging upon the bench, Your Honor, for an allowance of a period of time, maybe a short period of time just to prepare for the knowledgeable waiver, or not the knowledgeable waiver today but the volunteering of the waiver of counsel today. I'm begging, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Hollingsworth, are there items of evidence that might be subject to objection, whether well-taken or not? You can recognize as an officer of the court that there might be an objection and argument required?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Sure. There might be.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I tend to be constrained by the rules of evidence but there are sometimes gray areas.

THE COURT: How about admission of evidence?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yes, there would be photographic, there would be physical, there will be video tape...

MR. EDWARDS: Your Honor, I'm prepared to deal with it.

THE COURT: What are the predicate questions that have to be asked before a video tape's admissible?

MR. EDWARDS: Well, video tapes would be under physical evidence and cross examining one of State's witnesses, I would actually have to ask some of the basic essentials of who, what, where, why and when to see if the individual was actually there or if they have any knowledge of the material that they are seeing, if they remember that the material was recorded or just, just simple, the simple things would just really be enough for me to be secure.

THE COURT: Okay. You're telling me essentially that you want to try your case but you're not able to try it today, is that right?

MR. EDWARDS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: So if I don't grant you a continuance, you'll need a lawyer, is that right?

MR. EDWARDS: Well, Your Honor, if you didn't write me a continuance I would have to ask you to assign me a new attorney so that I would – yes, yes, Your Honor, that's right, yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. Are you asking for a continuance?

MR. EDWARDS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Okay, I'm denying that request. Now, as far as assigning you another attorney, I don't assign attorneys. That's a function of the Marion County Public Defender. Sometime today you'll be given his address, maybe even his phone number. You can ask him to determine whether or not you had a good counsel and whether or not the counsel is properly prepared, but I'm denying your request for a change of counsel because I can't grant it. Otherwise we're ready for trial today with Mr. Cushing representing you. Anything else, Mr. Cushing?

MR. CUSHING: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything else, Mr. Hollingsworth?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: No.

MR. EDWARDS: Your Honor, would it be possible that I could file an objection –

THE COURT: Why do you keep objecting?

MR. EDWARDS: I'm not comfortable with Mr. Cushing on my case, Your Honor.

THE COURT: That's not – we're talking about why you object, why you interrupt, okay? Stop it.

MR. EDWARDS: I have a, I have a filing that I would like the clerk to file, Your Honor, if that would be possible –

THE COURT: Anything else known to you, Mr. Poindexter?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: One other matter per the *Sherwood* case is clearly that the defendant's request to go pro se is timely made. I'd just like the record to reflect that this request is certainly not timely made –

THE COURT: By denying his request for a continuance –

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yeah.

THE COURT: I'm implying that at the very least.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Thank you.

THE COURT: You still have a lawyer. You talk with your lawyer about whether you're going to file something or not.

MR. EDWARDS: I haven't had the opportunity.

THE COURT: Well, he's here now.

MR. EDWARDS: Your Honor, I don't know if, Your Honor, may I ask a question to the bench, now directed (inaudible) to the bench?

THE COURT: No, you ask your lawyer.

**AND THIS IS END OF REQUESTED
TRANSCRIPT.**

STATE OF INDIANA VERSUS AHMAD EDWARDS
CAUSE NUMBER 49G05-9907-CF-121975
JURY TRIAL – DECEMBER 19, 20 AND 21, 2006
SENTENCING JANUARY 17, 2006
HONORABLE GRANT W. HAWKINS
MR. HOLLINGSWORTH FOR STATE
MC. MCSHANE FOR DEFENDANT

FIRST DAY OF TRIAL
DECEMBER 19, 2005

THE COURT: This is State of Indiana versus Ahmad Edwards, cause number 99-121975. Mr. Edwards is here with Mr. McShane, State by Mr. Hollingsworth. The matter comes on for trial by jury this morning. I have been advised—I'm sorry, Friday I was told, last week I was told Mr. Edwards wanted to proceed *pro se* and we would have to think about that today. I have a copy of **Sherwood** up here somewhere, so let me walk through it.

MR. MCSHANE: Wouldn't do you any good, Judge, I don't ever look at it until night.

THE COURT: I hear you. At any rate, as you are aware, Mr. Hollingsworth e-mailed me his concern, a concern he discussed with you, that there be a hearing on Mr. Edwards' request and that I not rely on the record made previously. That's where my research was leading me but I responded that I appreciated his thoughtful comments on the issue.

MR. MCSHANE: That's, that's right, Judge, and Mr. Hollingsworth and I, for the record, heard about

this on Friday, he asked if I had any objection if he contacted the Court about it, I said none whatsoever and what you just stated is consistent with what he told me on Friday.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: We'll get you a copy of the e-mail if you'll have it.

THE COURT: I had no doubt about it; as a matter of fact, I think I printed the e-mail and put it in the file somewhere. The file's voluminous so who knows where.

MR. EDWARDS: Objection, Your Honor. Objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: What's your objection?

MR. EDWARDS: My objection is me and my attorney actually had discussed a defense, I think prosecution had mentioned that, and we are in disagreement with it. He has a defense and I have a defense that I would like to represent or present to the Judge.

THE COURT: What does that have to do with what I've been saying so far?

MR. EDWARDS: I just wanted to make the record with that objection. This is the most present opportunity that I had. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. EDWARDS: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Hollingsworth, consistent with the note you sent me and that note being consistent with the conversation you and Mr. McShane had, I believe during the last trial I inquired of Mr. Edwards regarding the fifteen points mentioned in

the Sherwood case. At that time I asked Mr. Edwards if he understood that he would be responsible for certain portions of the trial and he indicated yes. I didn't inquire into his ability to actually perform those functions because performance, I don't think, is necessarily a criteria anymore as long as the person understands he has the obligations. The denial last time, I think, was based primarily on the fact that Mr. Edwards wanted to proceed under the defense of insanity and that that request would have caused a continuance which, which is a basis the Court can use for denying the opportunity to proceed *pro se*. Mr. McShane, does your client—if your client proceeded *pro se*, would he be seeking the invocation of that defense?

MR. MCSHANE: Let me double-check with him, if I may.

THE COURT: Okay.

**DEFENSE CONFERS WITH DEFENDANT OFF
THE RECORD**

THE COURT: Any progress, Mr. McShane?

MR. MCSHANE: Just one more moment if I could, Judge. Thank you for the time, Your Honor. I'm always a little bit shy about getting into attorney/client matters but I would say this is a matter of a conclusion, having spoken with Mr. Edwards here. It appears to me that he does not wish to pursue the defense of insanity at trial, should he represent himself. I should state for the record I have no intention of doing that or we would have filed the appropriate documents with the court to put that specific statutory defense motion with respect to the pre-trial requirements under the Indiana competency

and insanity clause. If Mr. Edwards were allowed to represent himself, and I should make it clear my position is the same as it was last week when this matter came before the Court and that is, he has an absolute right to do that, which I believe he is, and two, that it not delay the proceedings or otherwise interrupt the efficient and fair administration of justice such as requirement a continuance. What he's indicated to me is that were he to proceed to trial, representing himself, that his defense would be self-defense. He is prepared to go forward with that defense on his own today. That is not the defense that I would be intending to advance to the jury in this case. And for the record, as his counsel, and I really haven't wavered from this since I first became familiar with this case, I believe that the defense that would be most in Mr. Edwards' interests to be advanced at trial would be basically that he didn't intend to kill anybody, not that . . .

THE COURT: Whereas he would be arguing he intended to kill but was doing so in self-defense?

MR. MCSHANE: Well, he intended to protect himself under . . .

THE COURT: Using deadly force?

MR. MCSHANE: Using deadly force.

MR. EDWARDS: Objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: It's not time for you to object right now.

MR. EDWARDS: All right, okay.

MR. MCSHANE: So those, from my vantage point anyway, those defenses are different in the case and again, regardless of my views, I think that his right to represent himself under the Sixth Amendment of the United States Constitution and the parallel provision of the Indiana Constitution, the section of which escapes me right now, he still has an absolute right to do that as long as he doesn't run afoul of what I perceive to be the only two exceptions here, so that's our position.

THE COURT: Well, I'm, you know, the easiest thing for me to have done would have been to say sure, let him defend himself, get the case done in a couple of days and not really care whether justice had been done or not. I think he last time satisfied the **Sherwood** points by saying he understood he would be responsible for certain portions of the trial. This time you're telling me that there would be no delay caused. I spent some time going over Doctor Richard Sena's report of July 27, 2004; Doctor Sena's report of May 28, 2004; Doctor Dwight Schuster's report of December 31st, 2002; Doctor Philip Coons's report of November 26th, 2002; Doctor Ned Masbaum's report of October 3, 2001; and Doctor Steven Berger's report of February 27, 2001; and finally Doctor Lance E. Trexler's report of February 23, 2000. Let me say that that—I think it was August of 2000 or so Judge Miller found Mr. Edwards to be incompetent, it was before I was presiding here. I think it was before Mr. Hollingsworth was assigned to this court, and we have so many reports—and this is not a complete list of the reports—we have so many reports because of findings prior to the prior, I'm sorry, reports prior to initial finding, then we have reports from a private doctor employed by the Public Defender agency,

Doctor Trexler; reports from Logansport doctors; re-reports from doctors Masbaum and Schuster. Each and every report where a mental state—I'm sorry, where a neurological exam was performed found either delusions, a delusional disorder of the grandiose type or schizophrenia of an undifferentiated type, that's (inaudible) one. Several of the reports refer to rambling writings as an indication of an inability to stay focused. The report upon which we relied in finding that Mr. Edwards was competent was the report of Doctor Robert Sena from July 27, 2004, from Logansport, still found that there was schizophrenia of an undifferentiated type; found that Mr. Edwards acknowledged his need for counsel; found that Mr. Edwards was able to plan a legal strategy in cooperation with his attorney. So I'm going to carve out a third exception and if I'm wrong we'll just—if I'm wrong and there's a conviction, we'll just try this case again but I think it requires more than just an understanding of **Sherwood** fifteen points; requires more than just a plan that doesn't cause a continuance. I think it requires abilities that exclude the doctors' findings, if you will. With these findings, he's competent to stand trial but I'm not going to find he's competent to defend himself. So the request to proceed *pro se* will be denied.

MR. EDWARDS: Objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Objection noted. Now are there any preliminary matters, Mr. Hollingsworth?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: If he's not going *pro se*, no.

THE COURT: Are there any . . .

MR. MCSHANE: I, I suppose I should probably just complete the record on this issue, Judge. I take exception to the Court's ruling. I don't believe that **Sherwood** allows for the Court to recognize the exception you just described on the record . . .

THE COURT: Actually I don't think **Sherwood** addresses that particular possibility. Tell you what, let me . . .

MR. MCSHANE: As I heard it, as I heard the Court's announcement of the ruling here, the Court's of the view that Mr. Edwards is competent to essentially cooperate with his lawyer and share in the responsibility in his defense to that extent, but not to do it on his own. I think . . .

MR. EDWARDS: Objection, Your Honor.

MR. MCSHANE: I think in discussing this issue, it does come up in **Sherwood**—excuse me, Judge.

**DEFENSE COUNSEL CONFERS WITH
DEFENDANT OFF THE RECORD**

MR. MCSHANE: That in **Sherwood**, citing **McCasky versus Wiggins**, a U.S. Supreme Court case from 1984, the Court indicates quote “the right to speak for one's self entails more than the opportunity to add one's voice to a cacophony of others” end quote. That's one of those five dollar words which I think is synonymous with like a chorus of others and I, I think really goes to the heart of the opportunity to represent one's self. It describes the singular nature of that right and truly, under the Bill of Rights, the personal character of that right. So I, with all due respect, would just make that statement in support of our continued position that Mr.

Edwards should be able to go forward representing himself alone in this case without what he perceives to be unwarranted interference from counsel that he disagrees with, but we only have a disagreement here and I think a disagreement in and of itself is not sufficient to deny Mr. Edwards' request. He's indicated to me again, Judge, that he wishes to address the Court.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: May I – I'm sorry.

THE COURT: The ruling's been made. Any other preliminary issues, Mr. McShane?

MR. MCSHANE: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Hollingsworth?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I would just like to comment on the ruling myself, for the record.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I actually—I've had a dilemma because as a prosecutor, although partisan here, I am also concerned the defendant gets a fair trial and reading through the medical records on the defendant, seeing his conduct in court I don't know—I agree with you, sir, I don't know—that **Sherwood** truly addressed the issue of a seriously mentally ill defendant proceeding *pro se*. I don't know how that could be . . .

THE COURT: I'm sorry, let me interrupt, I forgot to mention, and Mr. McShane, I'm sorry, the voluminous writings shared with the Court by your client.

MR. MCSHANE: I have been provided copies of those.

THE COURT: Just keys into what some of the doctors were saying and if you'll remember, the finding of competence was conditioned by the doctors on the assistance of counsel.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yes.

THE COURT: So he's competent with counsel. Please proceed.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I agree. I agree and I think, unfortunately I think justice would not be served in fairness to the defendant by his proceeding *pro se*. Clearly, his wish is not an intelligent one. Obviously this case will be scrutinized, possibly on appeal, but I think the Court has made the right decision to see that justice is done and hopefully this case will make a caveat to **Sherwood**. There's also some indication of not only mental illness but of some serious brain damage that defendant suffered about a decade ago in an automobile accident so that, I believe, has been documented. I can't recall the report. So I'm just, I'm agreeing with the Court, I think under the circumstance, justice is satisfied by him, by Your Honor's ruling. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. EDWARDS: Objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Objection is noted and from now on you have got to speak through your attorney, do you understand? We gave you a hearing on your intent, er, your desire to proceed by yourself and I've denied your request, so your attorney will speak for you from now on.

MR. EDWARDS: Well, Your Honor, I would like to address . . .

THE COURT: Yes or no, do you understand?

MR. EDWARDS: Under the First Amendment . . .

THE COURT: Do you understand?

MR. EDWARDS: Under the First Amendment I have a right to speak, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand what I said to you?

MR. EDWARDS: Your Honor . . .

THE COURT: Do you understand what I said to you?

MR. EDWARDS: Your Honor, I do understand but I would like to Constitutional right of the First Amendment . . .

THE COURT: We'll note your objection. Let's take a recess, then we'll get the jury questionnaires. In the meantime we'll take care of the rest of the morning calendar.

MR. MCSHANE: Judge, I have one more matter here.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR MCSHANE: Judge, I have one more matter here.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. MCSHANE: I'm sorry, given what's transpired in the proceedings here, actually, I'll hold off on that.

THE COURT: Okay. If you feel the need to make a record, I'm willing to do that.

MR. MCSHANE: I don't need to right now.

THE COURT: Okay, then.

MR. MCSHANE: I, I would like to confer with Mr. Edwards here during the recess.

THE COURT: Good luck with that.

MR. MCSHANE: Yes, Judge.