1	Bring in the jury.
2	(Whereupon, the jury was brought in.)
3	THE COURT: Good morning ladies and
4	gentlemen of the jury. As you recall we ended last night
5	with the State resting. This is the time in the trial
6	where the Defendant has an opportunity to make a
7	presentation should the Defendant choose to do so. You
8	will recall that the Defendant has no obligation to do
9	anything. Okay?
10	Mr. de Vlaming, how would you like to
11	proceed?
12	MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, the defense would
13	call Mr. Frank Oliver.
14	(Whereupon, the witness was sworn.)
15	Whereupon,
16	FRANK OLIVER,
17	a witness, was called for examination by counsel for the
18	Defendant, and having been duly sworn, and was examined
19	and testified as follows:
20	DIRECT EXAMINATION
21	BY MS. RIVELLINI:
22	Q Good morning, would you tell us your name
23	please?
24	A My name is Frank Oliver.
25	Q And what city do you live in?

1	A I live in Miami, Florida.
2	Q How long have you lived there?
3	A I lived there since 1979.
4	Q What do you do for a living?
5	A I am a graphic designer.
6	Q How long have you been doing that?
7	A About ten years.
8	Q At one point were you also a member of the
9	Church of Scientology?
10	A Yes, I was.
11	Q What years were you a member of the Church of
12	Scientology?
13	A I joined Scientology in June of 1986. I was a
14	member until 1992.
15	Q Were you also a graphic designer artist while
16	you were a member?
17	A Yes, I did that part-time as well.
18	Q Did you also do some graphic art design for
19	them while you were a member?
20	A In 1989 I was doing some graphic for the Office
21	of Special Affairs.
22	Q You mentioned the Office of Special Affairs, do
23	you call that OSA?
24	A Yes, we do.
25	Q All right, and you were particularly a member

1 of OSA?

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A I was recruited for OSA in late 1989 and I worked as an investigations officer in OSA until I left in 1992.

- Q When you were a member were you actually member down in Miami?
 - A Yes, I was, and in California as well.
 - Q So you did some traveling for the church?
- A Yes.
 - Q Was that for some training?
 - A Yes, it was for upper level training as an investigations officer.
 - Q Can just anybody become a member of OSA or do you have to go through any particular courses?
 - A No, they recruit specific individuals for the Office of Special Affairs, it's not something that you join within the organization. They have to select you and qualify you in order to become a member of the Office of Special Affairs.
 - Q Is it a way of working your way up the ranks?
 - A Yes, it is.
 - Q What kind of things do you learn when you become a member of OSA?
 - A I learned that organization perceives that it has a great number of enemies in the world. When I went

out to Los Angeles I also learned that many of the things that are done by the Office of Special Affairs are not known to the general membership of the Scientology. A lot of the activities are kept in secret.

Q What exactly is the purpose of the Office of Special Affairs?

A That is a little bit of a difficult question because there is a stated purpose and then there is an actual purpose.

Q What is the stated purpose?

A The stated purpose if to handle the legal and public relations of the Church of Scientology as it perceived by the public.

Q What is the actual purpose?

A The actual purpose is to investigate and to impede the forward progress of any tries to stop Scientology or to criticize Scientology.

Q That's the actual purpose?

A That's the actual policy of the investigation division of the Office of Special Affairs, yes.

Q Does that policy have a name, or did it have name that you learned?

A It's actually the stated, it's like the product of the Office of Special Affairs. It's like, what it does. Every single department in Scientology has like,

1	it's product or what it does, it's description. That
2	would be the description of the Office of Special
3	Affairs.
4	Q Was there not a code name, but a special
5	name that you understood codified those policies?
6	A There were different policies that we opera

a There were different policies that we operated under Scientology. And when you are doing a specific thing then that has -- then that is referred to as something. A lot of the activities that we were involved in, confidential operations, operations against individuals that we targeted, that came under a policy that was called "Fair Game".

- Q "Fair Game", is that actually a written policy?
- A Yes, it was.
- Q And was something that you relied upon when you were a member of Church of Scientology?

A That is just something that you had to do. I mean that's what you are assigned to do.

MS. RIVELLINI: Your Honor, may I approach the witness please?

THE COURT: You may.

BY MS. RIVELLINI:

Q Mr. Oliver, I'm going to show you two documents that have previously been marked as Defense Exhibit for identification, numbers and 5 and 6. I am going to ask

1	you to take a look at them and tell me if you recognize
2	what they are?
3	A This is
4	Q Just tell me first if you recognize what both
5	documents are?
6	A Yes, I recognize both documents.
7	Q Now, could you tell me what the documents are?
8	A Okay. This one here that says, "Penalty for
9	Lower Conditions." If someone is
10	Q Before describing the contents, can you tell me
11	if you know what it is?
12	A Yes, I do know what it is.
13	Q What would you call this?
14	A That's a policy letter on penalties for lower
15	conditions, it's "Fair Game". It talks about how to
16	treat someone that has been classified as an enemy of the
17	organization. They are subject to the "Fair Game
18	Doctrine".
19	Q This is actually a written policy of "Fair
20	Game"?
21	A Yes, it is an excerpt of "Fair Game" is in that
22	section there.
23	(The documents hereinafter
24	referred to were marked as
25	Defendant's Exhibits Nos. 5

1	and 6 for identification.)
2	BY MS. RIVELLINI:
3	Q Is this something that you have had a chance to
4	review and highlight?
5	A Yes.
6	Q And who wrote this "Fair Game Policy"?
7	A L. Ron Hubbard.
8	Q Were you required to read this during your
9	tenure at OSA?
10	A Yes, you are required to read it and know the
11	policy, not just read it. You have to have an
12	understanding of it and be able to apply anything that
13	you read.
14	MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, at this time I
15	would like to introduce what has previously marked for
16	identification Defendant's Exhibit Number 5, and go over
17	the portion described by the witness with the jury.
18	MR. TYSON: Judge, I would have a standing
19	objection.
20	THE COURT: It will be admitted and so
21	marked.
22	(The document heretofore
23	marked as Defendant's
24	Exhibit No. 5 for
25	identification was received

into evidence.)

MS. RIVELLINI:

Q First tell me, Mr. Oliver, who is "Fair Game" applied to?

A It's applied to anyone who is considered an enemy of the organization or identified as a suppressive person of the organization.

Q Is suppressive person synonymous with enemy then?

A Yes.

Q Can you describe exactly what the "Fair Game Policy" is and how it is used?

A Basically, if someone is categorized as being suppressive person and they are subject to "Fair Game" the gloves are off so to speak, just about anything can be done to the individual because they are viewed by the organization as being a person who is trying to impede the goals and purpose of Scientology.

Q And if you can read the screen can you tell us exactly "Fair Game Policy" order is?

A Well, it says here an "SP Order" which is a Suppressive Person Order on someone is "Fair Game". That person is now subject to "Fair Game". It says there, they may be deprived property, or injure by any means, by any Scientologists without any discipline of the

Scientologists. If for example, someone in the organization has been decreed to be "Fair Game" or someone outside of the organization --

Q I am going to ask you speak a little bit louder.

A Okay. If someone within the organization or outside the organization has been categorized as a suppressive person and they are subject to "Fair Game" just about anything done to them without any fear of retribution by the organization to the person doing that to them.

Q Okay.

A For example if they were cheated in some way, then you are not subject to any of the ethics of the organization as having done anything wrong, because that person has been classified as "Fair Game".

Q What else does it tell you that you can do to a suppressive person?

A They can be tricked, sued, lied to, or destroyed. That pretty much opens the door, you can do just about anything to the person.

Q Okay, there is a line in there that says a Scientologist can do anything to any of these individuals without any discipline of that Scientologist. Is discipline something that is common?

A Throughout different levels of the organization, discipline varies from someone losing a position maybe, even something much more severe.

Q Is there a place where people who are disciplined go to?

A Yes. If you are a member of the Sea

Organization, which is an internal organization within

Scientology, it's like a fraternal organization that runs

Scientology.

Q Is that the organization that is down in Clearwater?

A Yes, Flag Land Base. Those people can be sent to what is called the RPF, which stands for Rehabilitations Project Force. It is basically a gulag, or boot camp where they send dissidents or people that have failed at something, too. They send them there to pretty much anything they want them to do. You are subjected to harsh treatment, corporal punishment, manual labor.

Q Is Scientology essentially based upon rewards and punishments?

A Yes, it is.

Q So when it says, "Not to be subject to any discipline." That is understood by the members?

A Correct.

	Q	All right.	You	actua	ally	were	a	member	of	OSA
and	you	actually follo	wed	this	poli	icy?				

A Yes, we did.

Q It specifically says, "May be tricked, sued, or lied to, or destroyed." Were you taught certain skills on how to trick, sue, lie, or destroy individuals?

A Within the Office of Special Affairs some of the training that we received, that we drilled, were things that an ordinary member of the organization wouldn't know about, however anyone within the Office of Special Affairs would know about what we were taught.

Q When you say drilled, what do you mean by drilled?

A When you drill it means that you receptively go over something with someone else, maybe a twin that they hook you up with, so that you have two people.

O A twin?

A A twin is let's say for example, if you and I were in the Office of Special Affairs and we were going to have to do this project, you and I would twin, we would get together and I would practice on you and you would practice on me until we both had a full understanding of what we going to do.

Q Would these practice drills go on for big complex points to carry out, or for a variety of events?

A It could be something small, it could be something within in group of individuals. It wouldn't necessarily be a -- we wouldn't have fifty people drilling on something. Normally, it is something that would happen within an academy, a teaching setting, if you will. It would be for smaller groups.

- Q Was this constantly going on?
- A Yes.

Q So you learned specifically from the directors in OSA how to trick?

A We learned several different techniques. They teach you things, and they have names for them. For example, if they wanted me to go in somewhere and impersonate someone, or say that I was someone that I wasn't, that's called a suitable guise. And they actually showed you how to do a suitable guise. How to go in and say that you are somebody else. Or how to ask a question without them thinking that you are really digging for information on someone.

Q You also mentioned that one of your duties while you were in OSA is to carry out investigations. Would you tell us a little bit about that?

A Anyone identified by the organization as an enemy the first action that is taken is intelligence gathering. That's used -- there are different methods

that they teach you gather intelligence on an individual. Some are legal, some are not.

Q What would be an example of something that you would want to find out about a critic?

A If for example there was someone that was identified as a critic that was saying something against Scientology the first thing that would be done would be a complete check on the person, what they called an ODC, which stands for Overt Data Collection. What that is, you would get all the information on the individual, name, address, you would obtain their social security number. You would check all court records. Any kind of information that would be publically available would be in ODC.

Q And that would be something that you would actually go after?

A Yes, I did many of these. There was something also called a CDC, which is Covert Data Collection. CDC were obtained by other individuals that had access to private information on individuals. We would obtain credit card information, all your credit information, copies of your phone bills, private investigators would be hired, and they would go through your garbage. They would talk to your neighbors. They would talk to your friends. They would previous employers.

0 What about travel arrangements?

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Α Absolutely.

We would try and obtain any information there Α was on the individual and if they were put on, if we were running a surveillance operation where we were actually watching the individual, we would try and find out exactly what they were doing and when they were doing it. There was even a document that was sent down from senior management to us that listed all the airlines on it, and showed us how to obtain information on an individual by using the frequent flyer miles programs of major airlines. You would pretend that you would be that individual, you would call up and give the name and social security number and the airlines would provide you with all that person's travel, itinerary, anything that they might currently have on the record. You would just pretend that you are that person and say, "Yeah, I want to know how many frequent flier miles I have." And they would say, "You just got an extra thousand for your trip you are taking next week." "Oh, yeah, can I confirm that with you." They would give you all the information and we would have the intelligence information in the subject that we were trying to get the information on.

Q So you learned how to obtain itinerary information for travel?

Q For example, when someone was going to arrive in an airport?

A Yes.

Q You mentioned that you sometimes hire outside personnel, what kind of people would you hire?

A The actual hiring of private investigators was done by the senior management of the Office of Special Affairs in conjunction with the attorneys at the church.

Q Were you actually taught how to use them as an in-between from Scientology?

A Well, the way that it works is this, the private investigator should, in essence, work for an attorney, however, within the Scientology organization that was not the way it was done. They were paid by the attorneys but the actual people running the operations and giving the marching orders to the investigators were the people in the Office of Special Affairs. Some of the training I received when I went to Los Angeles was on how to run a PI, or private investigator. We were actually given a check sheet, if you will, of the project that we were going to do. It delineates on there exactly which things we want the private investigator to do. The private investigator is given a description of what his targets are and he reports back to me, and I would write reports, send them up to senior management, and there

were different people in my capacity doing this with different private investigators.

Q Why are these outside sources used, and why are the lawyers used as shields?

A The organization itself, it would be deemed inappropriate in any other setting, that an organization like a church, if you will, would be doing an investigation on someone. So a shield needs to be created in order to justify the investigation of a private individual. So they bring in the attorneys and say we need so many PI's, we need some investigators from inside the organization to obtain intelligence information on a private individual. How can we do this? Well, this is one way we can do it.

- Q Is that more for public relations?
- A Completely.
 - Q Who is really in charge?
- A The Office of Special Affairs, actually the Sea Org. senior management is in charge.
 - Q How long did you actually practice in the Office of Special Affairs?
 - A Two years.
- Q During those two years was there ever any discretion on your part about what you might do and carry out?

A No, you can come up with an idea, but you have to go up the chain of command to make sure that they want you to do, your idea may be great, or your idea cannot be so great. So everything has to get cleared with whoever your senior is, or whoever is right above you. And maybe even several steps above that.

Q So while you were in the Office of Special
Affairs if you wanted to go check out where someone was,
could you just leave the building and go check it out, or
would you have to clear it first?

A No, I would have to be given instructions, check this person out, and then I would check them out. If I discovered that someone was saying something about the organization I would have to write a report, send it up the line, and they would tell me what to do next.

Q Why work under that strict of a policy, was there some benefit of doing that, did you actually get some rewards?

A Well, if you do what you are told, naturally you move up. Your statistics, you are measured in the organization by statistics, just like you would anywhere else. You do good, your statistics go up, you are regarded better. If your statistics are up you are rewarded with more time for study, maybe more time for spiritual counseling that they call. If you are in the

23

24

25

1	Sea Organization, which is their internal fraternal
2	organization, it's run like a military organization, you
3	may be, if your statistics are going up, then maybe you
4	are given liberty that weekend and you can actually go
5	out, or do something outside of the organization.
6	Q Okay, at one point I take it that these rewards
7	were extremely important to you?
8	A Yes, they were.
9	Q You took it to heart, you found it very
10	important?
11	A Yes, I did.
12	Q Now, for example in a workplace your rewards
13	might be based on money?
14	A Yes.
15	Q Is that fair?
16	A Yes.
17	Q Maybe if you do well for a year, you get a
18	raise at the end of the year?
19	A Correct.
20	Q Is that how it was in Scientology?
21	MR. TYSON: Judge, I am going to object to

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MS. RIVELLINI:

- it has gone on for quite awhile now.

this continual line of leading questions here. I'd ask -

Q In Scientology is the reward system more on an annual long-term basis, or is based on something more quickly?

A Yeah, it's sporadic and it's pretty much, what have you done today kind of thing. What have you done this week kind of a thing. If you do something that is instantly then you are rewarded pretty much at the same time. Cumulatively it may help you ultimately move up in the organization.

Q How are these point systems or these statistics charted?

A It's different for each different department.

If for example --

Q How is for OSA, for example?

A Okay, if the Office of Special Affairs there are about a dozen statistics that measure our performance when you are in the Office of Special Affairs, they could be identifying threats to the organization, could be one statistic. Number of threats against the organization that we do a successful operation against. Number of inches of positive writing in the newspaper. A negative statistic would be number of inches of negative writing in the newspaper about the organization. Number of operations carried out successfully. Number of national —— let's say there are different categories for our

enemies of Scientology, they could be local, regional, or national. If someone that is nationally attacking the organization gets downgraded to someone who is not doing it nationally any longer, maybe they are just identified as a local, then those statistics go down. Your personal statistics go up. This person is being neutralized in some way.

Q Is that something that you continuously worried about?

A That was how my performance was measured.

MR. TYSON: Judge, may we approach?

THE COURT: You may.

(Whereupon, a bench conference was held outside the hearing of the jury.)

MR. TYSON: Judge, based on your prior ruling you said that you were going to let him say that he was a member Scientology, the "Fair Game Policy" say what it is, the penalties and violations. You said that you were not going to let them put the religion on trial. He said everything that he needs to say. From here on out it is cumulative, and they are putting the religion on trial. He has already said that they can be lied on, trick, cheated, sued. It's all cumulative from here on out.

MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, the "Fair Game

Policy" and I didn't read it. We are just talking about specifically the words punishment and points. I thought that was one of the things that could get into.

MR. TYSON: Judge, there is a limit to it.

MR. TYSON: Judge, there is a limit to it.

You said that it was very limited. I sat there, let them

put it all out there according to your ruling. I am

suggesting that they should be done by now.

THE COURT: I have a strong tendency to agree with Mr. Tyson. You are well into this, and well beyond, frankly, what I envisioned.

MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, that is where I don't understand where you are drawing the line, and why I tried to clarify. If you are saying the line is drawn then I will move on.

THE COURT: I am saying that you are close to the line. And you need to move through this and get to something that's more directly relevant.

MS. RIVELLINI: Okay. May I approach the witness, Judge?

THE COURT: Yes.

BY MS. RIVELLINI:

- Q Mr. Oliver, you testified that this is a policy that you practiced while you were in OSA organization?
 - A Yes.
 - Q And you have also said that you recognized a

1	second document here.
2	A Yes.
3	Q Can you take a look at it and tell me what the
4	document is called?
5	A It's called the "Cancellation of Fair Game."
6	Q This is something that you also read and
7	practiced and understood while you were in Scientology?
8	A Yes.
9	MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, at this time I
10	would move the second document, what has previously been
11	marked for identification as Exhibit Number 6 for the
12	Defense and ask that it be entered into evidence.
13	THE COURT: Mr. Tyson?
14	MR. TYSON: I have an outstanding
15	objection.
16	THE COURT: It will be admitted and so
17	marked.
18	(The document heretofore
19	marked as Defendant's
20	Exhibit No. 6 for
21	identification was received
22	into evidence.)
23	MS. RIVELLINI:
24	Q This document, Mr. Oliver, is called
25	"Cancellation of Fair Game"?

22

23

24

25

- A Correct.
- Q Could you go ahead and read that to me?
- A It says, "This PL" which means policy letter --
- Q Well, actually the practice of --

A Oh. "The practice of declaring people "Fair Game" will cease. "Fair Game" may not appear on any ethic order, it causes bad public relations. This PL, which stands for policy letter, does not cancel any policy on the treatment or the handling of an "SP".

- Q Who wrote this?
- A That was also written by L. Ron Hubbard.
- Q And that done obviously before he died?
- A Yes.
- Q And he has since died?
- A Yes.
 - Q Do you remember about what year that was?
 - A 1986, I believe.
 - Q Tell me how it is if that says it cancels "Fair Game" that you actually practiced "Fair Game" while you were in the Office of Special Affairs?

A The way that it is actually written, if you take a good look at it, says that it doesn't cancel any policy on the treatment or handling of a suppressive person, all it basically does is eliminate the badge of "Fair Game". So we are not to call it "Fair Game" any

longer. Nor is it to supposed to appear on any document as "Fair Game". However, there are still policies in place how someone that is declared a suppressive person is treated, and that is basically "Fair Game". We just can't call it that any longer.

- Q It is still practiced then?
- A Of course.

- Q Even well after that was issued?
- A All that says is to stop calling it "Fair Game" and that they can't -- that "Fair Game" cannot appear on an ethics order, but the things that you can do someone, it says it does not cancel any policy on the treatment or the handling of an SP. The treatment of an SP --
 - Q Suppressive person?
- A Yeah, a suppressive person, as defined in "Fair Game" is not canceled, just the name "Fair Game".
- Q Who can actually change a policy in Scientology?
 - A L. Ron Hubbard.
- Q How about once he has passed on, can any policy be changed?
- A There are policies written, the first policy that is in every single document, every single course in Scientology is called keeping Scientology working. It appears on the front of every single course that you do

	2%
1	in Scientology. In there it delineates that no one has
2	the authority to change policy, but L. Ron Hubbard.
3	Q So if a written document were to come out in
4	the '90's after he has passed on, which would rule?

A It couldn't come out. No one can rewrite the bible today. So no -- according to the dogma of Scientology, unless L. Ron Hubbard comes back to life again, no one can rewrite the policy of the Church of Scientology, but L. Ron Hubbard.

Q Okay, if a written document were to be sent around it would not have the effect that this --

A No, they would investigate who was issuing an illegal order, or creating a policy letter without issue authority.

MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, if I may have a moment?

THE COURT: You may.

BY MS. RIVELLINI:

Q Now the terms suppressive person and enemy are used as being synonymous?

A Yes.

Q What exactly makes somebody a suppressive person?

A Anyone that has committed an act that is contrary to or against the beliefs of the Scientology

1	ammand and desired
	organization.
2	Q So if I didn't believe in Scientology that
3	would SP necessarily?
4	A No, not unless you actually shared that view
5	with someone, or made it public, or did something to the
6	organization.
7	Q Would Mr. Minton be considered a suppressive
8	person?
9	A According Scientology, he would.
10	Q Are the practices and beliefs of Scientologists
11	supposed to be kept in
12	MR. TYSON: Judge, objection, a continuing
13	objection. And I would ask if we can approach?
14	THE COURT: Please approach.
15	(Whereupon, a bench conference was held
16	outside the hearing of the jury.)
17	MR. TYSON: Judge, are we over the line
18	yet?
19	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Judge, in the
20	proffer she asked him, and I think she is doing a pre-
21	emptive question. He asked him whether not he signed a
22	non-disclosure form and cross examined on that.
23	MR. TYSON: I am not getting into that.
24	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Oh, you are not.
25	MR. TYSON: Not unless she does. I only

1 got into because you did.

MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, you did tell us that we could go towards Mr. Howd's reasons to be completely honest in his testimony. I was going to ask him if he signed a non-disclosure form when he was a member of the Office of Special Affairs.

MR. TYSON: Judge, the reason why I crossed examined him is because they brought all that up. My initial position was that they were going to put the religion on trial, and it's relevant, and I think we are way past that now.

THE COURT: I agree with everything you said, but what Ms. Rivellini said that she wants to do is get testimony and demonstrate a basis as to why Mr. Howd's testimony would be less than truthful. I cannot prohibit her from doing that.

MR. TYSON: I don't think it is allowable to have one witness to testify on another witness' truthfulness. I think that is exactly what she is going.

THE COURT: I don't think she is going to do that.

MS. RIVELLINI: No.

THE COURT: I think she is going to demonstrate that there may be policies that would motivate him to do that, and I do not believe that she

will go beyond that. Am I correct?

MS. RIVELLINI: That's correct. My next question was going to be, did you sign a non-disclosure form, and would you have been able to come out and say anything against Scientology that was not prescribed to you, and is there a penalty for doing so.

MR. TYSON: I am just wondering how far, because we just keeping further and further.

THE COURT: Your points are very well taken. But I am going overrule the objection on this point.

BY MS. RIVELLINI:

- Q Mr. Oliver, are most of the policies of Scientology supposed to remain internal?
- A Yes, there is a great deal of information, according to the organization, maintained confidential.
- Q Did you actually have to sign a form stating that you would keep everything a secret, a non-disclosure form?
- A When I joined the Office of Special Affairs, a non-disclosure form, and a complete life history on my part was required.
 - Q And tell me what that form required of you?
- A The non-disclosure required that I not divulge any of the secret information that I would be privy to

the Offi	ce c	of S	Spe	cial	Afi	fairs	und	er j	penalty	of,	I
believe,	it	is	a	milli	Lon	dolla	ars	per	infract	ion	

Q Were there also penalties from the organization itself about your rank?

A You would be -- if you violated those policies you would be subjected to the internal ethics of the ethics practices of the organization. You are subject to lose any ranking that you had, any position, your certificates, and the organization felt that your spiritual freedom was at stake as well, if didn't have access or availability Scientology practices.

Q If you were still a member of the Office of Special Affairs or when you were still a member of the Office of Special Affairs, if you were called in to testify would you be free to testify?

MR. TYSON: Objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MS. RIVELLINI:

Q Mr. Oliver, would there have been a penalty -MR. TYSON: Objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Let her finish her question.

BY MS. RIVELLINI:

Q Based upon the non-disclosure form that you signed if you had come into court, or any arena and testified contrary to what Scientology wanted you to,

```
1
     based on that form would there be a penalty for doing so
2
     freely?
3
```

Α Yes.

> Objection, your Honor. MR. TYSON:

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, may I have a

moment.

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: You may.

MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, may we approach?

THE COURT: Yes.

(Whereupon, a bench conference was held outside the hearing of the jury.)

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: We are about through. The only other area that I wanted Ms. Rivellini to ask is as to what happened on the tape. There is a policy of "Fair Game" that they want to have them labeled as criminals. I think that you heard that in the I think it goes right to the defense of allowing the touching so that he could be arrested and declared a criminal. She wasn't sure whether you would permit that area of inquiry. It would be brief, but I think it goes to the heart of the defense.

MR. TYSON: That is his opinion, and that is going straight to what is in the province of the jury. MS. RIVELLINI: It's not an opinion, it's a fact.

THE COURT: It sounds to me like it is part and parcel of the "Fair Game Policy", and to the extent that it is I will overrule, but let's make sure we understand what we are doing. You are merely going to elicit information from him that the "Fair Game Policy" includes efforts to have someone as a criminal.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: That's fine.

MS. RIVELLINI: Correct. The only other question that I had planned on asking him, because they made a point during Mr. Howd's testimony that "Fair Game" is not currently in place, and not being used, is if he knows — how recently he knows "Fair Game" has been used. And if he has personal knowledge about it. And that goes to them contacting his family as recently as within a week ago. Because it goes to impeach Mr. Howd's testimony.

MR. TYSON: Judge, it is prejudicial.

That's hearsay as the contacting his family.

MS. RIVELLINI: The fact that he knows a call was made goes to his knowledge that "Fair Game" is still being implemented and it contradicts what Mr. Howd testified.

MR. TYSON: Judge, that is highly

1 | inflammatory to the jury.

THE COURT: I agree with Mr. Tyson. You are not going to go there for the reasons that he just stated.

BY MS. RIVELLINI:

Q Mr. Oliver, in line with the "Fair Game Policy" and the labeling of someone as an enemy, suppressive person, or a critic, telling about the understanding that you have about criminality comes into place, and why it is important that someone is labeled a criminal?

A There is different policies within the organization where "Fair Game" and the practices "Fair Game" are delineated, it's not just limited to this one particular policy letters. There are other policies within the organization.

Q Tell me what it means to be labeled by Scientology, not what it means out common knowledge?

A Any one who attacks Scientology is a criminal according to Scientology.

Q Is that a word that is used over and over again?

KANABAY COURT REPORTERS

A Yes, if a minister were to speak out against Scientology he would be labeled a criminal, and if he didn't have a crime they would dig into his past and find

1 one. No matter who.

Q It is important for Scientology to expose a critics crimes?

- A Absolutely.
- Q Were you taught to do this?
- A Yes.
 - Q How would you go about it?

A Using investigative technique. We would obtain any kind of information that would be on an individual, his background. We would talk to neighbors, we would have private investigators sent out. We would obtain any kind of information that would either prove that the person had been a criminal, link them to criminal activity, or if that failed then to try and create criminal activity.

Q Would you stop until you had created that criminal activity?

A I saw things done when I was in the Office of Special Affairs, which I personally didn't participate in, however, I did see them done, I did hear of them when I was in the Office of Special Affairs, and the higher the threat level of the individual, the subject was, the more efforts that would be expended on proving that that person was a criminal.

Q If you were told to manufacture a crime, to

make that critic a criminal, okay if that was your job that day --

MR. TYSON: Objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled.

BY MS. RIVELLINI:

Q If that was your job that day and the event were about to end and you had not completed that task, would there be sanctions?

A There would sanctions on anyone who accepts that task and not complete it successfully. I was fortunate that I was never placed in a position of having had to do it. I felt bad for anyone that was in that position, people that I saw that were subjected to having to do that.

- Q Is that why you left the church?
- A That was one of many pivotal reasons why I left the organization.
 - Q Okay, when you left were you handed a document?
- A I tried to leave the organization the right way through using their own policy, however, in the end I was handed a document by Scientology, it was as Suppressive Person Declare.
 - Q What does that mean?
- A I was declared an enemy of Scientology because I wanted to leave the organization for that reason.

1		MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, if I may have just
2	a moment.	
3		THE COURT: Okay.
4		MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, that's all I have.
5		THE COURT: Mr. Tyson, cross examination?
6		MR. TYSON: Judge, if I could have a
7	moment.	
8		CROSS EXAMINATION
9		BY MR. TYSON:
10	Q	How are you doing, Mr. Oliver?
11	A	Very good, sir.
12	Q	Now, you left there in 1992, right?
13	A	Correct, sir.
14	Q	Does this book look familiar to you?
15	A	Yes, I have seen that book before.
16		MR. TYSON: Judge, may I approach?
17		THE COURT: You may.
18		BY MR. TYSON:
19	Q	You have seen this book before?
20	A	Yes, sir.
21	Q	What is that chapter on?
22	A	That says, "Suppressive Acts, Suppression of
23	Scientolo	gy, and Scientologists."
24	Q	That's what we are talking about here, right?
25	A	Yes, sir.

Q I want you to look into the chapter and tell me
what the last thing it says in there is, starting with
"nothing"?

A It says, "Nothing in this policy letter shall
ever or under any circumstances justify any violation of
the laws of the land or --"

MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, I am going to object to him reading it without it being entered into evidence first, and then being published to the jury.

MR. TYSON: Judge, I can enter a copy it.

I have a copy. That's not my book.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. RIVELLINI: We would ask that he go ahead and do it.

MR. TYSON: I will go ahead and do it now.
THE COURT: Okay.

MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, under the rule of completeness we would ask that the entire section be entered, not the entire book.

MR. TYSON: Judge, I am offering it only to impeach him as to whether that policy does still exists, that's all I am offering it for.

THE COURT: Okay. I am going to accept what has selected from that book to use for feature. So you objection is overruled.

BY MR. TYSON:

Q Mr. Oliver, I want you to look at this, this is a same thing as that photocopy? Can you give me the book back?

THE COURT: Mr. Tyson, that is Exhibit

Number?

MR. TYSON: Number 7.

THE COURT: Okay, State's Exhibit Number seven is admitted into evidence.

(The document hereinafter referred to was marked and State's Exhibit No. 7 for identification and was received into evidence.)

BY MR. TYSON:

Q Mr. Oliver, please look at 7, that is in evidence. Read that please to the jury?

A It says, "Nothing in this policy letter shall ever, or under any circumstances justify any violation of the laws of land, or intentional illegal wrongs. Any such offenses shall subject the offender to penalties prescribed by law, as well as ethics injustice actions."

Q Now, that says that you can't do anything illegal, right?

A Yes.

1	Q Were you aware of that?
2	A I see this document, and I see what it says.
3	Q When was the last time you have seen that
4	document you have never seen that document, have you?
5	A I don't recall ever seeing this particular
6	document.
7	MR. TYSON: Judge, may I approach the
8	witness?
9	BY MR. TYSON:
10	Q Mr. Oliver, you don't know Richard Howd, do
11	you?
12	A No, sir, I don't.
13	Q And you have never been in the Clearwater
14	office, have you?
15	A Yes, I have.
16	Q Were you stationed there?
17	A No.
18	Q When were you there?
19	A In Clearwater?
20	Q Uh-huh.
21	A The last time I was inside Flag, the Flag Land
22	Base was in 1990, I believe. It may have been '91.
23	Q Is it fair to say that you no longer
24	Scientologists?
25	A No, that is not fair to sav.

Q

1	Q Could you tell me why on February 6th of this
2	year you were shining a laser light pen, similar to this
3	one, with a laser dot in their face when you were across
4	the street from them in Clearwater?
5	MS. RIVELLINI: I am going to object to
6	him testifying. The facts are not in evidence. I think
7	he first has to ask him if, in fact, he was doing so, and
8	then ask him why?
9	THE COURT: Objection overruled.
10	BY MR. TYSON:
11	Q I'll repeat it, why are you showing the laser
12	light pen you do admit that you did that, right?
13	A No, I don't recall shining it anyone's eyes,
14	sir.
15	Q Shining it around their face and their camera?
16	A No, I remember shining it specifically into
17	someone's camera, who was videotaping.
18	Q With their eye right behind, which means that's
19	right where their face is, doesn't it?
20	A No, they were holding it down around their
21	waist.
22	Q If I showed you a video, would that maybe help
23	you?
24	A It might, it's been some time.

Let me ask you this, Mr. Oliver, have you ever

1	given them the finger?
2	A Sure.
3	Q What does that mean?
4	A That means that I don't like them.
5	Q Does it mean, fuck you?
6	A It might.
7	Q Is it fair to say that the average person that
8	when you give somebody the finger it means fuck you, is
9	that fair to say?
10	A Yeah, if someone did it to me, I would know
11	what it would mean, and I would probably do it right
12	back.
13	Q That would be a provocative act, wouldn't you
14	agree, something that would provoke people?
15	A If somebody did that to me I would consider it
16	provocative.
17	Q Also a laser light pen in their face would be
18	provocative, too, wouldn't it?
19	A It might.
20	MR. TYSON: Judge, I can mark this State's
21	Exhibit Number 8 for identification.
22	THE COURT: Okay.
23	(The video hereinafter
24	referred to marked as
25	State's Exhibit No. 8 for

1	identification.)
2	MR. TYSON: Judge, if I can publish it to
3	the jury?
4	THE COURT: Are you admitting that into
5	evidence.
6	MR. TYSON: Yes, Judge.
7	THE COURT: Any objection?
8	MS. RIVELLINI: No, sir.
9	THE COURT: Okay, it will be admitted and
10	you can publish it.
11	(The video heretofore
12	marked as State's Exhibit
13	No. 8 for identification
14	was received into
15	evidence.)
16	MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, I am going to
17	assume that there are no other contents other than what I
18	have viewed.
19	MR. TYSON: Judge, may we approach on
20	that?
21	THE COURT: Approach.
22	(Whereupon, a bench conference was held
23	out of the hearing of the jury.)
24	MR. TYSON: There is a little bit of him
25	picketing, but if the jury wants to see that tape we can

1	bring them back and let them look just at the portion.
2	MS. RIVELLINI: I couldn't remember what
3	else was on there. We looked about five videos.
4	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Judge, I have never
5	seen this.
6	MR. TYSON: He gave them the finger.
7	MS. RIVELLINI: Right, and then shining
8	the light.
9	MR. TYSON: The laser light in the face.
10	MS. RIVELLINI: Right.
11	MR. TYSON: And then he just walking
12	around picketing. I will stop it, and I will stop at the
13	laser light, and then if they want to see the video again
14	we can bring them into court and play that relevant
15	section. I just can't edit it this quick.
16	MS. RIVELLINI: Is there anything else on
17	the video besides him even picketing?
18	MR. TYSON: No.
19	MS. RIVELLINI: The whole video is only a
20	couple of minutes?
21	MR. TYSON: It's not even that long, about
22	thirty seconds.
23	THE COURT: Are you okay with that?
24	MS. RIVELLINI: Yes. I just didn't know
25	if there was any second part to the video.

1	(Whereupon, the video was played for	
2	jury.)	
3	BY MR. TYSON:	
4	Q You are giving them the finger, aren't you?	
5	A Yes, I am.	
6	Q That's you with a laser pen, isn't it?	
7	A Yes, I believe so.	
8	Q Is Mr. Minton with you?	
9	A Yes.	
10	Q You are across the street from the	
11	Scientologists?	
12	A Yes.	
13	Q They are not up in your face with the video,	
14	are they?	
15	A No, they aren't.	
16	Q It is going right in the camera, isn't it, Mr.	
17	Oliver?	
18	A Yes, it is.	
19	Q And your testimony is that the camera is down	
20	to their side?	
21	A I believe he had it down by his waist.	
22	Q You are flashing it all around, wouldn't it be	
23	fair to assume that you got it in his face?	
24	A No, sir.	
25	Q I didn't see the Scientologists picking on	

1	anybody	there,	were	they?
2	A	Not a	at tha	at par

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A Not at that particular moment, no, sir.
- Q You're messing with them though, aren't you?
- A If that is how you choose characterize it, sir.
- Q Laser light in somebody's face, that's not a good thing, right?
 - A No.
- Q If I put it in the Judge's face I am going out of here in handcuffs. Would you agree?
 - A Yeah, but I haven't shined it anyone's face.
 - Q You just shined it at them?
- A I didn't shine it in anyone's face. I was very clear when I was doing it in anyone's eyes. I wouldn't want that done to me.
- Q Would it be safe to assume that the average person may be provoked with somebody doing that?
 - A They may be.
- Q Okay. Your intention was to provoke them, wasn't it?
 - A No, it wasn't. I objected to being videotaped.
- Q Let's talk about that. Wait a second. If I play it back, Mr. Bunker, part of your group is holding a videotape on them, isn't he?

KANABAY COURT REPORTERS

- A Uh-huh.
 - Q Do you want to see it again?

1 Α No, I don't need to see it again. 2 Okay, but you object to them videotaping you, 0 3 but it's okay for your group to videotape them? Is that what you are telling this jury? 5 The technique of videotaping is someone that --6 from my understanding you can do freely in this country, 7 however, I don't need my life chronicled. 8 So is it fair to say that when you do it, you Q 9 are doing it freely, but when they do it they are 10 chronicling your life? 11 No, not particularly in that, no, not at all. Nobody forced you to be in Clearwater? It's a 12 Q 13 free country, but you don't have to be here, do you? 14 Α I can if choose to be. 15 Absolutely. You can be on any street you want. Q 16 Okay, can you provoke people when you are doing that 17 though? 18 Α Define provoke. 19 Messing with them, stirring them up, egging Q 20 them on, looking for a fight. Did you do that? 21 No, I don't go around looking for a fight, sir. A 22 Q 23 24

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

25

5
Q Okay. Much like we all have clips of videos,
right. We will get into that later. You were shining
the laser light at them though, right?
A I was shining it into the camera of the person
recording me.
Q Now, have you ever received any money either
directly, or indirectly from Mr. Minton?

I believe we went out to dinner and Mr. Minton Α bought everybody in the restaurant dinner that night. I think that would be direct.

You are involved in the Lisa McPherson civil suit, aren't you?

Yes, I am. A

And you plan on testifying for the Lisa McPherson family, I guess is the best way to describe that?

- A Actually, no.
- Q What do you plan on doing there?
- I am a legal consultant on that case. Α
 - Are you being paid for that? Q
 - No, I am not. Α
 - Q Okay. But the case is being funded by Mr.
- 23 Minton, isn't it?
- 24 Α I believe so.
 - Mr. Minton is paying for a third party to sue Q

1	the Church of Scientology, isn't he?
2	MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, I am going to object
3	if the answer calls for hearsay.
4	MR. TYSON: He has already basically
5	answered it, Judge.
6	THE COURT: Objection overruled.
7	BY MR. TYSON:
8	Q Mr. Minton is funding a third party to sue the
9	Scientologists, isn't he?
10	A I believe so.
11	Q Okay. The Lisa McPherson Trust, do you have
12	any knowledge about that at all?
13	A Yes, I am on the advisory board.
14	Q You are on the advisory board. That Trust is
15	funded by Mr. Minton, isn't it?
16	A Yes, it is.
17	Q And that Trust in turn is funding the civil
18	suit, isn't it?
19	A I don't know that to be a fact.
20	Q Well, you are on the board, where is the money
21	going?
22	A Sir, I don't know that for a fact.
23	Q I don't quite understand your answer.
24	A I haven't
25	Q You said that you don't know for a fact, is

	this	working	
--	------	---------	--

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

No, not at all, I haven't seen any Α documentation of that sort, so I can't honestly answer the question. My capacity is an advisory capacity.

I am not talking about documentation. I am talking about day-to-day talk around the Lisa McPherson Trust as to where that money is going. How many people are involved in that?

There may be a dozen or so. I am not there everyday. I live in Miami.

I understand that, you understand the gist of my question though?

You are asking me to speculate on something A that I have no first-hand knowledge of.

Let's leave at that then. Basically, you have told this jury that you are trained in dirty tricks. That is basically what you are telling them, right?

Α I was trained in specific investigative technique.

You can call it that if you want. You don't mind if I call them dirty tricks, do you?

I don't know, would you categorize what I did Α as a dirty trick?

Putting a laser light on somebody.

Is that a dirty trick? A

	50
1	Q If you are trying to provoke them it is.
2	A You are assuming that I was trying to provoke
3	them.
4	Q Have you ever met Richard Howd before?
5	A I don't believe I know Mr. Howd.
6	Q You don't know anything about Mr. Howd?
7	A Only what I have heard thus far.
8	Q Hearsay, right, all you have heard is from
9	other people talking about him?
10	A In the courtroom here, too.
11	MR. TYSON: Judge, if I could have a
12	moment please.
13	THE COURT: Yes.
14	BY MR. TYSON:
15	Q You say the church brings in attorneys to mess
16	with people, is that what you said?
17	A No, I didn't say that.
18	Q What do they bring them in for?
19	A The attorneys that I worked with for the Church
20	of Scientology are in-house counsel. Moxon, Kobrin.
21	Q When you were involved in these activities, or
22	alleged activities that you testified to, you chose to be
23	involved in those, didn't you?
24	A It was what I was required to do as a member of
25	the Office of Special Affairs.

can quit your

Is that what

23

24

25

1	Q Well, I am required to be here in court today,
2	but you know what, I can turn around and walk right out
3	the door.
4	A True.
5	Q I can quit my job the same as you can quit you
6	job, right?
7	A I
8	Q But you made a choice, didn't you? If that is
9	even true and this stuff even happened, that would have
10	been your choice to that kind of stuff, wouldn't it?
11	A Yes.
12	Q And as far as illegal activities, you are
13	saying that you were never involved in any. Is that wha
14	you are telling this jury?
15	A Yes.
16	Q Okay. You are not going to dime yourself out,
17	are you?
18	A Nope.
19	Q Of course not, of course not. So any illegal
20	activities that you are telling this jury about is stuff
21	that other people may have told you?
22	A No, not exactly right, sir.

MS. RIVELLINI: Yes, sir, but we need to

MR. TYSON: That's all I have, Judge.

THE COURT: Redirect?

1 approach before we do that.

THE COURT: Okay.

(Whereupon, a bench conference was held outside the hearing of the jury.)

MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, I believe Mr. Tyson clearly opened the door for me to get out the point that there have been ramifications for him leaving the church, and that, in fact, he has been followed and harassed. He asked him, "Well, they didn't go around provoking you, did they? They didn't do anything to you, did they?"

And, in fact, he asked, "If you didn't like it, you could just leave and walk out?" Like there would be no repercussions, and in fact, there have been.

MR. TYSON: Judge, there wasn't any response to him saying he couldn't leave. I didn't open any door there. I was very careful about that. I didn't mention the videos, I didn't mention what Mr. Minton did on the videos and whether that was "Fair Game" what he did. I kept the door very tight so that we wouldn't get in that part.

MS. RIVELLINI: He wasn't responding to questions that I asked him. He was responding to questions asked of him by the prosecutor.

THE COURT: Give me a for example. If you go into this line of questioning, what do you expect to

MS. RIVELLINI: He asked him if what he was doing, standing out there picketing was just because he hates Scientologists and the fact is that they didn't do anything to provoke you, and in fact, they have done things to provoke him. Also, Judge, he specifically said, "When you were there you were there of your own free will, and you could have just left, just like I could quit my job." And that is not the case. And he is misleading them by leaving them on that point.

MR. TYSON: He has already testified about

MS. RIVELLINI: It was upon your line of questioning. I didn't ask him if he was there of his own freewill.

RPF, whatever that stuff is, he has already been there.

It's all what you put out.

MR. TYSON: I went no further than yours was.

THE COURT: I am going to let you hit it real brief. Real briefly.

MS. RIVELLINI: That's all I need. That's all I need.

THE COURT: I don't want to dwell on it, because we have already gone way far beyond it. Let me make sure that I understand what it is you expect to get

out.

MS. RIVELLINI: I plan on asking him, "The prosecutor asked you, if you were there of your own freewill." "Yes, I was." And when you stopped liking what was going on, you tried to leave? Just like the prosecutor said you could? "Yes, I did." And you weren't allowed to leave peacefully, were you? "No." So, in fact, it is not just like Mr. Tyson leaving his job, you, in fact, were harassed? "Yes, I was."

MR. TYSON: In 1992. Relevance, and I didn't do anything else other than to comment on the fact that he didn't have to do anything that he wanted to do. He said that he didn't do any of those activities.

MS. RIVELLINI: You asked him specifically

_

THE COURT: We are going further and further. He can say yes, he was harassed. And I don't want to hear about what those harassments were.

MS. RIVELLINI: That's why I phrased it that way, so I could cut it off just there.

THE COURT: I don't want to hear all the gory stories.

MR. TYSON: Judge, I would ask if he starts going into it that you would interrupt so that I don't look like I am trying to hide anything.

1 MS. RIVELLINI: That's fine with me. 2 THE COURT: She is not going to do it. 3 MS. RIVELLINI: If he responds further than I've asked then I have no problem with how you conduct the courtroom. But I would only the question the 5 6 way that I just phrased. 7 MR. TYSON: My question is that she may 8 ask a very simple question, he may just ramble on. 9 THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. 10 MS. RIVELLINI: I don't know if you want 11 to argue that at the bench. He entered only one page of 12 a document. 13 THE COURT: I've already ruled. 14 want to argue that again? 15 MS. RIVELLINI: You ruled that only he had 16 to enter it. I would like to enter it under the rule of 17 completeness. And we can either argue that now, or come 18 back up. 19 MR. TYSON: I don't know how it is 20 completeness, Judge. He just testified it is for the 21 limited purpose of showing that they have -- showing that 22 they can't do anything illegal. I didn't go into any of 23 the policy. I did nothing about that. 24 THE COURT: Is there anything in that 25

document that you find to be relevant to the issue that

Mr. Tyson was addressing, other than the portion that he used?

MS. RIVELLINI: Yes, sir, on page 883 where it talks suppressive acts, anybody who does those things, any person who agrees that would do such thing, a suppressive act, out of self-interest, only to the detriment of all others they cannot be granted the rights ordinarily accorded rational beings. So this paragraph within its own policy completely contradicts that you can't do someone. They don't even treat them like a human being.

THE COURT: But his paragraph pertained to violations of the law. I am not sure those two things are congruous.

MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, I think if you look at one versus the other, to take just his portion out of context is completely misleading as to what their real policy is, which is if you don't treat someone like a rational human being --

THE COURT: So you want to enter just one page?

MS. RIVELLINI: I will be happy to limit it to that.

MR. TYSON: I will object to that. It is putting the religion on trial. It's obvious from the

THE COURT: I am drawing the line.

MR. TYSON: They keep going and going and going.

THE COURT: I am going to let you put that one page in, and I am let you ask that one question. If he goes beyond, yes, I was harassed, then I will interject and stop it.

MS. RIVELLINI: I will be happy to ask it as a leading question.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. RIVELLINI:

- Q Mr. Oliver, the prosecutor asked you if you disliked Scientology or Scientologists, and you told him
 - A Yes, that is true.
- Q Okay, but then you expressed that you have gone out and picketed and some things against Scientology.

 How do you reconcile that?

A I don't have anything against Scientologists, a lot of them don't really know what goes on within the organization itself. My problem, if you will, or my concern is the abusive practices of the organization as deemed and carried out and told to be done by the management. Individual Scientologists I have no qualm

referred to was marked as

25

T	with them. A lot of people are my friends in Scientology
2	that I can't talk to anymore because of the situations.
3	Q So is it fair to say that the anger, or the
4	discontent that you seem to express on that video is not
5	with the people, but with the policies?
6	A Absolutely. It's with their abusive and
7	hurtful policies. Not with the individuals. Some of
8	them don't even know what is really going on in there,
9	they don't.
10	Q You weren't trying to mislead this jury?
11	A Not in any way.
12	Q Now, Mr. Tyson showed you the last paragraph of
13	a policy.
14	MS. RIVELLINI: If I can approach the
15	witness?
16	THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.
17	BY MS. RIVELLINI:
18	Q Just one other page from that policy, and it's
19	in Defendant's Exhibit Number 9 for purposes of
20	identification. Can you just take a look at it, and take
21	a look at the cover page to see where it comes from. Do
22	you recognize that chapter?
23	A Yeah.
24	(The document hereinafter

1	Defendant's Exhibit No. 9
2	for identification.)
3	BY MS. RIVELLINI:
4	Q Okay, turn directly to the page that I have
5	pointed out and highlighted. Can you just read the
6	highlighted paragraph and tell me if you understand what
7	it means?
8	A It says
9	Q Read it to yourself and tell me if you
10	understand it?
11	A I understand it.
12	MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, at this point I
13	would like to enter into evidence only page 883 from the
14	same chapter that the prosecutor entered the page from.
15	THE COURT: Mr. Tyson?
16	MR. TYSON: I would renew my relevance
17	objection, Judge.
18	THE COURT: I understand it will admitted
19	as Defense Exhibit Number?
20	MS. RIVELLINI: Number 9.
21	THE COURT: Number 9. Okay.
22	MS. RIVELLINI: And only this section will
23	be published to the jury and entered it into evidence.
24	THE COURT: You may go ahead and publish
25	it.

(The document heretofore marked as Defendant's Exhibit No. 9 for identification was received into evidence.)

MS. RIVELLINI:

Q Would you go ahead and read the highlighted portion from page 883, from the Chapter of Suppressive Acts?

A It says, "Suppressive Acts are clearly those covert, or overt acts knowingly calculated to reduce or destroy the influence, or activities of Scientology or prevent case gains, or continued Scientology successes, and activity on the part of a Scientologist. As persons or groups that would do such a thing act out of self interest, only to the detriment of all others. They cannot be granted the rights ordinarily accorded rational beings."

Q And you said that you understood that paragraph?

- A Yes, I do.
- Q Is there anything in that paragraph that contradicts what you learned as "Fair Game"?
 - A No. It's just phrased nicely.
 - Q In fact, the prosecutor showed you that this is

1 dated 1991, correct?

A Yes.

Q Could anything that is written here directly conflict or change "Fair Game" as it was done by L. Ron Hubbard?

MR. TYSON: Judge, I am going to object.

He is incompetent to answer that question. He has been out of the organization for eight years. How he would even know about this. He has never seen this before.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MS. RIVELLINI:

Q From what you learned when you were involved so heavily in Scientology, from what you learned can a policy later after L. Ron Hubbard died be changed?

A No, it can't. That one, in fact, you showed me didn't seem to be written by L. Ron Hubbard. It was another author listed underneath the name on the bottom.

- Q That makes a big difference?
- A Big difference.
- Q The fact that it says that people who commit suppressive acts that they cannot granted ordinarily accorded rational beings. Is that essentially saying that you don't treat them like they are humans?
 - A That is how I interpret it.
 - Q Now, the prosecutor kind of made the connection

- in your involvement in Scientology and his job here with the State of Florida. When you were in Scientology, no one forced you to become a member?
 - A No one forced me to become a member.
- Q Okay, no one forced you at the time you were there to stay a member, is that right?
 - A No one forced me to stay a member.
 - Q And for a while you liked being a member?
- A Yes.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q You even have a tattoo and it meant a lot to you?
- 12 A Yes.
 - Q At some point to you did that change?
 - A Yes, it did.
 - Q Did you try to take the steps that were taught to you to properly leave the church?
 - A Yes, I did.
 - Q When you tried to do that were there any repercussions?
 - A Yes, there were.
 - Q In fact, it is not just like for Mr. Tyson if he were to quit his job, and he said he could walk out the door. You couldn't just walk out the door and say that I am done with you all and never hear from them again?

1	A	I could, and suffer the consequences, sure.
2	Q	So there were consequences when you left the
3	church?	
4	A	Yes, there were.
5		MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, that's all I have.
6		THE COURT: Mr. Tyson, anything further?
7		RECROSS EXAMINATION
8		BY MR. TYSON:
9	Q	You do recognize that book there, right?
10	A	Yeah, I've seen that book.
11	Q	So Mr. Hubbard, he is dead?
12	A	Yeah, he's dead.
13	Q	Are you sure, we are not talking about Elvis
14	being ali	ve? He is dead, right?
15	A	As far as I know, sir, he is dead.
16	Q	That's the typical book that you all have in
17	Scientolo	gy?
18	A	It's typical, yeah.
19	Q	Now, you said the reason for activities, you
20	are not m	ad at the people, but the policies, but you
21	aimed the	laser light at the people, right?
22	A	Yeah, a particular security guard, yes.
23	Q	That's a person, right?
24	A	Excuse me?
25	Q	That is a person though, right?

A Correct.

Q And for lack of a better term, I am not going to claim ignorance here, but I really don't know that much about Scientology, I really don't. I don't know that much about you guys. That's why I say Scientology and anti-Scientology. I am not trying to offend you when I say that. But your message for lack of a better way to describe it, to simply it would be anti-Scientology?

A No, I wouldn't say that. I don't have a problem with people being Scientologists.

Q I am talking about anti-Scientology policies.

I mean that is why you are picketing and protesting, to
get your message out against Scientology, you want to
expose them, right?

A I want to expose the abusive practices.

Q Okay, fair enough. Let me ask you this question, how is shining a laser light on them sending a message to the rest of the public that you want to expose their policies, tell the jury that?

A That particular person that was filming me --

Q I asked you a question, how does that send your message to the public, your protest, if I go to a car dealership I get a lemon, I am out in front holding a sign, right, that's protest, right? I am shouting in the street, they're bad. Okay? They are bad, that is why

25

1	you are holding signs, right?
2	MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, there hasn't been a
3	question. I am going to ask that he stop editorializing
4	and just phrase one simple question.
5	THE COURT: Mr. Tyson, please ask your
6	questions.
7	BY MR. TYSON:
8	Q You were there to protest to get your message
9	out, aren't you?
10	A Correct.
11	Q And your message that you want to get out is
12	to the public, isn't it?
13	A No, not necessarily. It's also to the
14	Scientologists.
15	Q For them too, but also to the public, would it
16	be fair to say them, too?
17	A Well, whatever public would be there at 10:30
18	at night, or 11:00, whatever time it was.
19	Q You picket during the day too, right?
20	A Yes, I do.
21	Q And speaking of nighttime, there's not a lot of
22	people there at night. I mean it's 12:00 at night you
23	are doing that laser pen, isn't that?
24	A There are a lot of people walking in and out,

they were all Scientologists.

```
1
           Q
                My question to you is, you have a message that
 2
      you want to get out, how is putting a laser light on an
 3
      individual, on a person, aiming it right at them in the
 4
      camera, how is that getting your message out?
 5
                It wasn't. The picket sign in my other hand
 6
      was getting the message out.
 7
           Q
                That's right it wasn't, was it?
 8
                     MR. TYSON: No further questions.
 9
                     THE COURT: Any further questions of this
10
      witness?
11
                     MS. RIVELLINI: Juste a moment, Judge.
12
      No, sir.
13
                     THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Please step
14
      down.
15
                     (Whereupon, the witness was excused.)
16
                THE COURT: We are going to take a fifteen
17
      minute recess. We will be adjourned until 10:15.
18
                     (Brief break)
19
                     (Whereupon, the jury was brought in.)
20
                     THE COURT: Counsel for the Defendant
21
      please call your next witness.
22
                     MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Yes, your Honor, at
23
      this time Bob Minton would like to take the stand in his
24
      own defense.
25
                     (Whereupon, the witness was sworn.)
```