ONLEGIALRING PROTECTION ORDER OR CIVI	L SEXUALLY ORIENTEE			Me 2/2011
IN THE C	OURT OF COMMON	This is I PLEAS origina DUNTY, OHIO	e true and o	correct appy of the
Order of Protection Per R.C. 2903.214(F)(3), this Order is indexed at	Case No. 2010 Judge McKA	CV -25943v	HAR	Clerk of Courts
LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY WHERE INDEXED		MBULL NG PROTECTION	State	OHIO
- PHONE NUMBER	(R.C. 2903.214)	LLY ORIENTED O	OFFENSE P	
PETITIONER:  GARRICK KRLICH  First Middle Last  v.	Petitioner: G/	RSON(S) PROTEC ARRICK KRLICH mily or Household ICH		DOB: 12/24/60
RESPONDENT:		RESPONDEN	T INENTIEU	
	SEX	RACE	HT 5'10"	180
JOE TAKASH First Middle Last	EYES GR DRIVER'S LIC.	HAIR BLD NO. EXP. D	02:05/90	TE OF BIRTH STATE
Address where Respondent can be found:  1071 DORIS DRIVE  HUBBARD, OH 44425	Distinguishing F	eatures:		
WARNING TO LAW ENFORCEMENT: RESPONDE (Violence Against Women Act, 18 U.S.C. 2265, Federal Full Fall	NAMES FOR THE OF STREET OF STREET			
THE COURT HEREBY FINDS: That it has jurisdiction over the parties and subject matter, and heard within the time required by Ohlo law. Additional finding	the Respondent was p	rovided with reasons	•	
THE COURT HEREBY ORDERS: That the above named Respondent be restrained from committed protected persons named in this Order, as set forth below. Add				ner and other
The terms of this Order shall be effective until 05 / 0	4 / <u>2016</u> (DA	TE CERTAIN - FIVE Y	ears Maxim	UM).
WARNING TO RESPONDENT: See the warning page	attached to the fron	t of this Order.		
FORM 10.03-F: CIVIL STALKING PROTECTION ORDER OR CIVIL	SEXUALLY ORIENTED C	FFENSE PROTECTION	ON ORDER FU	LL HEARING
Amended: July 1, 2010 Discard all previous versions of this form	8			

1	IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS TRUMBULL COUNTY, OHIO				
2	TROMBOLIL.	COOMIT, OHIO			
3	GARRICK KRLICH, Petitioner	) Case No. 2010-CV-2594			
4	-vs-	) Magigtrate Datriels E. McCanthy			
5		) Magistrate Patrick F. McCarthy			
6	JOE TAKASH, Respondent	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  MAGISTRATE'S DECISION ONLY			
7					
8					
9	Hearing on a Petition for a Stalking Civil Protection Order				
10	held on May 4, 2011				
11	BEFORE: MAGISTRATE PATRICK F. MCCARTHY				
12	DEFORE: MAGISTRATE PAIRICK F. MCCARTHY				
13	AT: Trumbull Co. Court of Common Pleas 161 High Street, NW				
14	Warren, Ohio 44				
15	APPEARANCES:				
16	AFFEMICES.				
17	On behalf of the Petitioner:				
18	Mr. Robert A. Henkin, Attorney at Law				
19	Accorncy at law				
20	On behalf of the Respondent:				
21	*				
22	Ms. Deborah L. Smith, Attorney at Law				
23					

(Whereupon, prior proceedings were not requested to be transcribed.)

THE COURT: I'm ready to give you my decision. As in any protection order case, again, it's whether there's a pattern of conduct. And it comes down in this case to the credibility of the witnesses.

In this particular case I certainly do find Mr. Krlich's testimony quite credible. And I believe he was definitive and I think, incredibly definitive about the fact that he believed it was Joe Takash that he saw driving the numerous occasions and beeping the horn. I didn't find Joe Takash's testimony particularly credible in a number of regards.

First, the notion that it was some kind of innocent beeping just to the Clementes and he, he knew nothing about it, you know, bothering the Krliches, I just didn't find that to be credible testimony.

I didn't find his testimony to be credible as to the incident in September of 2010 in the evening that it was just some, you know, some other guy driving by at 2:36 that he happened to be beeping at, just coincidently right in front of the Krliches. I think it is a pattern of conduct. I think Mr. Krlich's testimony was that it actually was a

continuous pattern of conduct. And the gaps in time are, aren't necessarily because there was a gap in the conduct but because there was a gap in the footage that was available to show it.

2.

2.2

But I, I did find Mr. Krlich's testimony and evidence more credible than that of Mr. Takash. And on that basis I am going to find that he has shown -- and on the question of whether, Mr. Takash's notion that he just didn't know that it bothered them. I, I believe that the conduct in going by and repeatedly beeping, it was certainly intended. And that's what some of the case law indicates. When there's an obvious intention to cause mental distress to another person by doing this ongoing pattern of conduct, then that is sufficient to justify a finding of menacing by stalking for purposes of issuing a protection order. And I find that's exactly what was going on here.

I mean it was a big joke. It was a big thing to go by the Krliches and beep that horn. And I believe that Mr. Joe Takash has taken part in that conduct knowingly and with an intent to cause mental distress. Therefore I believe that a protection order should be issued here. I am going to prepare that paperwork. It will be a protection order in place, be in place for a period of five years. It

will be, indicate that you're not to have contact with the 1 Krliches; that you're not to go near their residence. Given 2 the fact that we're dealing with a close community, I do not 3 include the footage limitation in these restrictions. However, you know, just know that, you know, if there's any 5 kind of conduct that is going to, you know, remotely look like 6 harassment or an effort to purposely go by there for purposes 7 of causing mental distress here, you'll run the risk of being 8 arrested and charged.

So I will include what I deem to be appropriate restrictions on, including a restriction specifically about beeping the horn in or around or near the Krlich residence, or encouraging or causing others to do so. That will be my decision. I'll put it into written form as soon as humanly possible here, have it mailed out to everybody. You still are at the same address on Doris Drive, is that correct, Mr. Takash? I do need to ask a couple other quick questions here just to confirm my information. Can I have your date of birth, please?

MR. TAKASH: Excuse me?

THE COURT: Your date of birth?

MR. TAKASH: 2/5/90.

THE COURT: 2 --

20

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

MR. TAKASH: 5/90.
THE COURT: '90. Your height?
MR. TAKASH: 5/10.
THE COURT: Your weight?
MR. TAKASH: 180.
THE COURT: Eye color?
MR. TAKASH: Green.
THE COURT: Hair color?
MR. TAKASH: Dark blond.
THE COURT: Okay. All right. I'll have
this mailed out in short order. I just hope, I mean, that
this stops. You know, I mean, I don't buy the business that
this is all just some innocent little thing that, popping by
the Clementes and just waving and beeping. It's not credible.
It's not believable. And I certainly didn't buy the business
about, you know, just being a, a crazy coincidence at 2:30 in
the morning. So cut it out or there will be further
consequences. It's the easiest thing to stop. The easiest
thing to stop. But it seems to just be not the easiest thing
to certain people.
Anyways, that will be my decision. I'll
get it out to everybody. You do know the objection process.
So I'll have it mailed out in short order. It is

approximatelý 4:30 here. We have two more cases here, and I guess I'll see counsel up front here on what we're going to do with those. I'm not going to do them today. I do have time tomorrow afternoon, but we'll talk about that when you come up. Any other questions about this case at this point in time? MR. HENKIN: No, Your Honor. THE COURT: We are in recess. Thank you. 

## REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

This is to certify the foregoing represents a true and correct transcript of the proceedings had in the aforementioned cause as reflected by the stenotype notes taken by me on the same.

Richelle J. Guerrieri Official Court Reporter