1	IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS TRUMBULL COUNTY, OHIO
2	TROMBOLLI COONTT, ORIO
3	GARRICK KRLICH,) Case No. 2010-CV-1565 Petitioner)
4	-vs-) Magistrate Patrick F. McCarthy
5)
6	MARK J. SILVIDI,) TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS Respondent) MAGISTRATE'S DECISION ONLY
7	
8	
9	Hearing on a Petition for a Stalking Civil Protection Order
10	held on December 21, 2010.
11	BEFORE: MAGISTRATE PATRICK F. MCCARTHY
12	DEFORE. MAGISTRATE FAIRICK F. MCCARINI
13	AT: Trumbull Co. Court of Common Pleas
14	161 High Street, NW Warren, Ohio 44481
15	
16	APPEARANCES:
17	On behalf of the Petitioner:
18	Mr. Robert A. Henkin,
19	Attorney at Law
20	On hoholf of the Demonstrate
21	On behalf of the Respondent:
22	Mr. Jeffrey D. Adler, Attorney at Law
23	

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

THE COURT: I'm ready to give you my decision. In any civil stalking protection order case the sole issue before me is to decide whether there's been sufficient evidence provided to demonstrate that there's been conduct by in this case, Mr. Silvidi, that would meet the definition in Ohio of menacing by stalking. That is a person engaging in a pattern of conduct in which they knowingly caused another person to either believe the offender would cause physical harm to the other person -- and there's no evidence of that so that, that does not apply here -- or a

I guess what I believe in this case is a couple things. First of all, I certainly believe that Mr. Krlich is convinced that Mr. Silvidi rode by his house on numerous occasions intentionally beeping his horn as part of this, this bizarre behavior that apparently takes place in Hubbard of going by Mr. Krlich's residence and beeping horns.

pattern of conduct in which the person knowingly caused

another mental distress.

I further believe that this has caused Mr. Krlich, this whole, this whole conduct, not, not just the specific conduct at issue in this case but this ongoing

behavior in Hubbard has caused him mental distress. He sought counseling for it. He's, he's on medication partly, at least partly as a result of it.

I also believe that it, I disbelieve

Mr. Silvidi's testimony that this is the only time that, the

time on August 19th was the only time he ever did it. I mean,

I watched those tapes. That's the same vehicle. It's your

car. You know, and there were at least three or four times

before then that, that it was your car and you're going by

there and you're beeping. It's, it's just the identical car.

I find that far too coincidental for it to be the only time

that it happened. Plus the time you went by on the 19th when

you acknowledged it was you, first of all, it was dark out. I

mean, maybe they're outside playing volleyball but you're

beeping, beeping, beeping. It's a very convenient excuse, and

I don't really buy it.

However, the question I have really that, that I don't think is met here is whether there is what I, I consider required to be proven that there's a present pattern of conduct that's taking place. And what happened in this case is that after it occurred and after the police took action and after it went to court and you were warned, there hasn't been anything since that point in time. And that was

way back in September of 2009. This petition wasn't filed until June of 2010 and there hasn't been any activity since, you know, long before that. There's testimony about some incident in February that may have happened and -- but it was very vague testimony. I didn't find it particularly compelling.

Secondly, there's this incident in, in, just a few days ago of alleged following. And I don't find, I actually do find that that appears to have been sort of a coincidental event. And I think while Mr. Krlich may believe it was Mr. Silvidi following him I -- following him I, I don't find that I'm convinced that that's exactly what was happening on that occasion.

So I guess what I have here is, I think there had been conduct before then of beeping the horn. I don't know if it was 20 or 30 times or five or six times, but I don't believe it was just once. I just don't buy that. But, but I think it stopped. And I think he actually went and he apologized. And I hope that was a sincere apology. It does appear to have stopped since that point in time. And so I don't believe there is or was at any point during the pendency of this petition that a pattern of conduct in existence. And any, any pattern of conduct that may have

previously existed ended some time in September of 2009 and didn't continue up to any recent time. So for that specific reason, I don't find that the standard has been met here for menacing by stalking and I'm not going to recommend the granting of the protection order in this particular case.

Having said all that, you know, I'm, I'm going to sound like a broken record here. But I would hope that any reasonable person that listened to what happened in the courtroom today or on any other hearings here would figure out that it's wrong what's happening in Hubbard. That whether people think Mr. Krlich, what they think of him personally, what kind of person they may think he is. Whether they think he's overreacted to this it's, it's one of the strangest most -- I mean, it's sick in a way what's happened. It, it, it's like children, like a group of children that pick on somebody in the neighborhood.

I mean when I was a little kid there was a lady a couple blocks over and she was a little crazy and kids used to ride by her house and throw eggs and do stuff like that. At Halloween she got toilet papered. And this poor old lady, you know, had to put up with that stuff. And that was little kids doing that. This is, this is adults throughout Hubbard. And I'm not just picking on you, Mr. Silvidi. It's

been a whole group of people doing this. And, and it's, it's really, really warped. And it's caused Mr. Krlich, like I said, regardless of what anybody may feel about him, it's obviously caused him plenty of grief in his life. The kind of grief that nobody deserves to have to put up with. The point where he's, he's got this phenomenal security system here where, where it's happened on so many occasions that, you know, to sit -- and I mean, you testify to one point, well, you know, somebody brought it on himself. Nobody does anything that brings that kind of crud from an entire community, or at least a large segment of people that apparently know one another and have, have made it into this big joke to do this. I mean, you know, it's the most juvenile, ridiculous thing I've had come into my court in awhile.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And, and if, you know, just common sense of decency and some shame about any involvement you may have had doesn't convince you not to ever do it again, then I'm wasting my breath here. You know. Because I mean anybody that, that, you know, is participating in that, shame on them.

To the extent that you stopped participating in it and that you apologized for, for whatever you, at least for the one incident that you

acknowledge having done, again, I hope that's sincere.

And I can assure you that would it come to my attention that, that it's restarting, then, you know, then a pattern may ultimately be reestablished here and I may be stuck revisiting this issue. At this point though, I try and be real specific on every case that comes into my court and judge it on the evidence that I hear on the specific case that I have. And in this specific case under this specific evidence I don't find that there was a pattern of conduct, or at least whatever pattern of conduct there was ended well prior to the, the filing of this petition, so I can't find that the standard for menacing by stalking has been met. So it will be my recommendation not to issue the protection order.

I'll put my decision into written form.

I'll mail it out to everybody. I think counsel is well aware of the process for objecting to that decision. Everybody still at the same address as here, East Liberty Street and Princeton; correct?

And, you know, I don't want to belabor the point any longer but for God's sake, you know, if it was me sitting out there and, and I had seen this, not only would I never -- I would go out of my way never to even remotely try

1	and do anything disruptive, I would encourage all those I know
2	who might be likely to engage in that conduct to cut it out
3	and to leave the gentleman alone. I mean whether you like
4	him, whether you don't, I guarantee you he's not going to
5	follow anybody he doesn't think is going to be doing anything.
6	That's, that's what I, I see from, from this. So I, I don't,
7	I don't know how, the notion becomes that is somehow deserved
8	because I don't buy into that one little bit.
9	So anyway, enough of my lecturing. I've
10	made me ruling. I'll put it into written form. I'll get it
11	out to everybody here. Are there any other questions at
12	this point, Attorney Henkin?
13	MR. HENKIN: No, Your Honor.
14	THE COURT: Attorney Adler?
15	MR. ADLER: No.
16	THE COURT: Thank you very much. We are in
17	recess.
18	* * *
19	
20	
21	
22	

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

This is to certify the foregoing represents a true and correct partial 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