1 IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS 2 TRUMBULL COUNTY, OHIO 3 Garrick Krlich, Case No. 12-CV-2724 4 Plaintiff 5 - VS -Magistrate Patrick F. McCarthy 6 Ron Duez, PARTIAL Defendant TRANSCRIPT OF PRKOCEEDINGS 7 Hearing on request for civil protection order held Thursday, 8 9 January 10, 2013 BEFORE: Magistrate Patrick F. McCarthy 10 11 AT: Trumbull County Court of Common Pleas Courtroom Number 1 12 161 High Street, NW Warren, Ohio 44481 13 14 APPEARANCES: 15 On behalf of the Plaintiff: 16 Mr. Robert Henkin Attorney at Law 17 Youngstown, Ohio 18 On behalf of the Defendant: 19 Mr. Ron Duez Pro Se 20 21 22 Official Court Reporter: Lori J. Rittwage

23

THURSDAY, JANUARY 10, 2013

. . . .

THE COURT: I have all the evidence before me. I'm ready to give you my decision here.

In any protection order case, I have a very simple decision before me. It's to determine whether the petitioner, Mr. Krlich here, whether he's presented sufficient evidence to show that the respondent, Mr. Duez, engaged in menacing by stalking. As pertains to this case, specifically a pattern of conduct in which he caused mental distress to another.

In this case, I appreciate, you've been more forthright than several other witnesses, Mr. Duez, but I do believe that you have engaged in conduct over a period of time that was intentional and was intended to harass. It was part of the general thought process going on in Hubbard that it's sort of comical and/or a thing to do, to drive by Mr. Krlich's house and to harass him by beeping the horn.

Is it possible that maybe your kids did it on some occasions? I suppose it is. And if it's determined that they do it, I don't know, if they're old enough to drive, they're probably old enough to come into court. And if they want to do that, they can have the same thing happen.

I do find that there has been sufficient evidence.

102 <u>14</u>8

This has certainly caused Mr. Krlich some substantial mental distress. So I find there has been a pattern of conduct, particularly I think you've been well aware for some period of time that this has been an issue and I believe that, you know, I think you're sort of trying to be honest here in saying you're not sure when it was, but I think you know you did it. Maybe on these two occasions. Maybe more. And I'm guessing one of these things in August, June, or July of this past year was probably involving you as well. And it's just such a crazy situation. It's so unnecessary. That, you know, the Court feels that, first of all, the standard has been met. Secondly, that it really doesn't have much of an alternative in many of these cases but to issue a protection order. going to recommend the issuance of a protection order in this case.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Now, to address your concern about Mrs. Krlich.

First of all, you know, the protection order that has been issued in previous cases simply states that you shall not blow your horn. I can't remember the exact language, but I'm going to use the same language I've always used. Blow a horn or otherwise cause a disturbance or a noise at or near the Krlich residence. I think that's easy enough. I mean the circumstances that would arise for somebody to have to beep

their horn near that intersection, that they would have to, you know, I'm sorry, it's not every day that you come up and suddenly have to blow your horn because there's going to be an accident. And it would be quite coincidental that you'd get to that point. And I think it would be pretty evident from the videotape because you know that it's gonna be available. That there would be sort of extenuating circumstances that would justify that. So I don't think there should, needs to be any undue concern that there would be sort of unjustified enforcement activity on this.

You know. Don't beep your horn. Don't cause disturbances at or near the Krlich residence. If you see Mr. Krlich out, you know, don't bother him. You know? It's really simple. And, you know, I don't think there's any need to have sort of some great concern that you're gonna be unjustifiably, you know, targeted for something if you do that. I mean it's the simplest thing. I mean these protection orders, I tell people every time I issue one, they're the simplest orders in the world to comply with. Just leave somebody alone.

I mean, I wish -- I just have to comment on this.

This notion that, you know, putting the cameras up has helped cause the problem? You know, the problem happened without the

cameras. If people are stupid enough to think that it's a good idea to challenge that system, you just saw the system. Heck, I think the Pentagon would like to have that kind of security. I mean this gentleman has been required to expend substantial amounts of money and it's caused him completely unjustifiable mental distress to deal with this situation. I don't know what I'd do if I was in his circumstance. You know. I just don't know what I'd do. I can't believe the ignorance of people that still think it's somehow comical.

And, you know, if it was my kids that were driving by, you know, especially after I got hauled into court, first of all, I'd be embarrassed and then I'd tell 'em, "You don't want to end up where I was."

And secondly, I'd tell 'em, "If it ever comes to my attention that you did that, you know, you wouldn't be driving a car. Wouldn't be able to sit down to drive a car."

You know. I mean this stuff has to end. And it has to begin with some people actually taking some responsibility for just basic human decency towards another person. And until that happens, you know, I hope I don't have more of these cases coming through the court. I take 'em on a case by case basis. I make an individual determination every single time. I do believe, I believe Mr. Krlich has met the standard

made an apology. You're one of the first people that actually 1 came up here and made an apology so I give you some credit for 2 that. If you meant it, then you know what you've got to do 3 from this point forward. It's not complicated. 4 So I hope that you take this seriously because I sure do. 5 I don't want to see this ever have to come back. I don't want to see --6 protection orders are easy. Don't bother somebody. You won't 7 ever have any reason to have to worry about it being enforced 8 against you. If you choose to do otherwise, then you'll have 9 to face those consequences. So I hope that's the end of any 10 kind of problems you're gonna have with this situation. 11 12 Questions? 13 MR. HENKIN: No, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Mr. Duez, you had a question. 15 RON DUEZ: Yeah. The protection order, 16 that's not a misdemeanor or anything like that? 17 THE COURT: It's not criminal.

THE COURT: It's not criminal. It's a civil protection order. It doesn't go on your criminal record. But understand, it does get reported to 9-1-1.

18

19

20

21

22

23

RON DUEZ: Understood.

THE COURT: It's available to any police department. And the bottom line is it can result in criminal prosecution if you violate it. It's not a criminal charge

itself. What it is is it's a restraining order, essentially a 1 restrictive order to put certain conditions that if you 2 violate them then the police, who otherwise couldn't file a 3 charge against you, because that protection order is there, if 4 you do that stuff, they can file a charge against you. 5 misdemeanor level criminal charge that they would have the 6 opportunity to file against you if you engaged in that 7 conduct. So this is all within your control. 8 Don't engage in the prohibited conduct. You won't have a charge filed against 9 you. And, you know, I have people say all the time they're 10 concerned that, well, somebody is gonna target me and file the 11 12 charge. My experience is that it doesn't happen. would worry much more about my own conduct than that of the 13 14 other person. 15 So I don't think I have anything further. 16

questions?

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. HENKIN: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Any questions?

RON DUEZ: No. Thank you.

THE COURT: We are in recess. I'll have that mailed out. And if you could come forward and give me that address, please.

(End of proceedings; 12:31 p.m.)

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

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

. .

1-30-13

. _

Lori J. Rittwage,

Official Court Reporter