Witness: Craig Grogan

Date: 2004-10-25

Proceedings held October 25, 2004

Called by: Defense

Phase: Guilt

Examinations: Direct – Mark Geragos; Cross – Birgit Fladager; Redirect – Mark Geragos; Recross – Birgit Fladager; 2nd Redirect – Mark Geragos

Day 1 of 1 for this witness

Court: San Mateo County Superior Court, Redwood City (People v. Scott Peterson)

Source: https://pwc-sii.com/CourtDocs/Transcripts/Grogan-def.htm

Page/line: not available (source HTML has no page or line markers)

Text below is verbatim from the source page for this date only.

Direct Examination by Mark Geragos

GERAGOS: Good morning, detective. The first thing I want to ask you, you had some notes that Sharon Rocha had given about Laci Peterson, is that correct?

GROGAN: Yes.

GERAGOS: The very first line of the notes states that on June 9th of '02 Laci called at around 7:00 a.m. to announce that she was pregnant, is that correct?

GROGAN: That's correct.

GERAGOS: Okay. And based on your investigation in this case that's not contradicted anywhere else that June 9th in the morning is when the family and friends found out that Laci was pregnant, correct?

GROGAN: I don't think so, no, sir.

GERAGOS: Okay. So there's nothing that you know of that suggests any other date, correct?

GROGAN: That the family was first notified, not that I know of, no, sir.

GERAGOS: And specifically I'm going to ask you also about a couple of other things that I forgotten. I apologize for dragging you in. One of the things I asked you about when you were here for your marathon session last time was about the code for the phone that you thought was somewhat suspicious, do you remember that?

GROGAN: Correct.

GERAGOS: You had Scott,

JUDGE: Which phone, Mr. Geragos?

GERAGOS: That Scott knew the access code for Laci's phone, is that correct?

GROGAN: Yes, that was a question I was asked.

GERAGOS: I'm showing you a report by Brocchini and here's Laci Peterson's phone, and then they've got the access code, do you see where the access code is, 8184?

GROGAN: I see that, yes.

GERAGOS: Okay. And then I'm going to show you the wiretap records which shows (209) 505-0337, which is Scott Peterson's phone, and do you see the access code there?

GROGAN: I do.

GERAGOS: It's 8184 also, is that correct?

GROGAN: That's correct.

GERAGOS: So it would appear that both access codes for Laci and Scott's phones were the same, is that correct?

GROGAN: That appears, yes.

GERAGOS: Now the, I'm going to show you a series of pictures that,

JUDGE: Have they been marked?

GERAGOS: Yes, these have not. I showed it to Detective Grogan before we came in. There's a, I'll separate out. Some are 2/18 and a couple of them I think we identified as on the 24th of December, correct?

GROGAN: Yes.

GERAGOS: I'm going to show you, detective, I'm going to show you some pictures that you were shown at the break. I think with the exception of this here. This one is the 24th, is that correct?

GROGAN: This first one I'm looking at, yes.

GERAGOS: Okay. The others look like it's 2/18. It looks like there's no olive oil there, but there is here.

JUDGE: Mr. Geragos, I'm not sure the jury can hear you.

GERAGOS: It looks like to there's no olive oil in this picture that was taken on the 24th, but there is here leads you to believe that would be on the 2/18 date?

GROGAN: Yes, it could be 2/18. I guess it could be 12/27, also, I don't know.

GERAGOS: Take a look at those and make sure the others of these photos were also taken on the 18th of February.

GROGAN: The rest of these?

GROGAN: Yes.

GERAGOS: The one that's taken on the 24th, judge, I'd like to mark separately.

JUDGE: Okay. We'll mark that Defendant's 8T. And that was taken on December 24th?

GERAGOS: 24th.

JUDGE: And that's one photograph, right?

GERAGOS: That's correct.

JUDGE: All right. Defendant's 8U is how many photographs?

GERAGOS: Let me count those up.

GERAGOS: Detective, do you know how many you've got right there?

GROGAN: I'm sorry, Mr. Geragos, in this stack or the total of the two?

GERAGOS: The whole stack you've got right here I'm going to mark these.

GROGAN: These?

GERAGOS: Yes.

GROGAN: There's eight here and four here.

GERAGOS: So mark 12 altogether.

JUDGE: 8 U, 1 through 12.

GERAGOS: And 8U, 1 through 12, this accurately reflects the photos that were taken on the 18th at the second search warrant?

GROGAN: I believe so, yes, sir.

GERAGOS: Okay. And specifically the one that I've got up here, this would have been the 24th, is that correct?

GROGAN: That's correct.

GERAGOS: And this is the book that, the phone we talked about before, correct?

GROGAN: Correct.

GERAGOS: Okay. There's, this mug, as far as you know, nobody ever took that for testing, is that correct?

GROGAN: That's correct.

GERAGOS: Okay. And then, and this recipe that's right there, I believe I've got the photo of that yet to be marked, but it's about to. That is this one right here, is that correct?

GROGAN: Yes, sir.

GERAGOS: Okay. And then,

JUDGE: Has that been marked?

GERAGOS: It's going to be right now. I'll have it marked.

JUDGE: We should identify it for the record.

GERAGOS: That's D8U-3.

JUDGE: 3. Okay. Close-up of recipe.

GERAGOS: And then we also have this D8U-1. This is the nursery?

GROGAN: Yes.

GERAGOS: Okay. And then specifically D8U-2 was also taken. These are the, it looks photo albums and other items of sentimental value, is that correct?

GROGAN: Yes.

GERAGOS: Okay. Specifically when you went in on that search warrant you were looking of or looking for photographs of any items that were either sold or disposed of by Scott Peterson that would normally have sentimental value, correct?

GROGAN: Yes, we did have those listed. I think there's some language in that there.

JUDGE: What room was that in, do you know?

GROGAN: That's in the converted garage or the living room.

GERAGOS: Now the, also on the 18th I've got what's marked as D8U-4, where were these items found?

GROGAN: I think that's also the converted garage area or living room. There's a coffee table that's located in there.

GERAGOS: Now D8U-5, where was this item found?

GROGAN: I'm not sure, Mr. Geragos, but I believe that's in that kitchen area of the home.

GERAGOS: D8U-6 is another view of that same, roughly the same view into the kitchen, correct?

GROGAN: That's correct. That's it.

GERAGOS: D8U-7 appears to be the cupboard above or looking out into the yard?

GROGAN: Yes.

GERAGOS: And then D8U-8 is another picture of the cupboard and the interior of it?

GROGAN: Yes.

GERAGOS: D8U-9 somebody took a photo of the interior of the dishwasher, is that correct?

GROGAN: Yes.

GERAGOS: And then a close-up of the, somebody took a close-up of the French Toast recipe?

GROGAN: Yes.

GERAGOS: And then this is the spare bedroom. I'm sorry, that last one was D8U-11 and this is D8U-12, is that correct?

GROGAN: Yes, this is the spare bedroom of the home.

GERAGOS: Okay. And then D8U-10 is another photo of a recipe, is that correct?

GROGAN: That will be the cover of that book, recipe book, I think.

GERAGOS: Okay. Now the items that you were looking for that were of sentimental value, you were looking for something that had been disposed of, is that correct?

GROGAN: I, I think there's some language like that, yes, in that search warrant.

GERAGOS: Okay. Then I'm going to show you another picture. These are taken on the 27th of December, two pictures. I'm going to mark these as defense next in order. Do you recognize what that is?

JUDGE: That's 8V?

GROGAN: Yes, that's the flat bed trailer at the warehouse location.

JUDGE: 1 and 2.

GERAGOS: Thanks.

GERAGOS: Now specifically these two photos accurately reflect how that trailer looked that evening? I'm showing you D8V-1.

GROGAN: Yes, sir, I think I've seen the photo before.

GERAGOS: And D8V-2, same?

GROGAN: Yes.

GERAGOS: All right. And there's also on the 18th, I'm going to show you a photo of a camouflage jacket, is that something that you were looking for on the 18th or something you thought was some kind of evidentiary significance?

GROGAN: Yes.

GERAGOS: And that was seized on February 18th?

GROGAN: Yes, it was.

GERAGOS: And do you know where it was seized from?

GROGAN: It was in a closet, the hall closet of the home.

GERAGOS: And that's, it's got a placard on it. It says No. 79. That means it was evidence number, Item No. 79. You seized that from the house on the 18th?

GROGAN: Yes.

GERAGOS: Okay. You have reason to believe that this was the jacket that Scott Peterson was wearing on the 24th, is that your belief?

GROGAN: I don't know. I think there were, if I remember right, there were two camouflage jackets and we may have seized one the first time and then we saw that one later and decided to collect it as well.

JUDGE: Has this exhibit been marked?

GERAGOS: Now this jacket was also sent out for testing, correct?

GROGAN: Yes, sir.

GERAGOS: And it came back with no blood detected on this as well, correct?

GROGAN: That's correct.

GERAGOS: You and I talked before about the significance of Amy being invited over for pizza by Scott. Then I went back through your notes and I showed you this this morning. I assume you were unaware that she had actually told you that at some point during one of your interviews, is that correct?

GROGAN: Yeah, I knew that she had told someone that and looking at this, this is definitely my handwriting. And she did tell me that somewhere, however, I don't, I'm not the dates that those notes go with.

GERAGOS: It's a fair statement that that for whatever reason never made it into a report, correct?

GROGAN: I don't think so, no.

GERAGOS: And the reason that was significant is if the, if Scott Peterson, at least from your mind, as investigator was planning on doing something on the night of the 23rd he wouldn't have invited his sister over, correct?

GROGAN: Well, that's an argument that can be made. Certainly Laci, her last contact with anyone was at 8:30 p.m. that night and I don't know what time Laci would have, or I'm sorry, Amy would have left, if she did come over for dinner.

GERAGOS: Certainly the, that is an important fact. Now that you've seen it, you wrote it down in your notes, correct?

GROGAN: I did write it in the notes, yes.

GERAGOS: Now at some point Detective Buehler met with the Rocha's, is that correct? And you had gone to tell I believe Mr. Peterson, Lee Peterson about Amber Frey, Frey, and Buehler had gone over to tell the Rocha's, is that correct?

GROGAN: Yes, I think, I think the Rocha's may have come to investigative services and met with him there.

GERAGOS: Okay. Now at a certain point specifically you've had a number of meetings with Ron and Sharon, is that correct?

GROGAN: Yes.

GERAGOS: Now specifically you met with them, we went over this, on the 29th at about 1150 hours, is that correct? The 29th of December?

GROGAN: Yes.

GERAGOS: Okay.

GROGAN: There was an interview then.

GERAGOS: He also on the 30th of December had received a telephone call from Sharon?

GROGAN: Yes.

GERAGOS: Okay. In neither of those conversations did she indicate that Scott had said that Laci was missing on that first phone call, did she?

GROGAN: No.

GERAGOS: Okay. January 2nd you again received a call from Sharon regarding a follow-up out on a highway on a suspicious person, is that correct?

GROGAN: Yes, sir.

GERAGOS: Okay. She never told you at that point that the first thing that Scott had said is that Laci was missing, is that correct?

GROGAN: No, she didn't say that in that conversation.

GERAGOS: January 6th you spoke or you met with Sharon at the MPD, is that correct?

GROGAN: Yes.

GERAGOS: Okay. And she had a friend with her at that point?

GROGAN: That's correct.

GERAGOS: Okay. Had never had mentioned the fact Scott supposedly said that la Laci was missing in that interview, did she?

GROGAN: No.

GERAGOS: On the 9th of January you telephoned Sharon and Lee Peterson and spoke to them about, on the 9th you spoke to them about the situation in San Francisco bay, is that correct?

GROGAN: That's correct.

GERAGOS: Okay. No time in that conversation did she make mention of this Laci is missing comment?

GROGAN: No.

GERAGOS: And then on the 16th you telephoned Sharon at her home at about 9:00 in the morning, is that correct?

GROGAN: Yes.

GERAGOS: Okay. That was after Buehler had gone over to tell her about Amber Frey?

GROGAN: Yes, it would have been the following day.

GERAGOS: Okay. Then you went over to their home on the 17th of January, is that correct?

JUDGE: "Their home," who are you referring to?

GERAGOS: You went over to the Rocha home.

GROGAN: Yes, sir, it appears so.

GERAGOS: Okay. And then at that point on January 20th had you at some point told the Rocha's and the friends of Scott to see if they had any recollections of memories now that they knew about Amber that they didn't have before or behavior that they thought was odd?

GROGAN: Yes, I think I asked them if, you know, there was any behaviors that they had noted previous to this that were, that they thought were odd that I wanted to know about it.

GERAGOS: Okay. And that was after they had been told about Amber, is that correct?

GROGAN: That's correct.

GERAGOS: Okay. So the first time you met with or spoke with Sharon on the phone after that 16th date was the 20th of January?

GROGAN: Yes, I think so.

GERAGOS: Okay. Then on January 25th you met again with Sharon at the headquarters main interview room, is that correct?

GROGAN: Yes, I did.

GERAGOS: Okay. Still did not have that, there was no recollection or no statement about Scott saying Laci was missing?

GROGAN: No, sir.

GERAGOS: Okay. Then spoke again with her on the 27th of January by telephone?

GROGAN: Yes.

GERAGOS: Okay. Still no mention of the, that comment by Scott?

GROGAN: No, there wasn't.

GERAGOS: Okay. And then specifically on January 28th that's the first time that Sharon told you that in the first call she received from Scott that he had said McKenzie is in the backyard with the leash on and Laci is missing?

GROGAN: Yes.

GERAGOS: And then she said when she got off the phone she told Ron Laci's missing. And the first time you heard that was on January 28th, is that correct?

GROGAN: Yes.

GERAGOS: Now the, did you look at any of the interviews that Ms. Rocha had given, for example, to the Today Show on December 30th in which she says mom, that she said that Scott said, "Mom, is Laci there"?

GROGAN: No, I have never seen that before.

GERAGOS: Did you ever look at the January 14th Today's Show where she said "I just immediately, I knew she was missing"?

GROGAN: No, I have never seen that before.

GERAGOS: Okay. That would have been the January 14th show would have been two days before she was told about the existence of Amber Frey, is that correct, or the day before?

GROGAN: It would have been the day before, yes.

GERAGOS: And that, at least if the transcript's accurate, she's the one who said that she knew Laci was missing just by the panic rising in Scott's voice, correct?

GROGAN: Yes, that's what it says.

GERAGOS: Now, the people that you talked to about whether they had, now that they knew about Amber, whether they had thoughts or concerns or new memories about Scott Peterson, would that have included friends or people who have actually testified in this case?

GROGAN: I'm sure it does include some of those people, yes.

GERAGOS: Okay. Sandy Rickard, is that one of the people?

GROGAN: I think so, yes.

GERAGOS: Okay. Specifically any of the, Patti Amador?

GROGAN: Yes.

GERAGOS: And those were all people known to you to be friends of Sharon's that you also asked to, if they had recollections now that they knew about Amber about Scott to please let you know, is that correct?

GROGAN: Yes. Those were people that were there on the, on the 24th, 25th and people that I think had gone to the volunteer center, some of them.

GERAGOS: Okay. And then specifically some of those people ended up calling you back, correct?

GROGAN: Yes, I interviewed some of those people, yes.

GERAGOS: Susan Aquino, who is Sharon's sister, she called back and had this, sometime after she finds out about Amber, all of a sudden she has a memory about something Scott did on the 24th, correct?

GROGAN: I don't know what you're specifically talking about there but,

GERAGOS: Did she call you back?

GROGAN: I did talk to her I think once on the phone and once before, before trial.

GERAGOS: Okay. How about Rose Rocha, did she call?

GROGAN: I think I called her.

GERAGOS: Okay. And these people, and Brent Rocha, I assume?

GROGAN: Yeah, I talked to Brent a few times, yes.

GERAGOS: Okay. And this is after you had asked them to please report anything that you thought or that they thought was odd now that they knew about Amber Frey, correct?

GROGAN: Yeah. I think I told that to Sharon and some of those other people. That was the reason for interviewing them was to find out their observations on the 24th, 25th, in that area.

JUDGE: Are you looking for Defendant's N?

GERAGOS: N.

JUDGE: Purchase ticket from a pawn shop.

GERAGOS: I had neglected to ask you. Ms. Fladager asked you during her direct exam about the croton watch, do you remember that?

GROGAN: Yes, we talked about that.

GERAGOS: Okay. And then I think she asked you specifically about a community service officer finding a pawn slip, is that correct?

GROGAN: Yes.

GERAGOS: And I'm showing you Defendant's Exhibit N, is that what you were referring to when you were talking with Ms. Fladager?

GROGAN: Yes, I think that's the pawn slip that either I attached with my report or she showed me that day.

GERAGOS: Okay. Thank you. I have no further questions.

JUDGE: Ms. Fladager.

GERAGOS: And just for the record that was Defendant's Exhibit N.

Cross Examination by Birgit Fladager

FLADAGER: Detective Grogan, during the early part of this investigation, the later part of December and the early part of January, you had a lot of dealings with various members of the Rocha family, is that correct?

GROGAN: Yes.

FLADAGER: And did you also have dealings with friends of the Rocha family?

GROGAN: Yes.

FLADAGER: Was it important to you to deal with these people in a gingerly fashion given what they were currently experiencing?

GROGAN: Yes.

FLADAGER: Did you attempt to push them hard to make them remember things when you were talking to them at that time period?

GROGAN: Not, not generally. Maybe if there was a specific issue that I need to find out about I would, I would certainly try to get that information.

FLADAGER: During that time period, during your, while you were doing this investigation were you cognizant of the fact that this family did not want to believe that Laci Peterson had been murdered?

GERAGOS: Objection, objection, calls for speculation.

JUDGE: No, I'll overrule it.

GROGAN: I'm sorry, your question again, please.

FLADAGER: While you were doing this investigation in late December and early January and you're dealing with the Rocha family and their close friends, were you mindful of the fact in your dealings with them that they did not want to believe that Laci Peterson had been murdered?

GROGAN: Yes.

FLADAGER: As an experienced investigator, were you aware that that was a possibility?

GROGAN: Yes.

FLADAGER: Were you aware that these friends and family were trying to rally and be close together?

GROGAN: Yes.

FLADAGER: And did it appear to you that they did not, certainly did not want to suspect that Scott Peterson had anything to do with Laci Peterson's disappearance?

GROGAN: That's the way it appeared, yes.

FLADAGER: That they were trying to shore each other up?

GROGAN: Yes.

FLADAGER: Protect each other?

GERAGOS: Well, there would be an objection.

JUDGE: Sustained. That's, that's argument. What does that mean? Vague.

GERAGOS: It's all argumentative.

FLADAGER: During these various phone calls and in-person conversations that you had with Sharon Rocha between December 29th and about January 20th did you ask her on each and every one of those occasions to go back in her mind and review exactly what happened on December 24th?

GROGAN: No.

FLADAGER: Were you dealing with other issues with her?

GROGAN: Yes, some of those she's calling to give me information about leads and that's where,

FLADAGER: By the time the existence of Amber Frey became well known and the parents were aware of it, did you think perhaps that might have an impact on memories of the family members involved?

GROGAN: The time frame between when it happened and a month later or so when Amber Frey was known to the family, that's your question?

FLADAGER: Yes.

GROGAN: Yeah, it's possible the time frame may have some effect on their memories. It is a significant day so people will tend to remember that a little bit better than something that happened that was innocuous.

FLADAGER: More reason for asking the family friends once they became aware of Amber Frey to go back and, well, let me ask you this: What is it exactly that you wanted the family to do once they became aware of Amber Frey?

GROGAN: Well, what I had asked Sharon to do was to tell me any behaviors that she had noted in Mr. Peterson that she thought was odd or unusual.

FLADAGER: And these behaviors, you wanted to know the behaviors starting December 24th or were you focusing on starting January 14th or 15th, what did you mean "both"?

GROGAN: Well,

GERAGOS: Compound.

JUDGE: It is compound. Sustained.

FLADAGER: What exactly were you trying, what time period were you trying to get from her?

GROGAN: I don't know if I gave a specific time period, but I was talking about mostly going backward from that date, even, maybe even before Laci disappeared.

FLADAGER: And why did you ask that question?

GROGAN: Well, the family was very supportive of Scott, both families were initially, and that information did cause them to question what his actions may have been in this so they may have told me more things at that point then they would have told me at a time when they were in full support of Mr. Peterson.

FLADAGER: On January 28th when you had this conversation with Ms. Rocha, she called you on the telephone?

JUDGE: Amy Rocha?

FLADAGER: Sharon Rocha

JUDGE: You said Ms. Rocha.

FLADAGER: Sharon Rocha on January 28th, do you recall that phone conversation?

GROGAN: Yes. I don't remember who initiated that. I think she called me.

FLADAGER: Do you have that report in front of you? If not, I'll show you a copy.

GROGAN: I don't have it in front of me, but I can look it up.

FLADAGER: Let me bring it to you. Just take a look at those first three paragraphs.

GROGAN: Okay. Go ahead.

FLADAGER: In that phone conversation with Sharon Rocha, did she tell you that she had been thinking about the first telephone calls that occurred on December 24th between her and Scott Peterson?

GROGAN: Yes.

FLADAGER: Did she tell you that the first call she received from Scott was at 5:15 p.m.?

GROGAN: Yes.

FLADAGER: Did she tell you Scott said, Hi, mom, is Laci there? Sharon said no. And Scott told Sharon if Laci calls the house and McKenzie is in the backyard with the leash on and Laci is missing?

GROGAN: That's what she said, yes.

FLADAGER: And did she then say that she told Scott to call their friends to see if any of their friends had seen Laci and then call her back?

GROGAN: Yes.

FLADAGER: And then Sharon said when she got off the phone she went and told Ron Laci's missing?

GROGAN: That's correct.

FLADAGER: Sharon said she was certain that Scott said Laci's missing in the first phone call and that she repeated it to Ron after the first phone call, is that what she said?

GROGAN: That's what she said.

FLADAGER: And then she said that Scott did not sound panicked, however, Sharon said she felt something was wrong immediately after that first phone call?

GROGAN: That's what it says, yes.

FLADAGER: And are you aware of Ron Grantski's phone call to 911?

GROGAN: Yes, I listened to it.

FLADAGER: Did he use the phrase "we've been told that Laci's missing, our daughter's missing?

GROGAN: Yeah, he says, he certainly says "missing" in there.

FLADAGER: The other individuals that Mr. Geragos asked you about, the other family and friends who contacted you throughout, actually, these other folks he listed, Sandy Rickard, Patti Amador, Susan Aquino, Rose and Brent Rocha, are these people you had contact with throughout the course of this investigation?

GROGAN: Yes, some more than others.

FLADAGER: And during the first, say, three to six months of this case being investigated by you, did you get additional information from lots of people that had previously been interviewed?

GROGAN: Yes.

FLADAGER: Is that common during an investigation?

GROGAN: Yes, it is. And maybe more so in this one because it's such a long time period that where things are going on between the event, Laci's disappearance and the arrest where people can still have contact with Mr. Peterson.

FLADAGER: So some of the information that you were getting from some of these people was information that was new, that had just happened recently that had happened subsequent to Laci's disappearance, is that right?

GROGAN: I'm sorry, I got lost in your question.

FLADAGER: Okay. I'll try again. Some of the information that you were receiving from these people was essentially new information, is that right?

GROGAN: Some of it was, yes.

FLADAGER: And some of it was information that they were reporting to you saying, you know what, I didn't say this before, but I've been thinking about it and this is perhaps strange in retrospect?

GROGAN: Yes, some, some occasions.

FLADAGER: No further questions.

Redirect Examination by Mark Geragos

GERAGOS: Yeah, a lot of the information that you got where people had these new memories turned out to be just false, didn't it?

GROGAN: I can't specifically think of an incident where that's happened, but it probably has.

GERAGOS: How about Harvey Kemple talking about the golf course. The, whatever the name of that golf course is, testified here that six months later he had this epiphany basically, did you guys send somebody out to the country club to check out what he said?

GROGAN: About, yeah, there was a statement about Scott golfing there or something to that effect, is that right?

GERAGOS: Right. And then he mentioned somebody by the name of Stephanie or something like that so you send somebody out there to check up on this information, right?

GROGAN: That's correct.

GERAGOS: It turns out it was his long time friend, Mr. Tobin, who he's known since third grade, right?

GROGAN: That was one of the people that was contacted and I don't think there was a Stephanie that we could find.

GERAGOS: Right. So the name Stephanie that Harvey Kemple testified to this jury at the country club that would back up his memory, there was no Stephanie that even worked at the country club, correct?

GROGAN: There's no Stephanie that works there.

GERAGOS: And the guy that he'd grown up with since grade school told him said, no, Scott wasn't over here golfing, right?

GROGAN: Yeah, he said that he wasn't aware of that.

GERAGOS: Okay. You know, we've heard about the, what is her name, Debbie Wolski, who was the yoga instructor, she's one of these ones who came up with new information, correct?

GROGAN: She did, yes.

GERAGOS: Okay. When you went to check it out we find out here in the middle of trial that some of that stuff's substantially wrong, demonstrably wrong, isn't it?

FLADAGER: Objection, argumentative.

JUDGE: Overruled. Maybe demonstrably is the wrong word, but erroneous.

GERAGOS: Yeah, a little bit erroneous. You were sitting here in the courtroom we stipulated to some of the stuff that she said was wrong.

GROGAN: That's correct. Something that she said that she told the district attorney's office.

GERAGOS: Okay. The, and that would not be, and, frankly, it's not unusual, is it, in a situation where somebody gets caught up in a very emotional situation that all of a sudden a memory may get, I don't want to say clouded, but the memories may be inaccurate, isn't that a fair statement?

GROGAN: That's a fair statement.

GERAGOS: Okay. And that's part of the problem with this case is that emotions were running so high that you never know whether or not you're getting an accurate statement, isn't that correct?

GROGAN: That's, that's true. You need to try to corroborate the information that comes in.

GERAGOS: Right. So that's why when I was showing you, for instance, the transcripts from NBC where Sharon is saying that Scott had panic in his voice and that she knew immediately Laci was missing. That would tend to at least corroborate that maybe the memory had been clouded a little bit after the information of Amber Frey, isn't that correct?

GROGAN: That's something that you'd have to consider as a possibility. I don't, I don't know if that's the case in that particular instance or not.

GERAGOS: Okay. And basically there's emotions were running quite high, and still to some degree do, in Modesto about this case, isn't that correct?

FLADAGER: Objection, relevance.

GERAGOS: Goes to, I'm laying it as foundation.

JUDGE: Well, you're talking about Modesto. That's a big city so I'm going to sustain the objection.

GERAGOS: Well, the Court did take judicial notice of the fact that there was a change of venue granted because of that.

JUDGE: Change of venue. You can answer.

GERAGOS: You know that there was a change of venue granted by the local judge there specifically because of he didn't believe that anybody could get, especially Scott Peterson get a fair trial there, correct?

GROGAN: Yes, I'm very aware of it. I've been living here since February.

GERAGOS: And one of the reasons we're here is because there is a, there's a high degree of emotion and prejudice against my client in that city and in that county, correct?

FLADAGER: Objection, argumentative and speculation.

JUDGE: Sustained.

GERAGOS: You're aware of that there are people who come up and I mean you had testified before that there's been 10,000 tips in this case roughly, correct?

GROGAN: Yes, over that.

GERAGOS: And many of those tips are people just doing their damnedest to come up with something, some kind of evidence ore suggestion about Scott Peterson, isn't that correct?

GROGAN: Some of those tips that's the case.

GERAGOS: In fact most of the tips that we're getting now, or at least I'm getting from your office that come through discovery all revolve around that, isn't that correct?

GROGAN: I, I don't know, Mr. Geragos. I'm still not reviewing those tips as they come in. Someone else does that. I wouldn't be able to tell you what most of them say or do.

GERAGOS: Okay. Unfortunately, I do. One of the things that I think after it became apparent that Amber Frey was around on January 15th or 16th, there was a burglary of Scott's house within a couple of days, correct?

GROGAN: Yes.

GERAGOS: Sometime that evening?

GROGAN: Yes.

GERAGOS: And didn't three of Laci's friends, close friends of Laci and Scott's come over that same evening and also screaming and yelling at Scott at that point?

FLADAGER: Objection, relevance.

JUDGE: Sustained.

GERAGOS: Okay. Were you aware of death threats against Scott?

FLADAGER: Objection, relevance.

JUDGE: Sustained.

GERAGOS: Were you aware of the shock jocks on the front lawn screaming at him and calling him a murderer?

GROGAN: Yes, I'm aware of that.

GERAGOS: Thank you. I have no further questions.

Recross Examination by Birgit Fladager

FLADAGER: Detective Grogan, Mr. Geragos brought up Debbie Wolski. And when you talked about statements that she made that it's important to corroborate. Didn't Debbie Wolski draw very clear, precise drawings of the various jewelry that she saw Laci Peterson wearing?

GROGAN: She drew, when we were talking, a ring that she seen Laci wearing, which, I believe, was her grandmother's wedding ring. And it matches, that drawing does match the ring itself or photographs of the rings that were held by Edward's Jewelers.

FLADAGER: And regardless of where Mr. Kemple may have gotten his information, didn't you confirm that Scott Peterson actually was going to the country club in the early January time frame?

GROGAN: Yes, he was.

FLADAGER: And didn't you become aware even that there were people, as Mr. Geragos might suggest, that there were people at the country club that he was very much aware that he was going there?

GROGAN: I know that there's, there's indications that he's gone there through surveillance and I can't recall who said he was at the, at the golf course during that time, but I think there is a statement like that.

FLADAGER: A statement, do you know a person by the name of Duncan Reno or Reno Duncan who works at the country club?

GROGAN: I don't know him.

FLADAGER: Okay. Are you aware of that there's a manager or somebody that works at the country club?

GROGAN: Yes.

FLADAGER: And did you receive information through this investigation that there were folks that were complaining about the fact that Scott Peterson was at the county club in January?

GROGAN: Yes, I think I read a report somewhere.

GERAGOS: Objection as to relevance. I don't have any problem with this as long as I can get into all the other complaints that people in Modesto have about him.

JUDGE: Well, I'm going to sustain the objection.

FLADAGER: All right. I have no further questions.

2nd Redirect Examination by Mark Geragos

GERAGOS: The one time that he was at the country club surveilled he was there for 30 to 45 minutes, correct, at 5:15 in the evening, correct?

GROGAN: No, I thought there was more than one occasion, but I could be wrong about that, sir, I don't know.

JUDGE: Anything about that one visit?

FLADAGER: No.