

17A104268

Case # 17A104268 and 16HF06535
SUPPLEMENTAL AFFIDAVIT
STATE OF VERMONT
WINDSOR COUNTY, ss.

NOW COMES Trooper Adam Marchand, affiant(s), being duly sworn and on oath, deposes and says that:

1. I am a full time Law Enforcement Officer certified by the Vermont Criminal Justice Training Council in May of 2007. I am employed by the Dept. of Public Safety as a Vermont State Trooper assigned to the Williston Barracks.
2. On 9/18/17 at approximately 1012 hours, VSP dispatch received a report from [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]). She reported that a new tenant named [REDACTED] paid the security deposit in silver coins and [REDACTED] was concerned they may be stolen.
3. I later spoke with the complainant over the phone, and verbally identified her as [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]). [REDACTED] advised that she/they rent to a [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] paid the security deposit in brand new silver coins, which were in plastic containers. [REDACTED] thought that [REDACTED] first name was possibly [REDACTED]. She estimated that he was in his mid 30's. [REDACTED] said that there were 7 containers. [REDACTED] accepted the coins as a deposit. She wasn't sure what the value of them were, but she advised that someone checked and they were possibly worth \$1,500 \$1,800.
4. [REDACTED] had done a reference check and [REDACTED] had some type of involvement in a burglary case, possible location in Hartland or Tunbridge or that area. This was in May or around that time.
5. [REDACTED] advised that [REDACTED] was asked where he got the coins, and he looked uncomfortable and said he got them from some guy who owed him money. [REDACTED] did not know the name of this person.
6. [REDACTED] and I agreed to meet on 9/19/17 to take a look at the coins.
7. I noted in my investigation that there were a few cases involving a [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]). The case numbers were 17B201313 (VSP Royalton) and 16HF06535.
8. On 9/18/17, I called the Hartford, VT Police and referenced case number 16HF06535. I ended up speaking with Hartford Officer Keeling. Keeling had also recently spoken with [REDACTED] I learned that a [REDACTED] [REDACTED] was the suspect they had. The case was a theft of year 2015 silver dollars that they were investigating. Keeling advised that [REDACTED] also does go by [REDACTED]
9. On 9/19/17 I met with [REDACTED] at the Williston State Police Barracks. She provided the coins. They were in 7 plastic sleeves with black tape covering the openings, and the 7 plastic sleeves were in a larger plastic bucket. [REDACTED] advised that the bucket is what [REDACTED] provided them in. I later examined the coins and found that there were 175 one ounce, fine silver dollar coins, year 2015. One ounce, fine silver dollar was written on each coin, along with the year of 2015. I placed the coins into the temporary property room on 9/19/17 at approximately 1007 hours while I responded to another call for service. I took them out at approximately 1054 hours to process them. After processing them I entered

them into the FileonQ evidence system and secured them in evidence locker number 8 on 9/19/17 at approximately 1221 hours.

10. [REDACTED] also provided a sworn, written statement, which I provided to Officer Keeling. [REDACTED] also stated that there were welding tools, carpentry tools, and bicycles on the premises. [REDACTED] also advised that [REDACTED] had a nice black pickup truck. Officer Keeling told me that they had nothing else reported stolen.

11. I showed [REDACTED] the Vermont DMV photo of [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]), and she instantly identified him as who she knows as [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] confirmed the spelling of [REDACTED]. The photo I showed her did not have his name on it.

12. I communicated with Officer Keeling, who advised that [REDACTED] can now be arrested for Grand Larceny.

13. On 9/21/17, SGT Warner and I went to the location in Charlotte to find [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Greenbush Road. We were unsuccessful at that time. Later that afternoon, [REDACTED] called and said that [REDACTED] was there. SGT Lucas and I traveled back to the location. I knocked on the door to the building where [REDACTED] advised [REDACTED] lives. [REDACTED] eventually came to the door. I recognized him as [REDACTED] from his Vermont DMV photo. I asked to come in and talk with him. He asked what it was about, and I said it was a case that involved him. He said he needed more information. He was very hesitant to let me in or come out and talk to me. He was standing with the door open but he was inside the threshold. I said I just wanted to talk to him. He said that he thought he needed to speak to someone about this. I said he must know what this is about. [REDACTED] said he didn't know but didn't want to be present here by himself. He was still hesitant about letting me inside while he called someone. I told him can I break this to him now, and I asked/directed him to come outside so I could explain what was going on. He came outside on his own. I told him Hartford Police, Officer Keeling, this ring a bell? [REDACTED] said yes. I took [REDACTED] into custody for Grand Larceny. Prior to this we did not discuss details of his case. Once [REDACTED] was handcuffed, I followed him inside to get shoes. I also asked/directed him to find some ID. He eventually showed me to his wallet on the table. From the wallet I retrieved his photo US Passport card, which identified him as [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. After initially handcuffing him behind his back, I used SGT Lucas' transport belt which allowed [REDACTED] hands to be in front. [REDACTED] advised that the handcuffs felt fine (not uncomfortable).

14. I transported [REDACTED] to Montpelier and met with Officer Keeling, where I there transferred custody of [REDACTED] to him.

17A104535

VSP received a call from [REDACTED] [REDACTED] regarding [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] reported [REDACTED] was in violation of the lease that they had and that he was also in violation of COR. A check revealed that COR's were not violated at this time due to a technical error of only [REDACTED] first name appearing on the order. This was identified to the Windsor County SA's office. [REDACTED] was made aware that VSP could not take enforcement action on a civil (Lease) issue and that she would need to address this in civil court if she felt damages were due.

[REDACTED] was spoken to about the allegations.

No Further action taken at this point.

17A104581 (13:23:35 10/06/17)

On the above date and time, I was advised of a report of a possible violation of conditions of release incident in Charlotte, VT. I was advised [REDACTED] (DOB) called to report that her tenant, [REDACTED] (DOB) has violated his conditions of release by contacting her and harrasing her. It should be noted that there is an ongoing issue between these two parties, which stems from [REDACTED] being a witness to a criminal case against [REDACTED] in Windham County. It should also be noted that [REDACTED] does not want [REDACTED] as a tenant any longer due to this issue and is trying to get [REDACTED] removed from his residence on their property. This issue is quickly tying up valuable resources over what is mainly a civil issue concerning eviction/residency.

In speaking with [REDACTED] by telephone, she indicated that [REDACTED] had purchased a truck, but had not registered it, and has parked the vehicle in a spot that the lease agreement states it cannot be. [REDACTED] asked if the vehicle could be towed. [REDACTED] advised that she had sent [REDACTED] emails advising the vehicle needed to be moved. [REDACTED] further advised that she believed [REDACTED] has violated his conditions of release by coming to her place of business and was harrasing her. Whwn I asked [REDACTED] to describe how she thought he was harrasing her, she advised that [REDACTED] came to ask her to clarify the issue with his truck and that he was agitated and animated. I asked if [REDACTED] threatened her in anyway and she said no. I advised her this was not a violation of his conditions and that this would not be considered harrassment.

[REDACTED] asked if she could have [REDACTED] truck towed since it was parked where it was not supposed to be on the property. I advised her that she could but that this again was a civil issue and the tow would not be at the direction of the Vermont State Police.

After getting of the phone with [REDACTED] I drove to [REDACTED] Greenbush Rd. to get a better understanding of the property, to include where [REDACTED] was living and where he had parked the truck in question. Upon arrival, I met with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] advised that [REDACTED] had moved the truck and indicated it was fine where it was currently parked. [REDACTED] advised that he has tried to be a mediator between [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] when it was appropriate. [REDACTED] also indicated that he and [REDACTED] had gone to court and started the eviction process. [REDACTED] advised he believed that [REDACTED] would have to move out by the beginning of November at the latest. I was unable to speak with [REDACTED] as he had left the property prior to my arrival.

Case closed.

Court record: 119756

Generated 10/06/2017 at 01:41 PM

Doc_id: 119756

32. You shall not discuss the pending case with [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

17A104610

Service of New Conditions of Release on [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Conditions sent back to HPD as well as Windsor Co SA for filing. NFA

VERMONT STATE POLICE / CORPORAL MARK MAGNANT / 17A104610 / NARRATIVE

On 10/08/17 this trooper served Corrected Conditions of Release on [REDACTED] [REDACTED] at [REDACTED] Greenbush Road in the Town of Charlotte. The COR were dated 10/04/2017 and were signed by Judge Tomasi. These conditions were served at the request of SGT Robert Lucas. [REDACTED] was house sitting at this location. [REDACTED] signed for and was presented a copy of the COR. The original COR were relayed and handed to Trooper Thomas Howard who in turn relayed the COR to SGT Robert Lucas at the Williston Barracks.

That ended this trooper's involvement.

No further action.

###

17A104859

On October 22, 2017 at approximately 0800 dispatch advised me of a citizen dispute reported by [REDACTED] (DOB: [REDACTED]) of [REDACTED] Greenbush Road, Charlotte VT. Initial case information was as follows:

"911 shel agent 20 [REDACTED] Charlotte [REDACTED] [REDACTED] DOB: [REDACTED] callback: [REDACTED] // out on conditional release charge with grand larceny one of his conditions is that he may not be within 300 feet of her or abuse or harrass her. his name is [REDACTED] [REDACTED] DOB?? male is in the kitchen on the main floor Male has been within 300 feet of her and told female to call the police.

08:07:44 10/22/2017 Helfant, Nikia

911 shel agent 336 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] on 21 [REDACTED] DOB: [REDACTED] callback [REDACTED] he said his landlord is in his room and knocking stuff over and filming him."

While responding I asked dispatch to check conditions for [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (DOB: [REDACTED]) Dispatch uploaded the follow conditions into the case pertaining to the complaint:

14. You must NOT have contact with [REDACTED], [REDACTED] This includes in person, in writing, by telephone, by e mail or through a third person.
32. You shall not discuss the pending case with [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
33. You shall not be within 300 feet of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] her residence, her place of employment and her motor vehicle.

Upon my arrival, I met with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] in her driveway with her brother [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] first asked me if I knew anything about this case. Apparently other Troopers had assisted the parties with ongoing issues. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] went on to advise me that [REDACTED] is a tenant occupying a room with a lease that is very clear that the property is a "community center". [REDACTED] [REDACTED] advised that she was having a "community event" today, October 22, 2017 with numerous people coming over. [REDACTED] went on and advised there was one room on the upper level that is [REDACTED] "living premissis". [REDACTED] [REDACTED] also advised there is ingress and egress going up and down the stairs for [REDACTED] to get to his room.

I asked [REDACTED] if she also lived at the property. [REDACTED] advised she [REDACTED]. I established that the location was not [REDACTED] formal residence and learned she lived [REDACTED]. I then asked [REDACTED] if she went there. [REDACTED] stated "yes" due to an event at 9am. I then advised [REDACTED] that she put herself within 300' of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] stated "yeah".

[REDACTED] went back to stating that she was having a "community event, in the community house" and that [REDACTED] occupies one room in the house. [REDACTED] advised that she does have a lease agreement with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] advised she was in the formal eviction process with [REDACTED] and that he had been served notice of eviction. [REDACTED] then advised me that there are "common areas" in the lease that [REDACTED] can access when they are not having an event. [REDACTED] advised that 4 days prior, on October 18th they provided [REDACTED] notice that they were having the event that would occupy the whole main floor (to include the kitchen area which is a common space for [REDACTED] and on his lease agreement). [REDACTED] advised me that her air B&B on the south side of the house had nothing to do with the rest of the house and that it's locked.

On October 22, 2017 at approximately 1135 hours dispatch advised me that [REDACTED] [REDACTED] was on the phone and that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] took his property. I spoke with [REDACTED] who advised me that the [REDACTED] took a couple spatulas and plates from the common area. I advised [REDACTED] that they just had an event, a brunch, and maybe the spatula's and plates were dirty and they were going to clean them vs. leaving them there. [REDACTED] advised that was a possibility. [REDACTED] also advised me that while in the driveway [REDACTED] [REDACTED] gave him some paperwork, invaded his person space in and aggressive manner, and said "I'll do a lot more than that" while they were discussing the paperwork. [REDACTED] felt the statement, which a neighbor named [REDACTED] witnessed, was threatening. I advised [REDACTED] that the statement was not a criminal threat but that I would forward that incident to the S.A. as well for review on possible D.C. charges.

On October 25, 2017 I received [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] statements at the barracks. Lt. Lucas advised that I hold off on submitting this case to be reviewed for possible VCR charges as it is unclear if [REDACTED] [REDACTED] has even been issued the updated conditions. Lt. Lucas is coordinating with Windsor County S.A. Office Ward Goodenough to see if [REDACTED] conditions were actually served. [REDACTED] claimed he has not checked his mail and has not received any updated condntions.

On October 28, 2017 I spoke with witness [REDACTED]. While speaking to [REDACTED] (independent witness) he advised me that [REDACTED] [REDACTED] was attempting to serve [REDACTED] [REDACTED] eviction paperwork which [REDACTED] [REDACTED] refused to accept or sign. [REDACTED] went on to advise that he observed [REDACTED] come on strong in and aggressive tone with [REDACTED] concernig various issues. [REDACTED] further advised that he saw both [REDACTED] [REDACTED] get into [REDACTED] personal space and vice versa. [REDACTED] claimed that [REDACTED] was chasing him at one point and that [REDACTED] witnessed this. I asked [REDACTED] about this. [REDACTED] advised he did not see [REDACTED] chasing [REDACTED]

While speaking to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] on October 28, 2017 he asked me if the State Police could take his \$40 in back rent and give it to his landlord [REDACTED]. I advised [REDACTED] that he would need to go through his attorney and the State Police are not responsible for transferring rent funds from a tenant to a landlord.

I will be standing by until I hear further from Lt. Lucas on this ambiguous case.

On October 31, 2017 I learned that [REDACTED] was served his updated conditions of release from Windsor County Superior Court. Based on the conditions not being in effect on October 22, 2017 when [REDACTED] filed her complaint about a VCR violation, there will be no criminal charges.

From: Leise, Andrew

Sent: Wednesday, November 1, 2017 10:24 AM

To: [REDACTED] [REDACTED] IN VERMONT' <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Case# 17A104859 Conditions Complaint 10/22/17

Hello [REDACTED]

I just wanted to take a moment and close the loop with you regarding your complaint from 10/22/17. This was one of the original cases you filed and the day of your event. I came down to meet with you and [REDACTED] in person. Your complaint involved [REDACTED] violating his updated conditions. You both also provided sworn statements which we have on file at the barracks.

In checking with court, the updated conditions had never been served by them and [REDACTED] never received them. The "updated conditions" were served the other day by one of our Troopers and are now in effect. As those conditions were not in effect on October 22nd, there will be no criminal charges stemming from that incident.

That specific case is considered closed.

Respectfully,
Andy

Dear Andy,

Thank you very much for closing the loop on this. We understand and we do appreciate all of the excellent work you are doing. We are very sorry to be contributing to your work load. We hope that our newest statements will help facilitate some enforceable actions with [REDACTED]. In the meantime, we have decided to stop our business activities at the [REDACTED] until he is under control. We will have to continue to go there to inspect the premises from time to time, but will not hold any more events or exhibits until he is gone.

Thank you again,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Greenbush Road

Charlotte, Vermont 05445

Website: [REDACTED]

Like us on Facebook! [https://www.facebook.com/\[REDACTED\]](https://www.facebook.com/[REDACTED])

Mobile: [REDACTED]

Case Closed

AWL 10/28/17

E mail to Troops/ A1 Supervisors:

All,

Today I spent over an hour at [REDACTED] rental/air b&b/event property located at [REDACTED] in Charlotte after she called to complain her tenant [REDACTED] was violating conditions of release. Long and short of it is she has a tenant [REDACTED] (DOB: [REDACTED]) that she is in the process of evicting. [REDACTED] still has a right to his rental per his lease. [REDACTED] has conditions that he not:

14. You must NOT have contact with [REDACTED], [REDACTED]. This includes in person, in writing, by telephone, by e mail or through a third person.
32. You shall not discuss the pending case with [REDACTED].
33. You shall not be within 300 feet of [REDACTED] her residence, her place of employment and her motor vehicle.

█████ reported that the downstairs portion of the event venue is her "workplace". She feels that █████ being downstairs is a violation of the conditions. Only issue is, the kitchen which █████ has a right to in his lease is downstairs as well as ingress and egress points. It should be noted that the event venue also sits on █████ █████ which she also considers her "workplace". █████ █████ so this is not her residence.

Today, █████ went to the event property where █████ also lives as she was having 15 20 clients over who paid to rent out the bottom half of the building. Problem is, the kitchen area where she was going to have "brunch" for her clients is also downstairs where █████ has a right to in the lease. Today █████ was cooperative, and to mediate the issue, agreed to move his belongings out of the kitchen and hall (ingress/egress) point so █████ could have her clients over at 0900 am sharp. She was adamant they would be there at 0900 and was being pushy. The first 2 clients didn't show up until 0930 hours. Based on that, I question her honesty.

I spoke to █████ about how this was all very ambiguous and I was perplexed that the court would even issue conditions for this scenario. The case was mediated today after an hour+ of VSP resources and intervention. I will be sending my case to the S.A. for review to ascertain if this is civil vs. criminal. I feel it's civil.

If anyone has to go down be prepared. This may be a good case for a A1 supervisor to look into and consult the court as to why they set these ambiguous conditions based on the situation at this property.

Corporal Andrew W. Leise
Vermont State Police
Williston Barracks
2777 St. George Road
Williston, VT 05495
1 802 878 7111
andrew.leise@vermont.gov

17A104867

On 10/23/17, VSP Williston received a call from [REDACTED] [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] Greenbush Rd in Charlotte, reporting that he had just been walked in on by his landlord [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] stated that he had just gotten out of the shower and half naked in the kitchen when [REDACTED] walked into the shared kitchen with another person, took a water from the refrigerator and then went into a meeting room off the kitchen.

[REDACTED] stated that he felt this was a violation of their lease and that VSP needs to do something about this.

[REDACTED] was advised a lease violation was technically a civil issue and there was not much VSP could do about this. I advised [REDACTED] that since the kitchen was a common area for technically all the residents that he should avoid the embarrassment by being dressed. I informed him that I would have a discussion with [REDACTED] but as far as a law violation, there was none.

In speaking with [REDACTED] she advised she had gone into the common area ([REDACTED]) and did not intentionally make contact with [REDACTED] as they are not suppose to have contact according to the conditions of release on [REDACTED] I advised [REDACTED] that she should not put herself into these types of situations and that while [REDACTED], after hours visits may warrant a bit of notice as [REDACTED] was clearly not expecting her that evening.

End Report

17A104889

I responded to [REDACTED] in the town of Charlotte for a welfare check. Upon arrival, I found the residence to be secure and no one was at the residence. I informed dispatch to call the complainant and inform them of my findings.

Case closed

434

17A104939

Report by Trooper Bradley Miller:

On 10/27/2017 at approximately 1234 hours, Vermont State Police received a report from [REDACTED] [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) stating that his landlord, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED], had entered his residence and "trashed" the apartment.

I arrived on scene and spoke with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] showed me the kitchen/dinning room area and said that [REDACTED] had removed all the furniture and put it in a different room that was locked. [REDACTED] stated that the furniture was owned by [REDACTED] [REDACTED] further stated that the dinning room was not a common area but everyone else considered it to be and that [REDACTED] considers it a business area where she hold events.

The property that [REDACTED] said was trashed was the items that were previously on the moved furniture. The items were not damaged but placed on the counter.

[REDACTED] then went over to a door that entered the side room where the furniture was placed. [REDACTED] opened the door with no issue. I then noticed that the door frame was damaged and appeared to be recent. [REDACTED] admitted that he pulled the door and broke the frame. [REDACTED] said he could repair the door and make it look like new again. I advised him I would still have to document the damage.

[REDACTED] then stated that [REDACTED] had removed his property from the residence. There was a notice on the kitchen door that the property would be removed if it was not done by [REDACTED] There was also an email sent to [REDACTED] stated that he doesnt read email from [REDACTED] and he wasn't home to read the notice therefore it was illegal for [REDACTED] to do. I informed [REDACTED] it was a civil issue.

I was able to read the notice that was on the kitchen door and the email that [REDACTED] also forwarded to Lt. Robert Lucas. The email stated that based on the lease between the two parties, [REDACTED] was able to remove the property from common areas. [REDACTED] provided photographs of the property moved and photographs of the property in the storage locker.

I infomred [REDACTED] that the issues he was expiencing were civil issues and he should speak with his attorney about them.

A case update was sent in an barracks wide email.

Case closed.
Miller/229

E mail from Leise:
From: Leise, Andrew
Sent: Saturday, October 28, 2017 1:26 PM
To: Miller, Bradley <Bradley.Miller@vermont.gov>
Cc: Lucas, Robert J <Robert.J.Lucas@vermont.gov>
Subject: [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Boots

Hi Brad,

██████████ called today to report that his \$450 logging boots were taken from his apartment entryway yesterday. He feels that ██████████ took them. If you could add that to your case report from 10/27 and maybe follow up with ██████████

Thank you,
Andy

Corporal Andrew W. Leise
Vermont State Police
Williston Barracks
2777 St. George Road
Williston, VT 05495
1 802 878 7111
andrew.leise@vermont.gov

17A104973

On October 29, 2017 at approximately 1528 hours dispatch advised me by radio transmission of a theft complaint reported by [REDACTED] (DOB: [REDACTED]) of [REDACTED] Greenbush Rd. in Charlotte. There have been numerous recent complaints from both parties as they are involved in an ongoing landlord/tenant dispute.

I called [REDACTED] who advised me that sometime between 1700 hours on October 28, 2017 and 1430 hours on October 29, 2017 someone entered his apartment area which is also an event center owned by [REDACTED] and stole his trail camera. [REDACTED] described the camera as being a GSM Outdoor Stealthcam G Series TrailCam, Olive Green in color, and that the value was approximately \$109.95. [REDACTED] sent me the last 3 photos on the camera which were that of [REDACTED] as well as [REDACTED]. It should be noted that [REDACTED] had sent [REDACTED] notification of an event she was having in her "event center" at the same property and asked that everything be removed from it. [REDACTED] advised in her notifications to [REDACTED] that any property not removed would be placed into storage per their lease agreement.

I asked [REDACTED] if there was any evidence of forced entry. [REDACTED] advised there was not. [REDACTED] felt that his landlord [REDACTED] who has keys to the property, took the camera or moved it somewhere where he could no longer locate it.

It was reported on 10/28 by an independent witness [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] refused to accept eviction paperwork or sign documents concerning his eviction. This in turn aggravated [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].

An e mail was sent to [REDACTED] asking if she may have moved the camera or boots by mistake. The e mail also advised [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] was looking for a criminal investigation concerning his \$109.95 game camera and \$450 logging boots which went missing over the past 2 days as well. I received an e mail back from [REDACTED] who articulated that the property may have been stored in bins in storage per their lease agreement. This information was sent to [REDACTED] and he was advised to contact his landlord/tenant attorney.

On November 15, 2017 at approximately 1122 hours Sgt. Ravelin and I stopped to speak to [REDACTED] in person. While speaking to [REDACTED] inside his apartment area he had his reported stolen trail camera on his kitchen table. [REDACTED] advised me that he located the camera and forgot to call me.

In a stalking order issued to [REDACTED] she was ordered by the court to return [REDACTED] property which she secured and placed into storage. It is believed that [REDACTED] boots are in storage.

Active,
AWL 11/15/17

E mail to [REDACTED]

Hello [REDACTED]

■■■■ has called to report that his \$450 Logging boots and \$80 trail camera have been stolen. He advised that only you and ■■■■ have access to the event center/apartment via keys. He did not report any forced entry.

Just checking to see if those items could have been moved somewhere to the side while either your or ■■■■ were cleaning up the entryway of your event center. He is requesting a criminal investigation if they are not located.

Thank you for your continued assistance with this difficult landlord/tenant situation.

Andy

Corporal Andrew W. Leise
Vermont State Police
Williston Barracks
2777 St. George Road
Williston, VT 05495
1 802 878 7111
andrew.leise@vermont.gov

17A104974

On 10/29/2017 at approximately 1701 hrs [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (DOB [REDACTED]) called VSP Williston to report [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (DOB [REDACTED]) was in violation of his court ordered conditions of release.

I am familiar with both parties due to their below involvements:

9/17/17 Tpr. Marchand arrested [REDACTED] in connection with a Windsor County burglary. This was based of a report made by [REDACTED]

10/6/17 Sgt. Hammond responded to a report made by [REDACTED] accusing [REDACTED] of violating his conditions of release.

10/22/17 Cpl. Leise responded to a report made by [REDACTED] accusing [REDACTED] of violating his conditions of releas.

10/24/17 Lt. Lucas responded to a report made by [REDACTED] accusing [REDACTED] of taking items from a refrigerator.

10/27/17 Tpr. Miller responded to a report made by [REDACTED] accusing [REDACTED] of destroying property.

10/29/17 Cpl. Leise responded to a report made by [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] had seized personal items.

I spoke with [REDACTED] by phone at approximately 1801 hrs.

[REDACTED] advised she and her family own the property at [REDACTED] Greenbush Rd., Charlotte. The property is referred to as the "[REDACTED] [REDACTED]". It is a [REDACTED] with exhibits and seminars about [REDACTED] history, specifically related to [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] advised the [REDACTED] has several apartments and bedrooms, one of which is leased to [REDACTED] for \$10 per month.

In September, 2017 [REDACTED] contacted VSP after [REDACTED] paid his \$10 rent payment in what was suspected of being stolen coins. As a result of this report, [REDACTED] was charged with crimes related to a burglary in Windsor County, VT. As such, he was (reportedly) issued conditions of relaease. One of the conditions were that he not have contact with [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] advised a week prior to this incident, there was a function at the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] attended by several college aged females. [REDACTED] advsed [REDACTED] was naked and in a kitchen area. The kitchen area was described as being shared by other tenants.

[REDACTED] advised [REDACTED] had since been trying to "push boundaries". She advised she felt like he was trying to intimidate her.

She advised the [REDACTED] held an event on [REDACTED] in a bedroom on the ground floor. [REDACTED] living space was reportedly on the 3rd floor. [REDACTED] advised she had given [REDACTED] notice via email and posting it on his door not to attend or disrupt the event in the days ahead of it. [REDACTED] advied [REDACTED]

did show up, after being told not to. She advised he had to walk downstairs in order to show up at this event.

██████████ advised she walked into the event and saw ██████████ speaking with her ██████████. ██████████ advised she asked him to leave and he insisted she or they had his camera.

██████████ advised ██████████ had not reason to be in the event space, other than to cause problems.

After speaking with ██████████ I received a copy of ██████████ court ordered conditions of release. Pertinent conditions state that he is not allowed to have contact with ██████████ ██████████

I then received information from Lt. Robert Lucas indicating ██████████ was not formally served and had not signed for his conditions of release. Lt. Lucas mentioned an error where multiple sets of conditions of release were granted, causing confusion and a lack of clarity as to what the actual conditions were.

Lt. Lucas and I discussed the issue and both agreed ██████████ was likely aware of the current conditions, prohibiting contact with ██████████ but had also not been formally served them.

Tpr. Bradley Miller and I met with ██████████ at the ██████████ Greenbush Rd., Charlotte later in the evening of 10/29/17. He was upset that we were there roughly 5 hours after the incident occurred.

When asked about the events of the evening, he mentioned ██████████ was harassing him by taking his property and locking it up. He stated he could not perform duties related to his employment because she continually took items like boots and tools. He insinuated awareness that he should avoid her, however he needed these items to make money and eventually move out.

I advised ██████████ of the accusations made against him and that it was my interpretation he had not actually been served the most current conditions of release prohibiting him from contacting ██████████. I informed him I had no intentions of arresting him for a violation of his conditions, if he weren't actually served them in the first place. As such, I provided ██████████ with a copy of the latest set of conditions of release which were printed on 10/29/17 from VT courts online. He placed this with several stacks of other documents, on the floor in what seemed to be a common area/kitchen.

██████████ was advised to avoid ██████████

Based on the potential for ██████████ not being served the most current conditions of release there is insufficient evidence to support probable cause for a violation of conditions.

This case is considered a non criminal citizen dispute.

Sgt. William Warner
VSP, Williston

On 11/10/17 ██████████ sent an email to Lt. Robert Lucas regarding the ongoing dispute. In part of this email, ██████████ claimed I followed him upstairs and that Tpr. Miller "searched" every room of his home, checking behind doors, the refrigerator and in closets.

It should be mentioned I asked [REDACTED] if we could come inside. He granted permission. When he walked upstairs I asked him if we could come up and he again granted permission.

Tpr. Miller and I stood in a common area while [REDACTED] got dressed in another room. Tpr. Miller stood near me during the entire interaction. He did look around and observe the surroundings but did not search the entire residence.

On 11/7/17 another revised set of conditions of release for [REDACTED] were drafted.

In November, 2017 a protection order prohibiting [REDACTED] from contacting [REDACTED] was granted and later disposed by the courts.

Warner, 204

17A105043

Report by Trooper Bradley Miller:

On 11/2/2017 at approximately 2021 hours, Vermont State Police received a call from [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]) about an ongoing landlord tenant issue.

[REDACTED] stated that she went to check on the property and found the door between an Air B&B unit and [REDACTED] unit had the lock broken on it and was open. [REDACTED] stated that she had last been at the apartment a couple days prior and knew the door was locked. No one else has been to the Air B&B unit since and the only person with a key was her and [REDACTED] who had not been at the unit between these times.

[REDACTED] stated she thought that [REDACTED] had broken the door because of the ongoing issues with him breaking other locks in the Unit. [REDACTED] stated that nothing was missing out of the unit and there was no further damage.

I advised [REDACTED] this was a civil issue due to the Landlord Tenant relationship. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] was to be out of the residence within the coming week due to the beginning of the eviction process.

[REDACTED] called and left a voicemail and stated that the cost of the lock and service to replace the lock was \$250 over three different locks that had been replaced.

This case will be considered closed due to the civil nature.

Miller/229

17A105206

VERMONT STATE POLICE / CORPORAL MARK MAGNANT / 17A105206 / NARRATIVE

On 11/12/17 complainant [REDACTED] [REDACTED] DOB [REDACTED] called the State Police to report approximately ten (10) [REDACTED] posters were missing from the walls in the hallway of the exhibit room located at [REDACTED] Greenbush Road in Charlotte. [REDACTED] owns this property along with her brother [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

There has been an on going landlord/tenant civil dispute between [REDACTED] and Tenant [REDACTED] (aka [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] [REDACTED] as well as pending criminal charges on [REDACTED] for Grand Larceny (Windsor County).

[REDACTED] occupies a room in the same hallway where there are several exhibit rooms. The hallway is part of the exhibit hall according to [REDACTED]. The hallway is also permissible ingress and egress to [REDACTED] living quarters, as stipulated in the lease agreement and recently issued Court Conditions of Release (Windsor County) 11/07/17. The lease agreement terminated on 11/10/17, according to [REDACTED] (copy on file w/ 17A104990).

According to [REDACTED] the posters are considered part of the exhibit and are valued at #25 \$30 apiece. [REDACTED] advised that the posters were last known to be there on 10/31/17 at approximately 8:30 PM when Trooper James Fox stood by with her at that location to prevent any problems with [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] advised that she discovered the posters missing today, 11/12/17 at approximately 11:30 AM. [REDACTED] advised that there have been no events at the exhibit hall during the past two weeks.

I asked [REDACTED] to provide a detailed description/inventory of the items missing. [REDACTED] advised that she would do so. As of the date of this report (11/19/17) no inventory of these items has been received.

[REDACTED] advised that in addition to the posters (2) smoke detectors and (1) metal stand (approximately 3 3.5' H x 4 5' W), gray/tan in color, with 2 or 3 adjustable shelves inside remain missing as previously reported to this trooper. [REDACTED] suspects that this is retaliation by [REDACTED] who feels he was wronged by the [REDACTED] when they removed his property and placed it in storage, as per their prior notice & lease agreement (civil). A copy of the notice and lease agreement are on file with 17A104990.

[REDACTED] suspects that these items are in [REDACTED] living quarters. [REDACTED] advised that she is concerned that if they serve [REDACTED] with 48 hour notice to enter his apartment that these items, if there, will be gone.

I asked [REDACTED] who else had access to the apartment. [REDACTED] advised that the only people who have keyed access to the apartment are herself, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. I asked [REDACTED] if she had ever seen [REDACTED] with other people at his apartment before. [REDACTED] advised that she was aware of at least two other females that had been to his apartment. [REDACTED] advised that one of the females is named [REDACTED] but did not know the name of the second female.

[REDACTED] advised that [REDACTED] is not living there full time and uses a bicycle or borrows many different cars to get around.

I advised [REDACTED] that any attempt to get a search warrant for [REDACTED] living quarters would be based on circumstantial evidence, however, I informed [REDACTED] that I would discuss this with the on call State's Attorney and report back.

This trooper contacted on call Deputy State's Attorney (DSA) Susan Hardin. After advising Hardin of the circumstances in this case she advised that there was not enough in this case to apply for a search warrant. Hardin recommended that [REDACTED] install cameras to try to catch the individual in the act and/or pursue a No Stalking Order on [REDACTED]

This trooper contacted [REDACTED] and informed her of my communication with DSA Hardin and her recommendations. I informed [REDACTED] that the 48 hour notice appeared to be her only option at this time.

[REDACTED] continued to express concern about [REDACTED] retaliating against herself, her family and/or their property. She advised that she had spoken with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] identified as [REDACTED] [REDACTED] formerly of Tunbridge, Vermont and now living in California. According to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] advised that she believes [REDACTED] has [REDACTED] but had been unable to get him any help over the years. According to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] advised that she had to go through legal efforts to get [REDACTED] out of their house.

Information documented at this time. Case is closed pending new information.

No further action at this time.

###

From: [REDACTED] [REDACTED] IN VERMONT [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Sunday, November 12, 2017 1:08 PM
To: Magnant, Mark <Mark.Magnant@vermont.gov>
Subject: License plate number + [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Corporal Magnant,

Here is the license plate number of the vehicle that [REDACTED] was using last week and parking at the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] I also have a photo of the vehicle at the [REDACTED] if that is needed.

Meanwhile, I spoke recently on the phone with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] who is a [REDACTED] [REDACTED] in Tunbridge Vermont but who is presently residing in California. I called her in hopes that she would be able to offer [REDACTED] a home. She said she would not. Her phone number is: [REDACTED].

I will follow up with the other information you requested (listing of items missing) later today.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Greenbush Road
Charlotte, Vermont 05445

Website: [REDACTED]

Like us on Facebook! [https://www.facebook.com/\[REDACTED\]](https://www.facebook.com/[REDACTED])

Mobile: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

17A105218

Report of Sgt. Paul Ravelin,

On November 13th 2017 at approximately 1537 hours I served a Temporary Relief from Stalking order on [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (DOB [REDACTED]). The order was read to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and she signed it upon receipt. Cpl. Leise and I spent an additional hour and a half attempting to resolve the issues between [REDACTED] and the plaintiff who is also her tenant, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (DOB [REDACTED]). There have been numerous calls for service between the two parties. Most of the incidents have been a civil issue.

The order was faxed to Shelburne

No further action taken.

17A105263

VERMONT STATE POLICE / CORPORAL MARK MAGNANT / 17A105263 / NARRATIVE

On 11/15/17 a Temporary Order for Stalking or Sexual Assault was issued by The Chittenden Superior Court Civil Division on behalf of [REDACTED] aka [REDACTED] DOB [REDACTED] (RE: Docket No. 127 11 17 Cnsa). The defendant on the order is [REDACTED] DOB [REDACTED]. The order was issued by the Honorable Judge Robert A. Mello on 11/13/17. A hearing is scheduled in this matter on 11/29/17 at 08:30 a.m.

The above order was served by Sergeant Paul Ravelin, assisted by Corporal Andrew Leise, on 11/15/17 at 12:00 p.m. The order was signed by [REDACTED] but dated 11/14/17.

On 11/16/17 at 13:13 hours plaintiff [REDACTED] contacted the State Police regarding the following:

CALL INFORMATION:

[REDACTED] is not home now, available by cell at work [REDACTED]. Claiming that [REDACTED] is not meeting the conditions imposed on her in a RFA he obtained recently.

Shelburne PD is faxing a copy of the order to the barracks.

This trooper reviewed a copy of the order and associated paperwork, application, statements etc. prior to contacting [REDACTED]. This trooper then contacted [REDACTED] and learned that he wanted to report that [REDACTED] had not returned his property within 24 hours as specified by Sergeant Ravelin the day before. In reviewing the order I determined the following and issued an e mail for clarification to A1 Troopers and Supervisors:

From: VSP Williston Troopers [mailto:A1TROOP@LISTSERV.DPS.STATE.VT.US] On Behalf Of Magnant, Mark

Sent: Thursday, November 16, 2017 2:22 PM

To: DPS a1troop <a1troop@listserv.dps.state.vt.us>

Subject: [A1TROOP] CLARIFICATION RE: [REDACTED] / [REDACTED] protection order

A1 Troops & Supervisors

On 11/16/17 [REDACTED] called because [REDACTED] had not returned his property today as specified in the order. In reviewing the order and attached paperwork it appears that the return of property was only included in the application for the order but not in the order itself. Prior to calling [REDACTED] back I contacted the Civil Division of Superior Court to confirm that this was in fact the case. The court clerk confirmed that the order does NOT specify that [REDACTED] return [REDACTED] property. The court clerk advised that this will be determined at the time of the hearing on 11/29/17. She also advised that if [REDACTED] needs his property sooner that he can file a motion for modification of the order with the court. I contacted [REDACTED] and explained all of this to him. He understood and advised he would go back to court to file a request for modification. As a heads up...a new order may appear here at some point. Just FYI~

MM/238 (RE: 17A105263)

On 11/16/17 at approximately 15:30 hours Attorney [REDACTED], representing [REDACTED] [REDACTED] called for clarification on this same issue. I explained the information contained in this report to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] advised that the [REDACTED] are willing to return the property to [REDACTED] so long as it is removed to his new residence. I informed [REDACTED] that I was unaware [REDACTED] had a new residence, based on my previous conversation with him, however, could not rule out this possibility. [REDACTED] advised that she would follow up on this and if necessary contact [REDACTED] [REDACTED] about making said arrangements.

No further action at this time.

###

17A105340

The complainant [REDACTED] [REDACTED] DOB [REDACTED] is reporting that he came home after being away and discovered a recording device missing and his electricity was turned off in the kitchen. The complainant believes it is his landlord [REDACTED] [REDACTED] DOB [REDACTED] is over stepping her boundaries again. I requested [REDACTED] e mail me the incident and a detailed description of the recording device.

E MAIL [REDACTED] SIC)

Hello Cpl. Busby,
Here is my statement:

On 11/21/17, my Netgear Arlo Secuirty System camera and camera base station, serial #VMS3130 100NAS, were stolen from [REDACTED] Greenbush Road in Charlotte by [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. The camera was set up above the front door. It was mounted on the outside of the building and the base station was locked inside the house in the basement, where it could only be accessed by someone with a key to the house. At that time, only [REDACTED] [REDACTED] had a key, leading to the conclusion that [REDACTED] [REDACTED] is the person who stole my camera and base station. She did not give 24 hours notice before entering the premises, and did not have a court order to authorize removal of my property.

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

I spoke with [REDACTED] and requested that she e mail me in regards to her involvement with this incident.

Case is active pending e mails from both parties.

434 Busby

E MAIL [REDACTED] SIC)

Trooper Busby,

Please see the correspondence below between [REDACTED] and myself pertaining to the thrown fuse. Note that this was the first and only communication that I had from him on this topic. I went over this morning, accompanied by my neighbor, [REDACTED]. Upon entering, we found a deadbolt that had been installed yesterday afternoon broken off the door to the mudroom. We reset the fuses, [REDACTED] half naked, filmed us through the mudroom door as we exited.

Requests from him on the property management have been addressed promptly when he has raised the issues to us. This summer he mentioned a wasp infestation, it was addressed by the next day. However, after we turned the coins he provided us with as a damage deposit into the Williston barracks and he was charged with grand larceny, any complaint has by passed us and gone to the police or the town. He recently complained about the heat being off. He kept the building so hot that he'd go around in his underwear and shirtless. When I went to check, I found the thermostats destroyed and all but two radiators turned off. This pattern is oft repeated.

Thank you for attention,



17A105364

VERMONT STATE POLICE / CORPORAL MARK MAGNANT / 17A105364 / NARRATIVE

On 11/23/17 at approximately 11:32 hours complainant [REDACTED] [REDACTED] DOB [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] Greenbush Road in Charlotte called the State Police to report the following:

CALL INFORMATION:

[REDACTED] is calling OBO [REDACTED] who own the property at this location. Recently [REDACTED] replaced all the dead bolts in areas that are NOT common areas. A tenant in the building, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] has since gone through and broken all the dead bolts and taken property out of the rooms that does not belong to him. This is an ongoing issue.

[REDACTED] was advised by dispatch he will receive a call back, but it will probably be a bit. He was okay with this and advised he would await a call.

This trooper made phone contact with [REDACTED] who advised that Dion Locksmith/Security had installed new locks on the doors throughout the rest of the building where his tenant resides. This was done on Tuesday (11/21/17), according to [REDACTED] advised that this morning their tenant ([REDACTED]) had called and asked to have a fuse re set. [REDACTED] advised that when he went over to the building where the tenant resides he discovered that the newly installed deadbolts had been tampered with. [REDACTED] advised that some of [REDACTED] tools were located next to one of the doors that had been tampered with.

This is part of an on going landlord/tenant dispute that has resulted in numerous police contacts by all parties involved during the past two months.

I informed [REDACTED] that I had already spoken with the Chittenden County State's Attorney's Office (Deputy S/A Susan Hardin) on a previous case reported by his sister, [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. I advised [REDACTED] that without some type of direct proof the State's Attorney's Office had already advised that they would not pursue a case like this, as the case would be circumstantial and could not be proven beyond a reasonable doubt.

[REDACTED] advised that he understood and thanked me for assisting with this situation during the recent past. I informed [REDACTED] that I would document the information he had reported under this case number.

[REDACTED] further advised of the following information which was disseminated in an e mail to A1 Troop:

From: VSP Williston Troopers [mailto:A1TROOP@LISTSERV.DPS.STATE.VT.US] On Behalf Of Magnant, Mark

Sent: Thursday, November 23, 2017 3:33 PM

To: DPS a1troop <a1troop@listserv.dps.state.vt.us>

Subject: [A1TROOP] UPDATE: [REDACTED]

All~

██████████ ██████████ called today to report newly installed locks in the ██████████ have been tampered with, he suspects ██████████. He advised that they have ██████████ coming to the ██████████ tomorrow (11/24) to remove all of the furniture and property inside that belongs to them. It will be placed in storage until all of this is resolved. They have hired the Sheriff's Department to stand by during this process. Just FYI!

Corporal Mark Magnant
Vermont State Police
Troop A Williston Barracks
2777 Saint George Road Williston, VT 05495
(p) 802.878.7111 (f) 802.878.2742
(e) mark.magnant@vermont.gov (w) <http://vsp.vermont.gov/>

Information documented. No further action at this time.

###

17A105432

Vermont State Police Narrative
17A105432
Trp. Knight

On 11 27 2017 I received a call from [REDACTED] [REDACTED] who wanted to file a complaint about his landlords [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] entering his apartment and taking his "Bookshelf".

[REDACTED] was upset and told me of an on going issue between him and his landlords. (please refer to those cases for further details)

It's noted:

[REDACTED] rents a single room in a larger building that has other single rooms to rent. Within this building there are common areas that all the tenants are allowed to enjoy ie kitchen and event room. Currently [REDACTED] is the only tenant because of the on going issues.

[REDACTED] told me that he last saw his book shelf inside his room with his belongings on it on 11 22 2017. [REDACTED] told me that he had left his apartment until 11 27 2017. When [REDACTED] arrived at his residence he noticed that his belongings were now on the floor and his bookshelf was gone.

[REDACTED] told me that the bookshelf came from another room in the apartment building that he acquired approximately a month ago. The bookshelf was described as a metal box that is 4 feet high, and 3 feet wide. [REDACTED] estimates the cost of the shelf to be approximately 50 dollars.

[REDACTED] also wanted to report a vehicle that was vandalized outside his apartment. When I asked questions about the ownership and use of the vehicle [REDACTED] became very upset. It was found that [REDACTED] did not own this vehicle nor did he want to tell me who owned the vehicle other then it belonged to a "girlfriend". I later received e mails from [REDACTED] asking me about what I was going to do about the damage done to the vehicle. I explained to [REDACTED] that I needed the person who owned the vehicle to contact me. Again [REDACTED] was very upset with this and told me that he rented the vehicle.

I asked [REDACTED] who had access to his room. [REDACTED] said that only he and the landlords (Them [REDACTED] do and that he has not given any spare keys to any of his friends. [REDACTED] told me that there is no lock on his bedroom door and only the main doors to the buildings have locks.

Once I got off the phone with [REDACTED] I called [REDACTED] [REDACTED] I asked [REDACTED] if she had been over to the building [REDACTED] lives at. [REDACTED] told me that she currently has a court order that prevents her from going over to [REDACTED] building nor is [REDACTED] allowed to contact [REDACTED] I explained to [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] had called and reported his bookshelf missing. [REDACTED] told me that she had no knowledge of anyone going over there and removing anything from the building. [REDACTED] also told me that it sounded like [REDACTED] was talking about a metal stand that [REDACTED] had stolen from the common area of the building. [REDACTED] told me that the metal stand was already reported stolen by her and [REDACTED].

I spoke with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] next. I asked [REDACTED] the same questions I asked [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] told me that he had no knowledge of anyone in the building but [REDACTED]

On 12 08 2017, Trp. Marchand informed me that he was contacted by a [REDACTED] in reference to a vehicle that was damaged and that [REDACTED] was the last person to be responsible for it. A voice mail was left on 12 8 17 ([REDACTED])

On 12 09 17 I spoke with [REDACTED], owner of the white Ford Van Colorado plates [REDACTED] referred to. [REDACTED] called to report/ get answers about her vehicle being taken and things missing. [REDACTED] explained to me that [REDACTED] was dating [REDACTED] roommate for a short periods of time. [REDACTED] stated that she never had any relationship with [REDACTED] to include being friends.

[REDACTED] told me that she was having car trouble just before Thanksgiving and [REDACTED] offered to look at the vehicle. [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] could look at the "engine" of her vehicle while she was away visiting people for the Thanksgiving holiday. [REDACTED] said that she left her car keys inside her apartment while she was gone for Holiday.

[REDACTED] explained to me that she did not give permission to [REDACTED] to driver her vehicle around nor did she want him taking the vehicle from her residence. It's noted that [REDACTED] does not have a valid operators license. [REDACTED] also noted to me that when her and [REDACTED] spoke about him looking at her vehicle neither party went into detail about what [REDACTED] was going to do to the vehicle other than "Look at the engine".

[REDACTED] said that when she came back from her Holiday her vehicle was not at her residence. [REDACTED] was in communication with [REDACTED] about her vehicle since it was not home yet. [REDACTED] eventually brought the vehicle back but [REDACTED] noticed that the spare tire was on the vehicle and the original tire was no where to be found. [REDACTED] was also missing a variety of items to include but not limited to "camping items". [REDACTED] asked [REDACTED] about the missing items and he told [REDACTED] that his landlords had stolen the items. [REDACTED] said that he had to take some of the camping equipment out of the vehicle because he needed to fit lumber in the back of the vehicle. [REDACTED] was upset by this because she had never given [REDACTED] permission to take the vehicle nor did she give permission to use the vehicle for personal lumber use.

[REDACTED] also told [REDACTED] that the tire had been slashed by the [REDACTED] and that [REDACTED] was working with Cpl. Leise to get the items back.

Since this phone conversation with [REDACTED] I have been in phone/email contact with both [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] admitted to having the property at one point in time but the [REDACTED] had taken it and placed it in storage.

[REDACTED] was later evicted from the [REDACTED] residence and a court order was in place for the [REDACTED] to return all the property that was taken from [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] had brought [REDACTED] belongings to the Shelburne PD but has yet to pick the items up. I had [REDACTED] go to Shelburne PD to see if any of her items were there but they were not.

While talking to a Shelburne PD Officer I learned that the [REDACTED] may have not brought all the items to the PD. I emailed Deputy States Attorney Kelton Olney about this matter and asked him what he wanted me to do. DSA Olney told me that he would reach out the [REDACTED] Attorney and tried to get this resolved.

It's noted that [REDACTED] continues to call me and ask for related case numbers and statue of his case. I gave this information to [REDACTED] but he continues to call. [REDACTED] also has a female "friend" that calls on his behalf attempting to gather this same information.

This investigation is still on going, but as of know their are no leads to who would have entered [REDACTED] room.

This ends my involvement.

Tpr. Clay Knight

17A105565

On December 7, 2017 at approximately 1532 hours while on duty I received the below e mail from [REDACTED] concerning "two men" who entered his apartment and threatened him with mace. After checking with my supervisors concerning the e mail I received, I was asked by Lt. Lucas to start a case to document the specifics. It should be noted that there have been ongoing issues between [REDACTED] and her tenant [REDACTED] at the property.

Over the past 3 months VSP Williston Troopers have handled more than 20 complaints stemming from this ongoing and tumultuous landlord tenant dispute.

The e mail I received on 12/07/17 from [REDACTED] was as follows:

From: [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Thursday, December 7, 2017 3:32 PM
To: Leise, Andrew <Andrew.Leise@vermont.gov>
Subject: RE: Monday 8:30am

Dear Andy,

Last night, two men entered my apartment and threatened me with mase. They came and went as they pleased throughout the night.

The analogy of viewing things from 10,000 ft was incredibly accurate. What seems like a few inches is equal to miles for those of us on the ground.

[REDACTED]

On December 7, 2017 at approximately 1705 hours I sent an e mail back to [REDACTED] to follow up after being asked by Lt. Lucas to look into the complaint. I called [REDACTED] prior to sending the e mail and there was no answer. A voicemail was left for [REDACTED] I asked [REDACTED] the below questions in my e mail which replied and answered.

Leise Did the two men identify themselves?

[REDACTED] This all occurred around 3am. I asked several times for them to identify themselves and one gave his first name as [REDACTED]

Leise Do you have a description of the two men?

[REDACTED] 1) Male White approx. 6' tall heavysset wearing all black 2) Male African American approx. 6' with black carhart hoodie and tan pants. I have attached a photo.

Leise Did they say if they were part of [REDACTED]?

[REDACTED] They refused to answer any questions except to say they had keys and [REDACTED] said he knew [REDACTED]

Leise What were the two men doing in the residence?

[REDACTED] They were walking around the second floor. The man in all black disappeared downstairs for a 2 minutes.

Leise How many times did the two men come inside the residence, and over what timeframe?

Twice to my knowledge within 15 minutes of each other.

Leise Why did they say they were going to use mace?

I saw flashlights shining into my residence so I came out onto the porch with my flashlight. When they refused to identify themselves or say what they were doing I kept my flashlight on them and that is when he pulled out the mace and threatened to use it if I didn't lower the flashlight. I asked him if he was threatening me and then backed into the house. 2 minutes later they came into the house then filmed me in the center entryway.

I reached out to the owner of [REDACTED] via e mail while off duty on 12/07/17. I asked [REDACTED] about the contact he had with [REDACTED] the morning of December 7, 2017. [REDACTED] advised me of the the following in his e mail:

Hello Andy.

Yes I was hired last night to patrol her property and inspect the house. I arrived on her property at 7:45pm and left at 4:00am. [REDACTED] had a concern that [REDACTED] would try to get in to the [REDACTED] last night and or damage her rental property.

I was with 1 of my security staff ([REDACTED]) At 8:53pm I spoke to [REDACTED] to say we were going to park in her driveway and to not be alarmed to see my black security SUV. After I parked [REDACTED] came out side to meet [REDACTED] and tell us to look inside the house to see if [REDACTED] had moved back to his room yet and see if the inside of house looked different from my prior photo documented visit. [REDACTED] and I parked at the end of [REDACTED] driveway and walked to her [REDACTED] to inspect the locks and conditions of windows as well as the surrounding landscape. Once we were satisfied with that building and the 2 bay garage on the street we walked to the [REDACTED] and I unlocked the North door with [REDACTED] using the keys were given to me by [REDACTED]. Our walk through the house took place during the 10:00 hour. Then and I lock the house when we left and return to my vehicle and [REDACTED] driveway. Here we sat for less than an hour while viewing the [REDACTED] and road for approaching vehicles or people. After sitting we would leave the vehicle and approached the barn to inspect it for potential intrusions and to view the exterior of the house for chance of entry by [REDACTED].

Again we would return to the security vehicle until we felt it was necessary to patrol the property again. Prior to 2 o'clock in the morning [REDACTED] and I decided to relocate the vehicle between the [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED] so that we may have a better view of the [REDACTED]. This next part has been copied from my shift report notes that I wrote during the 4 AM hour on December 7, 2017:

1. During the 10 PM hour [REDACTED] and I inspect the house for damages and to see if [REDACTED] had moved back to his room. He has not.
2. 2:09 AM Green cab drops off [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and his bicycle in the driveway of the neighboring [REDACTED] on [REDACTED].
3. After [REDACTED] went into the house he return back out with a high powered flashlight & his cell phone to confront [REDACTED] who are sitting in the car (between/by the barn and wood shed) & then myself. Demanded to know who we were. only I give my (first) name. After reading the name on the side of the

vehicle he let down his flashlight and elaborated some story about why he was on the property. How he was working on the [REDACTED] for months. He then returned to the house and locked himself inside. He is occupying the bedroom across from the room he has rented.

4. 2:49 PM turns out all of the lights in the house except for kitchen light. [REDACTED] soon after 3am turns on a light upstairs and comes downstairs. 3:30AM [REDACTED] sees me on front porch and comes outside the North door with his tablet in hand and bright flashlight pointed in my face. I told him to put the flashlight down as I raised my pepper spray can towards him. He asked me if I was threatening him. I told him no but I was uncomfortable not having the ability to see with the flashlight shown on my face.

5. 3:39 AM i open door on south end of building to inspect staircase that leads to basement announce my actions and presence to [REDACTED] and let him know that I was going to use this entrance. [REDACTED] followed me in. [REDACTED] and I stood at top upstairs for about six minutes while [REDACTED] filmed with his tablet and said he did not believe that we are interested in renting the downstairs of house. He said we couldn't and that he was allowed to be where he was. He had not moved back to his room at this point.

Based on my conversation with both parties by e mail, and the fact that the property owner [REDACTED] hired [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] to conduct a walk through at her property, there are no criminal violations. As [REDACTED] had his flashlight in [REDACTED] eyes after he asked him to put it down, I don't feel [REDACTED] pointing pepper spray at [REDACTED] constitutes assault or disorderly conduct. [REDACTED] did not articulate to me that he was "in fear of imminent serious bodily injury", etc. [REDACTED] has numerous weapons in his residence and the security company would have no knowledge if [REDACTED] had a weapon while [REDACTED] was shining his flashlight in [REDACTED] eyes.

This case has been documented and is considered closed as there are no clear criminal violations. An e mail was sent to night shift Troopers regarding [REDACTED] being back at the property again tonight 12/07/17 into 12/08/17. [REDACTED] has requested that [REDACTED] conduct additional security services at her property. (see attached e mail).

It should be noted that I handled this case (e mails etc) for approximately 1.5hours after having gone off duty at my residence.

AWL 12/7/17

E mail from [REDACTED]
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, December 7, 2017 3:32 PM
To: Leise, Andrew <Andrew.Leise@vermont.gov>
Subject: RE: Monday 8:30 am

Dear Andy,

Last night, two men entered my apartment and threatened me with mase. They came and went as they pleased throughout the night.

The analogy of viewing things from 10,000 ft was incredibly accurate. What seems like a few inches is equal to miles for those of us on the ground.

█
Date: 12/07/17
Time: 1737 hours

Hi █

A case has been started for your online e mail complaint documented below. The case number is 17A105565. I tried calling you 30 min ago and there was no answer. A voicemail was left for you.

Just a few questions:

Did the two men identify themselves?

Do you have a description of the two men?

Did they say if they were part of █ ?

What were the two men doing in the residence?

How many times did the two men come inside the residence, and over what timeframe?

Why did they say they were going to use mace?

I will try calling you again on Sunday. Today is my 5th day of 10 hour shifts. I was due off at 5pm, but I'm still on duty trying to assist you with your e mail complaint.

Thank you,
Andy

Corporal Andrew Leise
Vermont State Police
Troop A Williston Barracks
802 878 7111

17A105577

12/8/2017 1:15:39PM

Suspicious

Report of Sgt. Paul Ravelin,

On December 8th 2017 at approximately 1315 hours VSP Williston Dispatch received a call from [REDACTED] (DOB [REDACTED]) who stated her tenant [REDACTED] (DOB [REDACTED]) has put paper over all of the windows in the residence so that no one can see inside. [REDACTED] stated this was reported to her by her security guards at 0300 this morning. She stated she is afraid to go inside as he has guns in there.

I know from previous involvements there is are on going issues between [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. The most recent involved [REDACTED] hiring a moving company to remove all the furniture in the common areas of the residence to include the refrigerator. The food inside the refrigerator was placed into pans and buckets and placed outside on the front deck. [REDACTED] had no belongings in the residence. When I explained to [REDACTED] that it was not a State Police issue involving the papering of the windows, she stated she was afraid to go inside the [REDACTED]. I asked why it was she needed to go inside, she said to check on things. To be sure [REDACTED] was not damaging any of the [REDACTED] structure.

I again advised [REDACTED] that there was no indication [REDACTED] was damaging anything and the fact that he covered the windows with paper, while odd, was not a criminal act. [REDACTED] asked why the State Police were refusing to respond. I explained that there was nothing criminal in his behavior. [REDACTED] referenced [REDACTED] conditions of release from a pending case. I explained he had been charged with violating the conditions and is cited into court.

The call ended and a few moments later, Cpl. Magnant, who was sitting beside me during the call with [REDACTED] received an email from [REDACTED] outlining the paper on the windows issue. In it she referenced me as being frustrated and refusing to help. I called [REDACTED] back and spoke with her again. She became upset and asked what could she do. I asked if she had applied for a No Stalking Order. She stated she had not. I explained the process and advised that if she were to get the No Stalking ordered issued by a judge there could be a stipulation where [REDACTED] would have to vacate the property. [REDACTED] stated she would consider that option. The call ended.

No further action taken.

17A105679

On December 19, 2017 at approximately 0930 hours I located [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (DOB: [REDACTED]) at [REDACTED] [REDACTED] in Burlington (downstairs front apartment). Upon knocking on the door I heard [REDACTED] yell something upstairs loudly. When [REDACTED] came to the door I noticed he had his belt on with his sheathed straight blade knife. I advised [REDACTED] I had some paperwork for him, that he was not in any trouble, and I asked him to put his knives upstairs for our safety. [REDACTED] complied and walked to the top of the stairs and unsheathed two knives from his belt and placed them on the second floor landing.

I served [REDACTED] the temporary rfa that was granted by the court. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] is the plaintiff in the matter. I asked [REDACTED] to read over the order of the court and asked him if he had any questions. I did this because [REDACTED] new girlfriend [REDACTED] was upstairs, could hear us talking, and I did not want to embarrass [REDACTED] in front of her. I have had good rapport with [REDACTED] and chose to use discretion in issuing this order in the presence of his new partner. It should be noted that [REDACTED] has all but vacated the Charlotte address owned by the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and has been staying at this new address.

[REDACTED] understood the order of the court and didn't have any questions. [REDACTED] was also issued a flash cite for VCR to appear in Chittenden Superior Court on Thursday December 21, 2017 at 0830 hours. This citation was issued per the direction of my supervisors Sgt. Hammond and Lt. Lucas.

After clearing from serving the paperwork, I called [REDACTED] and left her a VM on her cell phone that the order had been served. I also e mailed DSA Kelton Olney advising him that the order had been served and sent him a scanned copy of the RFA for Thursday's proceedings. Olney was advised that [REDACTED] was flash cited into court for Thursday the 21st.

Upon returning to the barracks, the return of service for the order was scanned and e mailed to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] at Shelburne PD (rfa holding station). A copy of the order was placed in the two be filed box at A1. The original order was placed in the CCSA basket along with the flash cite I issued [REDACTED] The CCSA log sheet was completed at that time.

On December 19, 2017 At approximately 1430 hours I received a call from [REDACTED], [REDACTED] [REDACTED] new partner. [REDACTED] asked why I left a message on her work voicemail and asked that we (VSP) do not stop at her apartment again. I professionally advised [REDACTED] that I was trying to locate [REDACTED] to serve him a judges order, hence my call to her workplace, as I had no other contact info for her when that message was left. [REDACTED] workplace and the telephone number for [REDACTED] was located via an online google search. I advised [REDACTED] that if we had a judges order for [REDACTED] or P.C. for an arrest we would be stopping at her apartment to see if [REDACTED] was there. [REDACTED] was somewhat short with me, passive aggressive, and basically questioned police procedure with serving court paperwork, etc.

The following e mail was sent to Sgt. Hammond concerning this:

Sgt. Hammond,

I just spoke with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] partner [REDACTED] by telephone after she called in. [REDACTED] called to ask why I called her and left a VM message at her workplace this morning. She also asked that we don't stop at her apartment anymore. Prior to stopping at [REDACTED] this morning, I left [REDACTED] a VM at her workplace [REDACTED] after finding that info on Facebook. I didn't have any other contact

information for her. [REDACTED] is a co owner at the business. I later got [REDACTED] actual address and served the order and flash cite to [REDACTED]

While speaking to [REDACTED] I advised her that if Burlington PD has a Judges' order to serve ppwk on [REDACTED] or we have p.c. to arrest [REDACTED] for something, we would be stopping at her apartment if need be.

So you're aware in the event she calls.

Andy

This ends my involvement

Case Closed

AWL 12/19/17

17A105688

Introduction

On 12/14/2017 at approximately 2247 hrs, [REDACTED] (DOB [REDACTED]) called to report he had found firearms belonging to [REDACTED] (DOB [REDACTED]) at [REDACTED] Greenbush Rd., Charlotte.

Incident Background

[REDACTED] is the owner of [REDACTED], a private security company which had been contracted by the property owner, [REDACTED] (DOB [REDACTED]). [REDACTED] is the owner of the [REDACTED], which is located at [REDACTED] Greenbush rd. It is best described as [REDACTED] which has been converted to a [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] space.

[REDACTED] rents a room for \$10 per month. Through his lease he has access to a shared kitchen, shared bathroom and his bedroom. His lease prohibits him from leaving property in and around other rooms and hallways.

[REDACTED] and [REDACTED] have had an ongoing dispute which has generated 20+ service calls to State Police since September, 2017. At the time of this report, [REDACTED] has obtained a protection order against [REDACTED]. The order requires [REDACTED] surrender any firearms in his possession to law enforcement, among several other conditions.

[REDACTED] confirmed [REDACTED] was not physically on the property.

Investigation

Tpr. Brittani Barone and I arrived at the property at approximately 2336 hrs. Upon our arrival we were escorted upstairs by [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] showed us where [REDACTED] room was. He then led us to a room across the hallway, which he described as a "common area". [REDACTED] advised [REDACTED] was prohibited from being in this section of the property, according to his lease. The room was filled with belongings which [REDACTED] advised were [REDACTED] property.

[REDACTED] advised he located 3 firearms in a loft storage area. These firearms were provided to Tpr. Barone and I. The firearms were :

- Winchester model 30 30, Ser. #: 4769954
- Glenfield Model 60, Marlin, .22LR, Ser. #: 20407304
- Remington Model 7600, 30 06, Ser. #: 8501761

The firearms were seized pursuant to the Temporary Protection Order granted on 12/14/2017. They were checked in the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) and had not alerts. The firearms were entered into evidence as safekeeping at the Williston Barracks on 1/15/2017 at approximately 0105 hrs.

[REDACTED] suspected [REDACTED] was staying with his girlfriend in the Burlington, VT area.

Conclusion

Firearms were seized pursuant to Temporary Protection Order. At the time of this report the location of the defendant is unknown.

Warner, 204

17A105735

On 12/17/2017 at approximately 2252 hours, Vermont State Police received a call from [REDACTED] from the [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] was hired by [REDACTED] (DOB [REDACTED]) for an ongoing tenant issue with [REDACTED] (DOB [REDACTED]).

[REDACTED] has a pending TRO stating that he is not allowed to possess firearms. He has had multiple rifles taken in the past few weeks. [REDACTED] stated that during his walk through of the house, he observed what looked to be a pellet gun or small caliber pistol. He stated [REDACTED] has not been home in multiple days.

Trooper DiGregorio and I arrived at the residence. [REDACTED] is the owner of the residence [REDACTED] had been staying in. [REDACTED] met us at the residence to let us inside to check out the possible firearm.

We located the possible firearm to discover it was an air pistol. It was not a firearm.

It was a Remington 800 MAG. The air pistol was photographed but was not taken as it was not a real firearm and [REDACTED] is allowed to possess an air pistol.

No further action taken.

17A105742

On 12/18/2017 at approximately 1023 hrs, [REDACTED] telephoned the Vermont State Police to report a suspicious incident. According to [REDACTED] her security guard reported that former tenant, [REDACTED] had damaged the property at [REDACTED], Charlotte.

Upon meeting with [REDACTED] I learned that Troopers from the Williston barracks had been investigating ongoing complaints from both [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] advised Troopers had been to the residence located at [REDACTED] multiple times and as recently as midnight on 12/18/17. [REDACTED] advised Troopers had been at the residence the night before as [REDACTED] was reported to have a firearm, a violation of a TRO that [REDACTED] had been served on behalf of [REDACTED] stated she met with the responding Troopers and observed damage to the property which she claimed was not there previously, however, never made mention to the Troops as to what she observed. [REDACTED] added on this date, she received word from her security guard indicating he believed that [REDACTED] was attempting to "cut out the picture window."

[REDACTED] and I then travelled to the location in question, a [REDACTED] as she described it.

Upon arrival, I observed what appeared to be an uninhabited, multi floor, multi room dwelling. The dwelling appeared to be in various states of disrepair and abandoned by it previous habitant. While on scene I observed multiple pieces of damaged wooden trim, several cracked glass panes in the interior doors and several holes and dents in the sheetrock walls. In addition, I observed damage to a thermostat which was set to "70," however, the interior of the structure remained cold.

Upon making my observations, I confirmed with [REDACTED] that she did in fact note the damage the night before. [REDACTED] replied she had, however, did not report it to the Troopers on scene as it was "midnight."

While on scene, I photographed the damage per the request of [REDACTED]

Upon clearing I notified Sgt. Hammond of what I had learned.

This concludes my involvement in this investigation>

Case Closed.

Stephen McNamara
Sun Feb 11 13:26:49 EST 2018