

Gerald Richardson # 337823

10-22-2023


ASPC-YUMA/LAPAZ-UNIT 413-466

P.O. Box 8909

SAN LUIS, AZ 85349

TO BadJurist.COM


On The last day of trial, my Trial Judge went into the jury room, while deliberating, The Bailiff went home early, & Talked with the Jury & collected ballot's, not once but twice & the media & everyone watched & said nothing, this juron is the only one who came forward, now even though this Lawfirm from Chicago says I have a claim, ARIZONA atty's don't want to file the case against the judge, they want to file ineffective assistance of counsel, That would take me back to a Racist Court & County & not over than my case, so I'm having trouble finding a good honest ATTY & they want to charge \$18,500 & \$350 AN HOUR, I want to upload this case to COURT CAM as well.



Kari Lee Carlisle, is the person who caused the shooting. The states witness & stolen all my assets & dragged me, claiming someone broke in the house, & later changed her story

Come to find out, It was a Halloween  
Prank by victim, who was high on 13 separate  
drugs & The State covered it up.

The Judge gave me 7 yrs & The Prosecutor  
aggravated 16 for 3.5, But I had no criminal  
Records to aggravate, so they falsified  
the transcripts & made it 10.5  
I was disabled at the time  
& still is.

A large, stylized handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of several loops and a long horizontal stroke.

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MOHAVE

HONORABLE DEREK CARLISLE, JUDGE  
DIVISION II  
DATE: JUNE 24, 2019

FILED  
RECEIVED  
2019 JUN 26 AM 10:15

WIRLYNN J. JENSEN, CLERK  
SUPERIOR COURT - MOHAVE COUNTY  
\*MK

NOTICE/COURT ORDER

STATE OF ARIZONA,

Plaintiff,

vs

GERALD RICHARDSON,

Defendant.

CASE NO. CR 2018-01820

The Court is in receipt of an *ex parte communication* from Lynette Wedemeyer.

The clerk is directed to forward a copy of the *ex parte communication* to the State and counsel for the defendant and to place the correspondence in the confidential portion of the file.

The Court takes no further action on the *ex parte communication* at this time.

cc:

Mohave County Attorney\*  
Attorney for State

Robin Puchek\*  
Attorney for Defendant




EXHIBIT #1

June 14, 2019


RE: The State vs. Gerald Richardson

Dear Judge Carlisle,

I realize I probably should have done this sooner and it's probably a moot point now, but I wanted to mention a couple things that bothered me during this trial. On Tuesday, during an early break, the gals from Havasu who were riding together started discussing the case and others joined in, some of whom appeared to have already decided the case. I said, "You guys know we're not even supposed to be discussing this, right?!" One of them said, "Well, we're allowed to discuss it with other jury members." I said, "No. The Judge specifically said we were not allowed to discuss it with anyone, INCLUDING other jury members until AFTER we've heard all the testimonies and seen all the evidence and begin deliberations." That shut them up. Then, when we started deliberating, one of the men said that "he (the defendant) needed to be put away so he couldn't do this again to someone else." That shocked me. I said, "Really!? The guy rarely, if even ever, shot his gun before and this happened because someone was unexpectedly coming into his house. You really think he's going to go out and just shoot and kill someone?" He said, "Well he might!" I'm sorry I didn't say something earlier.

Regretfully,

Lynette Wedemeyer



IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA  
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MOHAVE

HONORABLE DEREK CARLISLE, JUDGE  
DIVISION II  
DATE: JUNE 27, 2019

FILED  
2019 JUL 01 AM 10:31

WILLYN THORPE  
SUPERIOR COURT CLERK

RECEIVED

NOTICE/COURT ORDER

STATE OF ARIZONA,

Plaintiff,

vs

GERALD RICHARDSON,

Defendant.

CASE NO. CR 2018-01820

JUL 01 2019  
MOHAVE COUNTY  
PUBLIC DEFENDER

The Court is in receipt of an *ex parte communication* from Lynette Wedemeyer.

The clerk is directed to forward a copy of the *ex parte communication* to the State and counsel for the defendant and to place the correspondence in the confidential portion of the file.

The Court takes no further action on the *ex parte communication* at this time.

cc:

Mohave County Attorney\*  
Attorney for State

Robin Puchek\*  
Attorney for Defendant



S8015CR201801820

1

EXHIBIT #2

June 17, 2019

RE: The State vs. Gerald Richardson

Dear Judge Carlisle,

My conscience is still gnawing at me over my decision to concede with the other jury members that the defendant was guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. I know you are probably extremely frustrated with me. For that I am sorry, but I can live with it. What I can't live with is knowing that I succumbed to the pressure of the moment and voted against my conscience.

I knew going into the deliberation room, from comments that had been made, that I was probably the only juror who was not convinced beyond a reasonable doubt of the defendant's guilt. The juror who was designated as the spokesman was also the one who said that the defendant "needed to be put away so he couldn't do this again to someone else." Early in our deliberations, he also adamantly stated that "we HAD to come to a UNANIMOUS verdict. Either we ALL needed to vote NOT guilty or we ALL needed to vote GUILTY." For the first three hours or so, the businessman on the jury and I were both not convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant was guilty. Then, he finally changed his vote and all the pressure was on me alone. The jury spokesman asked me what it would take to convince me to change my vote. I was confused and couldn't think straight under the pressure. I even took your Jury instruction notes and shut myself in the bathroom and plugged my ears to try to read through it all but I still couldn't focus under the stress and chattering of the other jurors. I really wanted to end deliberations and start fresh the next day but I knew everyone else wanted to reach a verdict and be done with it. Consequently, I felt pressured into making a decision that night, so I reluctantly gave in and conceded against my better judgment. I knew that I wasn't going to be able to change seven juror's minds to vote not guilty. Then, when you went around to each juror asking if that was our vote, I wanted to say no, but I did say I conceded when we were in the deliberation room even though I did so under duress. I was also honestly scared to answer that in front of the whole courtroom when I had already said I would concede. Hindsight, I wish I had written you a note asking if we could adjourn and start fresh the next day.

Right or wrong, as I saw it, the fact that it was Jessica, Molly and James coming through the door, people who totally qualified as being on the property lawfully, didn't matter because the defendant had no idea who was entering his home. From his perspective, it was an intruder. Even Kari told the officers three or four times that they weren't expecting Jessica and the kids to come back that night. So, the defendant wasn't expecting anyone but, all of a sudden, he (they) are woken up to someone talking and coming in the front door. The other jurors were not looking at it from the defendant's perspective at the time of the shooting, but from their perspectives, knowing all the facts surrounding the incident. It made me feel even worse when the officer who sat at the prosecuting attorney's table thanked every juror for their verdict.

Regretfully,

  
Lynette Wedemeyer

May 1, 2023

Gerald Richardson, ADC #337823  
ASPC - Yuma/LaPaz  
Unit 4B-46L  
P.O. Box 8909  
San Luis, AZ 85349

Re: *State vs. Gerald Richardson*  
*Mohave County Superior Court No. CR2018-01820*

Dear Mr. Richardson:

Thank you for writing to me about your case and sending me your documents. I have reviewed the decision of the Arizona Court of Appeals in your case. As I was able to determine from pulling the docket in your case, it appears that you have previously filed at least one Petition for Post-Conviction Relief pursuant to Rule 32. Any new claims that could be asserted in your case would require the filing of a new Rule 32 Petition. Generally, the following claims can be raised in a Petition for Post-Conviction Relief pursuant to Rule 32.1:

- (a) the defendant's conviction was obtained, or the sentence was imposed, in violation of the United States or Arizona constitutions;
- (b) the court did not have subject matter jurisdiction to render a judgment or to impose a sentence on the defendant;
- (c) the sentence as imposed is not authorized by law;
- (d) the defendant continues to be or will continue to be in custody after his or her sentence expired;
- (e) newly discovered material facts probably exist, and those facts probably would have changed the judgment or sentence. Newly discovered material facts exist if:
  - (1) the facts were discovered after the trial or sentencing;
  - (2) the defendant exercised due diligence in discovering these facts; and
  - (3) the newly discovered facts are material and not merely cumulative or used solely for impeachment, unless the impeachment evidence substantially undermines testimony that was of such critical significance that the impeachment evidence probably would have changed the judgment or sentence.
- (f) the failure to timely file a notice of appeal was not the defendant's fault;
- (g) there has been a significant change in the law that, if applicable to the defendant's case, would probably overturn the defendant's judgment or sentence; or

- (h) the defendant demonstrates by clear and convincing evidence that the facts underlying the claim would be sufficient to establish that no reasonable fact-finder would find the defendant guilty of the offense beyond a reasonable doubt, or that no reasonable fact-finder would find the defendant eligible for the death penalty in an aggravation phase held pursuant to A.R.S. § 13-752.

However, because you have previously filed a Rule 32 Petition, Rule 32.2 would generally preclude raising any grounds in a new Petition that were: finally adjudicated on the merits in your direct appeal, raised in your previous Rule 32 proceeding, or waived at trial or on appeal or in any previous post-conviction proceeding. Therefore, the grounds we might be able to raise in a new Rule 32 proceeding might be very limited. It would be helpful if you could provide me any documents that you have from your prior Rule 32 proceedings, including if possible a copy of the petition for post-conviction relief, the trial court's ruling on the PCR, and (if appealed) the court of appeals decision.

do you have a copy of your appellate brief (filed in the Arizona Court of Appeals) and your trial transcripts? If so, it would be helpful if I could review those documents as well. I'm sorry this has happened to you. I truly believe you should not have been found guilty by the jury.

The Law Offices of  
**Harriette P. Levitt, PLLC**

5363 E. Pima Street, Suite 101  
Tucson, Arizona 85712

TELEPHONE (520) 624-0400 FAX (520) 622-3308  
[hplevittlaw@gmail.com](mailto:hplevittlaw@gmail.com)

July 6, 2020

Gerald Richardson  
#337823  
ASPC Florence-East  
PO Box 5000  
Florence, AZ 85132

Re: *State v. Gerald Richardson*  
Case No. 1 CA-CR 19-0429  
Mohave Co. Cause No. CR201801820  
My File No. 19-4592

Dear Mr. Richardson:

I have received your letter dated June 29, 2020. Again, I am very much aware of your view of what happened on the night ~~XXXXXX~~ was killed and I am also very much aware of your view of how your case was handled at trial. You don't need to tell me again. I also believe you were wrongfully convicted, and I have been trying to correct that injustice.


I sent you copies of the State's Answering Brief and my Reply Brief last week. Your case is now "at issue". This means that the Court of Appeals will review all of the briefs and the records in the case. The Court will then prepare a decision on your appeal. The Court can either grant the appeal and reverse your conviction and sentence or the Court can deny the appeal, and affirm your conviction and sentence.

There is no set deadline by which the Court of Appeals has to reach a decision. You should expect it to take a few months. I will let you know once the Court of Appeals reaches a decision and I will provide you with a copy of it. Once we have the decision, I will advise you what to do next.

Gerald Richardson  
July 6, 2020  
Page Two

I know it is very difficult for you to be imprisoned. You have no criminal record and you didn't mean to kill Jessica. I'm doing the best that I can to help you. At this point, however, the only thing that all of us can do is wait. Please try to be patient.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Harriette Levitt".

Harriette P. Levitt

HPL:knv



HALE & MONICO  
AMERICA'S JUSTICE ATTORNEYS

August 3, 2023

Gerald Richardson # 337823  
Arizona State Prison Complex Yuma/Lapaz  
Unit 4B-46L  
PO Box 8909  
San Luis, AZ 85349

Re: *Your Inquiry to Hale & Monico*

Dear Mr. Richardson,

Thank you for reaching out to Hale & Monico regarding your potential claim. We have reviewed the information that you submitted and, unfortunately, we are not able to assist you with this particular claim, but appreciate that you considered our firm for your legal needs. Please be advised that there is a statute of limitations that requires you to file your lawsuit within a certain time frame. We would encourage you to contact another attorney immediately to assist you with your claim and help you preserve your rights.

Sincerely,

*Hale & Monico*

312.341.9646 | 53 W Jackson Blvd. Ste 334 | Chicago, IL 60604



[www.halemonico.com](http://www.halemonico.com)