

Transcript of Undisclosed Podcast
Adnan's PCR Hearing: Day 3
February 5, 2016

[0:00] Susan Simpson: I'm Susan Simpson with Undisclosed, and we're with day three of Adnan's PCR hearing. We are currently at the courthouse again. I'm trying to see how fast I can possibly shut down two glazed donuts. Uh, thanks to our fans who uh sent goodies to our new home base, Dunkin' Donuts. Um, I mean, yesterday was a big day. Today will be a big day. I'm hoping we can finish. I'm a little bit skeptical, but it'd be really nice if we could get through everyone—it's not going to happen. I shouldn't get my hopes up. Um, but we do have—well, we know from yesterday we'll have the State's cellphone expert up today, but I know that the defense has a few more witnesses left to go, so... yeah, it'll be a good day.

[0:45] Susan Simpson: Brief update from the mid-morning break on day three. Um, we just had Sean Gordon, the defense investigator, testify. And on direct he gave brief testimony, said he took the alibi notice, the list of 86 names, and contacted as many as possible to find out, um, if they'd ever been in touch with the defense. Um, turns out three names were repeats, so there's 83 names together. Of those, he talked to 41. Um, of those 41 names on the list, only four of them had ever heard from Gutierrez, and none of those four had ever been asked about being an alibi. Um, he then presented maps showing that 1801 Woodlawn Avenue was, in fact, Woodlawn High School in 1999, which happens to be the same address that eight people, or seven people, on the alibi notice shared. Those were the track team members. Um, the defense investigator also showed a copy of the Woodlawn High School yearbook, um, which we have discussed on Undisclosed before and Colin's discussed in great detail on his blog. Check it out.

Um, essentially, the defense took its alibis for the track, um, track time period straight copy-and-pasted from the yearbook. Um, there are like 30, 40 people on the track team. That's just boys. Only eight are in the yearbook, and that's the top eight athletes. To top it all off, the summary of the State's—or the defense's position was, she'd listed 83—86... 83 names; um, only talked to four; um, none of them were asked to be an alibi; and the track team members, they were just the random people that happened to be in the yearbook.

Then it went to cross. And... the State got away with everything. Um, this was a very limited witness. He was just used for this purposes [sic] to talk to the people on the alibi notice list and compare with the people who had been contacted to be alibis by the defense. That was his sole purpose. And remember, the State had started out by saying, 'Oh, look, she is so diligent. She listed 86 people on the alibi notice. Look how hard-working she is. Look how great and thorough she is.'

So, of course, today, their thing's changed entirely. They're like, 'Oh, that 86 names? Uh uh. That's just, like, that was—they were just trolling the State. Those 86 names mean nothing. The real names that matter are in these other files that are really nonspecific and don't show what's going on, but you didn't review those, did you?'

Borrowed, with grateful thanks to the volunteers who collaborated to make these transcriptions.
<https://undisclosedtranscript.wordpress.com/2016/02/08/adnans-pcr-hearing-day-3>

Um, and of course Justin and Chris are like, 'Objection. Scope. Objection. Scope. Objection. Scope,' because you cannot cross a witness on a topic they were never brought in to testify about in the first place.

But the judge allowed it, and uh... so Thiru got to do a wide-ranging cross, where he had lots of things to say, like, 'Look at this December 15th notice. Would it surprise you that the defense contacted several witnesses to be alibis before the first trial?' Uh, December 15th is the last day of the first trial. The last day. And Thiru's up there going, 'Oh, look, she talked to all these people before trial!' and apparently does not even realize that that was, like, the end of the trial. Not to mention, the original trial date was in October. She hadn't talked to anyone, and she was ready to go to trial without ever having contacted anybody at all—not even just useless people, like no one.

Um, so, the State is like, 'Oh, look, she contacted people!' and they put all these memos on to show how much she contacted people, but if you noticed how Thiru was doing it, he uh... he like has a little overhead projector, and he keeps sliding the memo up, so you don't see the date on the memo. All you see is, like, the notes. And you don't see the fact that they were all in December and November, so weeks before trial and weeks after the actual trial date was originally scheduled, she tries to contact eight useless alibi witnesses. And Thiru made a great case. He did. I mean, I'm not saying it's true, but he did put on a great case trying to argue that Gutierrez was very diligent in contacting these eight track team people.

Okay, good work, State, because those eight people are meaningless. There's no reason those eight would've been more likely to see Adnan than anyone else. They were just the eight people that the law clerk pulled off the yearbook, so... I'm sure that got lost in the cross, but like it doesn't... like, all that work he just did to show that she contacted the track team? No. All she did was—and here, wait, let's back up a bit. Here's the thing, she didn't even contact them despite those notes because she tried to call some of them. Um, but look at the subpoenas. They're all issued to 1801 Woodlawn High School, so even if she did contact them, she never got a valid address. She just served them at the high school... or attempted to. Um, in fact, one track team member was served. He went to the courthouse not knowing why he was there, and no one ever called on [inaudible] testified. Um, Sean Gordon, the investigator, did talk to him, and he said that other than that he'd had no contact.

But, of course, Thiru puts on a memo that says they tried to reach him and couldn't, and it has a little notation up there, says like '20 minutes l-a-t-' or something, and he's like, 'Oh... oh, look. Did this witness say that Adnan was 20 minutes late to practice?'

No, no, that's not what it says at all. He was just throwing shit at the wall. Um... 'cause that guy's already talked to the investigator. It was very clear. He never spoke to the defense. He had no idea why he was subpoenaed. Um... and despite, uh, the State's very creative piecing together of random notes—he wasn't piecing together so much as he was just making up very dark-sounding questions and pretending there was a factual basis, like saying, 'Oh. Look at this memo from the, from the

Borrowed, with grateful thanks to the volunteers who collaborated to make these transcriptions.
<https://undisclosedtranscript.wordpress.com/2016/02/08/adnans-pcr-hearing-day-3>

defense, talking about Gerald Russell and talking about what he remembers of the track practice and how they didn't take a roster and the—what he said during an interview. Doesn't that show that they were concerned about Adnan not actually being at track?'

That is a memo summarizing the State's interviews. It was a summary from the law clerk to CG saying, 'Here's a summary of everything the State's handed to us.' That was not something that they'd done. That was not something they were even—it was not about the alibi. It was just a summary typed up of State notes, and Thiru presents it as if it was actually a defense interview record that undermined the alibi strategy, so they moved away from it.

I'm annoyed at the judge for allowing it because that just wasn't... I can just imagine—when you have a witness that was brought in for a very specific purpose, they're there to testify about that only, and suddenly the judge is like, 'Go crazy. Go ask them about the,' uh, 'the thoughts and feelings of a random person 20 years ago that you've never met,' and it's allowed? I mean... it's not much you can do at that point, um...

Sso, I am not particularly impressed right now with the State because they are abusing the fact that they don't have to actually have stuff, um, challenged. They are simply misinterpreting notes and not calling witnesses, but um... I suspect that that will backfire at some point.

[7:45] Susan Simpson: We are at lunch break for the day three, and I'll just note that it is harder than I expected to do this podcasting-on-the-fly thing, especially with like all the other cameras and people going around. So... if I'm not as organized as I'd like to be, I apologize. I try and take, like, outlines during the bench conferences. I'm like, here, next time we record I'm going to hit points A, B, C and then I get to, like, C and the bench conference is over and... back to notes.

So... free-form associations about today. Um... a bit of backstory, on Monday, we had news that there would be a secret witness for the prosecution. Um... and there was kind of—I couldn't hear it, but there was kind of reference to this, him being afraid to come forward or something. And I was like, well, who's the secret witness? Um, well, spoiler: the secret witness is a security guard named Steve. But he may or may not be coming out now because the defense just called the best librarian on earth. She's the same librarian from Serial, and she was there to say, 'Uh, no, there were library—there were cameras in the library,' um, 'in 1999 in January.'

Um... so he asked her, like, on cross and direct, yeah: 'Would it surprise you to learn that there were no cameras there in January '99?'

And she's like, 'Well, it would.'

Um, so he left that hanging as if, like, he had information that showed she was a liar, but he never introduced it. Well, that backfired because now it's shown that, in fact, he did not have information that he was pretending to have. There were cameras there, and... Asia was right. Whoever she called

Borrowed, with grateful thanks to the volunteers who collaborated to make these transcriptions.

<https://undisclosedtranscript.wordpress.com/2016/02/08/adnans-pcr-hearing-day-3>

at the library would've known that, yeah, there were cameras. They told her right. She testified truthfully.

Um... so after the camera thing was a big flop for the State, they move on to security guard Steve. And they try and set up the—his affidavit testimony, saying like, 'Oh, so Steve worked at the library. He worked inside the library. He would've seen students at the library.' And the big reveal they're going for is that in March of '99, the defense investigator for Adnan's team did talk to Officer—or secur—officer [laughs] security guard Steve. And Thiru was going to say, 'Oh, look, it's proof it was a diligent investigation. They talked to security guard Steve, and security guard Steve ruined their case because he said something that destroyed the Asia alibi, and that's why Asia was never contacted because of the diligent investigation that determined that it wasn't correct.'

Well, no. According to the librarian, Steve was goofy and useless. And... she made a convincing case for why that is and that, like, well she did more security work than they did. They had no authority to do anything. They just stood there and, you know, tried to look intimidating. Or goofy, depending on who you were. There were a few points they made, like, the fact that security guards didn't start working at 11, like useless Steve was going to claim. Um... and Chris Nieto had the cross and had questioning this time, and he did a great job of pointing out that there were a hundred-plus students coming through that library between 2 and 4 p.m. And the fact that you didn't see someone that day would never be satisfactory proof or even, like, satisfactory evidence that someone hadn't been there that day.

So, if that's what Thiru was banking on to destroy the Asia alibi, um... they're in trouble right now. Yeah, it looks like this will not be the last day at all, for sure, so we'll go back in today, get done what we can. Hopefully, we're coming back sooner rather than later.

[11:19] Earnest Kellogg: Hi, how you doing? My name is Earnest Kellogg. I'm originally from Elizabethtown, Kentucky, out here to see and hear the Adnan Syed case. And I'm telling you I was amazed after listening to, uh, the testimony from both sides, and uh today, the defense totally squashed everything that the prosecutor had to say and his, uh, so-called um "expert witness". It was just unbelievable to hear and how he tried to dance around the fact that it was complete nonsense. I'm amazed and after 21 years in the military and being around a lot of uh good stuff, that was, that was complete, complete garbage. Awesome job by the prosec—uh, the defense. So, yeah, I'll be here Monday, absolutely. I'm already, like, ecstatic. My girlfriend's going to be amazed that I, you know, I got to be here and she didn't, but you know, I'm representing so... Thank you so much! Thank you, guys, for bringing attention to this. It's amazing, the voice that you've created and I, I'm just thankful that we have you guys around to, to do this, so...

[12:23] Saad Chaudry: I'm Saad Chaudry, and this is the third day, or this is right after the third day, of Adnan's PCR hearing. Uh, basically, my takeaway just coming out of this was the fact that when you relate it to football, is when a team is about to score on you with a minute left, and they're marching down the field and you know that you're about to lose the game, that you'll do anything to

Borrowed, with grateful thanks to the volunteers who collaborated to make these transcriptions.
<https://undisclosedtranscript.wordpress.com/2016/02/08/adnans-pcr-hearing-day-3>

stop it. So, you'll fake an injury. And it seems like they faked an injury, and they basically called a timeout and they're going to have to now wait 'til Monday to start over again. So, it's awesome because of the fact that the truth is here, and they're calling them out.

[13:00] Susan Simpson: So... we are just outside the court in Dunkin' Donuts from day three of the PCR hearing. We did not finish. We'll be back here Monday. I, hopefully, will be back here on Monday. I'll see if I can make it work.

So, we had uh the CAST agent, the FBI agent, come on the stand. The defense has not finished up. There are more defense witnesses to come, but because of timing issues, they put on the State cell expert this afternoon 'cause he couldn't be available on Monday, but obviously, he's going to be now. Um... he was very arrogant, I think everyone would agree. I think that's a, that's a fairly safe assessment. I feel like that's unbiased. Um, I don't think anyone in the room would disagree with that. He clearly had not read the files. He pretended he had and that—right off the bat, I was like, "This is going to be good," because he was like, 'The only thing Abe Waranowitz didn't do was drive testing.'

Like, well yeah, he very clearly did and explained how he did, and there were maps showing his drive test results. So if you don't think he drive tested... His—his exact words were: 'I didn't see an indication, I did not see any indication that he'd done drive testing.'

Yeah, no... that dude has not read the files at all. He's probably looked at the one page of cell records, maybe skimmed some testimony, but he clearly had no idea what was going on. It was pretty great.

Um, and it bit him in the butt because he decided to go on the record with Thiru's theory of what the fax cover sheet applies to. Um, Thiru's idea is that it applies only to the February 17th fax, which is the fax that was partially redacted or had the cell sites redacted, um, because some of the stuff on the cover sheet applies to that one but not others. Never mind that, like, the whole time zone thing applies to all the documents. Um, other stuff applies to all the documents. Um, Thiru likes this theory. He came up with it for the uh brief, the same brief in which he claimed that Exhibit 31 was not a subscriber activity report. Shock and surprise, the expert's opinion agrees with that.

So, we get to cross, and Justin points out right away that, uh, 'When's the date that you first talked to the prosecution in this case?'

He's like, 'Oh, January 5th.'

'Huh, that's the exact same date that Thiru submitted his expert designation in which he said what you were an expert in. And you were an expert in all kinds of things, like an expert on that Abe's testimony was fine, that all these records were fine, but you didn't get the records until a week after you talked to Thiru, you just said.'

Borrowed, with grateful thanks to the volunteers who collaborated to make these transcriptions.
<https://undisclosedtranscript.wordpress.com/2016/02/08/adnans-pcr-hearing-day-3>

He's like, 'Oh, I had, I had some documents before from people.'

And Justin's like, 'Whoa, just to be clear, that is not what you said five seconds ago.'

And Thiru—or, sorry, not Thiru—um, the expert tries to backtrack a bit, and he's like, 'Oh, uh... I got 'em, I got 'em after I talked to Thiru.'

And Justin breaks out with, 'You're under oath, Agent!'

Thiru objected, rightfully, and the Judge sustained it, rightfully, but it was still pretty funny. So, the whole time, the agent is sticking by this theory, which to his credit, he did admit, like, it's what he believed. He's like, 'Oh, I talked to some buddies, and we all agree it's probably what it was.' But he did admit that's all he did; he wasn't claiming he actually had any knowledge. He's just saying he talked about it and was like, 'Ah, this is probably what it is.'

So then Justin pops up one of the calls—two of the calls, actually—um, from January 16th, one of which happens—oh, I don't even know the exact time—but it happens at a time, and then 27 minutes later, there's an incoming call. The first call, the outgoing one, was made from L651A, which is Woodlawn, um, and the second call, 27 minutes later, was made from not too far from Dupont Circle, which is... a little bit more than 27 minutes away.

Um, as Justin put it, 'Agent Fitzgerald, are you aware, uh, whether the owner of this cellphone owns a helicopter?' I don't think he did. I'm not sure, but I'm pretty sure Adnan didn't have one at the time. Um, and I live very close to Dupont, and I've been driving up here for the hearing, so I can guarantee there is no chance in hell that you are going to get from Dupont—or from Woodlawn to Dupont in 27 minutes. I'd be much happier if you could. He's just kind of sitting there like, 'Well, I would have to do more research to figure out what is going on.' Y—you could just see him; he's like, 'What did I walk into? What did I agree to get involved with?'

And, uh... then as, um, things were getting pretty good, suddenly we're out of time, and uh... 'Don't you think it's better to take a break?' So... they're going to have the weekend. And I fully expect by Monday, they'll have a totally new theory to explain why all the other records are accurate, even if this particular record—even if that particular record from January 16th was not accurate, they'll have an explanation for why all the ones that do matter—A.K.A., all the ones that make Adnan guilty—are accurate. But that theory will necessarily contradict all the stuff that Agent Fitzgerald was claiming today. So... you know what? Good luck. Have a fun weekend. Come up with some new crazy idea to explain records that you don't understand, and you're not going to understand because you're not part of AT&T's billing department, and uh, then come back to court on Monday and try to explain why you're giving an entirely different opinion, one that once again just happens to agree with the State's theory of the case and yet is totally contradictory from the opinion you gave confidently on Friday. I'm looking forward to it.

Borrowed, with grateful thanks to the volunteers who collaborated to make these transcriptions.

<https://undisclosedtranscript.wordpress.com/2016/02/08/adnans-pcr-hearing-day-3>

[18:12] Colin Miller: Hi, this is Colin Miller down in South Carolina, reporting on day three of the reopened post-conviction review proceedings in the Adnan Syed case. I'm recording at about 4:30 p.m. Eastern time, and so far we've had testimony by three and-a-half witnesses.

The first witness this morning was Sean Gordon. He is a current private investigator for Adnan, and the principal part of his testimony, as far as I can tell, is that he got that alibi notice that Gutierrez turned over to the State back in 1999. That was an alibi notice with 83 names. And according to Gordon, he reached out to and was able to contact 41 of the alibi witnesses on that list, and according to him, all but four of those witnesses were not contacted by the defense back in 1999. And of those four witnesses who were contacted, none of them were actually asked about providing an alibi for Adnan. So that's pretty damning. That's pretty strong circumstantial evidence about failures of the defense team.

To my understanding, the Deputy Attorney General presented some evidence from the defense files about potential contacts or attempts to contact certain witnesses, and that's fine as far as it goes, but for instance, there was evidence presented—and I've talked about this on my blog—about how the memo given to Gutierrez that had eight track team members was basically a law student going into the Woodlawn yearbook and getting a very small percentage of the actual track team into that memo. And in fact, the key witness, Will, the track teammate who was mentioned in the ride-along notes for Jay, he told Sarah Koenig he was never contacted by the defense. So, overall, it seems a pretty spotty performance by the defense based upon the testimony by Gordon. There's a question in there. There was some type of mention on Twitter about something potentially significant with a track teammate. I'm looking into it, and if I find more about that, I'll report about it.

The next witness, as far as I can tell, was Michelle Hamiel, who was a librarian at the Woodlawn Public Library back in 1999. It seems to be she did two things: first, she confirmed that there were surveillance cameras back in 1999, which is consistent with what Asia said about there being surveillance cameras that could have recorded her interaction with Adnan on January 13th; and also, if I'm reading this correctly—I'm not 100% sure, but I think some of the Tweets said that she indicated no one from the defense team reached out to the library and asked about surveillance video tapes.

Now, we know from Serial that those tapes would have been recorded over by the time that Gutierrez was hired, so it would have been futile, but if we're looking at the reasonable versus unreasonable performance by the defense, then certainly this falls strongly on the side of unreasonable because easily this could have confirmed the alibi defense.

And speaking of ineffective assistance, the third witness today was David Irwin, a very respected criminal attorney in Maryland, and he gave really pretty compelling testimony about the Strickland standard for ineffective assistance of counsel. It has two prongs: unreasonable performance and, secondly, prejudice. In terms of unreasonable performance, to my understanding from the Tweets,

Borrowed, with grateful thanks to the volunteers who collaborated to make these transcriptions.
<https://undisclosedtranscript.wordpress.com/2016/02/08/adnans-pcr-hearing-day-3>

that Irwin not only said that Gutierrez fell below that standard, but that she fell well below that standard. And in terms of prejudice, he said from what he saw of Asia McClain, she was a terrific alibi witness and was, quote-unquote, a “game changer”. And in terms of prejudice, you’re looking at: ‘Did this have a reasonable probability of changing the outcome? Does it undermine our confidence in the jury’s verdict?’ Certainly very powerful evidence given by David Irwin.

As I’m recording now, we’re in the middle of testimony by FBI space—Special Agent Chad Fitzgerald. He is being called to rebut Grant, the defense expert who testified about the unreliability of the incoming pings based upon the disclaimer sent along by AT&T and the overall Brady claim. Interestingly, even if you take Fitzgerald and his testimony at their face, I think it proves that basically with the disclaimer, Gutierrez could have had the incoming pings deemed unreliable and therefore inadmissible. It’s my understanding from looking at the testimony of Fitzgerald, that he’s saying the disclaimer was included because if the recipient’s phone was turned off and a phone call went directly to voicemail, that would ping the tower of the caller as opposed to the person receiving the call. And what that means is, incoming pings can be unreliable.

And if you look to the Frye standard, the general acceptance standard that applies in Maryland, in order for expert evidence to be admitted, you have to establish both that expert and the evidence was based upon reliable principles and methods, and that those principles and methods were reliably applied in this case. And so, for instance, in this case, even if Fitzgerald is saying that disclaimer didn’t apply here, it’s sort of like a situation with a lie detector test. In fact, the very first case, the Frye case that led to the standard, was a polygraph case with a lie detector. And if you look at why lie detectors are found to be somewhat unreliable, it’s because, well, on the one hand, some people are sociopaths and you have false negatives; on the other hand, you have people who have either white coat syndrome: they’re stressed out like Mr. S., and you can have false positives.

Well, you could have an expert come in and say, ‘None of those problems existed in this case. We had a person who is a normal person. There was no excessive stress. This result in this case is reliable.’

Of course, any jurisdiction, including Maryland, is going to say, ‘That fails the expert evidence standard, and therefore the evidence can’t come in.’

It seems to me Fitzgerald is saying, ‘Yes, incoming pings can be unreliable, but in this case, they’re reliable.’ Well, that’s not good enough. That would fail the Frye test, and if Gutierrez used the disclaimer, the evidence could be deemed inadmissible.

The other thing—and I’m looking for this in the tweets; I haven’t gotten an answer yet—is how, or if, Fitzgerald was able to determine that Adnan’s phone was on at the time of incoming pings, like the 7:09 and 7:16 pings. Because the interesting thing is—and I wrote about this in my blog today—is that in the the Bulos Zumot case, there was testimony by a radio frequency engineer for AT&T, and what he said was if you have a call from an AT&T subscriber to an AT&T cellphone, the tower that

Borrowed, with grateful thanks to the volunteers who collaborated to make these transcriptions.
<https://undisclosedtranscript.wordpress.com/2016/02/08/adnans-pcr-hearing-day-3>

shows up in the records as being pinged is the tower of the caller. But also, even with that phone call going to voicemail, it shows up as a connected call in the call record. So, it's quite possible that Fitzgerald's testimony could be correct and, in fact, it applies to Adnan's case because even though on his records it looks like certain calls that are incoming are received, in fact, based upon this glitch in AT&T, those calls that show up as connected could be calls that went to voicemail because Adnan's cellphone was turned off.

So, nothing conclusive yet. I'm relying upon tweets about Fitzgerald's testimony, but it seems there's a decent argument at this point that even if we take Fitzgerald at his word and say, 'Grant's wrong. There are other issues with incoming pings,' there's a decent argument here that Frye was not met, and therefore there's a Brady violation.

[25:37] Tanveer Syed: Hello. My name's, uh, Tanveer Syed. We're across the street from the Mitchell Courthouse. I'm Adnan's older brother. Um, they just took Adnan out from the courthouse and loaded him up into the pre-trial detention services van to take him away. There's a group of people out here, um, just trying to, you know, see Adnan and wish him, you know—and say hi to him or to give him salaams. When he drove by, he yelled, "Assalaam alaikum" really loud. Um, we could all hear that. It was nice seeing Adnan, to see him outside, you know, coming out. I mean, it was—I haven't seen him in a long time and, you know, even just to see him outside, not behind those bars, even though he's shackled, um...

But overall, I think it was a positive day. Justin did a great job of, you know, questioning, getting the, um—the best part of the day, I think, was when they had two calls that were 27 minutes apart. And then Justin was like, 'Okay, well, this cellphone call came from what tower? Dupont Circle. This cellphone call was Baltimore. So, are you telling me unless—that he made it from Baltimore to D.C. in an hour?' And like, 'Unless Mr. Syed owned a helicopter...?'

That was, like, the most memorable moment of the day, was just like, 'Okay, you know.' The FBI expert, you know—just the same way we believed the prosecution 18 years ago, it was like, you know, FBI expert. Used to think FBI stands for "truth and justice", but in this case, seems like the FBI expert's just doing whatever the prosecutor wants him to do.

[26:48] Shamim Rahman: Um, my name is Shamim Rahman, and I'm Adnan's mom. Oh yeah, he was, you know, he was coming out. He was just waiting. It's freezing outside, but thanks God, you know, he saw us, and he was very excited. And we couldn't talk to him, but you know, when he was leaving—when he sit in the van, he said, "Assalaam alaikum." This make all of us happy.

We are so happy because everybody was there, and everything is good. And, you know, it's like more hopeful today. And yesterday. You know, I don't know how to thank to the, ah, the community and... You know, especially Rabia, she's like a daughter to us, you know. So, she brought everything, you know. Like right now, we are here because of Rabia. She's always there, you know.

Borrowed, with grateful thanks to the volunteers who collaborated to make these transcriptions.
<https://undisclosedtranscript.wordpress.com/2016/02/08/adnans-pcr-hearing-day-3>

[27:32] Rabia Chaudry: Hi, guys, this is Rabia, and today is day three of the PCR appeal, and I have spent most of my day at Dunkin' Donuts, as usual. Today, I actually didn't even go into the courthouse because I didn't see the point. Um, I know that there have been some excellent defense witnesses on the stand, and, uh... I also heard that the State presented their cellphone expert, which I had really been looking forward to, and I was also looking forward to Justin, um, really decimating him on the stand, and I heard that he did. So I'm really excited about that. I think it's going to be continued into Monday, Tuesday.

People keep asking the same question about whether the judge is going to rule immediately. No. That only happens in the movies, although I'm not saying it cannot happen. I mean, it would be ridiculous and very odd, but it could happen. Um, generally speaking, in the last PCR, it took about four months to get a ruling. It can take longer. Right now, the judge is retired. So we—I'm assuming it's going to take one to two months before we get a ruling. Uh, it could be faster; it could be later. But, you know, two to four months is like really fast in legal time, so, uh... you have to hold tight.

In the meantime, as we're waiting for the judge's ruling, there's still going to be a whole lot of stuff happening. There's still investigation ongoing. Susan, in fact, next week is traveling out to start working on, um, the new season. I mean, she's already started working but to interview some more witnesses. So there's a lot coming your way, and um, there's more evidence that we've unearthed that we're eventually going to get around to telling you guys about.

Dunkin' Donuts. I have to give a shout out to the Dunkin' Donuts on whatever this street is right in front of the, um, courthouse. Is it Calvert? No, it's not Calvert. It's on the corner of Calvert and something. But first of all, the management's been amazing. They've literally let us just park here for like three or four days. I'm sitting here, and people keep coming by. And people know I'm at Dunkin' Donuts and I'm tweeting. And also people in the courtroom are telling people 'cause when they ask, 'Where's Rabia?' they're like, 'Oh, she's at the Dunkin' Donuts.'

So all kinds of people who've, like, come from Philadelphia, come from New York, come from different parts of, um, the state to see the hearing are popping in to say, "Hi," introduce themselves. And we are being lavished with Dunkin' Donuts, um, gift cards and actual donuts. This morning, um, we had a listener, a supporter, send us like a two dozen donuts and a box of joe, which we've been like munching all day. We've gotten over \$160 worth of gift cards from Dunkin' Donuts. So we, um, appreciate it so much, you guys. Don't send any more Dunkin' Donuts gift cards—although if you do, we could always, like, give them to charity or something, which would be wonderful. But, um, we are well, well covered, mm, for the next couple of days for donuts and coffee. But thank you, guys, so much. It's amazing. But in the meantime, hopefully, we will check in with you on Monday, and have a good weekend.