

VIRGINIA: IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE CITY OF MARTINSVILLE

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,)	
CITY OF MARTINSVILLE,)	
PLAINTIFF,)	
)	CASE NO: CR19000009-00
v.)	
)	
BRIAN DAVID HILL,)	
DEFENDANT.)	

**MOTION FOR JUDGMENT OF ACQUITTAL OR NEW TRIAL BASED
UPON NEW EVIDENCE WHICH COULD NOT BE ADMISSIBLE AT
THE TIME OF CONVICTION; NEW EVIDENCE OF SPOILIATION
OF EVIDENCE COMMITTED BY COMMONWEALTH OF
VIRGINIA; REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS AGAINST COUNSEL
GLEN ANDREW HALL, ESQUIRE (OFFICER OF THE COURT) FOR
VIOLATING COURT ORDERS FOR NOT TURNING OVER BODY-
CAMERA FOOTAGE AND IT IS LIKELY DESTROYED AND
BIOLOGICAL EVIDENCE OF BLOOD VIALS OBTAINED ON DAY
OF CHARGE, ALSO LIKELY DESTROYED**

COMES NOW the Defendant, BRIAN DAVID HILL (“Defendant”), by and through himself pro se, and moves this Honorable Court for the following, for judgment of acquittal or a New Trial based upon new admissible evidence which could not have been legally considered admissible in 2019 until a new law had passed in 2021; and new evidence that the Commonwealth of Virginia by and through Martinsville Police Department had violated one or multiple Court Orders on omission and destruction of discovery materials aka Brady materials pursuant to Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83 (1963) and pursuant to the Court Orders. **This**

Motion is pursuant to Virginia Rules of the Sup. Ct. 3A:15; Virginia Code § 19.2-271.6; and *Schlup v. Delo*, 513 U.S. at 327 — 28. *Settles v. Brooks*, Civil Action No. 07-812, 18 n.6 (W.D. Pa. Jun. 26, 2008).

The request for judgment of acquittal is for criminal case no. CR19000009-00; charge of violating Virginia Code § 18.2-387. Indecent exposure dated September 21, 2018; and the criminal conviction judgment which was rendered on November 18, 2019.

Defendant requests in this motion that the Court consider all new **STATEMENT OF FACTS** concerning new facts of mental illness/disability/disorders which were not admissible at the time of the criminal conviction and spoliation of evidence by the Commonwealth, and that these **STATEMENT OF FACTS** warrant a judgment of acquittal, A New Trial, or an evidentiary hearing to make a determination on the new facts and allow both sides to present evidence to the Court; present any witnesses for direct examination and cross examination; and make a determination if Defendant had made a requisite showing of Actual Innocence through Legal Innocence, meaning that the law was never violated that a conviction cannot be sustained with the new evidence.

This Motion is pursuant to Virginia Rules of the Sup. Ct. 3A:15; Virginia Code § 19.2-271.6; and *Schlup v. Delo*, 513 U.S. at 327 — 28. *Settles v. Brooks*, Civil Action No. 07-812, 18 n.6 (W.D. Pa. Jun. 26, 2008) (“The Supreme Court in *Schlup* explained that an actual innocence claim in the context of seeking to have a procedural default "forgiven" so as to have the procedurally defaulted claims reviewed on the merits is a "gateway" claim. In other words, the claim of actual innocence in the *Schlup* context is not a claim that because I am actually innocent by virtue of that fact alone I am entitled to federal habeas relief but, rather, is a claim that contends because I am actually innocent, the court should **forgive my**

procedural default in the State courts and consider my procedurally defaulted claims on their merits. Schlup, 513 U.S. at 315.”)

Settles v. Brooks, Civil Action No. 07-812, 16 (W.D. Pa. Jun. 26, 2008)
 (“Petitioner counters that this evidence of his actual innocence overcomes the procedural default because to not entertain his **procedurally defaulted claim of actual innocence would result in a complete miscarriage of justice.**”)

This Court’s criminal conviction entered on the judgment of November 18, 2019, against Brian David Hill, an innocent man, is not a final judgment as the timely direct appeal of that criminal conviction is still pending after filing a timely NOTICE OF APPEAL (CAV Appeal no. 1295-20-3) to the Supreme Court of Virginia on September 9, 2021. Still pending. Therefore the final judgment had not been entered yet and this MOTION is being filed during the appeal pending process of Direct Appeal of the criminal conviction in this case. A judgment is usually not final until a timely appeal had concluded by the highest appeal Court available. Therefore this Motion should not be barred by any time limits. Also “Actual Innocence” is not procedurally time barred and “Actual Innocence” claims cannot be time barred. “Actual Innocence” is not procedurally barred.

Before the Statement of Facts, let us examine a new law as to admissibility of evidence material and relevant to his criminal charge, previously not admissible in the year, 2019, when Defendant had withdrawn his appeal. Defendant had not plead guilty and had retained his right to prove his Actual Innocence and overturn his conviction at a later date. With the new Virginia law in 2021, today is that day.

CITATION OF § 19.2-271.6. Evidence of defendant's mental condition admissible; notice to Commonwealth.

A. For the purposes of this section:

"Developmental disability" means the same as that term is defined in § 37.2-100.

"Intellectual disability" means the same as that term is defined in § 37.2-100.

"Mental illness" means a disorder of thought, mood, perception, or orientation that significantly impairs judgment or capacity to recognize reality.

B. In any criminal case, evidence offered by the defendant concerning the defendant's mental condition at the time of the alleged offense, including expert testimony, is relevant, is not evidence concerning an ultimate issue of fact, and shall be admitted if such evidence (i) tends to show the defendant did not have the intent required for the offense charged and (ii) is otherwise admissible pursuant to the general rules of evidence. For purposes of this section, to establish the underlying mental condition the defendant must show that his condition existed at the time of the offense and that the condition satisfies the diagnostic criteria for (i) a mental illness, (ii) a developmental disability or intellectual disability, or (iii) autism spectrum disorder as defined in the most recent edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders of the American Psychiatric Association.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The Statement of Facts is hereby presented to the Circuit Court for Martinsville based on the following new pieces of evidence:

1. Defendant suffers from a neurological mental condition/illness and disorder since childhood known as Autism Spectrum Disorder, this disorder is in The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM). It is a highly diagnosed disorder on many kids with unusual behavior issues in schools and daycares, and is a known disorder. Autism follows the child into adulthood and is considered a permanent neurological disability. Defendant had suffered from such disorder before the time of the alleged incident on September 21, 2018, during the time of the alleged incident on September 21, 2018, and after the time of the alleged

incident on September 21, 2018. This new Virginia Law and the evidence presented by Defendant plays a role in proving that there was NO INTENT to violate Virginia Code, citing Mens Rea, in regards to the charge of Virginia Code § 18.2-387. Indecent exposure, on September 21, 2018. See EXHIBIT 1 (EXHIBIT PAGES 1-3), EXHIBIT 10 (EXHIBIT PAGES 131-137), EXHIBIT 11 (EXHIBIT PAGES 138-139), AND EXHIBIT 12 (EXHIBIT PAGES 140-146).

2. Defendant was diagnosed in October, 2018, as to suffer from a psychosis after making statements about a guy wearing a hoodie threatening to kill his mother if he had not gotten naked. Psychosis Disorder was given to Brian David Hill by Psychiatrist Dr. Conrad Daum, a forensic psychiatrist. Psychosis was found in relevance to and material to the alleged incident on September 21, 2018, regarding the alleged indecent exposure allegations against Brian David Hill.
3. Only in 2019, when the Jury Trial was scheduled for December 2, 2019, Defendant's only best viable option at the time was to attempt to plead not guilty by reason of INSANITY, as at the time was Defendant's only option, but that option was not available to Defendant due to lack of sufficient evidence for the Circuit Court to find Defendant not guilty by reason of insanity. Now with the Legislature's 2021 passage of Virginia Code § 19.2-271.6, **Defendant now can declare himself not guilty by evidence of his mental disorders/illnesses/disabilities and no intent by reason of Autism Spectrum Disorder, Psychosis, and Obsessive Compulsive Disorder.** In regards to INTENT, the intent element of his charge, **Brian David Hill is innocent of the intent element and the intent element by the Commonwealth is disproven by the 2021 admissible evidence which was not admissible in 2019.**
4. The STATEMENT OF FACTS paragraphs 1 and 3; and paragraphs 18-23; could not have been used for the Jury Trial prior to Defendant withdrawing his appeal, filed on November 12, 2019, because the statute/law of Virginia Code § 19.2-

271.6 had not existed until 2021 after the General Assembly passed such bill into law and the Governor's approval by signing the legislation. In 2019, during the pendency of his Trial De Novo, Defendant was only permitted to try for mental insanity plea but that is a very high bar with ghastly consequences of indefinite detention in a State Mental Hospital if it had succeeded. Now thanks to the new 2021 law, now the defendant has another admissible and legal defense and that is his defense of Autism, Obsessive Compulsive Disorder, and Psychosis proving that Defendant had no intent of violating Virginia Code § 18.2-387; and intent is required to be proven to convict Defendant of the charge of violating Virginia Code § 18.2-387. All elements of a criminal charge and allegations must be proven beyond a reasonable doubt to convict, otherwise the Court must acquit.

5. The STATEMENT OF FACTS paragraphs 1 and 3; and paragraphs 18-23; and other FACTS could not have been used in the Jury Trial scheduled for December 2, 2019, even if Defendant had not withdrawn his appeal, filed on November 12, 2019, because the statute/law of Virginia Code § 19.2-271.6 had not existed until 2021 after the General Assembly passed such bill into law and the Governor's approval by signing the legislation. With the law in effect, Defendant can now have a defense for when he takes the matter back to Trial or request for Judgment of Acquittal to save scarce judicial resources by FACTS of Innocence. A criminal case "defense" is considered actual innocence. Having a defense means that you did not break the law, and the legal defense shows that the law was not violated.
6. Now that the statute/law of Virginia Code § 19.2-271.6, had been codified as the law, it nullifies Virginia Supreme Court verdict of Stamper v. Commonwealth, 228 Va. 707 (1985). Due to that Virginia Supreme Court decision, Normally the Courts bar usage of mental disorders and mental disabilities as any defense of NO INTENT or helps prove innocence; cause of that case law authority in the year of 1985 prior to the new law in the year of 2021. However the passage of this new

LAW by the Legislature nullifies that case law, nullifies Stamper v. Commonwealth, 228 Va. 707 (1985) and modifies existing law to permit usage of Developmental disability, Intellectual disability, and mental illness as a legal defense to a criminal charge in regards to INTENT and that such evidence would be admissible when normally it would be barred by the Courts in Virginia. Therefore it is codified as LAW that mental disorders and mental illnesses be considered as part of the evidence, facts, and elements of a charged crime. Mental disorders can disprove one or multiple elements of a charged crime and thus a Defendant cannot be held culpable as previously held under previous law.

7. THEREFORE, Defendant requests with the Circuit Court in this MOTION to modify and/or extend any existing or create new case law of Virginia Code § 19.2-271.6 with the nullification of Stamper v. Commonwealth, 228 Va. 707 (1985); to hold or find that Defendant Brian David Hill is entitled to a new criminal defense; and thus is either entitled to a New Trial or Judgment of Acquittal by establishing proof of his mental illnesses/disabilities/disorders and that those mental issues are material to the charge and thus prove that Defendant had no INTENT to violate any Virginia Law on the night of September 21, 2018. Defendant requests that the law in this Court must be extended or modified or newly created by the new law to extend to the criminal case of Brian David Hill, and to the wrongful conviction of Brian David Hill on November 18, 2019.

8. Under the United States and Virginia Constitutions you must be guilty of every element of a crime to be convicted. The Government bears the burden of proving every element of your crime beyond a reasonable doubt. Like in the OJ Simpson Trial case for example, if the glove doesn't fit, the Jury must acquit.
9. Defendant Brian David Hill never plead guilty when he had filed a motion to withdraw appeal. He had a defense with proof of evidence backing such criminal

defense which had not existed (as it was inadmissible in 2019) in the year of 2019 but now existed after the year of 2021. The judge recognized that Brian David Hill never plead guilty, such notion was marked out of the record by permanent black marker pen ink. On the Judgment entered by Hon. Giles Carter Greer on November 18, 2019: he or his Law Clerk had stricken from the record any notion of such. Therefore, it is a fact that Defendant never plead guilty to this charge in any Court of Law.

10. The Virginia Code § 19.2-271.6 provides that a Defendant can file and assert evidence to support his defense now that he had “no intent” to commit any criminal act on September 21, 2018. The law says “and shall be admitted if such evidence (i) tends to show the defendant did **not have the intent required for the offense charged**” (citations omitted).
11. With the new evidence presented along with the STATEMENT OF FACTS paragraphs 1 through 10; paragraphs 18 through 23; on December 21, 2018, the General District Court erred in finding that the evidence before it was sufficient to find that Defendant violated Virginia Code § 18.2-387 because the evidence **failed to show that the Defendant acted intentionally** to make an obscene display or exposure of his person. That means the Circuit Court also erred in affirming the judgment of the General District Court on November 18, 2019.
12. That criminal law statute provides, in relevant part, that “[e]very person who **intentionally** makes an **obscene** display or exposure of his person, or the private parts thereof, in any public place, or in any place where others are present, or procures another to so expose himself, shall be guilty of a Class 1 misdemeanor.” Va. Code § 18.2-387 (emphases added).
13. “The ‘obscenity’ element of Code § 18.2–387 may be satisfied when: (1) the accused admits to possessing such intent, *Moses v. Commonwealth*, 611 S.E.2d

607, 608 (Va. App. 2005)(*en banc*); (2) the defendant is visibly aroused, *Morales v. Commonwealth*, 525 S.E.2d 23, 24 (Va. App. 2000); (3) the defendant engages in masturbatory behavior, *Copeland v. Commonwealth*, 525 S.E.2d 9, 10 (Va. App. 2000); or (4) in other circumstances when the totality of the circumstances supports an inference that the accused had as his dominant purpose a prurient interest in sex, Hart, 441 S.E.2d at 707–08. The mere exposure of a naked body is not obscene. See *Price v. Commonwealth*, 201 S.E.2d 798, 800 (Va. 1974) (finding that “[a] portrayal of nudity is not, as a matter of law, a sufficient basis for finding that [it] is obscene’).” *Romick v. Commonwealth*, No. 1580-12-4, 2013 WL 6094240, at *2 (Va. Ct. App. Nov. 19, 2013)(unpublished)(internal citations reformatted).

14. While the evidence may show that Defendant was naked in public at night, as stated in the original Criminal Complaint Affidavit filed on September 21, 2018 by Officer Robert Jones of Martinsville Police Department; nudity, without more, is not obscene under Virginia law. Rather, “[t]he word ‘obscene’ where it appears in this article shall mean that which, **considered as a whole, has as its dominant theme or purpose an appeal to the prurient interest in sex**, that is a shameful or morbid interest in nudity, sexual conduct, sexual excitement, excretory functions or products thereof or sadomasochistic abuse, and which goes substantially beyond customary limits of candor in description or representation of such matters and which, taken as a whole, does not have serious literary, artistic, political or scientific value.” Va. Code § 18.2-372 (emphasis added). While Virginia does not appear to have established a clean definition of criminal intent, Black’s Law Dictionary defines it as “[a]n intent to commit an actus reus without any justification, excuse, or other defense.”

15. In summary, in order to show that the Defendant committed the offense of indecent exposure under Virginia law, the Commonwealth was required to prove,

among other things, that the Defendant had the intent to display or expose himself in a way which has, as its dominant theme or purpose, appeal to the prurient interest in sex, as further defined above, without any justification, excuse, or other defense.¹ The Commonwealth failed to do so. Rather, the Commonwealth's evidence, presented through its own witnesses, showed the Defendant as someone who was running around naked between midnight and 3:00 a.m. and taking pictures of himself because he believed that someone was going to hurt his family if he did not do so. See **EXHIBIT 4**. See EXHIBIT PAGES INDEX PAGES 45-46.

16. The General District Court on the Trial of December 21, 2018 and the Circuit Court while pending a Trial De Novo did not hear of Virginia Code § 19.2-271.6; and any evidence admissible pursuant to Virginia Code § 19.2-271.6 (2021, law) could not be admissible at the time of General District Court on the Trial of December 21, 2018; and not to be at the time of the Jury Trial set for the date of December 2, 2019, in the Circuit Court for the City of Martinsville. Now new evidence can be heard and be admitted for the Jury Trial or Judgment of Acquittal or New Trial by a rational trier of fact.

17. Had the passage of Virginia Code § 19.2-271.6 been prior to the Jury Trial set for December 2, 2019, the Defendant never would have filed a motion to withdraw appeal. The passage of Virginia Code § 19.2-271.6 gives the defendant a defense which had not been allowed previously at the time of both Trials in both the General District Court and the Circuit Court. The cause and passage of Virginia

¹ For the reasons stated above, the government's burden was to prove every element of the offense, including the mens rea, beyond a reasonable doubt. However, even if, arguendo, this Court were to find that the government's burden was only a preponderance of the evidence, the government has still failed to carry its burden.

Code § 19.2-271.6 had caused the Defendant to want to pursue either a New Trial, Actual Innocence, or Judgment of Acquittal. Since evidence that Defendant could not be allowed to use in both Trials is now permissible to be used and is admissible. This gives the Defendant, a laser-focused legal defense which can be used to be found not-guilty by a jury. A laser-focused legal defense which was not afforded to him in 2019 due to the previous law or laws regarding admissibility of mental illness, mental disability, and mental disorders as evidence for his/her defense to a criminal charge.

18. The General District Court and the Circuit Court did not hear, however, any evidence of Defendant having his dominant theme, or purpose being an appeal to the prurient interest in sex. For example, there was no evidence of Defendant making any sexual remarks, being aroused, masturbating, or enjoying his conduct, sexually or otherwise. If a person was purposing to expose himself in public because he or she found it sexually arousing, it would be logical that he or she would pick a place and time where he or she would expect to encounter lots of members of the public. Defendant did not do that. Rather, he was running around between midnight and 3:00 a.m. and the witnesses to his nudity were few. Hence, the statements Defendant made to police and his conduct both indicate that, in the light most favorable to the Commonwealth, he was naked in public **while having a psychiatric episode or mental breakdown**, but **without the intent necessary to commit indecent exposure under Virginia law**. Therefore, the Circuit Court and General District Court erred, as a matter of law, when it found that Defendant had violated Virginia Code § 18.2-387. The conviction must be vacated as soon as possible.

19. There was only one Mental Evaluation ordered by the General District Court regarding the time of the alleged incident on September 21, 2018, and at the time it was only regarding Mental Insanity or Competency. That evaluation was

conducted for this case in the General District Court, before it was appealed as a Trial De Novo review. Despite it being only for “Competency to Stand Trial”, that evaluation is relevant and material to what had happened on September 21, 2018. For GC18-3138. Evaluation Report is sealed so I am referring to the entire SEALED EVALUATION CASE FILES. Anyways, that evaluation was not pursuant to Virginia Code § 19.2-271.6, but nevertheless that mental evaluation by Dr. Rebecca K. Lochrer, PhD, shall constitute material evidence in support of Defendant’s defense in his criminal case pursuant to Virginia Code § 19.2-271.6. Therefore Defendant did push for such mental evaluation, even though in 2018 it was only permitted to be an evaluation for competency and/or insanity. Some of the diagnoses are: “Autism Spectrum Disorder” and “Obsessive Compulsive Disorder”. Both of those are evidence pursuant to Virginia Code § 19.2-271.6, and prove that Defendant had such disorders at the time of the alleged incident as charged on September 21, 2018.

20. There was an issue of non-compliance with one element of the Court Order for a Mental Evaluation where Attorney Scott Albrecht of the Public Defender Office in 2018 was supposed to provide all mental health records known to him and medical records known to him to Dr. Rebecca K. Lochrer, PhD, for the mental evaluation. Scott Albrecht did not provide a documented diagnosis from forensic psychiatrist Dr. Conrad Daum in October 24, 2018, where he had diagnosed Defendant as having “Psychosis” referring to Psychosis Disorder and “Autistic Disorder” referring to Autism Spectrum Disorder. See **Exhibit 12** (EXHIBIT PAGES 140-146) for the diagnosis on October 24, 2018. That was omitted from her PSYCHOLOGICAL EVALUATION and never introduced to Dr. Rebecca K. Lochrer, PhD, so she was in the dark in regards to the psychosis diagnosis. She, the psychological evaluator for the criminal case did not know about that past diagnosis which means her report was premature, erroneous (by lack of all

knowledge of all mental reports) and incomplete due to lack of her access to all relevant and material mental health records that Attorney Scott Albrecht may have been aware of but failed to give her a copy of as asked by the Court. See **Exhibit 13** (EXHIBIT PAGES 147-152), for the information on Dr. Conrad Daum being a “American Board of Forensic Psychiatry Certification in Forensic Psychiatry”. So he is a certified forensic psychiatrist, which means his evaluations and expertise is admissible in Federal and/or State Courts. Also now admissible under Virginia Code § 19.2-271.6.

21. The evaluation referenced and cited in paragraphs 17 and 18, prove for a fact that Defendant Brian David Hill suffers from Autism Spectrum Disorder, Obsessive Compulsive disorder, and a psychosis around the time of the charge of Brian David Hill for the alleged claim that Brian David Hill committed indecent exposure and was charged with violating Virginia Code § 18.2-387.
22. It is a fact that Brian David Hill has Autism Spectrum Disorder and had this disorder/illness since he was a child. See **Exhibit 1** (EXHIBIT PAGES 1-3). **Exhibit 1** is the “DISABLED PARKING PLACARDS OR LICENSE PLATES APPLICATION” with a Doctor’s medical certification in the year 2016 that Brian David Hill is permanently limited or impaired, because of his Autism Spectrum Disorder. See **Exhibit 10** (EXHIBIT PAGES 131-137). **Exhibit 10** is the “DIVISION FOR TREATMENT AND EDUCATION OF AUTISTIC AND RELATED COMMUNICATION HANDICAPPED CHILDREN, Department of Psychiatry, University of North Carolina, DIAGNOSTIC EVALUATION”. This proves to the Circuit Court of the City of Martinsville, that Brian David Hill’s claim of being autistic is not merely some new claim and is not some new claim to attempt to make Brian appear to be Autistic, but he is autistic for many years, for decades, well since he was four years old. He is Autistic and has always been Autistic since the age of 4 as documented by the **Exhibit 10** diagnostic report.

Brian David Hill establishes a STATEMENT OF FACT that Brian David Hill has been autistic since childhood, and thus this is a real disorder and he had this disorder in the 1990s even before 2018. This makes this FACT an undeniable FACT. Prima Facie evidence.

23. It is a fact that Brian David Hill has Autism Spectrum Disorder and had this disorder/illness in 2017 as well. See **Exhibit 11** (EXHIBIT PAGES 138-139), Letter from “Dr. Shyam E. Balakrishnan, MD”. The DMV record referenced in paragraph 20 and the letter both demonstrate the prima facie evidence that Brian David Hill has Autism Spectrum Disorder and Obsessive Compulsive Disorder.
24. There is an expert witness documented report (a whitepaper) from a Law Enforcement trainer regarding Autism Spectrum Disorder and interactions with Law Enforcement Officers. That would include interactions with people like for example: Commonwealth witness and Police Officer Robert R. Jones, who interacted with Brian David Hill on September 21, 2018, who Brian David Hill had Autism Spectrum Disorder. I submit to the Circuit Court of the City of Martinsville, a relevant and material whitepaper and expert witness testimony, 3-page report from Dennis Debbaudt. The Commonwealth of Virginia and the Circuit Court may contact this expert witness and subpoena him or depose him, expert named Dennis Debbaudt, at the address of 2338 SE Holland Street, Port St. Lucie, Florida 34953. His email is DDPI@flash.net. Phone: (772) 398-9756. The expert witness report applies to Brian David Hill on the situation with his interactions with Officer Robert Jones, the charging Officer on September 21, 2018. The report is titled: “Interview and Interrogation of people with autism (including Asperger syndrome)” This shall be a STATEMENT OF FACT regarding any oral or written statements obtained from Brian David Hill by Officer Robert Jones can be part of his Autism Spectrum Disorder. Brian David Hill warned Officer Robert Jones that he had Autism and can give misleading

statements when questioned. The officer refused to take heed of Brian's advice of his mental disability, of his communications issues, and totally treated it as if it weren't true, despite the medical records proving that Brian had Autism and has Autism. Brian didn't lie to the officer. Officer Jones did not take any of Brian's statements about Autism into account or consideration when charging the Defendant. See **Exhibit 14** (EXHIBIT PAGES 153-164).

25. According to **Exhibit 14** (EXHIBIT PAGES 153-164), a Federal Court Declaration Brian David Hill had filed notifying the U.S. District Court about the incident and his charge which had occurred on September 21, 2018. It is titled: "STATUS REPORT OF PETITIONER SEPTEMBER 27, 2018". Six (6) days after his arrest and charge. The reason it was filed on the date of October 17, 2018, was because Defendant had mailed the legal pleading to the wrong address: "324 West Market Street," "Martinsville, Virginia 24112". The mailing got returned to him (RETURN TO SENDER) for no such address and Brian David Hill later realized that he mailed the wrong city and State, and mailed it to the correct address of the Federal Courthouse at 324 West Market Street, Greensboro, North Carolina 27401. The **Exhibit 14** document is his statements about what he personally believed had happened on September 21, 2018, and what led up to it. He even said he thought he was "drugged" and yet the Commonwealth of Virginia never mandated any drug test DESPITE Defendant's claims of being "drugged", and it is their fault, it is the fault of Martinsville Police Department and Martinsville City Jail for not drug testing him when he is making statements in Federal Court, in writing, claiming that he thought he was drugged. Those written statements can be proven. I bet Defendant also told his attorney and/or the Officer and Brian's family during visitation that Defendant thought he was drugged and had blackouts. The Commonwealth never requested any drug test or Carboxyhemoglobin test because they were afraid that it would prove Brian Hill's

statements to be true, referring to any statements he made to Officer Robert Jones when being questioned about why he was naked.

26. This STATEMENT OF FACT shall present evidence that Defendant was deprived of Brady evidence material from the Commonwealth of Virginia in violation of multiple Court Orders, in violation of his Constitutional rights pursuant to Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83 (1963). Not just deprived of evidence, but evidence was destroyed by the Commonwealth of Virginia. Evidence such as: (#1) body-camera footage recorded by Officer Robert Jones and body-camera footage of any other police officers involved on September 21, 2018, regarding the arrest and interview/interrogation of Brian David Hill on September 21, 2018. Evidence such as: (#2) Blood vials drawn from Brian David Hill's arm at the Hospital after police detained Brian David Hill and handcuffed him and taken him to the Hospital. Technically Defendant was in Law Enforcement custody, in the custody of Martinsville Police Department after he was detained, and was at the Hospital with the officers present with defendant handcuffed. They were responsible for collection of any evidence and preservation of any evidence including biological evidence, concerning a pending criminal case matter before a Court. Biological evidence including blood samples and blood drawn from Defendant after being detained at a creek and had been taken to the Hospital by Martinsville Police and being driven there in an ambulance but still was under police custody. Blood vials were destroyed and laboratory tests which were supposed to be conducted including any drug or alcohol tests were then cancelled and blood vials destroyed. Martinsville Police Department was represented by the Commonwealth of Virginia, and Martinsville Police Department had committed two acts of spoliation of evidence. Therefore, the Commonwealth of Virginia destroyed evidence in violation of Court Orders and therefore, have violated multiple Court Orders which is CONTEMPT OF COURT, multiple times. Not

only has the Commonwealth of Virginia through its counsel Glen Andrew Hall, Esquire, committed the offenses of CONTEMPT OF COURT by omission of the body-camera footage and the blood vials drawn from Brian's arm, but had destroyed evidence and the Circuit Court should sanction Glen Andrew Hall, Esquire for destruction of biological evidence and destruction of video footage by a police body-camera recorded on September 21, 2018 of Brian David Hill.

The Circuit Court should punish Glen Andrew Hall and Martinsville Police department for violating one or multiple Court Orders.

See inherit or implied power and authority of all Courts under *Chambers v. Nasco, Inc.* (90-256), 501 U.S. 32 (1991); *Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v Hartford-Empire Co.*, 322 U.S. 238 (1944).

Spoliation of Evidence is considered a FACT, and can be part of the STATEMENT OF FACTS because any spoliation of evidence by the Plaintiff/Prosecutor of a criminal or civil case means that his/her case was a weak or unfounded one from the very beginning no matter what alleged facts are filed of his/her cause.

For purposes of this Motion, "destruction of evidence" means rendering discoverable matter permanently unavailable to the court and the opposing party. Such a broad definition is necessary because of the great many contexts in which courts and commentators have considered destruction of evidence. It has two components: destruction and evidence.

See 2 J. WIGMORE (John Henry Wigmore), *EVIDENCES* § 278, at 133 James Harmon Chadborn ed., Little, Brown 1979) (1940) (emphasis added). See Federal Rules of Evidence 401.; 32 C.J.S. Evidence § 535 (2008); Evidence—Admissibility of

Attempts by a Party to Suppress Evidence, 9 TEX. L. REV. 79, 100 (1930) (stating that it has “long been recognized” that a party’s misconduct in manipulating evidence is admissible as indicating a “consciousness of the weakness of his case,” and citing cases from the 1800s that applied the inference to the fabrication, suppression, or destruction of evidence).

See *United Medical Supply Company, Inc. v. U.S.*, No. 03-289C, 8 (Fed. Cl. Jun. 27, 2007) (“Spoliation is the destruction or significant alteration of evidence, or failure to preserve property for another's use as evidence in pending or reasonably foreseeable litigation.” *West v. Goodyear Tire Rubber Co.*, 167 F.3d 776, 779 (2d Cir. 1999) (citing *Black's Law Dictionary* 1401 (6th ed. 1990)); see also *Allstate Ins. Co. v. Hamilton Beach/Proctor Silex, Inc.*, 473 F.3d 450, 457 (2d Cir. 2007). It has long been the rule that spoliators should not benefit from their wrongdoing, as illustrated by “that favourite maxim of the law, *omnia presumuntur contra spoliatores*,” 1 Sir T. Willes *Chitty, et al.*, *Smith's Leading Cases*, 404 (13th ed. 1929). Spoliation may result in a variety of sanctions, with “the oldest and most venerable remedy” being an “adverse inference,” under which the finder of fact may infer that the destroyed evidence would have been favorable to the opposing side. Jonathan Judge, “Reconsidering Spoliation: Common-Sense Alternatives to the Spoliation Tort,” 2001 *Wis. L.Rev.* 441, 444 (2001); see also Jamie S. Gorelick, Stephen Marzen Lawrence Solum, *Destruction of Evidence* § 1.3 (1989) (hereinafter “Gorelick”).”)

If you catch the other side engaged in falsification including destruction of evidence, you can use that to argue that the other side's entire position lacks merit. And even more fundamentally, judges and juries do not like being tricked. If a judge or jury agrees that your opponent has engaged in falsification—even falsification relating only to one of several issues in the case—it will hold this quite strongly against your opponent and will come to doubt the validity of everything your opponent says and claims.

See 501 U.S. at 56–57; see also *Synanon Found., Inc. v. Bernstein*, 517 A.2d 28, 43 (D.C. 1986) (once a party embarks on a “pattern of fraud,” and “[r]egardless of the relevance of these [fraudulent] materials to the substantive legal issue in the case,” this is enough to “completely taint [the party’s] entire litigation strategy from the date on which the abuse actually began”).

See Some examples are: *Breezevale Ltd. v. Dickinson*, 879 A.2d 957, 964 (D.C. 2005) (**affirming sanction of dismissal where top executives of plaintiff company engaged in scheme to forge documents and subsequently denied the forgery in pleadings and sworn testimony**); *Synanon Found., Inc. v. Bernstein*, 503 A.2d 1254, 1263 (D.C. 1986) (**affirming sanction of dismissal where plaintiff, inter alia, destroyed audiotapes and made false statements to the court “that no responsive documents could be found” in order “to deceive the court, and to improperly influence the court in its decision on the defendants’ motions to compel, with the ultimate aim of preventing the judicial process from operating in an impartial fashion”**); *Cox v.*

Burke, 706 So. 2d 43 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 1998) (affirming sanction of dismissal where plaintiff gave false answers to interrogatories and deceptive deposition testimony); Pope v. Fed. Express Corp., 974 F.2d 982, 984 (8th Cir. 1992) (affirming sanction of dismissal for plaintiff's forgery of, and reliance on, a single document); Aoude v. Mobil Oil Corp., 892 F.2d 1115 (1st Cir. 1989) (affirming dismissal where plaintiff concocted a single document); Tramel v. Bass, 672 So. 2d 78, 82 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 1996) (**affirming default judgment against defendant who excised damaging six-second portion of videotape** before producing it during discovery).

**FACTS AND ISSUES WARRANTING JUDGMENT OF ACQUITTAL AND/OR
SANCTIONS AGAINST GLEN ANDREW HALL, ESQUIRE, AND AGAINST
THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA**

1. The General District Court of Martinsville had entered an Order on the date of November 28, 2018. See **EXHIBIT 5** (EXHIBIT PAGES 112-114) to this filing. That order had not been complied with by the Commonwealth of Virginia for spoliation and omission of the body-camera footage recorded on September 21, 2018. Blood vials are biological human evidence, so it is considered Brady discovery materials and are relevant and material to September 21, 2018, and this such spoliation also violates this Court Order.

2. This Circuit Court for the City of Martinsville and the General District Court of the City of Martinsville did not know that the Commonwealth of Virginia and the City of Martinsville, through its legal counsel named Glen Andrew Hall, Esquire, had not followed the Court Orders of November 28, 2018; February 6, 2019; and July 15, 2019. That he did not comply with those Court Orders and flagrantly violated those Court Orders without giving a good reason to justify such action(s).

3. The Circuit Court for the City of Martinsville had entered an Order on the date of February 6, 2019. See **EXHIBIT 6** to this filing (EXHIBIT PAGES 115-118). Order for discovery materials. That order had not been complied with by the Commonwealth of Virginia for spoliation and omission of the body-camera footage recorded on September 21, 2018. Blood vials are biological human evidence, so it is considered Brady discovery materials and are relevant and material to September 21, 2018, and this such spoliation also violates this Court Order.

4. The Circuit Court for the City of Martinsville had entered an Order on the date of July 15, 2019. See **EXHIBIT 7** to this filing (EXHIBIT PAGES 119-122). Order for discovery materials. That order had not been complied with by the Commonwealth of Virginia for spoliation and omission of the body-camera footage recorded on September 21, 2018. That order had not been complied with by the Commonwealth of Virginia for spoliation and omission of blood vials, aka biological evidence obtained from Brian David Hill while at Sovah Hospital on September 21, 2018, while in the custody of Martinsville Police department before being charged with indecent exposure. Blood vials are biological human evidence, so it is considered Brady discovery materials and are relevant and material to September 21, 2018, and this such spoliation also violates this Court Order.

5. Evidence in the Court record attached thereto had proven that the Defendant had repeatedly asked for the police body-camera footage and made statements under Affidavit in the Federal Court and had sent written letters to Martinsville Police Department. All of those letters asked for the Police body-camera footage as was supposed to be to comply with the General District Court's order dated November 28, 2018. See **EXHIBITS 2 (EXHIBIT PAGES 4-27) AND 3 (EXHIBIT PAGES 28-29)**.

6. Scott Albrecht was too afraid to push for a contempt proceeding against Glen Andrew Hall, Esquire, for failing and refusing to turn over a copy of the Martinsville Police body-camera footage which is relevant non-subjective evidence dated September 21, 2018, and refused or failed to allow inspection or copying of this relevant non-subjective evidence to defense attorney Scott Albrecht. Defendant kept asking for this body-camera footage over and over again. His requests went unanswered and then the body-camera footage was later destroyed as Defendant found out from Attorney Matthew Clark that Martinsville Police Department had a body-camera footage evidence retention period before destroying the evidence. It doesn't matter about the evidence retention period, because the Court Order demanded that this Brady material be turned over to the Defendant and his counsel to have it inspected and make copies for the purpose of legal defense to the criminal prosecution's charge.

7. The Martinsville Police Department who originally had filed the complaint in this case, is and was represented by Glen Andrew Hall, Esquire, and the Martinsville Police Department is the client of the Commonwealth Attorney Glen Andrew Hall, Esquire. As the client, the client as well as its representative legal counsel has to comply with whatever Court Orders are entered at the direct of this Court. Defendant was charged

with Virginia Code § 18.2-387, Indecent Exposure, in the City of Martinsville. When a criminal charge or any litigation is pending, evidence is supposed to be retained and safeguarded until the litigation is concluded and all appeal or appeals exhausted.

8. Martinsville Police Department did retain the body-camera footage at the beginning of when it was recorded as was outlined in a public news article printout titled: “Body Cameras Proving Useful for Martinsville Police | WSET”. See **EXHIBIT 2** (EXHIBIT PAGES 4-27) AND **EXHIBIT 8** (EXHIBIT PAGES 123-126).

9. While the General District court can argue that they transferred the case to the Circuit Court of Martinsville. This order originally came from the General District Court of the city of Martinsville. The Circuit Court may or may not hold the legal counsel in contempt for violating a General District Court order. However Glen Andrew Hall, Esquire, did violate that General District Court Order and two Circuit Court Orders with all intents and purposes described in this Motion and its attachments/Exhibits herein. This Court still has the power from its inherit powers to push for a contempt charge or contempt proceeding against Glen Andrew Hall for not complying with the Court Order in **EXHIBIT 5** (EXHIBIT PAGES 112-114) and the other two Court Orders as exhibited herein in Exhibits 5, 6, and 7.

10. Since it was up to Attorney Scott Albrecht entirely to ensure the proper following of the Orders of this Court, Scott Albrecht should also be considered as an accomplice of the contempt behavior of the Commonwealth Attorney Glen Andrew Hall, Esquire, since he allowed such blatant violation of the General District Court’s (“GDC’s”) and this Court's Order for discovery.

Citation of Court Order (COPY OF COURT ORDER, **EXHIBIT 5, EXHIBIT PAGES**

112-114):

It appearing to the Court that discovery pursuant to Rule 7C:5 should be granted to the Defendant, it is hereby ORDERED and DECREED that the Commonwealth's Attorney permit counsel for the Defendant to inspect and copy or photograph, within a reasonable time, before the preliminary hearing, the following:

- (1) Any relevant written or recorded statements or confessions made by the Defendant, or copies thereof, or the substance of any oral statements or confessions made by the Defendant to any law enforcement officer, the existence of which is known to the attorney for the Commonwealth;
- (2) [citation omitted]
- (3) Any exculpatory information or evidence as set forth by Brady v. Maryland and its progeny that is known to the Commonwealth.

[Citations reformatted above. May have minor spelling issues as it was copied and pasted]

Citation of Court Order (COPY OF COURT ORDER, **EXHIBIT 6, EXHIBIT PAGES**

115-118):

Came this day, the Defendant, Brian David Hill, by counsel, who moved, pursuant to

Rule 3A:11 of the Rules of Court, that the Commonwealth's Attorney be directed to permit the

Defendant discovery in this case, as set forth in the said Rule, and upon the motion of the

attorney of the Commonwealth requesting reciprocal discovery under the said Rule; and,

It appearing to the Court that discovery pursuant to Rule 3A:11(b) should be granted to

the Defendant, it is hereby ORDERED that the Commonwealth's Attorney permit counsel for the

Defendant to inspect and copy or photograph, within a reasonable time, before the trial or

sentencing, the following:

(1) Any relevant written or recorded statements or confessions made by the

Defendant, or copies thereof, or the substance of any oral statements or confessions made by the

Defendant to any law enforcement officer, the existence of which is known to the attorney for the

Commonwealth, any certificates of analysis pursuant to § 19.2-187, and any relevant written

reports of autopsies, ballistic tests, fingerprint analyses, handwriting analyses, blood, urine, and,

breath tests, other scientific reports, and written reports of a physical or mental examination of

the Defendant or the alleged victim made in connection with this particular case, or copies

thereof, that are known by the Commonwealth's Attorney to be within the possession, custody, or

control of the Commonwealth.

(2) Any exculpatory information or evidence under the guidelines established by

Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83 (1963), and subsequent case law, whether by way of statements,

real evidence, scientific analysis, or reports, known to or in the possession of the

Commonwealth

[Citations reformatted above. May have minor spelling issues as it was copied and pasted]

119-122):

Came this day, the Defendant, Brian David Hill, by counsel, who moved, pursuant to

Rule 3A:11 of the Rules of Court, that the Commonwealth's Attorney be directed to permit the

Defendant discovery in this case, as set forth in the said Rule, and upon the motion of the

attorney of the Commonwealth requesting reciprocal discovery under the said Rule; and,

It appearing to the Court that discovery pursuant to Rule 3A:11(b) should be granted to

the Defendant, it is hereby ORDERED that the Commonwealth's Attorney permit counsel for the

Defendant to inspect and copy or photograph, within a reasonable time, before the trial or

sentencing, the following:

(1) Any relevant written or recorded statements or confessions made by the

Defendant, or copies thereof, or the substance of any oral statements or confessions made by the

Defendant to any law enforcement officer, the existence of which is known to the attorney for the

Commonwealth, any certificates of analysis pursuant to § 19.2-187, and any relevant written

reports of autopsies, ballistic tests, fingerprint analyses, handwriting analyses, blood, urine, and

breath tests, other scientific reports, and written reports of a physical or mental examination of

the Defendant or the alleged victim made in connection with this particular case, or copies

thereof, that are known by the Commonwealth's Attorney to be within the possession, custody, or

control of the Commonwealth.

(2) Any exculpatory information or evidence under the guidelines established by

Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83 (1963), and subsequent case law, whether by way of statements,

real evidence, scientific analysis, or reports, known to or in the possession of the

Commonwealth

[Citations reformatted above. May have minor spelling issues as it was copied and pasted]

11. That order and possibly the other two Court Orders from the Circuit Court said: “Any relevant written or recorded statements or confessions made by the Defendant, or copies thereof, or the substance of any oral statements or confessions made by the Defendant to any law enforcement officer, the existence of which is known to the attorney for the Commonwealth”. They did know about it because any letters mailed to the Chief of Police or the Commonwealth Attorney are known to the Commonwealth Attorney. This was likely during the evidence retention period still in effect at that time for the Police body-camera footage. However the evidence retention period should not matter during a pending criminal litigation. Whether it be a civil litigation hold letter request or a criminal case proceeding, destruction of any evidence which is relevant and directly relevant or material to the prosecution of the case and to the defense of that said criminal prosecution is in direct violation of that Court Order or Court Courts. The multiple letters mailed by Brian David Hill on a pro se basis to the Martinsville Police Department and the letter mailed by Kenneth Ray Forinash and/or Stella Forinash who had mailed a typed copy of that same letter Brian had mailed multiple times to the Martinsville Police Department requesting that body-camera footage as it was supposed to have been turned over pursuant to the Court Order received by Glen Andrew Hall, Esquire, and ordered of Glen Andrew Hall, Esquire, an officer of the Court. Licensed to practice law in that Court,

licensed to practice law in the Commonwealth of Virginia. They knew as multiple letters were mailed, the Court had ordered such evidence to be turned over pursuant to Brady v. Maryland and Virginia Court Rules.

12. See the one Court Order from the General District Court (**Exhibit 5**) (EXHIBIT PAGES 112-114) and the two Court Orders from the Circuit Court requesting Discovery materials from the Commonwealth of Virginia (**Exhibit 6 (EXHIBIT PAGES 115-118), Exhibit 7 (EXHIBIT PAGES 119-122)**) which the Martinsville Police Department did not comply and thus legal counsel Glen Andrew Hall, Esquire for the Commonwealth of Virginia did not comply with all three of the Court Orders.

13. It is clear that the evidence being destroyed is a fragrant non-compliance with the General District Court order dated November 28, 2018 and the Circuit Court orders dated February 6, 2019, and July 15, 2019. Refusing to comply with a Court Order when ordered to do such a thing, whatever the Order says, is usually considered “Contempt of Court” when somebody refuses to comply with such an order. It is also considered defrauding the Court when the destruction of such evidence led to the Guilty verdict against Brian David Hill. Had the evidence not been destroyed, Brian would have had a good chance at winning as evidence inside of the body-camera footage could have been used to point out various things favorable to Brian David Hill's legal innocence to his charge of Indecent Exposure under Virginia Code § 18.2-387. Legal defense to the charge, Legal Innocence, referring to the same matter.

14. All Courts and Judges have the exclusive Constitutional inherit and implied powers to enforce their Court Orders and handle their own affairs. Courts also have the right to overturn a case fueled by FRAUD. Courts also consider destruction of evidence to be defrauding the Court as it had deceived the Court since the Court is a fact finding venue,

a quest to find out the truth on whether a person actually committed a crime or not, a fact finding Judicial branch of Government. If evidence is destroyed, then they cannot have the integrity to conduct proper fact finding in a criminal or civil case. It distorts and tears at the Judicial Machinery. When a Court Orders evidence to be turned over to another party and instead that evidence is destroyed without a good reason, evidence they were supposed to have and turn over or allow a copy to be made or whatever the case may be, then this leads to the Court having no legal power to do anything. This deteriorates justice to the extent where nobody respects the Court and nobody is respecting its authority and not respect its officers when there is no punishment or sanction against a rebellious non-complying officer rebelling against a lawful order of the Court. An officer of the Court is under higher standards than pro se filers because they swore an oath, that they will conduct their lawful duties and follow the laws including rules of the Court as well as the Bar rules of Professional Conduct for licensed attorneys. They have ethical duties as required by the State Bar. They have a higher standard of care regarding their conduct.

15. The City of Martinsville and its Martinsville Police department had destroyed the body-camera footage which is technically termed as: Spoliation. Spoliation is defined as the destruction or a significant or meaningful alteration of evidence.
16. The legal remedy for spoliation is sanctions against the spoliator which may range from exclusion of evidence up to dismissal of a case, or acquittal of the Defendant or a favorable decision of the victim party who is a victim from such spoliation of evidence. In determining the appropriate sanction, the trial court is required to consider:
 1. Whether the opposing party suffers prejudice as a result of the destruction of evidence;

2. Whether the prejudice can be cured;
3. The practical importance of the evidence;
4. Whether the spoliator acted in good or bad faith; and
5. The potential for abuse if the evidence was not excluded.

17. As to the first element: The opposing party Defendant Brian David Hill would suffer prejudice because the Court specifically ordered “Any relevant written or recorded statements or confessions made by the Defendant”. The Court demanded this specific evidence from the Commonwealth Attorney regarding the law enforcement officer involved with the Defendant, and they did not comply, they did not comply at all. So this satisfies the first ground. Because the evidence is destroyed and irretrievable, certain specific things in the body-camera footage can never be used to prove Brian David Hill innocent of his charge of indecent exposure. Proof such as discolored lips of suspect: Brian David Hill which would have warranted that Brian David Hill was under some kind of substance, narcotic, or gas that had affected the mental and physical well being of Brian David Hill. The body-camera footage would have contradicted the Affidavit of Sergeant Robert Jones in his original CRIMINAL COMPLAINT with his claim by the affiant that Brian was psychologically and medically cleared. The footage may also have shown Brian's behavior acting a weird or certain abnormal way under certain conditions where a behavioral or psychological expert can disagree with Brian being psychologically and medically cleared which threatens and contradicts the successful prosecution and conviction of Brian David Hill had any expert in mental behavior saw the body-camera footage. They would disagree and would feel that something was wrong with Brian but that would destroy the prosecution's narrative against the Defendant. The body-camera footage would have shown the discolored lips and one such cause of

discolored lips would be that of “CARBON MONOXIDE POISONING”. It would not be strange that the Defendant who only at one time was caught naked at night on a walking trail may be the victim or subject of CARBON MONOXIDE GAS POISONING. Even Scott Albrecht did not know about this at the time because nobody knew until 2019. It was too late to use that evidence after the General District Court of December 21, 2018, however the Police body-camera footage would have shown the discolored lips and maybe it would have shown other weird abnormal behaviors of Defendant Brian which would correlate it with symptoms of CARBON MONOXIDE POISONING. The body-camera footage is non-subjective evidence. The mouth and face would have been visible. If the Commonwealth Attorney had known or suspected that Brian was under a narcotic, substance, or gas at the time of his indecent exposure, then this adds credibility to his claims of a man wearing a hoodie threatening Brian to get naked, as drugs could play a role if somebody could have drugged Brian up to make him non-coherent. Coherent means logical and consistent. When drugged up by anybody at night where crime can be more prevalent because of the limited law enforcement presence at night, anybody could have drugged Brian David Hill with a narcotic or substance or gas. That would explain greatly why Brian behaved oddly, never engaged in indecent exposure prior to the alleged charge, and then does so under weird circumstances. This is not a normal indecent exposure case given Brian's written statements, saying that he think he was drugged and told his family that he blackouts in 2018 prior to receiving the knowledge in 2019 that gas was leaking from the fireplace in his Apartment for months and months, who knows how long the gas had been leaking into Brian's Apartment. The body-camera footage would have further proven Brian's claims of being drugged or subject to CARBON MONOXIDE POISONING. Under a weird odorless substance like that, worse than a narcotic and can cause any irrational behaviors not normally exhibited. Can even cause memory loss. Even the Martinsville Fire Department could have been subpoenaed to testify at the General district Court and could have been Court Ordered to examine

Brian's Apartment located at 310 Forest Street, Apartment 2, Martinsville, Virginia in 2018 and they would have found overwhelming evidence of CARBON MONOXIDE GAS POISONING at the very residence Brian David Hill was living in prior to his indecent exposure incident. The body-camera footage would have led to an investigation by the Fire Department or mandated to drug test Brian Hill and test his blood, saliva, and urine for any signs of narcotics or substances. If they had found the evidence of CARBON MONOXIDE POISONING or any injected drugs in Brian's system, then the Defendant did not intentionally engage in any behavior which could have been considered as violating Virginia Code § 18.2-387, Indecent Exposure, in the City of Martinsville. The destruction of the evidence means that it cannot be cured, as the evidence which would have proven Defendant innocent of his charge off the bat, it is gone forever and at the fault of Martinsville Police Department. This explanation also justifies "The practical importance of the evidence". It was clearly covered up on purpose to prevent the Court from ever learning the truth about Brian's intentions regarding what had happened on the night of September 21, 2018 on the Dick and Willie walking trail. This is a FRAUD ON THE COURT and Glen Andrew Hall knew that he had deceived the Court by permitting the destruction of evidence which contradicts the Court Order he was supposed to follow. He did not comply with the Court. That is CONTEMPT OF COURT. The last factor is "The potential for abuse if the evidence was not excluded." There is a way this cannot be abused, because a copy can be made of any original video recording or audio recording. All lawyers nowadays have access to a computer, whether Desktop or Laptop. They can easily make a copy of a video recording which was recorded by law enforcement. The Commonwealth Attorney could have easily added stipulations to protect the privacy of Brian David Hill and yet allow the legal counsel to inspect the footage or even allow expert witnesses to review over the body-camera footage including the GDC Court Ordered psychological evaluation and make a determination how it may come to his defense. If carbon monoxide caused temporary

insanity then the Court can easily order this to be turned over to a Mental Hospital with the Carbon Monoxide evidence and then they would have released the Defendant once they have documented that the Carbon Monoxide is out of Brian's system and thus Brian cannot repeat the conduct because sanity would be restored after the Carbon Monoxide Poisoning had left his system and verify that his home had corrected the issue concerning the Carbon Monoxide. There is one concern that the body-camera footage is usually disclosed in the media and the defense counsel can easily ask that it not be kept confidential under strict confidentiality so that it cannot be given to any media as a stipulation to protect Brian David Hill's privacy in the case. The stipulations could have easily been asked of the Court and the Commonwealth Attorney had failed to do so. So this is not a matter of whether it could have been abused or not, they could have reasonably asked the Court for stipulations to protect this evidence from being abused, no trouble at all. The Commonwealth did not want this footage to ever come out in a Court of Law. This is known as a “cover up”.

18. Evidence is usually covered up for a nefarious purpose. Innocent men do not cover their tracks. The Police had covered up evidence. Defendant voluntarily gave them permission to look at his camera, Brian David Hill covered up no evidence at all even at the risk of forfeiting his right to remain silent under Miranda rights. However, the Commonwealth Attorney covered up plenty of evidence, even more than the body-camera footage. The fourth ground of “Whether the spoliator acted in good or bad faith” and it is obvious that Glen Andrew Hall had acted in bad faith. It is clear that this spoliated/destroyed evidence could have been used to help clear Brian Hill's name from this horrible charge. They never explained why the body-camera footage should have been destroyed, the Court had ordered that the evidence be turned over and this action violates that Court Order, it is a contemptible offense. It isn't just potential evidence that was destroyed that may have

fallen through the cracks of the discovery order, the very evidence was DESCRIBED in the DISCOVERY ORDER. The order described the body-camera footage and the evidence matches the description given by the Court Order. It is not a good idea for an officer of the Court to defy a Court order. In fact he defied two Court Orders in the Circuit Court after the case was appealed. So he defied three Court Orders by refusing to turn over that evidence to inspection by the defense counsel and then destroyed the body-camera footage. All elements are met.

19. The case is getting so old, it has been dragged out because the Commonwealth Attorney Glen Andrew Hall had put up such a valiant resistance against Brian David Hill every step of the way, and he is one of the worst attorneys Brian had ever been prosecuted by besides Assistant U.S. Attorney Anand Prakash Ramaswamy who also destroyed evidence in his Federal Case. This attorney does not want Brian to have any relief or remedy. Many attorneys including private attorneys are scared of Glen Andrew Hall because of how dirty he conducts his business. Brian David Hill had met with 3 or 4 private attorneys in 2019 for free consultation (as Brian could have had his family operate an online legal fund to help get him a better lawyer) and all of them seem reluctant to fight to prove Brian's innocence without even examining the entire case. Pretty much all of them said they rather Brian withdraw his appeal without even looking at all of the records, without determining the witnesses and evidence. Even Attorney McPheeters was afraid as well. They acted like they were afraid to take on this attorney and tried to find excuses not to fight against him, like there is something going on behind the scenes, some fear that they do not want to cross this horrible lawyer. The attorneys were just afraid to fight against this Commonwealth Attorney. This made things more difficult for Brian David Hill to seek any justice. Nobody wants to push for a contempt proceeding against Glen Andrew Hall despite Brian's repeated requests over and over

again in January and/or February 2019 for the body-camera footage. Brian kept asking for it over and over again, yet nothing ever panned out.

20. There was also a situation where the Martinsville Police were with Brian at Sovah Hospital in Martinsville, Virginia on September 21, 2018 while Brian had suffered multiple high resting blood pulse readings over the level of 100 which are normally a sign of a serious heart issue or health concern. Sinus Tachycardia. Brian had blood drawn and multiple vials of his blood. Those blood vials disappeared after Brian was arrested while Brian assumed that the lab-work was conducted and Brian told Scott Albrecht about the blood vials when he was interviewed about his side of the story, that Brian Hill felt he was drugged with a narcotic or substance. However, Scott Albrecht refused to investigate the laboratory tests. By the time in 2019 that Brian was out of Jail and attempted to get access to his medical records from that night, there was no laboratory results and the blood vials aka biological evidence was destroyed without a valid explanation. Another cover up of good evidence. This evidence was also EXCULPATORY because it was drawn out of Brian at the Hospital after he was found naked at the Dick and Willie walking trail at night, after Brian was handcuffed, he was taken by ambulance to the Hospital with the Police with him. Officer Robert Jones was with Brian the entire time he was in a Hospital bed, when the blood vials were drawn. He even admitted under Oath in Federal Court on September 12, 2019, that he also assumed that the laboratory tests were done and said that they would normally be done but he never got access to Brian's medical records. Little did he know that the laboratory work ordered as COVERED UP, deleted from the chart without explanation? He lied and claimed that Brian was psychologically and medically cleared. He didn't even read Brian's medical records as admitted in Federal Court Transcript under **Exhibit 4**. He was asked by a Federal licensed Attorney Renorda Pryor if Officer Robert Jones knew that

Brian was diabetic, he said “no”. He was asked Officer Robert Jones if he knew that Brian had Obsessive Compulsive Disorder (OCD) and the officer seemed clueless. The officer was either part of the cover up or he was misled and the vials were destroyed. Either way, Officer Robert Jones screwed up charging Brian quickly but yet the Commonwealth Attorney did not even attempt to find or demand retention of these blood vials. In fact he rather they be destroyed as it may make things complicated for the simple indecent exposure misdemeanor charge. He rather Brian just be found guilty and keep fighting Brian for the rest of his life if Brian kept resisting through the Legal System. That way Glen Andrew Hall can take part in compelling Brian David Hill to pay legal fees out of his judgment proof SSI disability money, to commit an unlawful act of demanding federally protected money which is extortion and racketeering through the legal system, his little racketeering operation where he can charge Brian tens of thousands of dollars in legal fees the longer he fights this, he can keep punishing Brian over and over again until he is pushed into suicide then they can take his SSI money like a good RICO-statute violating criminal cartel or criminal enterprise corrupt racketeering scheme or something. It seems like this is like a racketeering operation through the criminal justice system and he can make as much money as he wants while destroying any evidence favorable to the defendants he persecutes. He knows a majority cannot afford good lawyers and they are screwed. It isn't constitutional to financially put somebody in debt over simply fighting for their Constitutional rights, it impedes a poor person's right to fight for Constitutional rights under the Due Process Clause.

21. It is quite clear that with the destruction of both the body-camera footage and the biological evidence both at the allowance of the Corrupt Commonwealth Attorney Glen Andrew Hall, that he will never present a fair and just prosecution. He had destroyed any and all evidence favorable to the ACTUAL INNOCENCE of Brian David Hill to the

charge of Virginia Code § 18.2-387, Indecent Exposure, in the City of Martinsville. Mr. Hall did this knowingly and intelligently.

22. It is quite clear that the General District Court or the Circuit Court should move to sanction Glen Andrew Hall, Esquire for contempt of court, as well as Scott Albrecht for refusing to enforce that Court Order and Scott Albrecht seemed like he didn't fight for retrieving the body-camera footage in writing and then inform the Court of such non-compliance with the Court Order. Scott Albrecht had colluded with the Commonwealth Attorney in not enforcing the Court Order and allowed the evidence to be destroyed on purpose. Both of them are guilty of allowing evidence to be destroyed that would benefit the Defendant in proving his innocence. Anything Brian writes on a pro se basis and mailed to the Police Department and/or the Commonwealth Attorney is usually forwarded to his court appointed attorney. Scott Albrecht knew that the Court Order was being violated, over and over again with Brian's multiple letters. Scott Albrecht knew that there was the existence of the body-camera footage and purposefully let the Commonwealth of Virginia destroy this footage knowing that it may have repercussions on both parties but the discolored lips is favorable to Brian David Hill. It would have proven that the Hospital had neglected to find out why Brian David Hill was not medically cleared and something was wrong with his mind and body at the time. Defendant and his entire family believes with enough cumulative evidence that it was prolonged exposure to CARBON MONOXIDE GAS POISONING in Brian's apartment in 2018. Pete Compton is a witness to that, which is at least one expert witness and one reasonable doubt necessary to have found Brian not guilty of his charge. Gas or drugs can do funny things to people's brains. As Brian is NOT a drug user, never has been, anybody could have given Brian a drug while out there at night on the Dick and Willie trail, even the road areas he took to walk there at night without letting his mother know, anybody

could have offered a drug or drugged him and made him have the very issues which led up to his arrest but not make him culpable to the charge as he was not responsible for what had happened. Carbon monoxide poisoning is a very serious mind twisting odorless gas and can make somebody do erratic or crazy things very easily. CO gas can make somebody hallucinate and have a psychosis.

EXHIBITS LIST

EXHIBIT #	PAGE #	DESCRIPTION
EXHIBIT 1	1-3	DISABLED PARKING PLACARDS OR LICENSE PLATES APPLICATION
EXHIBIT 2	4-27	Copy of pro se motion for discovery with proof that Police Chief G. E. Cassady was mailed letters requesting police body-camera footage
EXHIBIT 3	28-29	One page excerpt of Document #163, Filed 12/12/18, Page 4 of 6, one page of Federal Court Affidavit/Declaration or written filing, Document #163. Case #1:13-cr-435-1.
EXHIBIT 4	30-111	FEDERAL COURT TRANSCRIPT of Supervised Release Violating hearing regarding the criminal charge of September 21, 2018, in General District Court. Officer Robert Jones of Martinsville Police Department had testified and thus is relevant to this MOTION.
EXHIBIT 5	112-114	COURT ORDER – GENERAL DISTRICT COURT

EXHIBIT 6	115-118	COURT ORDER – CIRCUIT COURT
EXHIBIT 7	119-122	COURT ORDER – CIRCUIT COURT
EXHIBIT 8	123-126	Article: Body Cameras Proving Useful for Martinsville Police; Wednesday, May 1st 2013; WSET/ABC13 NEWS
EXHIBIT 9	127-130	Interview and Interrogation of people with autism (including Asperger syndrome) By Dennis Debbaudt - EXPERT WITNESS
EXHIBIT 10	131-137	“DIVISION FOR TREATMENT AND EDUCATION OF AUTISTIC AND RELATED COMMUNICATION HANDICAPPED CHILDREN, Department of Psychiatry, University of North Carolina, DIAGNOSTIC EVALUATION”
EXHIBIT 11	138-139	Letter from “Dr. Shyam E. Balakrishnan, MD”.
EXHIBIT 12	140-146	PSYCHIATRIC EVALUATION from Dr. Conrad Daum in October, 2018
EXHIBIT 13	147-152	Information about Dr. Conrad Daum being a certified Forensic Psychiatrist
EXHIBIT 14	153-164	Case 1:13-cr-00435-TDS, Document #153, Filed 10/17/18, Pages 1 through 11; DECLARATION/AFFIDAVIT OF BRIAN DAVID HILL regarding what happened on September 21, 2018

It is clear that Glen Andrew Hall did not comply and former Attorney Scott Albrecht did not attempt to enforce the (#1) General District Court Order on November 28, 2018; (#2) Circuit Court Order on February 6, 2019, and (#3) Circuit Court Order on July 15, 2019. Glen Andrew Hall and Martinsville Police Department (client of the Commonwealth of Virginia who represents the Local Law Enforcement) did not comply with the **EXHIBIT 5 (EXHIBIT PAGES 112-114), EXHIBIT 6 (EXHIBIT PAGES 115-118), AND EXHIBIT 7 (EXHIBIT PAGES 119-122)** Court Orders dated November 28, 2018, February 6, 2019, and July 15, 2019. Defendant requests that this Court hold Glen Andrew Hall, Esquire in CONTEMPT and maybe even hold CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS against him for spoliation of evidence requested from the Orders for Discovery Materials and allow further evidence to be shown and developed regarding such spoliation. Defendant is ready for showing the evidence of written correspondence and certified mail ever mailed, it is long overdue. Defendant is ready to demonstrate that Glen Andrew Hall should be held in contempt of court and recommendations to the Virginia State Bar for him to be disbarred from practice of law. Scott Albrecht was Brian David Hill's court appointed legal counsel all of the way until the body-camera footage was destroyed. So he was completely responsible for not enforcing those Court Orders ordered by the Court, and thus he is also presumed to be an accomplice to this spoliation of evidence, not Lauren McGarry and not Matthew Clark but Scott Albrecht who misled Brian David Hill and betrayed him and that was why Brian lost in General District Court. So both should be possibly sanctioned by this Court for wasting all of this time, wasting a lot of resources, causing all of these problems which cannot be undone. Degrading Brian's mental health, and deteriorating his mental and physical health.

Brian David Hill is innocent and should be adjudged Innocent from the STATEMENT OF FACTS proving that Brian David Hill had Autism Spectrum Disorder, Psychosis, and Obsessive Compulsive disorder at the time or around the time of his arrest on

September 21, 2018, and is relevant and/or material to the criminal charge against the Defendant.

Brian David Hill is innocent and should be adjudged Innocent from the STATEMENT OF FACTS showing that there was spoliation of evidence in violation of three Court Orders. One from the General District Court and the other two by the Circuit Court. Spoliation of evidence is proof that the case in chief by the Commonwealth of Virginia is a weak or unfounded one, that to his consciousness he rather win his case by any means necessary rather than play by the rules. He rather win than play fair. He should lose his case in chief for the destruction of evidence. Defendant has been up front and even if sometimes ranting or giving his opinion to the Commonwealth Attorney, he was upfront and honest about what had happened on September 21, 2018. He did the best he could to try to get the truth to be in the light in his criminal case. The Commonwealth Attorney Glen Andrew Hall made grave errors in the General District Court and Circuit Court. Spoliation of evidence including blood vials which is biological human evidence, it should be favorable to Brian David Hill the Defendant in this case, as further FACT of his ACTUAL INNOCENCE. Innocent men and women don't destroy evidence. That is a fact. Glen Andrew Hall and Martinsville Police Department both ignored Brian's letters asking Police Chief G. E. Cassady for the body-camera footage. It doesn't matter that they can ignore his pro se letters because Brian had an appointed lawyer. It doesn't matter because the COURT ORDERED the evidence and things like the body-camera footage or videos to be disclosed to the defense counsel. So they have violated the Court Orders, they cannot make the excuse that ignoring Brian Hill's letters to the Police Chief asking for the body-camera footage was rightful due to him having a lawyer when the Courts have ordered such evidence be retained or turned over to the defense lawyer or defense team. Therefore, Glen Andrew Hall has knowingly destroyed evidence and refused to turn over the body-camera footage as requested in Brian's letters to the Police Chief and as asked by Court Orders. Again, See **Exhibits 2 and 3**.

Therefore, the Defendant prays that this Honorable Court order the following:

1. That the Circuit Court declare or make a factual finding (after an evidentiary hearing) that Glen Andrew Hall, Esquire were in Contempt of Court for spoliation of evidence and refusal to turn over evidence to Defendant or his Legal Counsel as to the Court Orders dated November 28, 2018, February 6, 2019, and July 15, 2019;
2. That the Circuit Court consider a sanction or sanctions against Glen Andrew Hall by entering Judgment of Acquittal and acquitting Brian David Hill of his original charge of Indecent Exposure under Virginia Code § 18.2-387 for the prosecution's violation of the multiple Court Orders destroying evidence which would have led to the automatic acquittal of Brian David Hill whether in Martinsville's General District Court or in Trial De Novo in the Circuit Court for the City of Martinsville;
3. That the Circuit Court consider vacatur of the wrongful conviction dated November 18, 2019, and consider dismissing this case against Brian David Hill with prejudice as the damage of spoliation can never be undone and thus these permanent evidence destruction issues only warrant case dismissal with prejudice for good with any and all charge(s) dropped;
4. That the Circuit Court consider the newly admissible evidence of Brian David Hill's diagnoses of Autism Spectrum Disorder, Psychosis, and Obsessive Compulsive Disorder in regards to the INTENT element of the charge against Defendant to further consider that Brian David Hill is innocent of his charge which was filed on September 21, 2018;
5. That the Circuit Court consider filing a declaration or judgment of the Innocence of Brian David Hill or file an order of Judgment of Acquittal of Brian David Hill, whichever is proper;

6. That the Circuit Court waive and discharge any and all pending legal fees ever taxed or ordered against Defendant if the Circuit Court had determined that Defendant is innocent and thus should not be held to pay any fees or fines or any protected SSI disability money since Defendant is innocent;
7. That the Circuit Court waive and discharge any and all pending legal fees ever owed by the Defendant pursuant to all legal matters and cases that had begun from the original charge and prosecution on September 21, 2018, if the Circuit Court had determined that Defendant is innocent and thus should not be held to pay any fees or fines or any protected SSI disability money since Defendant is innocent;
8. That the Circuit Court consider providing any other relief or remedy that is just and proper, in the proper administration of justice and integrity for the Court.

Respectfully submitted with the Court, This
the 11th day of February, 2022.

Brian D. Hill
Signed

Brian D. Hill

Brian D. Hill
Defendant

Former news reporter of U.S.W.G.O. Alternative News
Ally of Q

310 Forest Street, Apartment 2
Martinsville, Virginia 24112
(276) 790-3505



JusticeForUSWGO.NL or JusticeForUSWGO.wordpress.com



CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE, CERTIFICATE OF FILING

Page 43 of 45

I hereby certify that a true and accurate copy of the foregoing Motion was faxed or emailed/transmitted by my Assistant Roberta Hill at rbhill67@comcast.net (due to Probation Conditions of not being allowed to use the Internet) or delivered this 11th day of February, 2021, to the following parties:

1. Commonwealth of Virginia
2. City of Martinsville

by having representative Roberta Hill filing his pleading on his behalf with the Court, through email address rbhill67@comcast.net, transmit/faxed a copy of this pleading to the following attorneys who represent the above parties to the case:

Glen Andrew Hall, Esq. Commonwealth Attorney's Office for the City of Martinsville 55 West Church Street P.O. Box 1311 Martinsville, Virginia 24114/24112 Attorney for the Commonwealth Phone: (276) 403-5470 Fax: (276) 403-5478 Email: ahall@ci.martinsville.va.us	Hon. Ashby R. Pritchett, Clerk of the Court Circuit Court for the City of Martinsville Phone: 276-403-5106 Fax: 276-403-5232 55 West Church Street, Room 205 P.O. Box 1206 Martinsville, VA 24114 Email: apritchett@vacourts.gov
--	--

The reason why Brian David Hill must use such a representative to serve such pleading with the Clerk on his behalf is because Brian is currently still under the conditions of Supervised Release for the U.S. District Court barring internet usage without permission. Brian's Probation Officer is aware of Roberta Hill using her email for conducting court business concerning Brian Hill or court business with the Probation

Office in regards to Brian David Hill. Therefore Roberta Hill is filing the pleading on Brian's behalf for official court business. Brian has authorized her to file the pleading. All exhibits or any exhibits with anything printed from any internet based service was printed and researched by Roberta Hill.

That should satisfy the Certificate of Service regarding letters/pleadings during the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic. If the Court wishes to contact the filer over any issues or concerns, please feel free to contact the filer Brian David Hill directly by telephone or by mailing. They can also contact c/o Roberta Hill at rbhill67@comcast.net and request that she forward the message and any documents or attachments to Brian David Hill to view offline for his review.

Brian D. Hill
Signed

Brian D. Hill

Brian D. Hill

Defendant

Former news reporter of U.S.W.G.O. Alternative News

Ally of Q

310 Forest Street, Apartment 2

Martinsville, Virginia 24112

(276) 790-3505

JusticeForUSWGO.NL or JusticeForUSWGO.wordpress.com

U.S.W.G.O.

