paragraph in this typed draft and then one sentence removed. 1 2 The problem is one of the sentences removed is 3 very significant. Because according to the notes that Mr. 4 Tisaby took, according to the first draft that he wrote in 5 hand, and according to the first draft we have that was 6 typed, though we don't know who it was typed by, J.W. told 7 Mr. Tisaby that K.S. had told her following the March 21 8 alleged incident, the first encounter between Mr. Greitens and K.S., said, quote, K.S. thought the defendant cared 9 10 about her.

So her feelings immediately after the events of
March 21 communicated to her good friend, J.W., were K.S.
thought the defendant cared about her. That was removed
from what we were given back in March. The whole rest of
the paragraph is there, and that's not there.

Now, would Mr. Tisaby remove that by himself? I
regret to say I highly doubt it. It seems improbable that
the agent would decide on his own that that sentence needed
to be removed. We don't know who removed it.

But what we know is it's clearly exculpatory.
This is significant evidence. When the prosecutor is trying
to claim and actually puts words in K.S.'s memorandum of
interview like traumatized and victimized, which she never
says in the videotape we have, and then K.S., we now know,
testified to the House Committee that she, quote, that Mr.

Greitens viewed her as, I was a thing, quote, I was a thing
 to him.

The idea that she told her good friend within days of the event that she thought Mr. Greitens cared for her completely contradicts that information. It is, without a doubt, exculpatory, and it was, without a doubt, removed by somebody on the prosecution team.

8 We didn't -- which, your Honor, exemplifies 9 exactly why that evidence was never turned over to us 10 because it exposed exculpatory information that didn't fit 11 the story that the circuit attorney wants to put out in 12 public.

We have Rule 25 that demands that the circuit attorney turn over statements of the witnesses in any form that they are summarized, whether asked for or not. On February 23rd, we submitted a request for discovery, which specifically asked for all statements and notes related to interviews taken of their witnesses.

On February 27th, we submitted a separate request
for discovery that focused particularly on Mr. Tisaby and
his company, and any notes they had related to any interview
of witnesses. We didn't get any information that you have
now in front of you, those 10 pages, at that time.

They weren't produced when they were requested.
They weren't produced when K.S. and P.S. were both deposed.