From: VolusiaExposed.Com < <u>volusiaexposed@cfl.rr.com</u>>

To: Michelle Kennedy < <u>michelle.kennedy@flcourts18.org</u>>

 $\textbf{Cc:} \begin{subarray}{ll} joel chandler @fogwatch.org & joel chandler @fogwatch.org \\ & & \underline{Oigital Court Reporters @flcourts 18.org \\ & , scott.ell is @brevardclerk.us \\ \end{subarray} \begin{subarray}{ll} fogwatch.org & joel chandler @fogwatch.org \\ & & , scott.ell is @brevardclerk.us \\ \end{subarray} \begin{subarray}{ll} fogwatch.org & , scott.ell is @brevardclerk.us \\ \end{subarray} \begin{subarray}{ll} fogwatch.org & , scott.ell is & ,$

Bcc: REDACTED

Subject: Re: PRR - Court Room Video - State v. Lloyd

Date: Tue, 25 Sep 2018 13:17:05 -0400

Michelle Kennedy Public Information Officer 18th Judicial Circuit

Michelle:

Attached (PDF) - you will find Judge Dugan's order regarding the motion you attached within your email. If you will review it - you will clearly see that Dugan ONLY restricted our camera from that particular trial - not the entire 18th Judicial Circuit.

In March 2018 - Judge Lemonidis illegally expanded it (video ban) without proper notice or hearing - and after making such comments as "fake news" - "yellow journalism" and "turning off the information tap" (Loyd's sentencing hearings - April & June 2017). http://volusiaexposed.com/highprofile/danaloydexpose.html (ALL THIRTY PLUS ARTICLES REGARDING THE LOYD PROSECUTION - INCLUDING VIDEOS ARE AVAILABLE FOR REVIEW WITHIN THE ABOVE WEB LINK)

Within 10 days of expanding the Dugan order - Lemonidis recused herself from the case - without giving a particular explanation for the recusal. An argument could be made that Lemonidis' recusal was connected to her illegal camera ban against VolusiaExposed.Com.

FYI - between Dugan's September 2017 order - and Lemonidis' March 2018 order our organization was still using our camera within the 18th Circuit.

You APPEAR to need an apology and / or assurances in order to broker / advocate for VolusiaExposed.Com. Unfortunately - the only assurances we can provide - are as follows:

Assurance #1 - Humans - by nature will make honest mistakes - whether they are government employees, or mere members of the public, etc..

Assurance #2 - In furtherance to Assurance #1 - the Clerk of the Court failed to redact the name of the juvenile victim in the Pallante sentencing documents - it has since been corrected - but NOT prior to

it being posted to the Internet for download. Will you office seek an apology and assurances from the Scott Ellis, the Clerk of the Court? Or will that violation (mistake as we see it) be ignored - as a simple mistake?

Assurance #3 - You can rest assured that during Loyd's March 2017 trial - Judge Lemonidis threatened to jail two of our representatives for merely writing down the names of the jurors. Lemonidis impounded our press notes - stating that if the jurors' names became public - it would "thwart" justice. Within the hour of Lemonidis's judicial rant - the Clerk had posted the jurors' names to their Internet site.

To this date - we have not received an apology - nor assurances of any kind for Judge Lemonidis that our representatives will not be wrongly threatened with incarceration - or that our press notes will not be illegally impounded. Point of fact - the only response we received from Judge Lemonidis - was to have her double down - illegally banning our camera circuit wide. From our stand point - the entire 18th Circuit is a proxy participant to this illegal camera ban. (video of incident available within the below web link)

http://volusiaexposed.com/highprofile/defenseofdanadelaney12.html

http://volusiaexposed.com/highprofile/inthedefenseofdanaloyd42018.html

Assurance #4 - Again, in furtherance of Assurance #1 - your office has provided us with courtroom videos in the past - that contain information on them that was not redacted. However, this very same information was redacted from the written record - by the Clerk of the Court. Could your office also have made errors in redactions?

So, Michelle - we have discussed this subject (camera ban) within numerous emails. Is the 18th Circuit willing to removed Lemonidis' illegal camera ban against VolusiaExposed.Com?

Absent the removal of the ban - and due to some information from one of your recent emails - we are leaning to securing the courtroom videos from your digital court reporting office. The cost of obtaining the videos from your office - is actually cheaper then sending a representative to video record.

Best of both worlds for VolusiaExposed.Com - still obtaining the videos - and still the victim of the 18th Judicial Circuit.

There is a reality that needs to be recognized - currently, who benefits the most in the ceasing of the camera ban - VolusiaExposed.Com, or the 18th Judicial Circuit?

Advocate all you wish in bringing closure to the camera ban - but in the end - are you really advocating for VolusiaExposed.Com, or are you advocating for the ethical soul of the 18th Judicial Circuit?

Regards,

VolusiaExposed.Com volusiaexposed@cfl.rr.com

```
bcc - several
On Tue, 2018-09-25 at 13:32 +0000, Michelle Kennedy wrote:
> John,
> Again, I have been a fierce advocate for Volusia Exposed in the past,
> but this was a serious violation and we need to discuss it.
>
> From: VolusiaExposed.Com < volusiaexposed@cfl.rr.com>
> Sent: Monday, September 24, 2018 11:17 AM
> To: Michelle Kennedy < michelle.kennedy@flcourts18.org>
> Cc:joelchandler@fogwatch.org; Brevard Digital Court Reporters <Digit >alCourtReporters@flcourts18.org>
> Subject: Re: PRR - Court Room Video - State v. Lloyd
> Michelle Kennedy
> Public Information Officer
> 18th Judicial Circuit
> September 24, 2018
```