

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

To: "Davidson, Gary" <GDavidson@vcso.us>

Cc: agant@vcso.us

Bcc:

Subject: Re: PRR - September's ROIs

Date: Mon, 03 Oct 2016 11:18:03 -0400

Gary: - Allow me to respond in this fashion - VolusiaExposed DID request an explanation from the VCSO (via your office) regarding the inconsistencies between Deputy Graves report - that the son never made more than a "one word" responses - and what the video clearly reveals. Your answer (email) to us was that this matter would be addressed / answered in a court of law. That sounds like a NO COMMENT position to us.

Also - from our perspective - it really doesn't matter if the VCSO's rationale for being there was allegedly true or NOT. Why? Because on the night of Dec 26, 2014 - Mr. Thripp would not have known whether the VCSO was telling the truth about receiving a report - or using a pre-textual lie. Think about it like this - during the Cruice shooting - did it matter whether Cruice actually have a GUN - OR was the deciding factor merely the alleged fact that the deputy that shot him THOUGHT he saw a gun?

Plus - IF the deputies REALLY believed the REPORT that the son was in danger - why did they leave? We believe that Thripp's 911 calls assisted the deputies in leaving - ironically the opposite of what is needed (element of the crime - call for service) that the criminal statute requires.

Additionally - one of the responding deputies on the video - stated that they were not leaving until the son came out AND that they (VCSO) would break down the door - neither happen - were those two statements by the VCSO pre-textual lies OR the truth? (Here is your first chance to clear up something for the next pending follow-up article).

Gary - if the police show up at your house in the middle of the night demanding access - do YOU know how to tell if they are using pre-textual lies OR telling the truth? The answer is easy - if they are telling the truth - they will have a search or arrest warrant - or be able to articulate exigent circumstances. Why is that - because while it is legal for the cops to lie to citizens - judges kinda frown on cops lying to them.

Apparently - the anonymous report that the father was threatening to shoot the son - was NOT even totally believed by the VCSO itself - at least to the level to rise to exigent circumstances. So We now ask you - if the VCSO believed the son was in danger (exigent circumstances) why didn't the VCSO just break down the door? - consider this your

second chance to provide us a response to our pending follow-up article.

Regards,

VX

“Facts are stubborn things; and whatever may be our wishes, our inclinations, or the dictates of our passion, they cannot alter the state of facts and evidence.” - John Adams

On Mon, 2016-10-03 at 14:23 +0000, Davidson, Gary wrote:

> No ROIs completed during the month of September. Thanks for sharing
> the link to the Richard Thripp story, John. Interesting that you
> never bothered to find out whether the reason for deputies responding
> to the Thripp residence in the first place was truthful or a
> pretextual lie perpetrated by law enforcement, as your article seems
> to suggest. Personal opinion here, but seems to me that you didn't
> bother to check that out because the answer might have debunked a
> major premise of your story....Shame your readers don't know the whole
> story instead of just the portions that fit into your biased premise.
>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: VolusiaExposed.Com [<mailto:volusiaexposed@cfl.rr.com>]

> Sent: Monday, October 03, 2016 10:01 AM

> To: Davidson, Gary

> Cc: Gant, Andrew

> Subject: PRR - September's ROIs

>

> Gary / Andrew:

>

> PRR - for September's ROIs

>

> BTW - we posted our first article on the Richard Thripp incident <http://www.volusiaexposed.com/vcso/richardthripp92016.html>

>

> Regards

>

> VX