

# **The State of Florida vs. David Ross Gregory**

***Homicide: First Degree Murder***

***The case and argument for the successful prosecution of  
David Ross Gregory for the September 24th, 2022  
premeditated shooting of  
Steven Paul Colon***

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Opening Statement.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Summary.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>The False Narrative/Background:.....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Events Leading Up to the Shooting:.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Ample Probable Cause to Proceed With Prosecution.....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Sarasota County Sheriff Office's/Detective King's Flawed Conclusion.....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Phony Fear/Faked Disability on the part of the Shooter and his wife.....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Interviews with Shooter &amp; Wife.....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>Negligence/Incompetence on the part of Lead Detectives/Leading Questions During Interviews:.....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Analysis of 911 Calls.....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Police Patrol Reports Analysis.....</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>Investigative Reports Analysis.....</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>Forensics/Crime Scene Reports Analysis.....</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>Medical Examiner Report Analysis.....</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>Police Investigation Files Analysis.....</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>Analysis of Witnesses and Neighborhood Interviews.....</b>	<b>89</b>
<b>Dayna Purcell Interview.....</b>	<b>91</b>
<b>Gary Osgood (HOA President) Interview.....</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>Sherry Pazzanese Interview.....</b>	<b>105</b>
<b>Kelsie Lloyd Interview.....</b>	<b>111</b>
<b>Tobin and Beth Johnston (HOA Secretary) Interview.....</b>	<b>122</b>
<b>Colleen Donlevy-Burns Interview.....</b>	<b>128</b>
<b>Penelope and Maida Nichols Interview.....</b>	<b>132</b>
<b>Melania Binder Interview.....</b>	<b>139</b>
<b>Robin and Richard Henry Interview.....</b>	<b>145</b>
<b>Challenging the Self-Defense Claim: A Detailed Analysis of the Amy Gregory's Interview (The Shooter's wife).....</b>	<b>149</b>
<b>Challenging the Self-Defense Claim/Detective/Detective and Sheriff's Office Personnel Investigative Negligence: A Detailed Analysis of the David Gregory's First Interview (The Shooter).....</b>	<b>181</b>

<b>Challenging the Self-Defense Claim/Leading Questioning by Detectives: A Detailed Analysis of David Gregory's Second Interview (The Shooter).....</b>	<b>213</b>
<b>Other Suspicious Deaths Potentially Tied to Amy and David Gregory (The Shooter and His Wife)/Additional Important Information/Additional Areas Requiring Investigation:.....</b>	<b>237</b>
<b>2018 Florida "Stand Your Ground/Use of Force" Statute.....</b>	<b>240</b>
<b>What were Florida's gun laws on concealed carry in 2022 and prior to HB 543?.....</b>	<b>256</b>
<b>The 2022 Florida Concealed Carry Firearm Statutes.....</b>	<b>257</b>

## Opening Statement

Imagine for a moment, you are a shy introverted person walking down the street minding your own business. You keep to yourself and generally prefer to avoid small talk and interactions with strangers. One morning you begin your walk by noticing one of your neighbors, the HOA president exiting the area while walking his three dogs. The HOA president doesn't particularly like you, but you may also not necessarily appreciate the neighborhood gossip and smear campaign that the HOA president and others involved with the HOA have been involved with. This neighborhood gossip and smear campaign merely because you may sometimes make too much noise when working out with your weights or the more "serious" accusations of not putting away your garbage container quickly enough after garbage day and the fact that you generally keep to yourself, you seem mysterious and you are not generally perceived as being friendly with the much older neighbors who live within the neighborhood HOA. So to avoid the HOA president, you wait several minutes until you know the HOA president has completely left the area with his dogs before you, yourself, begin your own walk. At times you might feel alone when walking, but that is ok because you like keeping to yourself and that is how you prefer it, at the moment, as you attempt to work through some recent life changes, including a recent parental divorce and all that this means.

So you choose to walk on a regular and consistent basis. Walking regularly is something that is not only part of your fitness routine, but something that you enjoy because it clears your mind as well.

As you exit your home and turn left, heading south, onto the main road you notice the HOA president walking south down, as well, that road at some distance, and so instead of continuing south, you decide to make a subsequent right hand turn, heading west, at the first intersection you encounter turning down yet another street off the initial main road to further avoid following directly behind the HOA president and his dogs. At this point in your walk you are still completely unaware and oblivious to the presence of yet another man and his wife who you had an unpleasant encounter with approximately 1 year prior. Even though you haven't seen them yet, this husband and wife are also currently outside as well with their dogs on the road to the near north of the initial entrance to the driveway where you first exited and began your walk today. You remember that during your first encounter with this husband and wife, a year prior, the husband became very hostile and aggressive towards you when you attempted to pet his dog. To this day, you still do not understand the reason for his hostility towards you, nor the need for the aggressive posture when all you were doing was simply trying to pet his dog.

After you make your first right at the intersection, heading west, you continue down this alternate path and as you continue walking down the road, still heading west, you get to a point near the end of the street and then decide to make a u-turn so as to continue avoiding the HOA president and his dogs who will soon be heading your way once again as he and his dogs make the circle back around the neighborhood. This is when you also notice that your Apple ear buds that you normally wear when you walk and that are normally in the carrying case are missing.

So you make your u-turn, now heading east, to both avoid the HOA president and his dogs and also to go back home to retrieve your missing ear buds.

As you are walking east down the street on your way back to your house, heading back towards the intersection, you notice for the first time this husband and wife who had been so hostile in the past heading south and towards the very same intersection that you are also heading towards yourself. As you see this couple heading in your direction, you can't help but feel the nervousness and dread begin to set in. So as you approach the intersection, you decide that the best course of action is to avoid any type of interaction with this husband and wife as well. So instead of heading north and going back home, which would require you walking past this couple, you instead turn right, in the complete and opposite direction from them and begin walking south and away from this couple.

Even though you have chosen to avoid this couple by walking south instead of north, this husband and wife chooses to follow directly behind you, on your path south and towards the end of the street. This husband and wife choose to follow behind you, even though this couple would always and almost exclusively cut through a neighbor's yard on their way back to their home because it was more efficient and would save time. You notice that instead of cutting through the neighbor's yard, they instead choose to continue to follow you south towards the end of the street. You are now beginning to feel more and more uncomfortable as this couple follows you, simply because you have had this negative and hostile encounter with the husband a year prior.

The wife and the husband are following behind, but they are spread apart. The wife and her dog are following closest behind you, while the husband and his dog are following at some distance behind the wife. Both the husband and the wife and their dogs are on the opposite side of the road from you. You are walking on the west side of the road, heading south in the same direction of traffic. The husband and the wife are on the east side of the road, heading south towards you but walking in the opposite direction of traffic.

So even though you are trying to avoid this couple, they still continue to follow you. This following of you by this couple continues until you get to the end of the street and so you now must choose whether to go completely around the block or attempt to make a u-turn and head north and back home. Even though this would mean passing this wife and her hostile husband on the road on your way back home, you make a u-turn and begin heading north. You on the west side of the road and they and their dogs on the east side of the road. As you now head north, you are determined to just simply pass by them as quickly as possible on the road as you continue on your path back home. The nervousness and dread that you feel, knowing that you are about to pass by this wife and her hostile husband, becomes more pronounced.

As you begin your final walk north, you first pass by the wife and her dog. You on the west side of the road, she and her dog on the east side of the road. You avoid engaging in any type of conversation. Once you have passed the wife and her dog, you see the husband, but there is still a little bit of distance between you and him and some distance before you reach the

area where the husband is apparently still lingering with his dog. As you get closer to the husband and his dog, the nervousness and dread you feel is now more palpable.

You are still walking north on the west side of the road and as you attempt to pass the husband and as you do he glares at you with an unfriendly look. You try and maintain a general awareness of where he is at all times as you pass. You are on one side of the road, he and his dog on the other side of the road. You continue on your way as you try to avoid any interaction whatsoever with this man who has been hostile to you in the past simply because you had the "audacity" to make an attempt to pet his dog.

You make it to a point in the road, now several feet past this man and his dog, but still within close proximity. As you walk past, this man's dog now crosses the street to your side of the road in an attempt to approach you from behind. It is a very small, but inquisitive dog. You turn your head to maintain a level of awareness of where the husband is located as you pass. But, before you can avoid it, his dog begins approaching you. In an attempt to stop the dog from approaching you and completely out of nowhere, this man now yanks this small dog's leash by the neck so forcefully that the poor dog winds up flying sideways and dragging on top of the pavement while completely on its side. This man continues his abusive behavior, as he drags the poor dog who is now yelping and crying, clearly in obvious pain and distress from the abuse.

As you hear this poor dog, now screaming and crying as he continues being abused by this cruel man, you turn around in an attempt to assist the dog. The man, seeing that you are attempting to assist his dog who is being abused by him, now becomes more agitated and quickly becomes very hostile towards you, as he stands up to confront you and screams "Dude, leave us the fuck alone" at you while continuing to yank forcefully on the dog. You try to assist the dog, but the man now begins shouting obscenities in your direction and in a fit of rage now crosses onto your side of the road. You and he are still quite a few feet away as the man now aggressively confronts you as he gets ever closer and is now crossing over to your side of the road. However, before you can even react or retreat, the man walks directly at you, takes out a pistol from his waistband, points the pistol directly at you and shoots twice, hitting you once in the abdomen. You know you have been shot and you then attempt to run as a form of retreat. As you attempt to retreat, the man then continues to scream at you at the top of his lungs "you motherfucker" as well as repeatedly screaming profanities in your direction. After being shot and in a state of complete panic and fear, you try to run. But before you can get very far, you collapse and fall into a ditch on the west side of the road. You lie in the ditch, writhing in pain and struggling to breathe.

After having shot you, this man continues his profane laced tirade, grabs his dog, one of the spent shell casings and he and his wife attempt to flee the scene of the shooting. By this time the HOA president is walking with his three dogs east on the side street approaching the same intersection. During his 911 call, he describes hearing two gunshots, seeing you stumble and fall and the shooter yelling "motherfucker". The HOA president then claims he did not see you in the ditch as he passes within feet of you with his dogs. Then instead of trying to locate

you and assisting you, the HOA president instead takes the time to return to his home and put his dogs away, and then eventually comes back outside to talk with the first responders to the crime scene. The HOA president, who has a personal dislike and bias, becomes the first person, on scene, to speak to the responders and investigators who first arrived on scene. It is this biased and false narrative on the part of the HOA president that would intentionally lead the shooting investigation off course from its infancy stage.

As the shooter and his wife flee the scene, they are interrupted by a neighbor who lives directly in front of the area where the shooting occurred. The neighbor details how the shooter and his wife appeared to be leaving the area in a hurry and that upon being interrupted in their attempt to flee the shooter tells the neighbor to call 911 with no other details about who had been shot or why.

The shooter and his wife returned home and also called 911. The shooter's wife immediately began to spin the false narrative of self-defense while on the call. However, many statements made during that call, raise plenty of doubt about the shooter's and the wife's self-serving version of events that unfolded before the shooting occurred. Even the timing of the shooting was in question, as the wife stated that the shooting had occurred 20 minutes prior to the 911 call when asked by the 911 operator. Also forensic evidence was tampered with by the shooter prior to the arrival of the police to their home. In addition, the wife did not even know if her husband had been assaulted or hit by you before her husband shot you. The wife had to ask her husband "did he hit you?" When asked if the husband was hurt in any way the response was no. It was during this call that the shooter's wife began to spin the self-serving false narrative of self-defense.

As stated earlier, it is the HOA president, who had a personal dislike and bias and who also just happened to be the first person to speak to the responders and investigators who first arrived at the crime scene. It is also this completely biased and false narrative on the part of the HOA president that would intentionally lead the shooting investigation off course from its infancy stage.

In the same way that most every single one of the neighbors were misled through intentional acts of rumor, innuendo, and outright lies by the HOA president, the HOA secretary and her husband as well as the shooter and his wife, in an attempt to create ill-will and support for your removal from the neighborhood, lead investigators were misled by these same individuals as well. Lead investigators took at face value the false rumors and claims made by the HOA president, the HOA secretary and her husband, the shooter and his wife, as well as many neighbors who had never met you but yet were told rumors and misrepresentations and lies about you from these very same individuals. Lead investigators even went as far as to assist the shooter and his wife in perpetuating these falsehoods and assist in the false self-defense narrative by asking a myriad of obviously leading questions intended to elicit a self-defense response from the shooter and his wife. The investigation was completely lead astray from the very infancy stages and continues to this day as the lead investigators attempt to feign any sort of serious approach to this investigation from any other perspective other than the false self-serving claim of self-defense on the part of the shooter and his wife. The HOA

president was the first person at the scene of the crime and the HOA president was the first person to intentionally lead the investigation off course once he spoke with officers after the shooting occurred. The HOA president was the very first person to speak to all the initial first responders that arrived on scene immediately after the shooting occurred and this immediately led the first responders and detectives off course during the critical infancy stage of the investigation and set the investigation on a erroneous and fatally flawed path with no critical judgment or questioning on the part of the lead investigative detectives who were assigned to this case.

In the police questioning of the HOA president, HOA secretary and her husband, there were no questions asked, nor any information divulged, regarding the shooter directly informing them that he intended to shoot you or that he had a gun. These accounts were relayed to the victim's parents, corroborating the statement given to the police by a key neighborhood witness. Additionally, another neighbor, who lived directly next door to the shooter and his wife, provided further insights into David's character and she had agreed to go on record. To this day, this vitally important witness, has yet to be interviewed by detectives.

Even though the HOA president wanted you removed from the neighborhood and had an ulterior motive for doing so, he knew very well that the shooter was threatening to shoot you because the HOA president had previously relayed this information directly to your parents. Similarly, the HOA secretary's husband made the same comment directly to your mother. This is significant and goes to premeditation, indicating that the shooter had a specific vendetta against you and was not acting out of fear, but rather seeking vengeance.

This report is based on the heavily redacted Sarasota County Sheriff's Department investigation, which is significantly lacking in thoroughness and detail. Simply connecting the dots from the available information reveals numerous gaps and deficiencies in the investigative process. For instance, no forensic evidence was collected from the shooter despite his claim that Steven grabbed his shirt and punched him. This should have resulted in trace evidence of Steven Paul's DNA on the shooter's clothing.

Additionally, there is missing evidence, such as statements from the parents and family of Steven Paul immediately following the shooting, which have mysteriously disappeared. Furthermore, it took several weeks for the police to interview key witnesses. There are still more witnesses with valuable information who have not yet been contacted.

These are only but a few of the investigatory deficiencies we have noted and have been frustrated about. However, one can still connect the dots here fairly easily. Despite these gaps and the lack of comprehensive investigative techniques, we have managed to piece together a complete picture of what more than likely transpired on that day. This report underscores the need for a more thorough, meticulous and proper investigation to ensure justice is served.

## Summary

From the very beginning, there was a clear animus from the HOA leadership towards Steven. The original plan, it would seem, was to get rid of Steven Paul from the community through HOA action and deliberate spread of slanderous gossip and rumors to effectuate the creation of a false narrative regarding Steven throughout the entire neighborhood.

Gary Osgood the HOA president had a personal dislike of Steven and was part of the group of individuals who spread false rumors & misinformation throughout the neighborhood

Toby Johnston and his wife Beth the HOA secretary also spread the false narrative as well.

The intent was to create ill-will with the hope of creating a “quorum” of neighbors in the HOA that would eventually avail the HOA of the possibility of taking potential action against Steven Paul and his grandparents in an attempt to potentially remove Steven Paul from the neighborhood.

Gary, Toby and his wife spoke with the shooter & his wife. Gary, Toby and his wife along with the shooter spoke with a multitude of neighbors around the entire area, many who lived quite a distance from Steven and most who had never met or even seen Steven, to perpetuate and spread this false narrative.

This neighborhood gossip and rumor mill was rampant and was led by Gary Osgood, Toby Johnston, Beth Johnston and David the shooter.

Steven Paul, who was very introverted, it would seem, was accused of a multitude of misgivings including keeping to himself and not being overly friendly, working out and making noise when dropping his weights on the ground and other minor HOA infractions such as not putting away the garbage cans and not moving his car prior to the HOA driveway being worked on.

David Gregory (the shooter) became friendly with Gary Osgood the HOA president as well as Tobin Johnston and his wife Beth Johnston the HOA secretary and injected himself into the affairs of the HOA to which the shooter and his wife did not even belong. In fact, the shooter and his wife actually lived in a rental condo that was part of a group of rental condos that was completely separate from the HOA condo association that Gary Osgood ran as president.

Why the shooter decided to involve himself in the affairs of an HOA condo association that he himself did not belong to is a curious issue. Did the shooter involve himself in the affairs of the HOA condo association that Gary Osgood, Tobin Johnston and Beth Johnston ran or was the shooter's help in dealing with “the problem” solicited by Gary, Tobin and/or Beth? Either way, Gary Osgood, Tobin Johnston and Beth Johnston knew David (the shooter) and his wife well enough to know that the shooter carried a concealed weapon and that David (the shooter) made it clear he had ill intent for Steven Paul as he had made multiple threats of his intent to use this weapon in the prior months, weeks and days leading up to the day of the shooting.

Even though Gary Osgood was fully aware of the threats that had been made against Steven by the shooter, on the day of the shooting, Gary Osgood the HOA president was the first person at the scene of the crime and was the first person to lead the investigation off course intentionally.

Gary Osgood, Toby Johnston, Beth Johnston and the shooter, it would seem, intentionally claimed during interviews that they only knew very little of one another, interacted only occasionally, some like Toby and his wife even claimed to be unaware that David the shooter had been known to carry a concealed weapon. All done in a concerted effort, it would appear, to distance themselves from one another after the shooting. Incredulously, the shooter even claimed to not know Gary Osgood's personal name while reciting and recalling each and every one of Gary Osgood's dogs' names verbatim while also knowing that Gary Osgood was gay. The shooter remembered each of Gary's dog's names, knew that Gary was gay, yet all while claiming to not know Gary's name himself? Highly unlikely.

Gary Osgood, also knew that David the shooter had been carrying a concealed weapon on his person after the first encounter with Steven. In Gary Osgood's own words when speaking with police on the morning of the shooting Gary stated "Um, it's—I—I know for a fact that he's always carried since Steven has assaulted them and Steven—took—like, one time took, like a fighting stance like he was gonna—wanted to box with David.

**Um, so, yes, David, um, has—has carried—walking his dogs ever since.** The shooter's own wife also corroborated Gary Osgood's statement as well as she also stated that the reason that David the shooter was carrying a concealed weapon was because of the shooter's mal intent towards Steven. **In addition, this pistol may very well have been carried illegally by the shooter as he did not appear to have the required concealed carry permit required by the state of Florida at the time of the shooting.**

One year prior or possibly one and a half years prior the shooter and his wife start an altercation with Steven over their dog approaching Steven. Steven was accused by the shooter and his wife of the crime of simply calling their dog over to him. The shooter became incensed that Steven would do such a thing and became aggressive and took a hostile posture by scolding Steven and telling him "**Man, don't call my dog!**" Why the shooter would become so aggressive with Steven over such a benign act is key to this case as the shooter allowed other neighbors to approach and pet his dog as attested to by Melania Binder a neighbor who lived in one of the condos facing the area of the shooting.

One week prior to the shooting there had been a driveway incident where the HOA was having work done on the driveway and supposedly each condo owner (of which Steven was not a condo owner, his grandparents were) was told to remove their cars from the driveway so that the gravel driveway could be worked on. Steven apparently did not "get the memo" and so apparently did not remove his car which caused Gary Osgood, Tobin Johnston and Beth Johnston to escalate the situation with Steven in order to force the removal of the car. It was this driveway incident that the shooter claims to have witnessed that became the "tipping point" and

provided the ultimate motivation for the eventual shooting of Steven by David Gregory but one week later so as to “**get rid of the problem**”.

This particular driveway event, instigated by Gary Osgood, Tobin Johnston and Beth Johnston was described as something that the shooter claims he and his wife witnessed the week prior to the shooting. Even though there is a very real possibility that Steven Paul may not have been aware at all of the requirement to move his car, he soon became the target of aggressive rhetoric from multiple parties including escalated aggressive behavior and rhetoric from the shooter himself. Witnesses subsequently directly heard the shooter express a violent intent against Steven, stating only 5 days prior to Penelope Nichols, a neighbor, that the shooter David Gregory stated directly to her “**If I had had my gun on me, I would have shot him**” Kelsie Lloyd, another neighbor, recounted a specific threat made by David Gregory towards Steven Paul, wherein Gregory stated, “**That kid’s got one time with me and I’ll put a bullet in him.**”

On the day of the shooting Steven was more than likely simply attempting to get back to his own house before first being cut off at the pass at his driveway entrance by David and Amy. So the likely scenario is that Steven Paul came out of his driveway north of the intersection of Westview Drive and Highland Rd. Steven Paul does not yet see David and Amy Gregory to the north of his condo driveway exit. Steven Paul decides to turn left, and heads south on Highland Rd. Amy Gregory stated during her interview that Steven Paul then turned right and headed west, away and down Westview dr. As he continues west on Westview Drive, either Steven now sees Gary Osgood and his dogs coming around the corner heading north on Shoreland towards Westview Drive and Steven Paul decides to avoid Gary Osgood and his dogs and instead decides to cancel his walk entirely or Steven Paul realizes that his apple ear-buds are missing from their case and Steven Paul then decides to go back home to retrieve them from his home? Either way, Steven Paul decides to turn around on Westview Drive and head back east towards the intersection with highland rd. It is at this time that Amy Gregory states that Steven Paul first sees both she and David (the shooter) on highland rd. After seeing David and Amy Gregory, Steven Paul more than likely takes notice that he cannot head north on highland, so to avoid David and Amy Gregory as they are now essentially blocking his path home, Steven Paul, instead, now turns right on highland and heads south towards Shoreland. However, at this point, David and Amy now follow Steven Paul heading south on Highland Rd in the direction of the eventual scene of the shooting. Upon passing the intersection at Westview dr. And Highland Rd., it is more than likely, at this point, that Steven Paul continues south on Highland, then realizes that David and Amy Gregory have followed directly behind him rather than choosing to cut through the yard directly across from the intersection to get back home. So rather than taking the shortcut through the neighbor’s yard to get back home, which is the path David and Amy would always generally take, David and Amy choose to follow Steven Paul south down Highland Rd heading towards Shoreland Dr. Steven Paul is now on the west side of Highland Rd walking with traffic. Amy and David Gregory are on the east side of Highland Rd walking against traffic. Upon noticing that David and Amy Gregory are following him, Steven Paul monitors the situation by looking back and then makes a decision to turn around and head home by walking north on Highland Rd back towards the intersection with Westview Drive and eventually to the driveway entrance to his home walking past David and Amy, on the opposite side of the road, in the

process. At this time, Amy and David are separated by some distance on Highland Rd as Amy is closer in proximity to Steven Paul and David is farther behind as they both follow behind Steven Paul heading still north at this point. Steven Paul first passes Amy and then subsequently passes David (the shooter). It is at this time, when Steven Paul passes David and his dog, that David's dog, a small miniature dog, takes it upon himself (as dogs often do) to cross the street in an attempt to approach Steven Paul. More than likely this approach by David's dog across the street was done by his dog to be both curious and friendly towards Steven Paul. David becomes incensed and enraged at his own dog as his dog tries to approach Steven Paul. A behavior that David (the shooter) had shown just before the shooting and also in the past. Approaching Steven Paul is clearly something that David (the shooter) did not want his dog doing. So David (the shooter) in an abusive attempt to intercept his dog David subjects his dog to physical abuse by yanking his dog's leash and causing his small miniature dog to go "sliding down the street, sideways, screaming." Steven Paul sees this abuse and it is at this point that Amy Gregory thinks she hears someone yell "what the fuck?". Here are David (the shooter)'s own words to detectives:

**"what had happened is, you know, the dog is on the ground, a little—a little dog. He said something, the dog thought it was an invitation to—to come. And I tried to get the cord and actually—goddamn, it's so terrible 'cause I tried to get the dog and I couldn't. And I missed him, and the poor little fucker went sliding down the street. He's sideways, and he's screaming. He's a little toy dog. And I stood up. I was like, "dude, leave us the fuck alone." And that's when he—when it happened, and —and then, after I—I—I grabbed the dog."**

As David subjects the dog to abuse, Steven Paul, as any concerned person would do in the same circumstance, attempts to assist the dog who is being abused by David (the shooter). David angrily crosses the street to retrieve his dog as Steven Paul attempts to assist the abused dog who is now on Steven Paul's side of the road. David (the shooter) becomes incensed that Steven Paul is trying to approach and assist the dog who is being abused by David. David becomes aggressive not only with his own dog but now also becomes aggressive with Steven Paul for attempting to assist or comfort his dog. This is when David (the shooter) escalates the situation even further and shoots Steven Paul, on Steven Paul's side of the street (west side), as he tries to assist the dog being abused by David. Angry at Steven Paul and looking for a confrontation, this is when David then confronts Steven Paul and shoots him. David Gregory fires twice, hitting Steven Paul once in the abdomen. After being shot, Steven Paul runs away and subsequently stumbles and falls in the ditch. In an attempt to cleanse the crime scene, David manages to pick up one of his spent shell casings but he is unable to pick up the other spent shell casing. So running out of time, David and Amy Gregory decide to flee the scene before someone sees them. However, upon attempting to flee the crime scene, David is interrupted by Dayna Purcell opening the front door to her condo and Dayna sees him hurriedly attempting to flee the crime scene. Since David now has a witness to his presence at the scene, David is now forced to tell Dayna Purcell to call the police. Had Dayna Purcell not been present at that moment, David and Amy would have likely both found and removed the second remaining shell casing and simply fled the scene without calling 911 at all. Upon arriving

at his home, David removes the cartridge from the pistol, but he fails to realize that there are only 3 rounds left in the magazine out of a total of 5 or 6 rounds. A 5 round magazine plus 1 round in the chamber (as David stated he always carried with 1 round in the chamber) indicating that there were 2 shots from his weapon plus one that was emptied from the chamber by David upon arriving back home leaving only 3 remaining rounds in the magazine or 5 shots to start with 2 shots fired and the third cartridge that was in the chamber removed by David and placed back into the magazine before arrival by the police on scene. What did David do with the bullet that was in the chamber after the shooting? Several witnesses close to the scene heard 2 shots fired. If so, what did David do with the missing 2nd spent bullet cartridge and why?

The 911 calls come in....

**9/24/22 at 7:16am- Dayna Purcell neighbor at 1855 Highland Rd, Osprey**

Dayna Purcell was in her kitchen and opened her front door when she heard the shooting. She interrupted David and Amy Gregory as they were attempting to flee the scene.

Dayna Purcell stated to the 911 operator “I just got up. I—I walked out in the kitchen. I heard a gunshot and I heard my neighbor outside say, “Call the police.”

**Dayna Purcell would later clarify in her statement to the police, when interviewed, that she heard TWO GUNSHOTS.**

When asked how long ago did this happen? Dayna replied “Just now. Like, two minutes ago.”

When asked if she saw anything? The shooter or anyone? Dayna replied “Yeah, I saw one of my neighbors um, walking down the road with his dog and he said, “Call the police.”

Upon being seen fleeing the scene of the crime by Dayna Purcell, David Gregory carrying his dog told her to “call the police” without explanation to her as to what she should call about. Dayna Purcell claims that she did not go outside but instead closed her door and proceeded to call 911.

Dayna claims that she called 911 two minutes after encountering David on the road walking away/fleeing from the scene of the crime.

**QUESTION: NEED CLARIFICATION ABOUT THE TIMING OF HER CALL. HOW LONG AFTER THE SHOTS WERE FIRED DID DAYNA MAKE HER CALL TO 911? DID IT OCCUR TWO MINUTES OR TWENTY MINUTES AFTER SHE HEARD THE GUNSHOT? OR WAS HER CALL MADE 2 MINUTES AFTER SHE ENCOUNTERS AND WITNESSES DAVID FLEEING THE SCENE WITH HIS DOG? THIS IS CRITICAL BECAUSE THE SHOOTER'S WIFE CLAIMED SHE WAS CALLING 911 TWENTY MINUTES AFTER THE SHOOTING HAD OCCURRED. ALSO DAYNA PURCELL STATES SHE SAW "ONE OF MY NEIGHBORS UM, WALKING DOWN THE ROAD WITH HIS DOG AND HE SAID, "CALL THE POLICE." AT**

**THIS POINT, THERE IS ABSOLUTELY NO MENTION WHATSOEVER OF DAYNA PURCELL ALSO SEEING THE SHOOTER'S WIFE, AMY GREGORY. WHERE WAS THE SHOOTER'S WIFE? WAS THE SHOOTER'S WIFE EVEN PRESENT AS DAVID ATTEMPTED TO FLEE THE CRIME SCENE? A MONTH LATER, IN A STATEMENT TO POLICE, DAYNA MENTIONS SEEING BOTH THE SHOOTER AND HIS WIFE OUTSIDE AFTER THE SHOOTING. WHICH VERSION IS CORRECT?**

Dayna claims she stayed in the house after encountering David fleeing the scene.

When asked if anyone was injured? Dayna replied **“I don’t see anything. I’m not going outside”**

**Dayna Purcell would later clarify in her statement to the police, when interviewed, that she heard TWO GUNSHOTS when she was inside near the entrance door to her home, she then witnessed Amy and David walking quickly away/fleeing the scene of the shooting, that David (the shooter) was looking over his shoulder and at that point were on the road near the end of her driveway, she then opened her door and upon doing so was told by David (the shooter) to call 911. Interestingly enough David (the shooter) denies having done this or seeing Dayna at all. Why does David (the shooter) lie about this to investigators?**

911 operator asks “That neighbor, do you know his name?”

Dayna replies **“David, I don’t know his last name.”**

Dayna Purcell also claims she did not see the shooting.

#### **9/24/22 at 7:18am- Gary Osgood neighbor at 1801 Highland Rd, Osprey**

When calling 911 Gary Osgood stated the following: **“I—I—I just—I just heard a shot. And I heard somebody say. “You motherfucker.” and I don’t know what’s going on.**

When asked by the 911 operator, **“How many shots did you hear?”** Gary Osgood replies **“Um, I think I heard two. I don’t know if there’s anything going on or not, but it just sounded like shots, and I heard somebody scream and I think I saw somebody fall but I’m not sure.”** Yeah. I’m—I’m getting closer to where I saw something happening but I don’t see anything here.

When told by the 911 operator that help was on the way, Gary Osgood replies **“Thank you. I’ve got my dogs. I gotta get in the house and I’ll come back out.”**

Gary Osgood was a first-hand witness to the shooting, he was walking his dogs and was heading east on Westview Dr. when he heard two gunshots, then heard David Gregory yell "You motherfucker" and subsequently saw Steven Paul fall after he had been shot.

**When asked by the 911 operator how many shots he heard, Gary Osgood stated he heard 2 GUNSHOTS.**

Gary Osgood was the first person to arrive at the scene after the shooting, yet he claimed that he did not see the person (Steven Paul) that he witnessed falling on the ground in the area.

**Gary Osgood had his own dogs with him and he stated he was going to go back to his house first and come back out-**

**QUESTION- WHY THE NEED TO COME BACK OUT TO THE SCENE OF THE SHOOTING IF GARY OSGOOD CLAIMS THAT HE DID NOT SEE ANYONE?? EITHER GARY LIKELY WOULD HAVE SEEN OR HIS DOGS WOULD ALSO HAVE SEEN, SMELLED OR SENSED STEVEN PAUL IN THE DITCH AS THE DITCH WAS SHALLOW AND WAS VERY CLOSE TO THE ROAD WHERE HE CLAIMS TO HAVE PASSED. GARY OSGOOD'S VERSION OF EVENTS MAKES VERY LITTLE SENSE.**

**9/24/22 at 7:20am- Amy Gregory wife of shooter at 1847 Highland Rd, Osprey (address is located in the row of condo units behind Dayna Purcell condo unit)**

First thing that Amy details is that there is "this guy that we've called the police on".

Describes Steven Paul as "this crazy guy in the neighborhood".

Amy Gregory claims that Steven Paul is "this crazy guy who attacks everybody. He's attacked us **twice**. We've called the police on him. We were walkin' our dogs. **HE COMES OUT**, and he starts pacin' around us. And then we think he's leavin'. So we're walkin' the other way on the street. He comes back our way, gets right at us, spits at us, turns around, and then goes at my husband and asks him what the fuck he wants. We're doin' nothin'—but walkin' our dogs. He went at my husband to attack him. David shot him in defense. My husband did shoot him in self-defense."

**FOLLOW-UP QUESTION TO STATEMENT- THE SELF SERVING SCENARIO AS DESCRIBED MAKES ABSOLUTELY NO SENSE WHATSOEVER? THE SHOOTER'S WIFE SELF SERVINGLY CLAIMS THAT THEY WERE DOIN' NOTHIN' AS SHE STATED. SO WHY IN THE WORLD WOULD ANYONE, LET ALONE STEVEN ACT IN THE MANNER AS DESCRIBED WITH ABSOLUTELY NO REASON TO DO SO WHATSOEVER? WHY WOULD STEVEN PAUL DO ANY OF THIS? WHY WOULD STEVEN WALK BACK TOWARDS THEM? WAS STEVEN PAUL SIMPLY PASSING AMY GREGORY FIRST AND DAVID (THE SHOOTER) SECOND AFTER ATTEMPTING TO GET BACK TO HIS OWN HOUSE. LIKELY SCENARIO IS THAT STEVEN PAUL CAME OUT OF HIS DRIVEWAY NORTH OF THE INTERSECTION OF**

WESTVIEW DR. AND HIGHLAND RD. STEVEN PAUL AND DOES NOT YET SEE DAVID AND AMY GREGORY TO THE NORTH OF HIS CONDO DRIVEWAY EXIT. STEVEN PAUL DECIDES TO TURN LEFT AND HE HEADS SOUTH ON HIGHLAND RD. AMY GREGORY STATED DURING HER INTERVIEW THAT STEVEN PAUL THEN TURNED RIGHT AND HEADED WEST, AWAY AND DOWN WESTVIEW DR. AS HE CONTINUES WEST ON WESTVIEW DR, EITHER STEVEN NOW SEES GARY OSGOOD AND HIS DOGS COMING AROUND THE CORNER HEADING NORTH ON SHORELAND TOWARDS WESTVIEW DR AND STEVEN PAUL DECIDES TO AVOID GARY OSGOOD AND HIS DOGS AND INSTEAD DECIDES TO CANCEL HIS WALK ENTIRELY OR STEVEN PAUL REALIZES THAT HIS APPLE EAR-BUDS ARE MISSING FROM THEIR CASE AND STEVEN PAUL THEN DECIDES TO GO BACK HOME TO RETRIEVE THEM FROM HIS HOME? EITHER WAY, STEVEN PAUL DECIDES TO TURN AROUND ON WESTVIEW DR AND HEAD BACK EAST TOWARDS THE INTERSECTION WITH HIGHLAND RD. IT IS AT THIS TIME THAT AMY GREGORY STATES THAT STEVEN PAUL FIRST SEES BOTH SHE AND DAVID (THE SHOOTER) ON HIGHLAND RD. AFTER SEEING DAVID AND AMY GREGORY, STEVEN PAUL MORE THAN LIKELY TAKES NOTICE THAT HE CANNOT HEAD NORTH ON HIGHLAND, SO TO AVOID DAVID AND AMY GREGORY AS THEY ARE NOW ESSENTIALLY BLOCKING HIS PATH HOME, STEVEN PAUL, INSTEAD, NOW TURNS RIGHT ON HIGHLAND AND HEADS SOUTH TOWARDS SHORELAND. HOWEVER, AT THIS POINT, DAVID AND AMY NOW FOLLOW STEVEN PAUL HEADING SOUTH ON HIGHLAND RD IN THE DIRECTION OF THE EVENTUAL SCENE OF THE SHOOTING. UPON PASSING THE INTERSECTION AT WESTVIEW DR. AND HIGHLAND RD., IT IS MORE THAN LIKELY, AT THIS POINT, THAT STEVEN PAUL CONTINUING SOUTH ON HIGHLAND, THEN REALIZES THAT DAVID AND AMY GREGORY HAVE FOLLOWED DIRECTLY BEHIND HIM RATHER THAN CHOOSING TO CUT THROUGH THE YARD DIRECTLY ACROSS FROM THE INTERSECTION TO GET BACK HOME. SO RATHER THAN TAKING THE SHORTCUT THROUGH THE NEIGHBOR'S YARD TO GET BACK HOME, WHICH IS THE PATH DAVID AND AMY WOULD ALWAYS GENERALLY TAKE, DAVID AND AMY CHOOSE TO FOLLOW STEVEN PAUL SOUTH DOWN HIGHLAND RD HEADING TOWARDS SHORELAND DR. STEVEN PAUL IS NOW ON THE WEST SIDE OF HIGHLAND RD WALKING WITH TRAFFIC. AMY AND DAVID GREGORY ARE ON THE EAST SIDE OF THE HIGHLAND RD WALKING AGAINST TRAFFIC. UPON NOTICING THAT DAVID AND AMY GREGORY ARE FOLLOWING HIM, STEVEN PAUL MONITORS THE SITUATION BY LOOKING BACK AND THEN MAKES A DECISION TO TURN AROUND AND HEAD HOME BY WALKING NORTH ON HIGHLAND RD BACK TOWARDS THE INTERSECTION WITH WESTVIEW DR AND EVENTUALLY TO THE DRIVEWAY ENTRANCE TO HIS HOME WALKING PAST DAVID AND AMY, ON THE OPPOSITE SIDE OF THE ROAD, IN THE PROCESS. AT THIS TIME, AMY AND DAVID ARE SEPARATED BY SOME DISTANCE ON HIGHLAND RD AS AMY IS CLOSER IN PROXIMITY TO STEVEN PAUL AND DAVID IS FARTHER BEHIND AS THEY BOTH FOLLOW BEHIND STEVEN PAUL HEADING STILL NORTH AT THIS POINT. STEVEN PAUL FIRST PASSES AMY AND THEN SUBSEQUENTLY PASSES DAVID (THE SHOOTER). IT IS AT THIS TIME, WHEN STEVEN PAUL PASSES DAVID AND HIS DOG, THAT DAVID'S DOG, A SMALL MINIATURE DOG, TAKES IT UPON HIMSELF (AS DOG'S OFTEN DO) TO CROSS THE STREET IN AN ATTEMPT TO APPROACH STEVEN PAUL. MORE THAN LIKELY THIS APPROACH BY

DAVID'S DOG ACROSS THE STREET WAS DONE BY HIS DOG TO BE BOTH CURIOUS AND FRIENDLY TOWARDS STEVEN PAUL. DAVID BECOMES INCENSED AND ENRAGED AT HIS OWN DOG AS HIS DOG TRIES TO APPROACH STEVEN PAUL. A BEHAVIOR THAT DAVID (THE SHOOTER) HAD SHOWN JUST BEFORE THE SHOOTING AND ALSO IN THE PAST. APPROACHING STEVEN PAUL IS CLEARLY SOMETHING THAT DAVID (THE SHOOTER) DID NOT WANT HIS DOG DOING. SO DAVID (THE SHOOTER) IN AN ABUSIVE ATTEMPT TO INTERCEPT HIS DOG DAVID SUBJECTS HIS DOG TO PHYSICAL ABUSE BY YANKING HIS DOG'S LEASH AND CAUSING HIS SMALL MINIATURE DOG TO GO "SLIDING DOWN THE STREET, SIDEWAYS, SCREAMING." STEVEN PAUL SEES THIS ABUSE AND IT IS AT THIS POINT THAT AMY GREGORY THINKS SHE HEARS SOMEONE YELL "WHAT THE FUCK?". HERE ARE DAVID (THE SHOOTER)'S OWN WORDS TO DETECTIVES:

"What had happened is, you know, the dog is on the ground, a little—a little dog. He said something, the dog thought it was an invitation to—to come.

And I tried to get the cord and actually—goddamn, it's so terrible 'cause I tried to get the dog and I couldn't. And I missed him, and the poor little fucker went sliding down the street. He's sideways, and he's screaming. He's a little toy dog. And I stood up. I was like, "Dude, leave us the fuck alone." And that's when he—when it happened, and —and then, after I—I—I grabbed the dog."

AS DAVID SUBJECTS THE DOG TO ABUSE, STEVEN PAUL, AS ANY CONCERNED PERSON WOULD DO IN THE SAME CIRCUMSTANCE, ATTEMPTS TO ASSIST THE DOG WHO IS BEING ABUSED BY DAVID (THE SHOOTER). DAVID ANGRILY CROSSES THE STREET TO RETRIEVE HIS DOG AS STEVEN PAUL ATTEMPTS TO ASSIST THE ABUSED DOG WHO IS NOW ON STEVEN PAUL'S SIDE OF THE ROAD. DAVID (THE SHOOTER) BECOMES INCENSED THAT STEVEN PAUL IS TRYING TO APPROACH AND ASSIST THE DOG WHO IS BEING ABUSED BY DAVID.

DAVID BECOMES AGGRESSIVE NOT ONLY WITH HIS OWN DOG BUT NOW ALSO BECOMES AGGRESSIVE WITH STEVEN PAUL FOR ATTEMPTING TO ASSIST OR COMFORT HIS DOG. THIS IS WHEN DAVID (THE SHOOTER) ESCALATES THE SITUATION EVEN FURTHER AND SHOOTS STEVEN PAUL, ON STEVEN PAUL'S SIDE OF THE STREET (WEST SIDE), AS HE TRIES TO ASSIST THE DOG BEING ABUSED BY DAVID. ANGRY AT STEVEN PAUL AND LOOKING FOR A CONFRONTATION, THIS IS WHEN DAVID PAUL THEN CROSSES OVER TO THE WEST SIDE OF THE ROAD, CONFRONTS STEVEN PAUL AND SHOOTS HIM. DAVID GREGORY FIRES TWICE, HITTING STEVEN PAUL ONCE IN THE ABDOMEN. AFTER BEING SHOT, STEVEN PAUL RUNS AWAY AND SUBSEQUENTLY STUMBLES AND FALLS IN THE DITCH. IN AN ATTEMPT TO CLEANSE THE CRIME SCENE, DAVID MANAGES TO PICK UP ONE OF HIS SPENT SHELL CASINGS BUT HE IS UNABLE TO PICK UP THE OTHER SPENT SHELL CASING. SO RUNNING OUT OF TIME, DAVID AND AMY GREGORY DECIDE TO FLEE THE SCENE BEFORE SOMEONE SEES THEM. HOWEVER, UPON ATTEMPTING TO FLEE THE CRIME SCENE, DAVID IS INTERRUPTED BY DAYNA PURCELL OPENING THE FRONT DOOR TO HER CONDO AND DAYNA SEES HIM HURRIEDLY ATTEMPTING TO FLEE THE CRIME SCENE. SINCE DAVID NOW HAS A

WITNESS TO HIS PRESENCE AT THE SCENE, DAVID IS NOW FORCED TO TELL DAYNA PURCELL TO CALL THE POLICE. HAD DAYNA PURCELL, NOT BEEN PRESENT AT THAT MOMENT, DAVID AND AMY WOULD HAVE LIKELY EITHER FOUND AND REMOVED THE SECOND REMAINING SHELL CASING AND SIMPLY FLED THE SCENE WITHOUT CALLING 911 AT ALL. UPON ARRIVING AT HIS HOME, DAVID REMOVES THE CARTRIDGE FROM THE PISTOL, BUT HE FAILS TO REALIZE THAT THERE ARE ONLY 3 ROUNDS LEFT IN THE MAGAZINE OUT OF A TOTAL OF 5 OR 6 ROUNDS. A 5 ROUND MAGAZINE PLUS 1 ROUND IN THE CHAMBER (AS DAVID STATED HE ALWAYS CARRIED WITH 1 ROUND IN THE CHAMBER) INDICATING THAT THERE WERE 2 SHOTS FROM HIS WEAPON PLUS ONE THAT WAS EMPTIED FROM THE CHAMBER BY DAVID UPON ARRIVING BACK HOME LEAVING ONLY 3 REMAINING ROUNDS IN THE MAGAZINE OR 5 SHOTS TO START WITH 2 SHOTS FIRED AND THE THIRD CARTRIDGE THAT WAS IN THE CHAMBER REMOVED BY DAVID AND PLACED BACK INTO THE MAGAZINE BEFORE ARRIVAL BY THE POLICE ON SCENE. WHAT DID DAVID DO WITH THE BULLET THAT WAS IN THE CHAMBER AFTER THE SHOOTING? WITNESSES CLOSE THE SCENE HEARD 2 SHOTS FIRED. IF SO, WHAT DID DAVID DO WITH THE MISSING 2<sup>ND</sup> SPENT BULLET CARTRIDGE AND WHY?

*When asked by the 911 operator if she knew if Steven Paul was still conscious or breathing, Amy Gregory (the shooter's wife) says the following: "What? I—don't know. We had to come back to the house and get the phone. So, I don't know where he is. I'm not going lookin' for him because he's dangerous. He's crazy." When Amy was asked if she knew where Steven was she claimed "I— I don't know. He lives in the condo neighborhood. He's always been trouble. I don't know what happened to him. We got out of there because we were scared."*

FOLLOW-UP QUESTION TO STATEMENT- THE SELF SERVING SCENARIO AS DESCRIBED IS CONTRADICTED BY STATEMENTS MADE WHEN INTERVIEWED BY POLICE. DURING THE POLICE INTERVIEW, AMY STATES THAT SHE SAW STEVEN FALL IN THE DITCH AFTER BEING SHOT BY HER HUSBAND. ***SHE CLAIMS THAT THEY LEFT THE SCENE OF THE CRIME BECAUSE THEY WERE SCARED. OF COURSE, SHE WOULD HAVE TO SAY THAT AFTER HAVING BEEN INTERRUPTED BY DAYNA PURCELL, WHO WITNESSED THEM ATTEMPTING TO FLEE THE SCENE OF THE CRIME. SHE NOW WANTS TO CLAIM THAT THEY HAD LEFT OUT OF FEAR AND NOT THE MORE LIKELY REASON THAT THEY WERE ATTEMPTING TO FLEE THE SCENE OF THE CRIME BEFORE BEING SEEN BY A NEIGHBOR.***

Amy Gregory described the weapon used as a .380 caliber handgun. When asked where the weapon was, Amy Gregory detailed the fact that the weapon was on the kitchen "counter with the clip out, UNLOADED." When subsequently told by the 911 operator to "Just make sure that that gun's not touched any further. Okay?"

FOLLOW UP QUESTIONS- WHY DID DAVID (THE SHOOTER) UNLOAD HIS WEAPON WHEN INSTRUCTED NOT TO TOUCH THE WEAPON ANY FURTHER? WHERE DID THE ROUND THAT WAS IN THE CHAMBER GO? WHY WAS THE ROUND IN THE CHAMBER

NOT PROVIDED TO THE POLICE WHEN THEY ARRIVED? WHY WAS THE WEAPON MOVED BY DAVID OR AMY GREGORY A SECOND TIME FROM THE COUNTER TO THE TABLE OUTSIDE THEIR HOME BEFORE THE POLICE ARRIVED EVEN AFTER BEING TOLD NOT TO TOUCH THE GUN ANY FURTHER? DID DAVID WANT TO AVOID THE POLICE GOING INTO HIS HOME? DID THE POLICE CONDUCT A SEARCH INSIDE THE GREGORY'S HOME FOR THE MISSING SHELL CASING OR THE MISSING ROUND IN THE CHAMBER? IF NOT, WHY NOT?

When Amy Gregory was asked by the 911 operator "And is your husband hurt in any way?" **she asked her husband "Um, he—did he hit you?** Then Amy says "**Yes, he hit him**" only after being told by her husband David who claimed Steven Paul had hit him. When Amy was asked again "and is your husband hurt in any way? Amy asks David (the shooter) "**Are you hurt? Where are you hurt?** She then states "**No**" "**He's not hurt**"

**FOLLOW UP QUESTION- WHY IS AMY ASKING HER HUSBAND WHETHER STEVEN PAUL HIT HIM? I THOUGHT HER CLAIM WAS THAT SHE ACTUALLY WITNESSED HER HUSBAND BEING ATTACKED BY STEVEN PAUL? IT APPEARS THAT MORE THAN LIKELY AMY NEEDED TO ASK DAVID IF HE HAD EVEN BEEN HIT BY STEVEN PAUL BECAUSE THE ATTACK NEVER ACTUALLY HAPPENED AS ALLEGED.**

When Amy Gregory was asked by the 911 operator "*And how long ago did the shooting happen?*", the shooter's wife responds "**Oh, it—it was probably 20 minutes ago.**"

**FOLLOW UP QUESTION- AMY GREGORY STATED THAT THE SHOOTING OCCURRED 20 MINUTES AGO. THAT WOULD PUT THE TIME OF THE SHOOTING AT 7:00 AM. WHY DID SHE WAIT 20 MINUTES TO CALL 911? WHAT DID THE SHOOTER AND HIS WIFE DO WITHIN THAT 20 MINUTE TIMEFRAME? WAS THE SHOOTER AND HIS WIFE INTENTIONALLY WAITING FOR STEVEN TO DIE IN THE DITCH OR TRYING TO COME UP WITH A FALSE SELF-SERVING STORY OF SELF DEFENSE BEFORE CALLING 911?**

When Amy Gregory was asked by the 911 operator "and did it appear that he was, you know, on any drugs today or anything? Is that why you think he was kinda coming towards you guys and trying to..." Amy then answers "**No. He does that to everybody. He tries to intimidate everybody.**"

**FOLLOW UP QUESTION- AMY GREGORY OBVIOUSLY KNEW STEVEN PAUL WAS NOT ON DRUGS. OTHER THAN STEVEN PAUL TURNING AROUND TO GO BACK HOME ON THE WEST SIDE OF THE ROAD WITH BOTH DAVID AND AMY ON THE OPPOSITE EAST SIDE OF THE ROAD. WHERE WAS THE ACT OF INTIMIDATION AS SHE CLAIMS? WHERE WAS THE ACTUAL THREAT? THE FORENSIC EVIDENCE CLEARLY SHOWS THAT DAVID (THE SHOOTER) APPROACHED STEVEN ON THE WEST SIDE OF THE ROAD AND NOT THE OTHER WAY AROUND AS ALLEGED. MORE THAN LIKELY THAT STEVEN PAUL WAS SIMPLY AFRAID, HIMSELF, OF BEING FOLLOWED BY DAVID THEN TURNED AROUND BECAUSE HE WAS BEING FOLLOWED BY DAVID AND DID NOT FEEL SAFE. SO INSTEAD HE TRIES TO AVOID DAVID BY TURNING AROUND SO HIS BACK IS NOT TO DAVID AND**

*HEADS IN THE OPPOSITE DIRECTION TOWARDS DAVID AND AMY IN AN ATTEMPT TO GO HOME TO SAFETY BEFORE BEING CONFRONTED AND SUBSEQUENTLY SHOT BY DAVID GREGORY.*

After claiming self-defense twice during the 911 call. Amy Gregory later states “**He scared me to death. He scared me to death. He was gonna kill my husband.**” “**David he was goin’ to kill you. He was freakin’ attacking you. The third fuckin’ time. Oh.**” David Gregory then swears “**Goddammit, Goddammit. Goddammit.**”

*FOLLOW UP QUESTION- IF AMY GREGORY WAS SO SURE THAT STEVEN PAUL WAS GOING TO KILL HER HUSBAND THEN WHY DID SHE HAVE TO ASK HIM IF STEVEN PAUL HIT HIM? HER STATEMENTS ON THE ALLEGED ASSAULT ARE CONFLICTING AND WEAK AT BEST AND OTHER THAN STEVEN PAUL WALKING PAST DAVID AND AMY IN AN ATTEMPT TO GO BACK HOME AS HIS REASON FOR USE OF DEADLY FORCE WAS NOT APPARENT OR NECESSARY. APPEARS THAT HER STATEMENTS IN THIS CASE ARE AN ATTEMPT TO BOLSTER AN ALLEGED SELF DEFENSE CLAIM SINCE THEY WERE NOW FORCED TO CALL 911 DUE TO BEING CAUGHT IN THE ACT OF FLEEING THE SCENE AFTER THE SHOOTING BY DAYNA PURCELL.*

Gary Osgood stated that he heard two gunshots and then he saw Steven stumble and fall. However, Gary claims that as he approached the area where Steven had fallen, that neither he nor his three dogs saw Steven in the ditch at the corner of Westview and Highland even though he was but only several feet away as he passed through the intersection of Highland and Westview. Gary Osgood then claims that he first put his dogs away and upon returning to the scene of the crime, only then did he spot Steven taking his last gasps of air while lying in the ditch. Gary’s version of events of his actions immediately in the aftermath of the shooting is highly suspect to say the least.

Gary Osgood the HOA president was the first person at the scene of the crime and Gary was the first person to intentionally lead the investigation off course once he spoke with officers Deputy Jay Patella and Deputy Paula O’Brien as well as Detective Megan Vinopal after the shooting occurred. He was the first person to speak to all the initial first responders that arrived on scene immediately after the shooting occurred and this immediately led the first responders and detectives off course during the critical infancy stage of the investigation and set the investigation on a erroneous and fatally flawed path with no critical judgment or questioning on the part of the lead investigative detectives, King and Ojeda who were assigned to this case.

In the police questioning of Gary Osgood and Tobin Johnston, there were no questions asked, nor any information divulged, regarding David Gregory directly informing them that he intended to shoot Steven or that he had a gun. These accounts were relayed to Paola Colon and Steven Colon, Steven Paul’s parents, corroborating the statement given to the police by Kelsie Lloyd Eden. Additionally, another neighbor who lived directly next door to the shooter and his wife, Linda Kremblas, provided further insights into David’s character and had agreed to go on record. To this day, this vitally important witness, has yet to be interviewed by detectives.

In addition, even though Gary Osgood wanted Steven removed from the neighborhood and had ulterior motives for doing so, he knew very well that David Gregory, was carrying a pistol with stated intentions to shoot because Gary Osgood had relayed this information directly to Steven Paul's parents. Similarly, Tobin Johnston made the same comment directly to Paola Colon, the victim's mother. This is significant and goes to premeditation, indicating that David had a specific vendetta against Steven Paul and was not acting out of fear, but rather seeking vengeance.

#### **When one includes...**

- the shooter's own prior threatening remarks made to multiple neighbors,
- the shooter's prior involvement with HOA leadership in an attempt to get rid of Steven Paul by as the shooter stated to "get rid of the problem" that would indicate intent and motive prior to the the day of the shooting,
- the shooter's wife's statements about Steven Paul that "He shouldn't be in that neighborhood" that would again indicate intent and prior motive.
- the shooter and his wife's choice of walking path on the day of the shooting. False statements and false claims of fear while intentionally and deliberately choosing to follow the victim down the road instead of using a readily available alternate and typical path of cutting through a neighbors yard and away from Steven Paul prior to the shooting.
- the shooter's intent to carry a concealed weapon for the expressed purpose of harming Steven Paul and
- the shooter carrying a concealed weapon that the shooter had no legal authority to carry under Florida State Statutes at the time of the shooting,
- the shooter's own cruel and abusive behavior of his own dog prior to the shooting as would have been viewed by the victim Steven Paul,
- the shooter's own approach and encroachment of the victim by, he himself, by going over to Steven Paul's (the victim's) side of the road before shooting him as detailed by the forensic evidence and corroborating statements made.
- shooting at the victim, Steven Paul, twice not once as heard by multiple witnesses and corroborated by additional missing bullets and or bullet casings from the weapon used in the shooting.
- Ballistic and forensic evidence with no injuries to the shooter, no gunshot residue or stippling that contradicts false claims made of any sort of struggle or close range contact had occurred prior to the shooting,
- the shooter's own aggressive behavior and posture during an alleged previous encounter with the victim, Steven Paul, approximately one year prior to the shooting,
- and the shooter's own aggressive behavior and posture and the yelling of profanities at the victim both before and after the shooting,

...the shooter's false claim of self-defense is one that is very easily discredited and is completely antithetical to the statements and evidence in this case.

This report is based on the heavily redacted Sarasota County Sheriff's Department investigation, which is significantly lacking in thoroughness and detail. Simply connecting the dots from the available information reveals numerous gaps and deficiencies in the investigative process. For instance, no forensic evidence was collected from the shooter despite his claim that Steven grabbed his shirt and punched him. This should have resulted in trace evidence of Steven Paul's DNA on the shooter's clothing.

Additionally, there is missing evidence, such as statements from the parents and family of Steven Paul immediately following the shooting, which have mysteriously disappeared. Furthermore, it took several weeks for the police to interview key witnesses. To this day, there are still witnesses with valuable information who have not yet been contacted.

These are only a few of the deficiencies we have noted and have been frustrated about. However, one can still connect the dots here fairly easily. Despite these gaps and the lack of comprehensive investigative techniques, we have managed to piece together a complete picture of what more than likely transpired on that day. This report underscores the need for a more thorough and meticulous investigation to ensure justice is served.

In fact, the investigation was so flawed as to infer and imply by any reasonable person the active and obvious assistance of the shooter and the shooter's wife by Detectives King and Ojeda during this investigation by being obvious in their leading questioning of both the shooter and his wife, not pursuing any serious or critical line of questioning whatsoever, not following up or pursuing critical opposing witness statements in any meaningful way, and not taking the necessary steps to pursue key critical evidence or statements, one would have to conclude in order to assist the shooter and his wife to perpetuate a false claim of self-defense while also cloaked under the umbrella of "Stand Your Ground" in this case even though there are incredible amounts of forensics and evidence that are completely contrary and that would require a reversal of any sort of recommendation or conclusion being made by Detective King at this time that this case is a simple case of "justifiable homicide". The recommendation being made by Detective King of "justifiable homicide" is a disgrace to anyone who needs to trust in the investigative process used in this case or wants to believe this case was, in any way, investigated properly by Detective King or Detective Ojeda.

## **The False Narrative/Background:**

The narrative propagated within the neighborhood where Steven Paul Colon resided was profoundly shaped by a campaign of misinformation predominantly led by the homeowners' association. Gary Osgood, the association's president, together with board members Tobin and Beth Johnston, spread numerous outright false rumors about Steven, drastically mischaracterizing his behavior and painting him as an "unstable" and "dangerous" individual with "mental health" issues and potentially on drugs.

These rumors included unfounded allegations that Steven was taking drugs. Gary Osgood even spreading rumors of drug use by telling neighbors as well as making statements to investigators claiming that he had seen "pill bottles" "spoon with white powder", etc..in the house he shared with his grandparents. Although not the only misrepresentation of Steven on the part of Gary Osgood as well as HOA board members Tobin and Beth Johnston, this particular rumor of was one of the most intentionally blatant misrepresentations about Steven as it was an obvious intent to fictitiously and maliciously paint Steven Paul as an erratic drug fueled individual on either cocaine or heroin. This could not be any farther from the truth as Steven Paul was actively engaged in an athletic regimen of regular salt and nutritional supplement intake as well as a regimen of regular and consistent multiple 10 minute walks per day as recommended by Stan Efferding a world renowned bodybuilder.

Stan Efferding, known as the "World's Strongest Bodybuilder," is a renowned powerlifter and bodybuilder who has set world records in both sports. His workout regimen focuses on strength training and functional fitness, emphasizing the importance of recovery and holistic health. A key part of his philosophy is advocating for several 10-minute walks daily, which he believes helps with digestion, recovery, and overall cardiovascular health.

Efferding also highlights the importance of proper salt consumption, countering common beliefs about sodium intake. He states, "We are not salt-sensitive; we are salt-deficient. Proper sodium intake is crucial for optimal performance and health."

Efferding shares his insights and routines on social media:

- Instagram: @stanefferding
- YouTube: Stan Efferding
- Facebook: Stan Efferding

This regimen, including both the intense powerlifting sessions and the daily walks and salt intake recommended by Efferding, was diligently followed by Steven Paul.

Other accusations stated that Steven made excessive noise in the garage while lifting weights, and that he irresponsibly handled the trash—either by failing to take in the trash cans on collection days or not breaking down cardboard boxes for recycling properly. Neighbors were told that Steven was unfriendly, often "spitting at people" in public, and exhibited "unstable" behavior. Did Steven Paul sometimes spit on the ground? Yes. Was he spitting at people? Absolutely NOT! What reason would Steven Paul have for having to spit at times? The athletic

salt intake regimen, as recommended by Stan Efferding and which Steven Paul followed, would often create excess saliva in the mouth, with a subsequent need to spit on the ground. The most egregious rumors insinuated that Steven was violent towards his own grandparents, including claims that he “broke his grandfather’s arm” and “pushed his grandmother down the stairs”. It was common knowledge that Steven Paul’s grandfather had an existing and dire heart condition which often resulted in imbalance and injuries from falling after moments involving lightheadedness and/or outright loss of consciousness. Once again, each and every one of these baseless rumors had been maliciously spread throughout the neighborhood by those involved in HOA leadership as well as the shooter and his wife.

These baseless rumors seeded fear throughout the neighborhood, with many residents who had never met Steven expressing apprehension based solely on the hearsay. Contrary to these rumors, individuals who actually encountered Steven noted that while he may have been reserved and not overtly friendly, he certainly was not hostile or aggressive. This narrative of fear and mistrust was meticulously crafted by Gary Osgood, Tobin Johnston, Beth Johnston, the shooter and his wife to falsely paint Steven as the aggressor, significantly biasing the community—and ultimately local law enforcement and the detectives investigating this case—against him.

## **Events Leading Up to the Shooting:**

Steven Paul Colon was consistently portrayed in a negative light by key figures within the community, including Gary Osgood, Tobin and Beth Johnson, and notably, the shooter himself as well as the shooter's wife.. This orchestrated campaign of defamation went beyond mere community gossip; it was a targeted effort that significantly influenced local perceptions without any direct knowledge or evidence.

As part of this campaign, there was an increasing rhetoric surrounding Steven's mental state, painting him as unstable and dangerous. Neighbors reported during police canvassing that they had heard about a "mentally unstable" man in the neighborhood who was perceived as a threat due to supposed mental health issues. These rumors were not isolated but were a widespread campaign narrative, purportedly confirmed by multiple sources, including the shooter. Such misinformation and lies about Steven's mental condition fomented an atmosphere of fear and mistrust in the neighborhood.

Furthermore, many residents testified that although they had heard these alarming stories, they had never actually seen Steven behave in the ways described. In fact, most attested that they had never even met Steven but had only heard rumors and hearsay. Those who did encounter him noted that he was non-confrontational, often choosing not to engage with others. This behavior was misrepresented as antisocial or hostile, further coloring the community's perception of him.

The situation was exacerbated a week prior to the shooting during an incident involving the homeowners' association's decision to re-gravel the driveway. Residents were supposedly told to move their cars off the driveway prior to the work beginning. Apparently Steven did not move his vehicle prior to the driveway re-graveling process beginning, and this became the focal point of escalation efforts by Gary Osgood the HOA president, Tobin Johnston along with Beth Johnston his wife to confront Steven Paul to demand the removal of his car from the driveway so the re-graveling process could continue. This particular event, instigated by Gary Osgood, Tobin Johnston and Beth Johnston was described as something that the shooter claims he and his wife witnessed the week prior to the shooting. Even though there is a very real possibility that Steven Paul may not have been aware at all of the requirement to move his car, he soon became the target of aggressive rhetoric from multiple parties including escalated aggressive behavior and rhetoric from the shooter himself. Witnesses subsequently directly heard the shooter express a violent intent against Steven, stating only 5 days prior to Penelope Nichols, a neighbor, that the shooter David Gregory stated directly to her **"If I had had my gun on me, I would have shot him"** Kelsie Lloyd, another neighbor, recounted a specific threat made by David Gregory towards Steven Paul, wherein Gregory stated, **"That kid's got one time with me and I'll put a bullet in him."** **These statements are crucial as it directly implicates Gregory's intent and premeditation, challenging the false narrative of self-defense and instead suggesting strongly that the shooter had a personal vendetta against Steven Paul prior to the shooting. Furthermore, the shooter's own wife indicated that her husband began carrying a concealed weapon after the first encounter with Steven Paul. A weapon, the shooter it appears, did not even have legal authority to carry as he did not have a concealed carry permit from the state of Florida.** The shooter's wife stated the

following during her police interview: “**And that first encounter with him is when we decided that—and just hearing the stories about things he’s done, and just a terror to the neighborhood, that’s when David thought, “You know what? I’m at least gonna be protected in case he tries to do something to you”** Detective King follows up by asking the shooter’s wife “**After that first time, he started carrying?**” to which Amy Gregory responds “uh-huh” in the affirmative. This speaks to the shooter’s **INTENT, INTENT, INTENT**. In addition, the shooter intentionally interjected himself into the matters of the HOA, to which he did not belong to by the way, having discussions with Gary Osgood and Tobin Johnston on how to “get rid of Steven”. This was admitted to by David the shooter himself in his police interview stating that the HOA had a “quorum”. **In the shooter’s own words during his police interview he stated the following: “and I even told the neighbors”, “I told the neighbors, I said, look, you guys live here. You have an association. You have quorum here right now. Change your fucking bylaws and get him out of here.”** This speaks to the shooter’s **MOTIVE, MOTIVE, MOTIVE and PREMEDITATION AS WELL.**

In the backdrop of these events, Tobin Johnston’s interaction with Steven also came to light; Tobin admitted to an interaction where Steven clearly attempted to disengage— “**he ran inside**” a behavior contradicting the aggressive image portrayed by the shooter. This evidence suggests that the narrative pushed by Gary, Tobin, Beth, and the shooter was not only misleading but dangerously false, aimed at isolating and targeting Steven within his own community. It is also evidence that Steven’s response was to walk or run away and not attack or assault anyone. A narrative counter to the one purported by the shooter in his statement and ultimately his “self-defense” claim.

#### **The Initial Encounter(s) a year to a year and a half earlier between Shooter, his wife and Steven Paul and multiple conflicting versions of the initial encounter by the shooter and his wife**

The shooter’s wife’s version of events during the first encounter with Steven Paul is described in her own words as the following: “**Probably started, um, I don’t know, a year and a half ago maybe. Our first incident with him, he basically did the same thing. We were out walking the dogs, and, uh, we just saw somebody walking down the street, and you know, didn’t pay any mind to him. He was just kind of walking straight at us. And this is our first encounter with him. He’s just walking straight as us, and David’s like, “Do you think we should move, or do you think—is this like chicken or something?” Do we move? And so Steven waits until he gets probably from you to me and just stares at us and does one of his sharp turns, and goes the other way. Well, then he comes back out at that his gravel driveway. We had just passed that. He comes back out and starts calling our dog like he wants our dog to come to him. And David turned around and he’s like, “Man, don’t call my dog!” So then Steven bowed up to him at that point. He’s even bowed up to me asking me if I want a piece of him. Um, with me, he didn’t get that close. He just kind of walk like pushed toward me.** When asked by the detective about the distance between Steven Paul and the shooter and his wife, she claims that Steven was allegedly about three or four feet away. The shooter’s wife also claims that they said nothing to Steven during the first encounter.

**“All we did was went home, and that’s the first time I called the police”**. When asked how many encounters they have had with Steven Paul, the shooter’s wife claims there were 4 alleged encounters. When asked if she reported any of them, the shooter’s wife claims **“I reported the first one.”** No other calls to the police were made during these other alleged incidences whatsoever.

The shooter’s version of events during the first encounter with Steven Paul is described in his own words as the following: **“The first time, he so, he comes out of his driveway. It’s 10:30 at night. Um, six, eight, months, a year ago. Um, he, uh, he got his flashlight on like he’s you know, YouTube or TikTok-ing or some of that shit. I don’t do that stuff, so I was just like, uh, and I kinda laughed, and I told my wife, I said, Just keep moving. He must be filming TikTok or something. And then, he turned his phone off. And he came back, and he got in front of me. He started swinging. You wanna fucking do something about it, buddy? You wanna fucking do something about it? And I said, No. I sure don’t, dude. And I said Come on baby. Let’s go. And we went home, and home quickly.** When asked by detectives if they called the police on the first encounter, the shooter claims to have called. The shooter then falsely states **“Yeah. She called, we called every time”** When asked by the detective about the timing of the alleged second encounter the shooter stated **“Well, just a couple of months after that, I guess. I don’t they’ve all been just a couple of months apart.”** When asked by the detective about “the third time”, he shooter stated **“That was today.”**

**The version of events for this first encounter as described by the shooter versus the version of events as described by the shooter’s wife are markedly different:**

1. **The shooter’s version supposedly takes place at night. The shooter’s wife makes no mention whatsoever of this first encounter taking place at night.**
2. **The shooter’s version describes Steven Paul as having his phone flashlight on as he ascribes his actions to YouTube or TikTok-ing or some of that shit. The shooter’s wife makes absolutely no mention of Steven Paul having his phone with him or using it with the flashlight function whatsoever.**
3. **The shooter’s version completely leaves out any reference to Steven allegedly calling his dog over to him and also leaves out any mention of the shooter’s own hostile response and aggressive posture with Steven Paul after Steven having called his dog over to him. The shooter’s wife describes in detail that Steven Paul was allegedly calling the dog over to him and her husband, the shooter, telling him “Man don’t call my dog!”.**
4. **The shooter claims that there were 3 separate encounters with Steven Paul including the first encounter about 1 year ago. The shooter’s wife claims that there were 4 encounters with Steven Paul including the first encounter about a year and a half ago. Yet not a single additional encounter was ever reported to the police prior to the day of the shooting.**
5. **The shooter claims that the first encounter was about 1 year ago and that there were allegedly 3 separate encounters that each occurred about 2 months apart. The math does not work.**

6. The shooter claims that he and his wife called the police after each and every supposed encounter. The shooter's wife stated that she only reported the first incident a year and half ago.
7. The shooter claimed that Steven Paul was swinging at him. The shooter's wife makes no mention of this whatsoever.
8. The shooter's wife claims that Steven Paul was first seen walking on the street towards them before going the other way and into the gravel driveway. The shooter makes absolutely no mention of Steven walking on the street whatsoever.

This pivotal initial first encounter set the stage for the tragic events that ultimately led to the killing of Steven Paul Colon by the shooter. During this initial meeting, both the shooter and his wife, Amy, admitted that Steven Paul attempted to interact with their dog—a common and typically benign act.

This first encounter soured when the shooter reacted in a hostile manner to Steven's attempt to pet his dog, confronting Steven by taking an aggressive posture and telling him, "Don't do that." In the shooter's wife's own words during her interview she stated the following: "Well then, he (Steven) come back out starts calling our dog like he wants our dog to come to him. And David turned around and he's like, "Man, don't call my dog." This hostile response from David the shooter marked the beginning of a negative interaction between Steven, the shooter, and his wife Amy. The shooter's wife claimed to have called the police after the first encounter with Steven Paul. However, the police did not take any action, as there was absolutely zero evidence of any type of assault on the part of Steven Paul whatsoever. Only the shooter and his wife's claims of aggressive behavior on the part of Steven Paul when in fact the aggressive behavior was instead initiated by the shooter himself and directed at Steven Paul, and NOT the other way around.

During the shooter interview, he described yet another version of the first encounter that was completely different than the wife's version of the first encounter. The shooter's version of events describing the first encounter was a likely fabricated story where he claims the very first encounter with Steven he had was when he mentioned seeing Steven doing what looked like "TikTok" and suddenly stated "he came back, got in front of me and started swinging. "You wanna do something about it, buddy?" This version of events seems highly suspect and likely fabricated and is contradicted by the wife's version of events where she makes absolutely no mention of a Steven Paul doing anything resembling Tik Tok or Steven Paul having a phone in his hand. A much simpler explanation for the phone (if Steven Paul was even using one) was the phone was being used for flashlight purposes as the first encounter occurred at allegedly 10:30 at night per the shooter.

The couple also mentioned other alleged encounters with Steven, and yet they claim to have called the police numerous times, when in fact, they only called but a single time during the first encounter, one year prior and the police never acted or filed any charges against Steven because there was absolutely zero evidence of any type of physical altercation or assault whatsoever other than the fabricated self-serving version of events of the shooter and his wife.

## **Ample Probable Cause to Proceed With Prosecution**

**Prosecution may proceed, including the arrest of a person for the use or the threatened use of force when**

**it is determined that there is probable cause that the force that was used or threatened was unlawful.**

THERE IS AMPLE PROBABLE CAUSE:

1. TO SHOW THE THAT DAVID GREGORY (THE SHOOTER) WAS NOT ACTING IN SELF DEFENSE AT ALL AND MORE THAN LIKELY ACTED IN A PROVOKING MANNER OR AGGRESSIVE MANNER HIMSELF BOTH PRIOR TO AND AFTER THE SHOOTING.
2. TO SHOW BASED ON CREDIBLE THREATS COMMUNICATED TO MULTIPLE NEIGHBORHOOD WITNESSES, THAT DAVID GREGORY HAD SHOWN MOTIVE AND INTENT IN THE DAYS AND WEEKS LEADING UP TO THE DATE OF THE SHOOTING.
3. TO SHOW BASED ON CONFLICTING TESTIMONY, PREVIOUS REPEATED DENIALS OF FALSE DISABILITY CLAIMS ON THE PART OF THE SHOOTER, AND ACTIVE INVOLVEMENT IN NUMEROUS ACTIVITIES THAT DIRECTLY DISPUTE THE CLAIMS OF DISABILITY AND THAT DAVID GREGORY WAS LYING TO INVESTIGATORS ABOUT HIS FADED DISABILITIES.
4. TO SHOW THAT DAVID GREGORY HAD MADE NUMEROUS STATEMENTS TO VARIOUS HOA INDIVIDUALS ABOUT "GETTING RID OF THE PROBLEM" PRIOR TO THE DATE OF THE SHOOTING
5. TO SHOW THAT THE SHOOTER HAD MADE THREATS ABOUT SHOOTING STEVEN PAUL TO MULTIPLE INDIVIDUALS IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD PRIOR TO THE SHOOTING. INDICATING MOTIVE AND INTENT.

6. TO SHOW THAT ON THE DAY OF THE SHOOTING, THE SHOOTER WAS ACTIVELY ENGAGED IN CRIMINAL ACTIVITY WHEREIN AS IN THE ABUSE OF HIS OWN DOG AS WOULD POTENTIALLY BE VIEWED IN THE EYES OF ANY RATIONAL PERSON, INCLUDING STEVEN PAUL. IN CONTRADICTION OF HIS FALSE SELF DEFENSE CLAIM AND REQUIREMENTS UNDER THE FLORIDA STAND YOUR GROUND STATUTE.

7. TO SHOW THAT THE SHOOTER HAD ACTED IN A VERY AGGRESSIVE MANNER AND HOSTILE POSTURE DURING A PREVIOUS ENCOUNTER WITH STEVEN PAUL ONE YEAR PRIOR.

8. TO SHOW THAT ON THE DAY OF THE SHOOTING, THE SHOOTER HAD ACTED IN A VERY AGGRESSIVE AND HOSTILE MANNER, INCLUDING YELLING NUMEROUS OBSCENITIES, TOWARDS STEVEN PAUL BOTH BEFORE AND AFTER THE SHOOTING. BEHAVIOR THAT IS COMPLETELY CONTRARY TO THE FALSE FEAR AND FALSE SELF-DEFENSE CLAIM.

9. TO SHOW THAT THE SHOOTER FIRED TWO SHOTS, NOT ONE ON THE DAY OF THE SHOOTING AND CONCEALED THIS DETAIL WITH INVESTIGATORS IN CONTRADICTION OF HIS FALSE SELF DEFENSE CLAIM.

10. TO SHOW THAT THE SHOOTER WAS INVOLVED IN ACTIVITIES THAT COULD NOT HAVE BEEN POSSIBLE TO PARTICIPATE IN BASED ON THE FALSE CLAIMS MADE TO INVESTIGATING DETECTIVES ABOUT BEING COMPLETELY AND SEVERELY DISABLED.

11. TO SHOW THAT AFTER THE SHOOTING, THE SHOOTER LIKELY TAMPERED WITH FORENSIC

PHYSICAL EVIDENCE IN AN ATTEMPT TO FURTHER CONCEAL HIS CRIME.

12. TO SHOW FORENSIC EVIDENCE TO INDICATE THAT, IN FACT, THE SHOOTER HAD APPROACHED THE VICTIM, STEVEN PAUL, ON STEVEN'S SIDE OF THE ROAD AND NOT THE OTHER WAY AROUND PRIOR TO THE SHOOTING IN COMPLETE CONTRADICTION OF HIS FALSE SELF-DEFENSE CLAIM.

13. TO SHOW THAT THE SHOOTER HAD BROKEN THE LAW BY CARRYING A CONCEALED WEAPON WITHOUT THE PROPER AUTHORIZATION OR PERMITTING FROM THE STATE OF FLORIDA AS WOULD HAVE BEEN REQUIRED UNDER FLORIDA LAW AT THE TIME OF THE SHOOTING.

14. TO SHOW THAT THE SHOOTER AND HIS WIFE ARE POTENTIALLY TIED TO ADDITIONAL/ANOTHER/OTHER SUSPICIOUS DEATH(S).

## **Sarasota County Sheriff Office's/Detective King's Flawed Conclusion**

The SCSO police conclusion is flawed with absolutely incorrect assumptions that are not based in fact nor are they logical. It is the result of how the investigation was led astray and was heavily biased towards Steven Paul from the onset.

As stated in Detective King's summary:

*The investigation revealed through eyewitness testimony and forensic evidence that on the morning of September 24, 2022 the victim Gregory and his wife Amy Gregory were walking their dog on Highland Road when they saw Steven Paul Colon following after another person walking their dog on Westview Drive while the couple continued their walk back to the residence on Highland Road, Colon approached them and began to pace in front of them in an aggressive manner on the roadway, Colon spit at the victim twice as he continued to get closer to the victim, the victim and his spouse heard Colon unintelligible words them Colon stepped face-to-face with the victim as he told Colon to get away Colon grabbed the victim by his shirt and struck him with a closed fist. The victim pushed away from Colon and told him to stop cologne continue to attack the victim as he attempted to wrap his arm around the victims neck, which was witnessed by Amy Gregory, the victim and fear of great bodily harm from Colon had pulled his 380 firearm from his waistband and fire one round into Colon, abdomen, causing Colon to turn away from the victim. Colon walked away and eventually stumbled into a ditch on the west side of the roadway where he died from his injuries, the victim had a reasonable fear of eminent harm to himself his spouse while walking on a right of way deadly force against Steven Paul Colon, who had intentionally struck victim, fear following factors to include:*

- 1.) Prior aggressive and intimidating counters with Steven Paul Colon while he walked his dogs in the neighborhood over the past year to the victims.*
- 2.) Documented neck, jaw and nerve disabilities*
- 3.) Statements made by the victim was struck by Colon in a physical altercation. It would cause him to suffer permanent, physical disability or even death.*

*The victims reported fear of Steven Paul Colon was also based on Colon's past aggressive behavior towards Colon's own family members and the Gregory's. The victim reported this fear of Colon is one of the reasons he started carrying a firearm during his walks in the neighborhood as to give him the ability to defend himself in any future attacks based on the investigative findings in the eyewitness testimony, it was determined that Steven Paul Colon intentionally struck the victim in the chest with his fist, against the victim's will and in violation of F.S.S. 784.1(a)1: Battery.*

- 1. “Steven Paul Colon following after another person walking their dog on Westview Drive”:** *Based on Gregory's own testimony, they eluded that Steven was following Gary Osgood “to head him off” but then turned around and headed in a different direction. This is pure speculation and actually makes no sense at all. Steven was known to not interact with neighbors based on several other witness statements. Including Gary Osgood himself.*
- 2. “Colon approached them and began to pace in front of them in an aggressive manner on the roadway, Colon spit at the victim twice as he continued to get closer to the victim the victim and his spouse heard Colon yell unintelligible words at them Colon stepped face-to-face with the victim as he told Colon to get**

**away Colon grabbed the victim by his shirt and struck him with a closed fist":**  
*Based on Gregory's own testimony this is not correct. Amy stated that Steven was walking on the opposite side of the road as them, which was the west side of Highland Road heading south and he would have turned back to head home once he reached Shoreland Drive. At that point he would have been heading North on Highland Road on the west side of the road while the Gregory's were heading now south on Highland Road but on the east side of the road, opposite Steven. Amy admitted that Steven passed her up without incident and continued on walking ignoring her and that she and David were separated by some distance on the opposite side of the road as Steven spit a single time and that it obviously "had absolutely no possibility of hitting either of them" (since he is on the other side of the road as them) and that it occurred when Steven was midway between the couple but still nowhere near them and he continued to "walk pass David" and that is when David claims he was chasing after his dog was which was walking over towards Steven's side of the street and David was chasing after the dog. How could Steven be approaching the couple if he never left his side of the road? David approached Steven based on the couple's own admission! So the scenario as concluded by detective King cannot be at all correct and what actually occurred. How could Colon "Step to the victim". It was the other way around! Is there any DNA of Steven on David's shirt" Was this tested? Were there any marks on David's chest? Amy stated Steven tried to wrap his arm around David's neck. David says "he punched me" and makes absolutely no reference to Steven "wrapping his arm around him" as the wife's self-serving statement claimed. In addition, the ballistics and forensics in this case do not support this self-serving version of events. There are additional inconsistent statements.*

3. **"Prior aggressive and intimidating counters with Steven Paul Colon while he walked his dogs in the neighborhood over the past year to the victims":** *During the shooter and wife interviews, they both allege that there were "multiple" encounters with Steven Paul after the alleged first initial incident nearly one year prior. Yet, not once did the shooter or his wife call the police to report a single incidence of any these alleged "multiple" incidences with Steven Paul. The fact that the police were never called a single time after the first incidence would indicate that these "multiple" alleged encounters were more than likely fabricated or completely exaggerated to falsely paint Steven Paul with false repeated encounters. All of these likely fabricated claims are highly suspect and completely self-serving on the part of the shooter and his wife. The shooter and his wife claim they had other encounters with Steven, yet they only called the police ONE SINGLE TIME during the first encounter about one year prior during which, by the way, the shooter himself acted as the initial aggressor. Not one single call was made subsequent to the first incident or prior to the day of the shooting. In addition, the police did absolutely nothing when called the first time because the false narrative provided to the police the first time could not in any way be corroborated. All of these statements from the shooter and his wife regarding supposed multiple encounters is complete hearsay and unsubstantiated on the part of the shooter and his wife and further illustrates the lack of any evidence whatsoever against Steven's alleged behavior, challenging the false narrative that he was a consistent source of trouble.*

4. **“Documented neck, jaw and nerve disabilities”:** *Based on subpoena of David’s medical records, there is no evidence of any “disability” also he was denied disability based on his own admission. Also there is evidence of David having performed physically demanding races for charity; A 5k run “Frogman Ruck” on 10/17/2020 and the other was on 8/15/2020 which was a 31 mile ruck for heroes wearing a weighted vest of more than likely at least 50lbs-100lbs or more as he symbolically carried the weighted bricks in his backpack for two fallen veterans that the shooter was sponsoring as the basis for his involvement in the ruck itself. Hardly what a “disabled” person could do. The information on these rucks were posted on Facebook by Amy and by David on the brianbillfoundation.org website of which David was a board member. Both posts were subsequently pulled down after the shooting in what would appear to be a case of deleting incriminating evidence in direct contradiction to the shooter’s false claim of “severe disability.”*
5. **“The victims reported fear of Steven Paul Colon was also based on Colon’s past aggressive behavior towards Colon’s own family members and the Gregory’s”:** *If there was a supposed fear of Steven Paul based on prior aggressive behavior towards Colon’s own family then why did David allow Amy to walk several hundred feet in front of her? Also, she was closer to Steven and actually following behind Steven for a portion of the time. It was stated by neighbors that Amy “would walk the dogs early every morning without her husband” and walk them directly in front of where Steven Paul was living. If such immense fear then why would he let her do this alone? Why no cell phones on either of them?*
6. **“Investigative findings in the eyewitness testimony, it was determined that Steven Paul Colon intentionally struck the victim in the chest with his fist, against the victim’s will and in violation of F.S.S. 784.1(a)1: Battery”:**  
*There is no physical evidence to prove this statement or conclusion true. No DNA testing and no bruising. Also, Amy did not mention a punch in her interview. In fact, Amy had to ask the shooter “did he hit you?” during her initial 911 call on the morning of the shooting. Steven never struck anyone in his life and based on witness accounts, they heard David yell “motherfucker” and also heard an “old man yelling at a boy saying horrible things.” Clearly David was the one acting in a very hostile and aggressive manner. An aggressive posture is completely inconsistent with a defensive posture. Hardly what someone claiming self-defense would do.*

## **Phony Fear/Faked Disability on the part of the Shooter and his wife**

The shooter claims in his initial interview with the police that he had “extreme fear of Steven”, and “he was extremely fearful of getting injured because he was crippled”. With regard to being disabled or crippled, we found absolutely NO proof that he was crippled whatsoever. He was denied disability several times. He had also participated in several very physically rigorous ruck races while wearing heavily weighted vests on his person. In addition, the shooter’s next door

neighbor Linda Kremblas attested to seeing David on numerous occasions walking around the neighborhood with a weighted vest on. Also, after the shooting, the shooter was also witnessed by his next door neighbor, exerting himself and carrying and lifting heavy items as he loaded belongings into a moving van. Linda Kremblas, Kelsie Lloyd, as well as Penelope also spoke of David. This in spite of David's false assertion that he was so severely disabled that he "couldn't even carry a gallon of milk". Two of which said that David was threatening to shoot Steven prior to the date of the actual shooting. However, in their statements, nowhere did any one of them claim that David's demeanor was not one of fear, but rather it was a demeanor of anger and vengeance, which contradicts his interviews of him falsely claiming to be the victim. Also several other neighbors claim to have seen Steven always walking and that he generally "kept to himself", would often "ignore them", would not approach and was not aggressive in any way.

## **Interviews with Shooter & Wife**

### **Amy Gregory Interview**

The interview is off to a suspicious start, when Amy "Gregory" is unable to clarify her legal name. She claims to be married to David Gregory, but still carries her maiden name, or previously married name. Assuming her and David Gregory were married in Florida...Under Florida law, you must update your name on your driver's license or state ID within 30 days of

changing your name. -*Although a minute detail, it demonstrates Amy's character early on in the interview. She is unable to clarify her true legal name and her marital status to David Gregory.*

Amy states "We just went our normal way, and we're always nervous, 'cause we know that kid (Steven) lives in those condos. -*If Amy and David were so "nervous" of Steven Paul, and have prior knowledge of his whereabouts...then one must question...why travel in the vicinity of someone you're nervous or fearful of? If they truly believed Steven Paul to be a threat, then why not take the simple measure of walking your dog on a different route? One could argue they deliberately placed themselves in a position to start an altercation.*

**Side Note 1:** Throughout the interview, Amy frequently starts her sentences saying, "um" or "uh".

According to Vrij A., Edward K., Roberts K., & Bull R. (2000). Detecting deceit via analysis of verbal and nonverbal behavior. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 24(4), 239–263. doi: 10.1023/A:1006610329284

*'Um' appears more frequently during deception when compared to truthful speech, perhaps as a result of the increased emotion and cognitive processing demands associated with lying, which in turn lead to speech planning problems that manifest as speech disturbances.*

**Side Note 2:** A detective's role is to interview suspects, victims, and witnesses unbiasedly; analyze information for validity, reliability, and accuracy; and compile a comprehensive and factual case file to be presented in court. -*Throughout the interview, the detectives fail to ask a lot of probing or follow-up questions, to Amy's accounts. A seasoned detective, or a detective invested in discovering the underlying truth, would pick up on little nuances, such as Amy's frequent use of the words "um" or "uh", or her inability to directly specify her legal name and marital status, as someone who may be deceptive or unforthcoming of factual information. Throughout this interview and others involving the case, it is apparent detectives conducted their interviews with bias, which automatically painted Steven Paul as the aggressor, and David Gregory as the victim. They also mishandled a key interview with Steven Paul's family, which provides KEY testimony coming from Steven Paul's perspective. In cases such as this...it is one man's word, against a dead boy. The detectives should be digging deeper and longer to uncover the truth.*

Amy suggests Steven Paul intentionally was "following" his neighbor Gary that morning, and perhaps went around the block to "cut him off". -*This statement is complete speculation, as Amy has no way of knowing Steven Paul's intentions. Also, important to note Gary himself did not make any statements in his interview suggesting he felt he was being "followed" or felt "threatened" by Steven Paul that morning.*

Det. King then **leads** Amy stating, "Okay, so Steven's "going after" the guy (Gary) you don't know." Amy states, "Exactly." -*What exactly is Steven Paul doing that would indicate he's intentionally "following" or "going after" Gary? Was he running after him? Was he shouting obscenities at him? The answer...No he was not. Again, this is an example of how Amy is misleading the investigators, and how the detectives lead Amy down a road to portray Steven Paul as the perpetrator.*

Amy states, "He (Steven) was swinging at David, or pushed David, but it looked he was taking his arm-to trying to go around his neck. Almost like he was going to pull him down." - This shows inconsistencies with her story. Which did Steven Paul do...Did he "swing" at David, "push" David, or "took his arm around David's neck"? These are three very different scenarios. When you go on to read David's interview, he reports Steven grabbing him by the shirt and punching him in the chest. Their description of events does not coincide.

Amy claims, she heard Steven say "what the fuck!", with an abrupt turn-around, and a hasty approach towards David. -Typically, when someone says "what the fuck" (a shortened expression of what is going on?), it is used to express shock, disbelief, or incredulity. *-If she truly heard Steven Paul state, "what the fuck" with an abrupt turn around...it makes more sense that Steven Paul was startled by someone, perhaps coming up behind him, or saw David pulling and/or aiming his gun towards Steven Paul without warning.*

Amy makes several claims throughout her interview, that when Steven Paul leaves the house, it's with the intention to start trouble, yet she attests when she and David saw Steven Paul walk down the driveway, he did not look in their direction, nor say anything to them, he just walked past them. -If Steven Paul left the home with the intention to start trouble that day, wouldn't he have done so at that point? Sounds like Steven Paul was minding his own business, while certain individuals paint him as this neighborhood boogeyman. Steven left his home that morning wearing slides & expensive prescription glasses. Armed with nothing but his cellphone, ear pod case (this will be important to note later), and house keys. Doesn't sound like someone looking for or anticipating trouble, sounds more like an individual out for a morning walk. Yet, David is the one out armed with a loaded gun, while walking his dogs at 7am. You tell me, who is the one looking for trouble?

Amy states, "For some reason, Steven walked back down Westview, and then he saw us, and I felt like that's when he's like, Oh, well. I'll just fuck with these guys." -What makes more sense, is Steven Paul turned around to retrieve his ear pods or to avoid Gary Osgood and his dogs and then began to proceed back home. It was discovered Steven Paul had an empty ear pod case on his person. His family later discovered the actual ear pods on his desk, which means he accidentally left them home that morning. Yet, Amy wants to paint a false narrative that Steven approached and attacked them completely unprovoked ...this makes no practical sense.

As Steven Paul turned around to walk back down Westview, it's important to note he made a decision to stay on the opposite side of the road, he made a decision to say nothing to Amy or David, and he in fact walked past them. *-These are Amy's accounts, yet she states, he randomly made a decision to "fuck with them." Her statements are completely conflicting. On the one hand she's pushing a narrative of him instigating trouble, yet she's literally describing an individual who is trying to avoid them by staying on the other side of the street, saying nothing, and walking past them. \*Again-detectives don't even challenge these conflicting narratives with any probing or follow-up questions whatsoever.*

## David Gregory Interview

David States, "They're going to lock me up for life because this kid was picking on me." -David is insinuating he felt "picked on" by Steven Pau, and is expressing worry about receiving a life sentence for his actions. This statement shows the actions of someone who was TRIGGERED and lashed out inappropriately. Not someone who was simply forced to defend himself.

David claims Steven Paul spit TWICE directly at him. Sates, "the spit landed right beside me on both sides." - This directly contradicts Amy's testimony. Amy attests, the spit "had no chance of hitting either of us" and indicates he spit ONCE on this occasion. She states, he was across the road, and although it seemed to be in their direction, it was in no way near them when it landed. What more than likely took place, as Steven was passing both Amy & David Gregory, he was clearing his throat (sound effect) and spitting. Steven had a frequent habit of throat clearing and spitting due to seasonal allergies. His own father makes the same "sound effect", when clearing his throat. David misconstrued Steven's spitting habits, as disrespect towards him, and took it personally...again TRIGGERING David.

Amy specifies Steven swung, or pushed, or wrapped his arm around David (she couldn't make a clear account) initially just prior to David shooting. David claims Steven approached him, grabbed his shirt, then he shot.- The two witnesses have different accounts of the supposed physical altercation that ensued just prior to the physical alteration. Amy describes more of physical fight or tussle amongst the two, where David describes being grabbed by the shirt & punched in the chest, which scared him into shooting. What ACTUALLY occurred??

David also contradicts himself. He first **very firmly** attests to being grabbed by the shirt and **punched** in the chest. Then he back pedals when the detective probes and asks again, "so he PUNCHED you?" and David states, "well **not really**, but he hits me with his right hand in the chest."-**Impeachment by Contradiction??** Where's the physical evidence of an assault on David if he was "punched"?...a red mark? a bruise? A scratch? Was a physical examination ever done on David to support his claims of being physically attacked?

David states, after getting hit he told Steven to "stop" but he was still allegedly being aggressive, and he "just wanted to go home", so then he shot him.- Pretty EXTREME way to get out of a situation to go home if you ask me.

**1st version provided early in the interview:** David states, " It was simultaneous." "Uh, he came up. And I was like, "Dude, get away from me." And he grabbed me, pop (assuming "punch" in chest), and that's when I went back and boom (assuming shot fired). Detective asks, "so, he punches you...then what?" David states, "and then, I shot him." David states, as soon as he hits him, he steps back and pulls his pistol. -David's **first version** of events comes across as pretty straight forward. Steven approached him unprovoked, David said, "dude get away from me," Steven grabbed his shirt with left hand, while simultaneously delivering a punch to the chest with his right hand, David "went back", pulled his pistol, and shot him once.

**2nd version later in interview after some probing and/or leading from detectives:** Det. King- "when he punches you, and you pull your pistol out, are you—is he moving forward towards you--or is he backing up? David states, "He was coming at me the whole time, I pushed

him." -As the detectives start asking more specific questions, his story alters. Now he claims Steven kept coming at him even after he pulled out his pistol. He also now inserts a new narrative, of "pushing" Steven before firing his pistol. He previously painted a picture of everything happening "simultaneously", almost too quick to recount. Now when detectives start asking questions to establish if David gave Steven an opportunity to retreat, David catches on to this, and changes his narrative. I find it very hard to believe anyone, (especially a young boy with no previous violent history) would continue to engage a man pointing a gun directly at them.

**Amy's Account:** Amy states, she was traveling several feet ahead of David with her dog, while David lagged behind with his dog. Amy states, Steven passed them both traveling in the opposite direction, without saying a word, on the other side of the road. She states, somewhere "in-between" her and David, Steven spit once with a "sound effect". She claims, she heard Steven yell "what the fuck", causing her to turn around, she saw David's back to her, and Steven facing her allegedly coming towards David. At this point, she claims to have witnessed Steven either "swinging", "pushing" or "wrapping his arm around" David. She then states, "**I only saw his arm kind of come halfway around him, and that's when I heard the shot.**" followed by David running and yelling to call 911, and Steven backing off & walking away until collapsing in a ditch. -This is important because she claims to see them still physically in a tussle when the shot went off. Whereas, David describes getting knocked back from an alleged chest punch, pushing Steven off him, pulling & pointing his pistol at Steven, while Steven is still allegedly charging in his direction.

Amy also makes no mention of David stating, "Dude, get away from me", no mention of David pushing Steven away from him, No mention of David falling back, then pulling his gun.-We now have 3 different versions of events from the shooter and his wife.

When asked by detectives to describe his first negative encounter with Steven (which Amy was present for), it completely conflicts with Amy's narrative of their first encounter. Two completely different stories.

**David's Interpretation:** "Um, six, eight months, a year ago. Um, he, uh, he got his flashlight on like he's you know, YouTube or TikTok-ing or some of that shit. I don't do that stuff, so I was like, uh, and I kinda laughed, and I told my wife I said, "Just keep moving. He must be filming TikTok or something." And then he turned his phone off. And he came back, and he got in front of me. He started swinging. "You wanna fucking do something about it, buddy? You wanna fucking do something about it?" And I said, "No, I sure don't, dude." And I said, "Come on, baby. Let's go." And we went home, and home quickly. And then the next time we saw him, he came up. He did spit on me."

**Amy's Interpretation:** "Our first incident with him, he basically did the same thing. We were out walking the dogs, and, uh, we just saw somebody walking down the street, and you know, didn't pay any mind to him. And then we noticed that like he wouldn't—he wasn't moving. He was just kind of walking straight at us. And this is our first encounter with him. He's just walking straight at us, and David's like, "Do you think we should move, or do you think—is this like, chicken or

something? Do we move? And so Steven waits until he gets probably from you to me—and he just stares at us and does one of his sharp turns, and goes the other way. Well, then, he comes back out at that—his gravel driveway—We had just passed that. He comes back out, starts calling (the dog) like he wants our dog to come to him. And David turned around and he's like "Man, don't call my dog." So then Steven bowed up to him at that point. He's even bowed up to me asking me if I want a piece of him."

Wife makes reference to Steven "wrapping his arm around David". Shooter claims "Steven grabbed his shirt and punched him then he shot Steven". These two versions of events are completely inconsistent and diametrically opposed. In fact, Amy has to ask David when on the 911 call if David was hit by Steven at all? She asks her husband the shooter during the 911 call "did he hit you?" Why did she even have to ask him that question if she claims to have witnessed the event?

## **Negligence/Incompetence on the part of Lead Detectives/Leading Questions During Interviews:**

Also, throughout the interview with the shooter, and also the wife, the detectives were coaching them with leading questions and almost behaving as a defense attorney would act in representing their client. Here are some examples:

Page 34 of interview with shooter Nate King says "well you shouldn't be in fear of going out and you know there's no reason you need to have a guy like this to fear. No, I'm saying you don't

**you don't deserve you and your wife do not need. No, I'm saying you don't have to live like this. You don't have to live under fear OK"**

Det Ojeda starts asking the question "Why do you say that" after David said "No, I got to live in prison now" and later he says "Yeah, but I think you're getting, I think you're getting way ahead of the process" King page 36 "you have the right to defend yourself?" it becomes exceptionally obvious that the police immediately take David's version of events *prima facie*. Case closed!

Detective King intentionally leaving out critical statements made by family members during the family interview about the shooter's having made prior threats while also Detective King and Detective Ojeda additionally making statements to family about this case being a "Stand Your Ground" case just hours after the shooting had occurred. When requested, family interview recordings also turn up missing due to alleged audio/visual problems.

No statement on file from key critical first responder, Deputy Jay Patella, made available after multiple requests.

## **Analysis of 911 Calls**

### Introduction:

The incident on September 24, 2022, resulting in the death of Steven Paul Colon, allegedly by David Gregory, underlines the complexity and contentiousness surrounding self-defense claims. An in-depth analysis of 911 call transcripts exposes significant inconsistencies, historical conflicts, and questionable behaviors that cast doubt on the self-defense narrative. This comprehensive summary scrutinizes these elements through a legal perspective, advocating for a re-evaluation of this case and the absolute necessity for a thorough legal re-examination,

additional proper and thorough investigation and subsequent charges being filed against the perpetrator in this case.

### **In-Depth Analysis of 911 Calls:**

Dayna Purcell's Observation (7:16 AM) - Attempted Scene Departure:

- Purcell's account indicates the Gregories' attempt to flee post-incident, with David Gregory instructing her to call the police devoid of context or acknowledgment of the shooting. This attempt to flee the scene of the crime, suggests a possible awareness of culpability and potentially indicating consciousness of guilt.. Legal examination should explore the implications of their departure attempt and lack of immediate clarification of events she describes, particularly examining the credibility of her portrayal of Steven Paul as the aggressor and the legitimacy of lethal force under Florida's self-defense laws.

Gary Osgood's Testimony (7:18 AM) - Eyewitness Perspective:

- Osgood's account of hearing two gunshots and witnessing the aftermath, including Steven Paul's fall, yet choosing to temporarily leave the scene, raises questions. Investigative focus should be placed on what Osgood actually witnessed that morning and what prompted his initial departure and claims that he did not see Steven lying in the ditch and subsequent return where Osgood claims that he then found Steven lying in the ditch gasping for breath. In addition, why and how his actions and statements may not align with the false self-defense claim of the shooter and his wife.

Amy Gregory's Account (7:20 AM) - Shooter's Spouse Narrative:

- Amy Gregory immediately spins the self-defense narrative that there was this "crazy guy in the neighborhood who attacks everybody, He's attacked us twice." She goes on to describe the alleged confrontation leading to her husband shooting Steven Paul in a claimed act of self-defense, marked by claimed previous aggressive encounters. This narrative, however, is fraught with inconsistencies when compared against other witness accounts and physical evidence as well as her own conflicting statements during the call. Conflicting statements such as her need to ask her husband during the call whether he had even been hit by Steven Paul whether or not the shooter had been hurt in any way. In addition, specific forensic evidence appears to have been tampered with prior to the arrival of officers to the home of the shooter and his wife. This, in spite of being given explicit instructions, during the call, by the 911 operator not to tamper with the weapon that had been used in the shooting. Legal scrutiny is required to evaluate the sequence of events before, during and after the shooting.

### **Prior Incidents and Motivational Context:**

- The previous encounter a year prior between Steven Paul and the Gregorys, including encounters involving their dog and David Gregory's alleged threatening remarks, provides essential context and motives behind the shooting.

### **Recommendations for Legal Proceedings and Re-examination:**

#### Thorough Case Reinvestigation:

- A comprehensive reinvestigation is imperative, focusing on detailed witness accounts, the sequence of events leading to the shooting, and the behaviors of the involved parties before and after the incident. This reinvestigation should aim to reconcile discrepancies in narratives with the factual evidence.

#### Critical Evaluation of Charges:

- The gathered evidence, along with the noted contradictions, should be meticulously evaluated to determine the appropriateness of charges against David Gregory. This includes a detailed analysis of the self-defense claim against the backdrop of Florida's statutes and the specific circumstances surrounding this incident.

#### Legal Review and Consultation:

- Consultation with legal experts specializing in criminal law and self-defense cases is recommended to ensure a comprehensive review of all legal aspects of the case. This includes not just the analysis of witness credibility and evidence integrity but also a review of the initial investigative and procedural responses by law enforcement. This collaborative effort should aim to assess the robustness of the self-defense claim and explore potential legal precedents and interpretations that could impact the case's outcome.

### **Conclusion:**

The scrutiny of 911 calls in the tragic case of Steven Paul Colon reveals significant legal and factual ambiguities surrounding the self-defense claim made by David Gregory. The inconsistencies across witness narratives, the questionable behavior of the Gregorys immediately after the incident, and the backdrop of prior conflicts necessitate a rigorous reevaluation of the case.

### **9/24/22 at 7:16am- Dayna Purcell neighbor at 1855 Highland Rd, Osprey**

Dayna Purcell was in her kitchen and opened her front door when she heard the shooting. She interrupted David and Amy Gregory as they were attempting to flee the scene.

Dayna Purcell stated to the 911 operator “I just got up. I—I walked out in the kitchen. I heard a gunshot and I heard my neighbor outside say, “Call the police.”

**Dayna Purcell would later clarify in her statement to the police, when interviewed, that she heard TWO GUNSHOTS.**

When asked how long ago did this happen? Dayna replied “**Just now. Like, two minutes ago.**”

When asked if she saw anything? The shooter or anyone? Dayna replied “**Yeah, I saw one of my neighbors um, walking down the road with his dog and he said, “Call the police.”**

Upon being seen fleeing the scene of the crime by Dayna Purcell, David Gregory carrying his dog told her to “call the police” without explanation to her as to what she should call about. Dayna Purcell claims that she did not go outside but instead closed her door and proceeded to call 911.

Dayna claims that she called 911 two minutes after encountering David on the road walking away/fleeing from the scene of the crime.

**QUESTION: NEED CLARIFICATION ABOUT THE TIMING OF HER CALL. HOW LONG AFTER THE SHOTS WERE FIRED DID DAYNA MAKE HER CALL TO 911? DID IT OCCUR TWO MINUTES OR TWENTY MINUTES AFTER SHE HEARD THE GUNSHOT? OR WAS HER CALL MADE 2 MINUTES AFTER SHE ENCOUNTERS AND WITNESSES DAVID FLEEING THE SCENE WITH HIS DOG? THIS IS CRITICAL BECAUSE THE SHOOTER'S WIFE CLAIMED SHE WAS CALLING 911 TWENTY MINUTES AFTER THE SHOOTING HAD OCCURRED. ALSO DAYNA PURCELL STATES SHE SAW “ONE OF MY NEIGHBORS UM, WALKING DOWN THE ROAD WITH HIS DOG AND HE SAID, “CALL THE POLICE.” AT THIS POINT, THERE IS ABSOLUTELY NO MENTION WHATSOEVER OF DAYNA PURCELL ALSO SEEING THE SHOOTER'S WIFE, AMY GREGORY. WHERE WAS THE SHOOTER'S WIFE? WAS THE SHOOTER'S WIFE EVEN PRESENT AS DAVID ATTEMPTED TO FLEE THE CRIME SCENE? A MONTH LATER, IN A STATEMENT TO POLICE, DAYNA MENTIONS SEEING BOTH THE SHOOTER AND HIS WIFE OUTSIDE AFTER THE SHOOTING. WHICH VERSION IS CORRECT?**

Dayna claims she stayed in the house after encountering David fleeing the scene.

When asked if anyone was injured? Dayna replied “**I don't see anything. I'm not going outside”**

**Dayna Purcell would later clarify in her statement to the police, when interviewed, that she heard TWO GUNSHOTS when she was inside near the entrance door to her home, she then witnessed Amy and David walking quickly away/fleeing the scene of the shooting, that David (the shooter) was looking over his shoulder and at that point were on the road near the end of her driveway, she then opened her door and upon doing so was told by David (the shooter) to call 911. Interestingly enough David (the shooter)**

**denies having done this or seeing Dayna at all. Why does David (the shooter) lie about this to investigators?**

911 operator asks "That neighbor, do you know his name?"

Dayna replies "**David, I don't know his last name.**"

Dayna Purcell also claims she did not see the shooting.

### **9/24/22 at 7:18am- Gary Osgood neighbor at 1801 Highland Rd, Osprey**

When calling 911 Gary Osgood stated the following: "**I—I—I just—I just heard a shot. And I heard somebody say. "You motherfucker." and I don't know what's going on.**

When asked by the 911 operator, "**How many shots did you hear?**" Gary Osgood replies "**Um, I think I heard two. I don't know if there's anything going on or not, but it just sounded like shots, and I heard somebody scream and I think I saw somebody fall** but I'm not sure." Yeah. I'm—I'm getting closer to where I saw something happening but I don't see anything here.

When told by the 911 operator that help was on the way, Gary Osgood replies "**Thank you. I've got my dogs. I gotta get in the house and I'll come back out.**"

Gary Osgood was a first-hand witness to the shooting, he was walking his dogs and was heading east on Westview Dr. when he heard two gunshots, then heard David Gregory yell "**You motherfucker**" and subsequently saw Steven Paul fall after he had been shot.

**When asked by the 911 operator how many shots he heard, Gary Osgood stated he heard 2 GUNSHOTS.**

Gary Osgood was the first person to arrive at the scene after the shooting, yet he claimed that he did not see the person (Steven Paul) that he witnessed falling on the ground in the area.

**Gary Osgood had his own dogs with him and he stated he was going to go back to his house first and come back out-**

**QUESTION- WHY THE NEED TO COME BACK OUT TO THE SCENE OF THE SHOOTING IF GARY OSGOOD CLAIMS THAT HE DID NOT SEE ANYONE?? EITHER GARY LIKELY WOULD HAVE SEEN OR HIS DOGS WOULD ALSO HAVE SEEN, SMELLED OR SENSED STEVEN PAUL IN THE DITCH AS THE DITCH WAS SHALLOW AND WAS VERY CLOSE TO THE ROAD WHERE HE CLAIMS TO HAVE PASSED. GARY OSGOOD'S VERSION OF EVENTS MAKES VERY LITTLE SENSE.**

**9/24/22 at 7:20am- Amy Gregory wife of shooter at 1847 Highland Rd, Osprey (address is located in the row of condo units behind Dayna Purcell condo unit)**

First thing that Amy details is that there is "this guy that we've called the police on".

Describes Steven Paul as "this crazy guy in the neighborhood".

Amy Gregory claims that Steven Paul is "**this crazy guy who attacks everybody. He's attacked us twice. We've called the police on him. We were walkin' our dogs. HE COMES OUT, and he starts pacin' around us. And then we think he's leavin'. So we're walkin' the other way on the street. He comes back our way, gets right at us, spits at us, turns around, and then goes at my husband and asks him what the fuck he wants. We're doin' nothin'—but walkin' our dogs. He went at my husband to attack him. David shot him in defense. My husband did shoot him in self-defense.**"

*FOLLOW-UP QUESTION TO STATEMENT- THE SELF SERVING SCENARIO AS DESCRIBED MAKES ABSOLUTELY NO SENSE WHATSOEVER? THE SHOOTER'S WIFE SELF SERVINGLY CLAIMS THAT THEY WERE DOIN' NOTHIN' AS SHE STATED. SO WHY IN THE WORLD WOULD ANYONE, LET ALONE STEVEN ACT IN THE MANNER AS DESCRIBED WITH ABSOLUTELY NO REASON TO DO SO WHATSOEVER? WHY WOULD STEVEN PAUL DO ANY OF THIS? WHY WOULD STEVEN WALK BACK TOWARDS THEM? WAS STEVEN PAUL SIMPLY PASSING AMY GREGORY FIRST AND DAVID (THE SHOOTER) SECOND AFTER ATTEMPTING TO GET BACK TO HIS OWN HOUSE. LIKELY SCENARIO IS THAT STEVEN PAUL CAME OUT OF HIS DRIVEWAY NORTH OF THE INTERSECTION OF WESTVIEW DR. AND HIGHLAND RD. STEVEN PAUL AND DOES NOT YET SEE DAVID AND AMY GREGORY TO THE NORTH OF HIS CONDO DRIVEWAY EXIT. STEVEN PAUL DECIDES TO TURN LEFT AND HE HEADS SOUTH ON HIGHLAND RD. AMY GREGORY STATED DURING HER INTERVIEW THAT STEVEN PAUL THEN TURNED RIGHT AND HEADED WEST, AWAY AND DOWN WESTVIEW DR. AS HE CONTINUES WEST ON WESTVIEW DR, EITHER STEVEN NOW SEES GARY OSGOOD AND HIS DOGS COMING AROUND THE CORNER HEADING NORTH ON SHORELAND TOWARDS WESTVIEW DR AND STEVEN PAUL DECIDES TO AVOID GARY OSGOOD AND HIS DOGS AND INSTEAD DECIDES TO CANCEL HIS WALK ENTIRELY OR STEVEN PAUL REALIZES THAT HIS APPLE EAR-BUDS ARE MISSING FROM THEIR CASE AND STEVEN PAUL THEN DECIDES TO GO BACK HOME TO RETRIEVE THEM FROM HIS HOME? EITHER WAY, STEVEN PAUL DECIDES TO TURN AROUND ON WESTVIEW DR AND HEAD BACK EAST TOWARDS THE INTERSECTION WITH HIGHLAND RD. IT IS AT THIS TIME THAT AMY GREGORY STATES THAT STEVEN PAUL FIRST SEES BOTH SHE AND DAVID (THE SHOOTER) ON HIGHLAND RD. AFTER SEEING DAVID AND AMY GREGORY, STEVEN PAUL MORE THAN LIKELY TAKES NOTICE THAT HE CANNOT HEAD NORTH ON HIGHLAND, SO TO AVOID DAVID AND AMY GREGORY AS THEY ARE NOW ESSENTIALLY BLOCKING HIS PATH HOME, STEVEN PAUL, INSTEAD, NOW TURNS RIGHT ON HIGHLAND AND HEADS SOUTH TOWARDS SHORELAND. HOWEVER, AT THIS POINT, DAVID AND AMY NOW FOLLOW STEVEN PAUL HEADING SOUTH ON HIGHLAND RD IN THE DIRECTION OF THE EVENTUAL SCENE OF THE SHOOTING. UPON PASSING THE INTERSECTION AT*

WESTVIEW DR. AND HIGHLAND RD., IT IS MORE THAN LIKELY, AT THIS POINT, THAT STEVEN PAUL CONTINUING SOUTH ON HIGHLAND, THEN REALIZES THAT DAVID AND AMY GREGORY HAVE FOLLOWED DIRECTLY BEHIND HIM RATHER THAN CHOOSING TO CUT THROUGH THE YARD DIRECTLY ACROSS FROM THE INTERSECTION TO GET BACK HOME. SO RATHER THAN TAKING THE SHORTCUT THROUGH THE NEIGHBOR'S YARD TO GET BACK HOME, WHICH IS THE PATH DAVID AND AMY WOULD ALWAYS GENERALLY TAKE, DAVID AND AMY CHOOSE TO FOLLOW STEVEN PAUL SOUTH DOWN HIGHLAND RD HEADING TOWARDS SHORELAND DR. STEVEN PAUL IS NOW ON THE WEST SIDE OF HIGHLAND RD WALKING WITH TRAFFIC. AMY AND DAVID GREGORY ARE ON THE EAST SIDE OF THE HIGHLAND RD WALKING AGAINST TRAFFIC. UPON NOTICING THAT DAVID AND AMY GREGORY ARE FOLLOWING HIM, STEVEN PAUL MONITORS THE SITUATION BY LOOKING BACK AND THEN MAKES A DECISION TO TURN AROUND AND HEAD HOME BY WALKING NORTH ON HIGHLAND RD BACK TOWARDS THE INTERSECTION WITH WESTVIEW DR AND EVENTUALLY TO THE DRIVEWAY ENTRANCE TO HIS HOME WALKING PAST DAVID AND AMY, ON THE OPPOSITE SIDE OF THE ROAD, IN THE PROCESS. AT THIS TIME, AMY AND DAVID ARE SEPARATED BY SOME DISTANCE ON HIGHLAND RD AS AMY IS CLOSER IN PROXIMITY TO STEVEN PAUL AND DAVID IS FARTHER BEHIND AS THEY BOTH FOLLOW BEHIND STEVEN PAUL HEADING STILL NORTH AT THIS POINT. STEVEN PAUL FIRST PASSES AMY AND THEN SUBSEQUENTLY PASSES DAVID (THE SHOOTER). IT IS AT THIS TIME, WHEN STEVEN PAUL PASSES DAVID AND HIS DOG, THAT DAVID'S DOG, A SMALL MINIATURE DOG, TAKES IT UPON HIMSELF (AS DOG'S OFTEN DO) TO CROSS THE STREET IN AN ATTEMPT TO APPROACH STEVEN PAUL. MORE THAN LIKELY THIS APPROACH BY DAVID'S DOG ACROSS THE STREET WAS DONE BY HIS DOG TO BE BOTH CURIOUS AND FRIENDLY TOWARDS STEVEN PAUL. DAVID BECOMES INCENSED AND ENRAGED AT HIS OWN DOG AS HIS DOG TRIES TO APPROACH STEVEN PAUL. A BEHAVIOR THAT DAVID (THE SHOOTER) HAD SHOWN JUST BEFORE THE SHOOTING AND ALSO IN THE PAST. APPROACHING STEVEN PAUL IS CLEARLY SOMETHING THAT DAVID (THE SHOOTER) DID NOT WANT HIS DOG DOING. SO DAVID (THE SHOOTER) IN AN ABUSIVE ATTEMPT TO INTERCEPT HIS DOG DAVID SUBJECTS HIS DOG TO PHYSICAL ABUSE BY YANKING HIS DOG'S LEASH AND CAUSING HIS SMALL MINIATURE DOG TO GO "SLIDING DOWN THE STREET, SIDEWAYS, SCREAMING." STEVEN PAUL SEES THIS ABUSE AND IT IS AT THIS POINT THAT AMY GREGORY THINKS SHE HEARS SOMEONE YELL "WHAT THE FUCK?" HERE ARE DAVID (THE SHOOTER)'S OWN WORDS TO DETECTIVES:

**"What had happened is, you know, the dog is on the ground, a little—a little dog. He said something, the dog thought it was an invitation to—to come.**

**And I tried to get the cord and actually—goddamn, it's so terrible 'cause I tried to get the dog and I couldn't. And I missed him, and the poor little fucker went sliding down the street. He's sideways, and he's screaming. He's a little toy dog. And I stood up. I was like, "Dude, leave us the fuck alone." And that's when he—when it happened, and—and then, after I—I—I grabbed the dog."**

AS DAVID SUBJECTS THE DOG TO ABUSE, STEVEN PAUL, AS ANY CONCERNED PERSON WOULD DO IN THE SAME CIRCUMSTANCE, ATTEMPTS TO ASSIST THE DOG WHO IS BEING ABUSED BY DAVID (THE SHOOTER). DAVID ANGRILY CROSSES THE STREET TO RETRIEVE HIS DOG AS STEVEN PAUL ATTEMPTS TO ASSIST THE ABUSED DOG WHO IS NOW ON STEVEN PAUL'S SIDE OF THE ROAD. DAVID (THE SHOOTER) BECOMES INCENSED THAT STEVEN PAUL IS TRYING TO APPROACH AND ASSIST THE DOG WHO IS BEING ABUSED BY DAVID.

DAVID BECOMES AGGRESSIVE NOT ONLY WITH HIS OWN DOG BUT NOW ALSO BECOMES AGGRESSIVE WITH STEVEN PAUL FOR ATTEMPTING TO ASSIST OR COMFORT HIS DOG. THIS IS WHEN DAVID (THE SHOOTER) ESCALATES THE SITUATION EVEN FURTHER AND SHOOTS STEVEN PAUL, ON STEVEN PAUL'S SIDE OF THE STREET (WEST SIDE), AS HE TRIES TO ASSIST THE DOG BEING ABUSED BY DAVID. ANGRY AT STEVEN PAUL AND LOOKING FOR A CONFRONTATION, THIS IS WHEN DAVID PAUL THEN CROSSES OVER TO THE WEST SIDE OF THE ROAD, CONFRONTS STEVEN PAUL AND SHOOTS HIM. DAVID GREGORY FIRES TWICE, HITTING STEVEN PAUL ONCE IN THE ABDOMEN. AFTER BEING SHOT, STEVEN PAUL RUNS AWAY AND SUBSEQUENTLY STUMBLES AND FALLS IN THE DITCH. IN AN ATTEMPT TO CLEANSE THE CRIME SCENE, DAVID MANAGES TO PICK UP ONE OF HIS SPENT SHELL CASINGS BUT HE IS UNABLE TO PICK UP THE OTHER SPENT SHELL CASING. SO RUNNING OUT OF TIME, DAVID AND AMY GREGORY DECIDE TO FLEE THE SCENE BEFORE SOMEONE SEES THEM. HOWEVER, UPON ATTEMPTING TO FLEE THE CRIME SCENE, DAVID IS INTERRUPTED BY DAYNA PURCELL OPENING THE FRONT DOOR TO HER CONDO AND DAYNA SEES HIM HURRIEDLY ATTEMPTING TO FLEE THE CRIME SCENE. SINCE DAVID NOW HAS A WITNESS TO HIS PRESENCE AT THE SCENE, DAVID IS NOW FORCED TO TELL DAYNA PURCELL TO CALL THE POLICE. HAD DAYNA PURCELL, NOT BEEN PRESENT AT THAT MOMENT, DAVID AND AMY WOULD HAVE LIKELY EITHER FOUND AND REMOVED THE SECOND REMAINING SHELL CASING AND SIMPLY FLED THE SCENE WITHOUT CALLING 911 AT ALL. UPON ARRIVING AT HIS HOME, DAVID REMOVES THE CARTRIDGE FROM THE PISTOL, BUT HE FAILS TO REALIZE THAT THERE ARE ONLY 3 ROUNDS LEFT IN THE MAGAZINE OUT OF A TOTAL OF 5 OR 6 ROUNDS. A 5 ROUND MAGAZINE PLUS 1 ROUND IN THE CHAMBER (AS DAVID STATED HE ALWAYS CARRIED WITH 1 ROUND IN THE CHAMBER) INDICATING THAT THERE WERE 2 SHOTS FROM HIS WEAPON PLUS ONE THAT WAS EMPTIED FROM THE CHAMBER BY DAVID UPON ARRIVING BACK HOME LEAVING ONLY 3 REMAINING ROUNDS IN THE MAGAZINE OR 5 SHOTS TO START WITH 2 SHOTS FIRED AND THE THIRD CARTRIDGE THAT WAS IN THE CHAMBER REMOVED BY DAVID AND PLACED BACK INTO THE MAGAZINE BEFORE ARRIVAL BY THE POLICE ON SCENE. WHAT DID DAVID DO WITH THE BULLET THAT WAS IN THE CHAMBER AFTER THE SHOOTING? WITNESSES CLOSE THE SCENE HEARD 2 SHOTS FIRED. IF SO, WHAT DID DAVID DO WITH THE MISSING 2<sup>ND</sup> SPENT BULLET CARTRIDGE AND WHY?

When asked by the 911 operator if she knew if Steven Paul was still conscious or breathing, Amy Gregory (the shooter's wife) says the following: **"What? I—don't know. We had to come back to the house and get the phone. So, I don't know where he is. I'm not going lookin'**

*for him because he's dangerous. He's crazy." When Amy was asked if she knew where Steven was she claimed "I— I don't know. He lives in the condo neighborhood. He's always been trouble. I don't know what happened to him. We got out of there because we were scared."*

FOLLOW-UP QUESTION TO STATEMENT- THE SELF SERVING SCENARIO AS DESCRIBED IS CONTRADICTED BY STATEMENTS MADE WHEN INTERVIEWED BY POLICE. DURING THE POLICE INTERVIEW, AMY STATES THAT SHE SAW STEVEN FALL IN THE DITCH AFTER BEING SHOT BY HER HUSBAND. **SHE CLAIMS THAT THEY LEFT THE SCENE OF THE CRIME BECAUSE THEY WERE SCARED. OF COURSE, SHE WOULD HAVE TO SAY THAT AFTER HAVING BEEN INTERRUPTED BY DAYNA PURCELL, WHO WITNESSED THEM ATTEMPTING TO FLEE THE SCENE OF THE CRIME. SHE NOW WANTS TO CLAIM THAT THEY HAD LEFT OUT OF FEAR AND NOT THE MORE LIKELY REASON THAT THEY WERE ATTEMPTING TO FLEE THE SCENE OF THE CRIME BEFORE BEING SEEN BY A NEIGHBOR.**

Amy Gregory described the weapon used as a .380 caliber handgun. When asked where the weapon was, Amy Gregory detailed the fact that the weapon was on the kitchen "counter with the clip out, UNLOADED." When subsequently told by the 911 operator to "Just make sure that that gun's not touched any further. Okay?"

FOLLOW UP QUESTIONS- WHY DID DAVID (THE SHOOTER) UNLOAD HIS WEAPON WHEN INSTRUCTED NOT TO TOUCH THE WEAPON ANY FURTHER? WHERE DID THE ROUND THAT WAS IN THE CHAMBER GO? WHY WAS THE ROUND IN THE CHAMBER NOT PROVIDED TO THE POLICE WHEN THEY ARRIVED? WHY WAS THE WEAPON MOVED BY DAVID OR AMY GREGORY A SECOND TIME FROM THE COUNTER TO THE TABLE OUTSIDE THEIR HOME BEFORE THE POLICE ARRIVED EVEN AFTER BEING TOLD NOT TO TOUCH THE GUN ANY FURTHER? DID DAVID WANT TO AVOID THE POLICE GOING INTO HIS HOME? DID THE POLICE CONDUCT A SEARCH INSIDE THE GREGORY'S HOME FOR THE MISSING SHELL CASING OR THE MISSING ROUND IN THE CHAMBER? IF NOT, WHY NOT?

When Amy Gregory was asked by the 911 operator "And is your husband hurt in any way?" **she asked her husband "Um, he—did he hit you?** Then Amy says "**Yes, he hit him**" only after being told by her husband David who claimed Steven Paul had hit him. When Amy was asked again "and is your husband hurt in any way? Amy asks David (the shooter) "**Are you hurt? Where are you hurt?** She then states "**No" "He's not hurt"**

FOLLOW UP QUESTION- **WHY IS AMY ASKING HER HUSBAND WHETHER STEVEN PAUL HIT HIM? I THOUGHT HER CLAIM WAS THAT SHE ACTUALLY WITNESSED HER HUSBAND BEING ATTACKED BY STEVEN PAUL? IT APPEARS THAT MORE THAN LIKELY AMY NEEDED TO ASK DAVID IF HE HAD EVEN BEEN HIT BY STEVEN PAUL BECAUSE THE ATTACK NEVER ACTUALLY HAPPENED AS ALLEGED.**

When Amy Gregory was asked by the 911 operator “*And how long ago did the shooting happen?*”, the shooter’s wife responds “**Oh, it—it was probably 20 minutes ago.**”

**FOLLOW UP QUESTION- AMY GREGORY STATED THAT THE SHOOTING OCCURRED 20 MINUTES AGO. THAT WOULD PUT THE TIME OF THE SHOOTING AT 9:00 AM. WHY DID SHE WAIT 20 MINUTES TO CALL 911? WHAT DID THE SHOOTER AND HIS WIFE DO WITHIN THAT 20 MINUTE TIMEFRAME? WAS THE SHOOTER AND HIS WIFE INTENTIONALLY WAITING FOR STEVEN TO DIE IN THE DITCH OR TRYING TO COME UP WITH A FALSE SELF SERVING STORY OF SELF DEFENSE BEFORE CALLING 911?**

When Amy Gregory was asked by the 911 operator “and did it appear that he was, you know, on any drugs today or anything? Is that why you think he was kinda coming towards you guys and trying to...” Amy then answers “**No. He does that to everybody. He tries to intimidate everybody.**”

**FOLLOW UP QUESTION- AMY GREGORY OBVIOUSLY KNEW STEVEN PAUL WAS NOT ON DRUGS. OTHER THAN STEVEN PAUL TURNING AROUND TO GO BACK HOME ON THE WEST SIDE OF THE ROAD WITH BOTH DAVID AND AMY ON THE OPPOSITE EAST SIDE OF THE ROAD. WHERE WAS THE ACT OF INTIMIDATION AS SHE CLAIMS? WHERE WAS THE ACTUAL THREAT? THE FORENSIC EVIDENCE CLEARLY SHOWS THAT DAVID (THE SHOOTER) APPROACHED STEVEN ON THE WEST SIDE OF THE ROAD AND NOT THE OTHER WAY AROUND AS ALLEGED. MORE THAN LIKELY THAT STEVEN PAUL WAS SIMPLY AFRAID, HIMSELF, OF BEING FOLLOWED BY DAVID THEN TURNED AROUND BECAUSE HE WAS BEING FOLLOWED BY DAVID AND DID NOT FEEL SAFE. SO INSTEAD HE TRIES TO AVOID DAVID BY TURNING AROUND SO HIS BACK IS NOT TO DAVID AND HEADS IN THE OPPOSITE DIRECTION TOWARDS DAVID AND AMY IN AN ATTEMPT TO GO HOME TO SAFETY BEFORE BEING CONFRONTED AND SUBSEQUENTLY SHOT BY DAVID GREGORY.**

After claiming self-defense twice during the 911 call. Amy Gregory later states “**He scared me to death. He scared me to death. He was gonna kill my husband.**” “**David he was goin’ to kill you. He was freakin’ attacking you. The third fuckin’ time. Oh.**” David Gregory then swears “**Goddammit, Goddammit. Goddammit.**”

**FOLLOW UP QUESTION- IF AMY GREGORY WAS SO SURE THAT STEVEN PAUL WAS GOING TO KILL HER HUSBAND THEN WHY DID SHE HAVE TO ASK HIM IF STEVEN PAUL HIT HIM? HER STATEMENTS ON THE ALLEGED ASSAULT ARE CONFLICTING AND WEAK AT BEST AND OTHER THAN STEVEN PAUL WALKING PAST DAVID AND AMY IN AN ATTEMPT TO GO BACK HOME AS HIS REASON FOR USE OF DEADLY FORCE WAS NOT APPARENT OR NECESSARY. APPEARS THAT HER STATEMENTS IN THIS CASE ARE AN ATTEMPT TO BOLSTER AN ALLEGED SELF DEFENSE CLAIM SINCE THEY WERE NOW FORCED TO CALL 911 DUE TO BEING CAUGHT IN THE ACT OF FLEEING THE SCENE AFTER THE SHOOTING BY DAYNA PURCELL.**

# **Police Patrol Reports Analysis**

## **Introduction:**

This document seeks to provide a comprehensive analysis and argumentation, challenging the preliminary self-defense claim posited by David Gregory in the shooting death of Steven Paul Colon. Given the examination of 911 calls, police patrol reports, and witness statements, there emerges a narrative fraught with inconsistencies, procedural anomalies, and a potential prejudicial bias against the victim, Steven Paul Colon. This analysis aims to dissect these components meticulously, advocating for the reopening of the case under a new lens of scrutiny.

## **Analysis of Key Evidence and Testimonies:**

### Absence of Deputy Jay Patella's Crucial First-Responder Account:

- Deputy Patella, among the first on the scene, provided immediate aid to Steven Paul Colon. His observations, particularly the actions taken and statements heard in those initial moments, are pivotal. The unavailability of his statement, despite repeated requests, raises significant concerns regarding transparency and the completeness of investigative records. His exposure to an initial biased narrative could have unduly influenced the case's direction from its inception.

### Deputy Paula J. O'Brien's Observations:

- Deputy O'Brien's perception of the incident as a potential criminal act by David Gregory, contrary to a self-defense scenario, merits attention. Her prior interactions with Steven, described as respectful, starkly contrast the negative portrayal propagated by certain community members. This divergence underscores the necessity of questioning the narrative foundation upon which the self-defense claim was established.

### Inconsistencies and Variances in Witness Narratives:

- The reported hearing of two gunshots by multiple sources directly contests David Gregory's self-defense claim predicated on a singular, reactionary discharge. Furthermore, Amy Gregory's and Gary Osgood's accounts exhibit notable discrepancies regarding the sequence and nature of the events leading to the shooting. These inconsistencies compromise the reliability of their testimonies and suggest a potential manipulation of facts to fit a preconceived narrative.

### Procedural and Investigative Gaps:

- The procedural handling of the crime scene, especially the weapon's management by the Gregorys (including its relocation and unloading), was inadequately scrutinized. This oversight raises questions about evidence integrity and the investigative rigor applied to the self-defense claim. Additionally, the failure to secure comprehensive statements from all responding officers limits the ability to construct a full, unbiased account of the incident.

### Potential Prejudicial Bias:

- The pervasive negative bias towards Steven Paul Colon, as evidenced by the characterizations provided by neighbors and subsequently relayed to first responders, likely tainted the investigative perspective. This bias, coupled with the absence of counter-narratives or a balanced assessment of Steven's behavior and history, underscores the need for a reevaluation of the case devoid of prejudicial influence.

## **Recommendations:**

- Comprehensive Case Review: A full reassessment of all available evidence, including a critical analysis of the missing statements and re-interviewing of witnesses, is imperative.

This review should seek to identify and rectify procedural oversights and ensure all narratives are thoroughly vetted for consistency and credibility.

- Forensic Analysis Reevaluation: A detailed forensic examination focusing on the ballistics evidence, the number and trajectory of the bullets, and the positioning of the involved parties at the time of the shooting could provide objective insights critical to evaluating the self-defense claim.
- Bias Assessment: An investigation into the potential prejudicial bias against Steven Paul Colon, including its origin and impact on the investigation, should be conducted. Understanding the influence of community narratives on the case's trajectory is crucial for ensuring justice.
- Legal Action: Based on the findings of a comprehensive case review, consider pursuing charges against David Gregory that reflect the totality of evidence and its implications. This may involve challenging the initial self-defense claim with a nuanced understanding of the events leading to Steven Paul Colon's death.

### **Conclusion:**

The discrepancies, procedural anomalies, and biases evident in the case of Steven Paul Colon's death necessitate a renewed investigation. Only through a meticulous examination of all facets of the case can justice be pursued with integrity and fairness. This document advocates for such a reexamination, underscoring the legal and moral obligation to ensure that the truth of Steven Paul Colon's tragic death is fully uncovered and addressed within the legal framework.

### **Police Patrol Reports**

#### **1. Statement from Deputy Jay Patella #2426-**

**NO OFFICER STATEMENT ON FILE. one of the first officers on the scene to arrive. First to pull Steven Paul from the ditch and proceed with live saving measures. First officer to open Steven Paul's hoodie and locate the bullet wound on Steven Paul's lower right torso. One of the first officers to speak with Gary Osgood.**

**QUESTION- REQUESTED DEPUTY PATELLA'S STATEMENT ON 5 SEPARATE OCCASIONS FROM THE SARASOTA POLICE DEPARTMENT. HAVE YET TO**

RECEIVE HIS STATEMENT. **WHY IS DEPUTY PATELLA'S STATEMENT OF WHAT OCCURRED THAT MORNING MISSING AND NOT AVAILABLE?** DEPUTY PATELLA HAD ALREADY BEEN GIVEN THE FALSE AND PERSONALLY BIASED NEGATIVE NARRATIVE PROVIDED BY GARY OSGOOD ABOUT STEVEN PAUL. A MAN WHO CLEARLY DID NOT LIKE STEVEN PAUL. A MAN WHO WALKED RIGHT PAST STEVEN PAUL AS HE LAY DYING IN THE DITCH. DAVID OSGOOD (HOA PRESIDENT), A MAN WHO SPENT MUCH OF HIS TIME ALONG WITH TOBY AND HIS WIFE (HOA SECRETARY) SPREADING THE NEGATIVE AND OFTEN FALSE RUMORS ABOUT STEVEN PAUL THROUGHOUT THE ENTIRE NEIGHBORHOOD INCLUDING TO DAVID GREGORY (THE SHOOTER) AND HIS WIFE AMY GREGORY. DAVID GREGORY AND HIS WIFE AMY GREGORY ALSO SPENT A GREAT DEAL OF TIME AND EFFORT IN THE DAYS AND MONTHS LEADING UP TO THE SHOOTING TALKING WITH NUMEROUS NEIGHBORS, AS WELL, SPREADING THE NEGATIVE AND FALSE NARRATIVE ABOUT STEVEN PAUL AS WELL. DEPUTY PATELLA ALONG WITH DEPUTY VINOPAL REPEATEDLY BRIEFED THIS FALSE NARRATIVE TO MOST ALL OF THE OFFICERS WHO SUBSEQUENTLY ARRIVED ON SCENE.

2. **Statement from Deputy Paula J. O'Brien #2873-**

one of the first officers on the scene to arrive. First to pull Steven Paul from the ditch with Deputy Jay Patella and proceed with live saving measures until the arrival of paramedics. Stated that Deputy Jay Patella opened Steven Paul's hoodie and located the bullet wound on Steven Paul's lower right torso. Deputy Paula O'Brien stayed with Steven Paul throughout his travel in the ambulance to the emergency department at Sarasota Memorial Hospital and stayed with Steven Paul until the crime scene forensics staff arrived at the hospital.

QUESTION- WHEN SPEAKING WITH THE FAMILY ON THE DAY OF THE SHOOTING, PAULA O'BRIEN STATED TO THE FAMILY THAT SHE FELT A CRIME HAD BEEN COMMITTED BY DAVID GREGORY. WHY DID SHE FEEL THIS WAY? WAS IT BECAUSE THERE WAS IN FACT A CRIME COMMITTED? IN THE PAST, SHE MENTIONED THAT STEVEN PAUL WAS ALWAYS VERY RESPECTFUL WITH HER. DID STEVEN PAUL SAY ANYTHING TO HER TO MAKE HER BELIEVE THIS?

3. **Statement from Deputy Matthew McAleer #3504-**

Arrived at 7:31am. Upon arriving Deputy Jay Patella advised him that he needed assistance securing the scene with crime scene tape and generating and maintaining a crime scene contamination log. He spoke with Dayna Purcell, the first person (neighbor) to call 911. Deputy Matthew McAleer claims that Dayna Purcell heard a "single" gunshot in the roadway outside of her house. When she exited the house, David Gregory advised her to call the police. At the direction of Sgt. Surran, Deputy McAleer then left Deputy Patella and relocated to the

**secondary scene at the shooter's home and relieved Sgt. Leavitt.**

**QUESTION- DEPUTY MCCALEER WAS IN CONTACT WITH DEPUTY PATELLA UPON ARRIVING ON SCENE. REQUESTED DEPUTY PATELLA'S STATEMENT ON 5 SEPARATE OCCASIONS FROM THE SARASOTA POLICE DEPARTMENT. HAVE YET TO RECEIVE HIS STATEMENT. WHY IS DEPUTY PATELLA'S STATEMENT OF WHAT OCCURRED THAT MORNING MISSING AND NOT AVAILABLE?**

**4. Statement from Sgt. Steve Leavitt #2035-**

**Arrived at the scene, went to David and Amy Gregory's home located in the second row of condos behind the crime scene and to the east of Highland Rd. Upon approaching David and Amy Gregory standing outside in front of their home. He directed David and Amy to get on the ground where they were subsequently secured and arrested. A weapon was located on a table outside of the residence.**

**5. Statement from Deputy Jackson Stroud #3087-**

**Arrived at the scene, located Sgt. Steve Leavitt and proceeded to handcuff David Gregory. Stated that Deputy Steve Klinge handcuffed Amy Gregory. He then proceeded to secure the scene with crime scene tape and started a contamination sheet. Was instructed by Sgt. Surran to transport David Gregory to police headquarters. Claims that David Gregory made no statements during the ride.**

**6. Statement from Deputy Josh Gnesin #2584 -**

**Upon his arrival, he is advised by Deputy Jay Patella that his assistance was needed to secure the scene. He along with Deputy Matthew McAleer proceeded to secure the initial scene with crime scene tape and he directed Deputy McAleer to generate a crime scene log. Sgt. Surran arrive on scene and directed both Gnesin and McAleer to relieve Sgt. Leavitt at the secondary crime scene located at David and Amy Gregory's home. He was subsequently relieved at the secondary crime scene by Deputy Jay Patella. Crime scene logs to both locations were provided to Patella.**

**QUESTION- DEPUTY GNESIN WAS IN CONTACT WITH DEPUTY PATELLA UPON ARRIVING ON SCENE. REQUESTED DEPUTY PATELLA'S STATEMENT ON 5 SEPARATE OCCASIONS FROM THE SARASOTA POLICE DEPARTMENT. HAVE YET TO RECEIVE HIS STATEMENT. WHY IS DEPUTY PATELLA'S STATEMENT OF WHAT OCCURRED THAT MORNING MISSING AND NOT AVAILABLE?**

7. **Statement from Deputy Brandon Burnside #2886-**  
responded to the scene at 7:19 am. Was tasked with transporting Amy Gregory to police headquarters. Placed her in an interview room, upon arrival.
8. **Statement from Detective Nathan King #2399-**  
no report written on 9/24/22. Subsequent report written on 6-15-23 where he indicates that this was a 2<sup>nd</sup> offense. He claims that, in his opinion, Steven Paul was the offender in the case.

*QUESTION: WHY WAS THIS INDICATED TO BE A 2<sup>ND</sup> OFFENSE AND WHEN WAS THE SUPPOSED 1<sup>ST</sup> OFFENSE AND WHY WAS THERE ABSOLUTELY NO ACTION OR REPORT TAKEN ON THE ALLEGED 1<sup>ST</sup> OFFENSE IF STEVEN PAUL WAS A SUPPOSED OFFENDER PREVIOUSLY? DETECTIVE KING WAS IN CONTACT WITH DEPUTY VINOPAL UPON HIS ARRIVAL ON SCENE. DEPUTY VINOPAL HAD ALREADY BEEN BRIEFED BY DEPUTY PATELLA UPON HER ARRIVAL ON SCENE. BOTH HAD ALREADY BEEN GIVEN THE FALSE AND PERSONALLY BIASED NEGATIVE NARRATIVE PROVIDED BY GARY OSGOOD ABOUT STEVEN PAUL. A MAN WHO CLEARLY DID NOT LIKE STEVEN PAUL. A MAN WHO WALKED RIGHT PAST STEVEN PAUL AS HE LAY DYING IN THE DITCH. DAVID OSGOOD (HOA PRESIDENT), A MAN WHO SPENT MUCH OF HIS TIME ALONG WITH TOBY AND HIS WIFE (HOA SECRETARY) SPREADING THE NEGATIVE AND OFTEN FALSE RUMORS ABOUT STEVEN PAUL THROUGHOUT THE ENTIRE NEIGHBORHOOD INCLUDING TO DAVID GREGORY (THE SHOOTER) AND HIS WIFE AMY GREGORY. DAVID GREGORY AND HIS WIFE AMY GREGORY ALSO SPENT A GREAT DEAL OF TIME AND EFFORT IN THE DAYS AND MONTHS LEADING UP TO THE SHOOTING TALKING WITH NUMEROUS NEIGHBORS, AS WELL, SPREADING THE NEGATIVE AND FALSE NARRATIVE ABOUT STEVEN PAUL AS WELL. REQUESTED DEPUTY PATELLA'S STATEMENT ON 5 SEPARATE OCCASIONS FROM THE SARASOTA POLICE DEPARTMENT. HAVE YET TO RECEIVE HIS STATEMENT. WHY IS DEPUTY PATELLA'S STATEMENT OF WHAT OCCURRED THAT MORNING MISSING AND NOT AVAILABLE?*

9. **Statement from Deputy Austin D. Van Camp #3239-**  
at 7:20 am was dispatched to the scene in reference to the sound of gunshots (plural) heard. Upon arrival at the scene, Steven Paul was found lying in the ditch on the cross streets of Highland Rd and Westview Dr. He stated Steven Paul was removed from the ditch by Deputies Patella and O'Brien to perform lifesaving measures until EMS arrived. He stated that Steven Paul had a gunshot wound to the right abdomen. He began getting information from witness Gary Osgood. He stated that Gary did not know the direction in which the shooter went. He

indicates the Gary stated "I heard 2 gunshots, and someone say mother fucker". He stated that Sgt Leavitt made contact with David and Amy Gregory at the secondary crime scene and Sgt Surran and Lt. Kaskey arrived on scene and notified Criminal Investigations who responded and took over the investigation. He stated that the scene was secured for preservation of evidence and a contamination log was started.

**QUESTIONS: GARY WAS THE FIRST WITNESS TO THE SHOOTING. HE HEARD 2 GUNSHOTS NOT 1. THEN HE HEARD SOMEONE SAY MOTHER FUCKER. WHY DID DAVID GREGORY SHOOT TWICE IF HE SUPPOSEDLY WAS SHOOTING IN SELF DEFENSE? WHO WAS YELLING MOTHER FUCKER? MORE THAN LIKELY STEVEN PAUL WAS IN SHOCK AND WOULD HAVE NOT BEEN ABLE TO YELL. WHY WAS DAVID GREGORY YELLING MOTHER FUCKER AT STEVEN PAUL AFTER SHOOTING HIM? WHY ALL THE RAGE AT STEVEN PAUL IF DAVID GREGORY WAS NOT THE AGGRESSOR AND DAVID WAS SO AFRAID FOR HIS LIFE? GIVEN THIS SCENARIO, IT SEEMS VERY LIKELY THAT DAVID GREGORY WAS, IN FACT, THE AGGRESSOR AND NOT STEVEN PAUL. DEPUTY VAN CAMP WAS IN CONTACT WITH DEPUTY PATELLA UPON ARRIVING ON SCENE. REQUESTED DEPUTY PATELLA'S STATEMENT ON 5 SEPARATE OCCASIONS FROM THE SARASOTA POLICE DEPARTMENT. HAVE YET TO RECEIVE HIS STATEMENT. WHY IS DEPUTY PATELLA'S STATEMENT OF WHAT OCCURRED THAT MORNING MISSING AND NOT AVAILABLE?**

**10. Statement from Deputy Steve Klinge #3087-**

**no statement on file.**

**QUESTION-WHY IS THE STATEMENT MISSING AND NOT AVAILABLE?**

**11. Statement from Deputy Sgt. Steven Robert Surran #0712-**

**no statement on file.**

**QUESTION-WHY IS THE STATEMENT MISSING AND NOT AVAILABLE?**

**12. Statement from Lt. Kaskey #3087-**

**no statement on file.**

**QUESTION-WHY IS THE STATEMENT MISSING AND NOT AVAILABLE?**

**13. Statement from Sgt. Tuck #2447-**

**no statement on file.**

**QUESTION-WHY IS THE STATEMENT MISSING AND NOT AVAILABLE?**

## **Investigative Reports Analysis**

### **Det. Meghan Vinopal's Report and Actions:**

Det. Vinopal's arrival at the scene and subsequent actions raise several procedural concerns. Firstly, the significant delay in her arrival potentially compromised the freshness of the crime scene and the immediacy of witness testimonies. Furthermore, the conspicuous absence of Deputy Patella's statement, despite repeated requests, introduces a critical void in the chain of evidence and casts doubt on the investigative rigor.

- Critical Oversight in Documentation: The failure to secure Deputy Patella's firsthand account directly undermines the integrity of the investigation, leaving unanswered questions about initial observations and actions at the scene.
- Reliance on Biased Narratives: The acceptance of a narrative that categorically identifies Steven Paul as the aggressor, based on third-party accounts with potential biases and without direct evidence, highlights a concerning lack of critical scrutiny. The investigation seems predisposed towards a particular interpretation, neglecting alternative scenarios or motives.
- Missed Opportunities for Evidence Collection: The lack of initiative to obtain and preserve video evidence from Ring.com, despite being aware of its potential relevance, represents a significant lapse in evidence collection, potentially affecting the case's outcome.

### **Det. Andrew Rowe's Canvassing Report:**

Det. Rowe's canvassing efforts reveal an investigation heavily influenced by neighborhood hearsay and anecdotal character assessments rather than substantiated facts. This approach risks embedding community biases into the official narrative, possibly skewing the investigation away from objective truth-seeking.

- Questionable Relevance of Anecdotal Evidence: The emphasis on community perceptions of Steven Paul, particularly those painting him in a negative light without direct relevance to the incident, suggests an investigatory bias that may unduly influence the case's framing.
- Insufficient Exploration of Premeditation: The narrative of David Gregory telegraphing his intentions to neighbors and openly discussing carrying a firearm for protection against Steven Paul suggests a premeditation angle that was not adequately pursued by investigators. This oversight neglects a critical line of inquiry into the shooter's mindset and potential planning prior to the incident.

### **Det. Luis Ojeda's Interview Summaries:**

Det. Ojeda's summaries of interviews with the Gregorys and the victim's family present a dichotomy between the portrayed and evidenced reality of the incident. The lack of aggressive behavior corroborated by family testimonies and toxicology reports contradicts the Gregorys' portrayal of Steven Paul as the aggressor.

- Discrepancy Between Claims and Evidence: The narrative forwarded by the Gregorys, claiming self-defense against an aggressive act by Steven Paul, is not supported by

forensic evidence indicating a shot fired from a distance, nor by toxicology reports negating the influence of stimulant drugs.

- Potential Investigative Bias: The early adoption of a narrative favoring the Gregorys' account, without substantial counter-evidence or exploration of contradictory narratives, indicates a potential investigatory bias. This bias may have steered the investigation towards a premature conclusion, neglecting the thorough examination of all facts and circumstances.

### **Overall Conclusions and Recommendations:**

The investigation into Steven Paul's shooting reveals significant procedural shortcomings, including gaps in evidence collection, a predisposition towards certain narratives, and a lack of comprehensive scrutiny. These issues collectively suggest an investigation that may have been unduly influenced by external perceptions and internal biases, rather than guided by objective evidence and a balanced examination of all relevant facts.

- Need for a Reevaluation: Given the identified shortcomings, there is a compelling need for a comprehensive reevaluation of the investigative process, ensuring that all evidence is thoroughly and impartially examined.
- Enhancement of Investigative Protocols: The case underscores the importance of robust evidence collection protocols, including the timely securing of witness statements and physical evidence, to uphold the integrity of the investigative process.

### **Investigative Reports**

Investigative Supplement from Det. Meghan Vinopal #3085-

Det. Vinopal arrived at the scene at 8:34am. One hour after being contacted by her supervisor and over an hour after the shooting occurred. **She stated that upon her arrival CSU Wafer was already present at the scene. We were briefed by Deputy Patella #2426 that a female later identified as Amy Gregory and her husband David Gregory were walking their dog when they had an altercation with a known male, Steven Colon. During the altercation, David fired his pistol...**

**QUESTION- DETECTIVE VINOPAL WAS IN CONTACT WITH DEPUTY PATELLA UPON ARRIVING ON SCENE. REQUESTED DEPUTY PATELLA'S STATEMENT ON 5 SEPARATE OCCASIONS FROM THE SARASOTA POLICE DEPARTMENT. HAVE YET TO RECEIVE HIS STATEMENT. WHY IS DEPUTY PATELLA'S STATEMENT OF WHAT OCCURRED THAT MORNING MISSING AND NOT AVAILABLE?**

At 8:51am (nearly 2 hours after the shooting) Det. Vinopal conducted a sworn audio interview with a witness, Gary Osgood. **Osgood stated he lives at 1801 Highland Rd., Osprey. The morning of the incident, about 10-15 minutes prior to the 911 call, Osgood was walking**

his dog when he saw David and Amy walking their dog. Since their dogs do not get along, David and Amy walked towards the Bentley Hotel, and Osgood went the opposite way.

QUESTION- GARY CLAIMS THAT HE WALKED IN THE OPPOSITE DIRECTION OF DAVID GREGORY (THE SHOOTER) AND HIS WIFE AMY ALONG HIGHLAND ROAD. GARY HEADING SOUTH TOWARDS SHORELAND AND DAVID AND HIS WIFE AMY HEADING NORTH TOWARDS THE BENTLEY HOTEL. HOW FAR DID DAVID AND AMY WALK AFTER FIRST ENCOUNTERING GARY OR DID THEY JUST HANG AROUND THE AREA CLOSE TO THE CONDO DRIVEWAY THAT GARY HAD JUST EXITED AND STEVEN PAUL WAS ABOUT TO EXIT? AT WHAT POINT DID DAVID AND AMY CHOOSE TO BEGIN WALKING SOUTH ON HIGHLAND DRIVE EVEN AS STEVEN PAUL WAS ON HIGHLAND HIMSELF AND WHY? WHY DID DAVID AND AMY NOT CUT THROUGH THE YARD, SOMETHING THEY ALWAYS DID, ON THEIR WAY HOME?

As Osgood was walking back to his house, he heard two gun shots and someone say “mother fucker”. After hearing the gun shots, he saw Steven stumble and fall. Osgood went to his house to put away his dog and then went to assist Steven. Osgood observed Steven in the ditch and directed deputies to Steven. Osgood did not observe David and Amy in the area.

QUESTION: HE HEARD TWO GUNSHOTS. WHY THE NEED FOR TWO SHOTS, IF SELF DEFENSE IS THE CLAIM? WHAT HAPPENED TO THE SECOND SHELL CASING? WAS IT PICKED UP BY DAVID GREGORY IN AN ATTEMPT TO CLEAN UP THE CRIME SCENE? DAVID GREGORY WAS SWEARING AT STEVEN PAUL AND CALLING HIM A MOTHERFUCKER AFTER SHOOTING HIM. HOW DOES THIS ALL PLAY INTO THE FALSE CLAIM OF SELF DEFENSE? GARY OSGOOD CLAIMS HE OR HIS DOGS DID NOT SEE WHERE STEVEN PAUL HAD FALLEN INTO THE DITCH, BUT INSTEAD PROCEEDED TO LEAVE THE AREA AND GO HOME TO PUT HIS DOGS AWAY FIRST BEFORE COMING BACK OUTSIDE TO “ASSIST” STEVEN. THIS VERSION OF EVENTS IS QUESTIONABLE AT BEST. HOW IS IT EVEN POSSIBLE THAT GARY OSGOOD PASSED WITHIN FEET OF STEVEN PAUL ON THE ROAD AND NEITHER HIS DOGS BARKED OR PICKED UP ON STEVEN PAUL’S PRESENCE IN THE DITCH NOR DID GARY OSGOOD HIMSELF NOTICE STEVEN PAUL STRUGGLING WHILE DYING IN THE DITCH? SEEMS HIGHLY UNLIKELY.

Osgood described Steven as a 24/25 year old who has mental health problems. Osgood stated Steven caused a lot of problems with the homeowner association and their community. Osgood stated Steven does not leave the house much but walks around the neighborhood late at night.

QUESTION: HOW DOES GARY OSGOOD KNOW THAT STEVEN PAUL HAS MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS? IS HE QUALIFIED TO MAKE SUCH AN ASSESSMENT? SO OTHER THAN THE WEEK BEFORE WHERE STEVEN PAUL DID NOT MOVE HIS CAR WHEN THE WORK WAS BEING PERFORMED ON THE CONDO DRIVEWAY, WHAT OTHER

**“PROBLEMS” DID STEVEN PAUL CAUSE WITH THE HOMEOWNER ASSOCIATION THAT WERE SO NUMEROUS AND SO EGREGIOUS IN NATURE?**

**Osgood stated recently he had an issue with Steven not moving his vehicle so workers can fix the community driveway. Osgood had to call Steven’s mother to assist them since Steven had mental health issues. Osgood went into the house with Steven’s mother and observed pill bottles along a tray that had a spoon with powder on it.**

**QUESTION: ONCE AGAIN, HOW DOES GARY OSGOOD KNOW THAT STEVEN PAUL HAS MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS? IS HE QUALIFIED TO MAKE SUCH AN ASSESSMENT? AFTER CALLING STEVEN PAUL’S MOTHER WITH ASSISTANCE WITH MOVING THE VEHICLE, GARY OSGOOD FOLLOWS STEVEN’S MOTHER INTO STEVEN PAUL’S HOME. WHO GAVE GARY PERMISSION TO ENTER THE HOME? GARY ALSO CLAIMS THAT HE OBSERVED PILL BOTTLES ALONG WITH A TRAY THAT HAD A SPOON WITH POWDER ON IT. THIS STATEMENT FROM GARY IS AN OBVIOUS ATTEMPT TO FALSELY PAINT STEVEN PAUL AS A DRUG USER AND A HEROIN USER AT THAT. DOES GARY HAVE ANY BASIS TO MAKE THESE INCREDULOUS CLAIMS OF DRUG USE? DOES GARY EVEN KNOW WHAT THE POWDER WAS? WHY DOES GARY INSINUATE DRUG USE WHEN IT COULD HAVE HAD A VERY SIMPLE EXPLANATION SUCH AS ATHLETIC NUTRITIONAL SUPPLEMENTATION?**

**Osgood stated, David and Amy have had confrontations with Steven prior to this incident. Steven previously spit on David and Amy and took a fighting stance to David. Osgood knows since these confrontations with Steven, David carries a concealed weapon.**

**QUESTION: HOW DOES GARY OSGOOD KNOW ALL OF THIS INFORMATION? HE OBVIOUSLY HAS SPOKEN WITH DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND HIS WIFE. GARY STATES THAT SINCE THESE “CONFRONTATIONS” WITH STEVEN PAUL, DAVID CARRY A CONCEALED WEAPON. THIS STATEMENT BY GARY OSGOOD CLEARY INDICATES INTENT AND PREMEDITATION ON DAVID GREGORY’S PART. IF GARY OSGOOD HAD ALREADY BEEN MADE AWARE OF THE FACT THAT DAVID WAS NOW CARRYING A GUN WHY DID GARY NOT CONTACT THE POLICE WITH ANY CONCERNs REGARDING THE POTENTIAL FOR ESCALATED VIOLENCE ON THE PART OF DAVID GREGORY, AT ANY POINT, PRIOR TO THE DAY OF THE SHOOTING?**

**Osgood stated Steven had another altercation with a neighbor named Toby. Steven became aggressive with Toby but when Toby confronted Steven, Steven ran away.**

**QUESTION: AGAIN, MORE RUMORS FROM TOBY. NO ONE WITNESSED THIS INCIDENT AND EVEN WHEN TOBY BEGAN TO SPREAD THIS STORY AMONGST THE NEIGHBORS, NO ONE SAW IT. TOBY CLAIMS THAT STEVEN RAN AWAY. IF THE NARRATIVE IS THAT STEVEN PAUL IS SUPER CONFRONTATIONAL, WHY DID STEVEN PAUL NOT CONFRONT TOBY AT ALL BUT INSTEAD CHOSE TO LEAVE AND “RUN” AWAY BACK INTO HIS HOME? WHO WAS THE AGGRESSOR, TOBY OR STEVEN? DID THE POLICE EVEN REALIZE OR**

*MADE AWARE THAT TOBY, HIMSELF, HAD BEEN ARRESTED AT THE BENTLEY HOTEL FOR FIGHTING WITH ANOTHER INDIVIDUAL?*

At 9:10 am Det. Vinopal conducted a canvass of the area. She was tasked to make contact with a number of residences on Highland Rd. These are some of the more notable comments from her discussions with various residents of the neighborhood:

**1845: Kelsie Lloyd, 336-793-7076, the owner of the residence was not there but gave me her email address Kelsie.E.Lloyd@gmail.com for her Ring camera. Christie Lloyd DOB 9/12/49, 336-407-2131, 804 Groveland Ave., Venice. Christy was house sitting for Kelsie and heard a bang that woke her up.**

**1841: Karen Synk, DOB 8/27/64, 941-685-0364. Heard a loud bang around 0700 hours.**

**1851: John Dial, DOB 1/2/56, 941-408-3258- Did not see or hear anything.**

**1855: Dayna was one of the callers (911). I left a card at her door.**

**1861: Did not answer residence but called back later. Marianne Levine, DOB 2/23/56 heard noise before a pop sound around 0700 hours.**

**1849: Linda Kremblas, DOB 2/5/64, 315-778-5175- Did not see or hear anything. Nadine Kremblas, DOB 12/20/88, 786-566-1769- Heard 1 gunshot around 0700 hours.**

**QUESTION: LINDA KREMBLAS LIVED DIRECTLY NEXT DOOR TO DAVID GREGORY (THE SHOOTER) AND HIS WIFE AMY AND HAD DIRECT KNOWLEDGE OF MANY OF THE FACETS OF THIS CASE THAT WERE NEVER INVESTIGATED. WHY WAS LINDA NOT INTERVIEWED, WHATSOEVER, WITH REGARDS TO HER KNOWLEDGE AND INTERACTIONS WITH DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND HIS WIFE? SHE LIVED RIGHT NEXT DOOR. WHY WAS THIS NEVER DONE BY THE DETECTIVES IN THIS CASE?**

**1869: Marsha Corcoran, DOB 12/1/54, 941-702-0026. Ring camera not working.**

**1755: Emily Wallen, DOB 9/27/01, 315-632-1986- Only heard yelling at 0700 hours.**

At 10:30am Det. Vinopal stated that she requested Investigator Book #2658 to subpoena Ring for subscriber information and submit a preservation letter for Kelsie Lloyd's account located at 1845 Highland Rd.

**She also requested Investigator Book #2658 to subpoena Sarasota School Board for Steven Colon's school records.**

**QUESTION: WHERE ARE THE SUBPOENA REQUESTS FOR THE SHOOTERS RECORDS, GUN PERMIT INFORMATION, COMPUTER SEARCH INFORMATION, PHONE RECORDS ETC?? WHY WAS THIS INVESTIGATION COMPLETELY FOCUSED ON STEVEN PAUL'S**

**RECORDS ONLY AND NOT DAVID GREGORY (THE SHOOTER) AND HIS WIFE AMY?**

Investigative Supplement from Det. Andrew Rowe #2187-

**Det. Rowe was contacted at 8:15am by Sgt. Friday and arrived on scene at 9:05am. He arrived at the incident location and was briefed by Dep. Patella and Sgt. Friday. Sgt. Friday directed me to ascertain case numbers on file pertaining to Colon.**

At 10:00am Det. Rowe began the task of canvassing the neighborhood. **I started at 1835 Highland Road and spoke with Penelope and Maida Nichols. I swore in Penelope and Maida and then asked them about the involved parties regarding this case. Penelope told me she had recently had a conversation with David about an altercation he had with Steven. David told her Steven confronted him late one night while he was walking his dogs. David told her Steven “charged” at him and he was in fear of what he might do.**

**David further related to Penelope that he has a concealed carry permit but wasn’t carrying a firearm that night. David said if Steven came at him again like that, he would have his firearm on his person and defend himself.**

**QUESTION: DAVID GREGORY WAS ALREADY SPEAKING WITH NUMEROUS NEIGHBORS (MANY WHO DID NOT EVEN KNOW STEVEN PAUL AT ALL) AND COMMUNICATING AND TELEGRAPHING HIS INTENTIONS BEFORE THE SHOOTING. WHY WAS DAVID GOING AROUND THE NEIGHBORHOOD AND SPREADING THIS NARRATIVE TO EVERYONE HE CAME IN CONTACT WITH? IT SEEMS LIKELY THAT DAVID WAS INTENTIONALLY ATTEMPTING TO SET THE STAGE WITH ALL THE NEIGHBORS TO MAKE THE CASE FOR AN EVENTUAL SELF DEFENSE CLAIM IN THE MONTHS, WEEKS AND DAYS LEADING UP TO THE DAY OF THE SHOOTING. THIS GOES TO THE SHOOTER DAVID GREGORY’S INTENT AND PREMEDITATION AND PLANNING BY SETTING THE STAGE with ALL THE NEIGHBORS PRIOR TO THE DAY OF THE SHOOTING.**

**Penelope and Maida said they had little knowledge of Steven, only they know law enforcement had been to his house in the past.**

**QUESTION: PENELOPE AND MAIDA KNEW VERY LITTLE OF OR ABOUT STEVEN? Where did THEY get this information? From David GREGORY (THE SHOOTER) as well?**

At 10:50 am Det. Rowe made contact with the resident at 1823 Highland Road, Melania Binder. Binder told me she “witnessed some of the altercation and agreed to speak with me.

**I swore in Binder and asked what she observed. Binder said she awoke at about 0700 hours. She was walking towards her living room when she heard what she described as a “firework sound”. Binder said she looked from her front door and observed a younger male running from the area and an older male yelling very loudly and angrily.**

**Binder said she knew David because he was always walking his dogs in the neighborhood. Binder didn't know too much about Steven.**

**At 11:08 am Det. Rowe made contact with Richard and Robin Henry at 1827 Highland Road. I swore both parties in and then asked them about today's incident. Robin stated she heard what she thought was a gunshot sometime around 0715 hours that morning.**

**Robin and Richard both said Steven has been causing concern in the neighborhood with his actions and they had heard through the community that Steven may have spit on David sometime in the past. This was just unconfirmed rumor, and they had no evidence to back this up.**

**QUESTION: CONTINUATION OF RUMORS. WHERE DID ROBIN AND RICHARD HEAR ABOUT THE SUPPOSED PAST "SPITTING" ON DAVID INCIDENT? DID THEY GET THIS FROM DAVID GREGORY (THE SHOOTER)?**

**At 11:28 am Det. Rowe made contact with Tobin Johnston and Beth Johnston at 1799 Highland Road. I swore in both parties and did a recorded interview. Tobin stated he was friends with Steven's grandfather who owns the unit Steven was living in. Tobin said Steven has been acting erratically since he moved into the unit and his behavior was escalating rapidly over the past few months.**

**QUESTION: WHAT DOES TOBY CONSIDER ACTING "ERRATIC" AND IN WHAT WAY SPECIFICALLY WAS STEVEN PAUL'S BEHAVIOR ESCALATING OVER THE PAST FEW MONTHS? STATEMENTS LIKE THESE ARE COMPLETELY UNTETHERED TO THE FACTS IN THIS CASE.**

**Tobin stated he did not witness or hear the incident this morning but did state he doesn't allow his wife to walk their dog at night anymore because Steven's actions were concerning to him.**

**Tobin stated recently he was bringing his trash cans in from the roadway when Steven yelled at him in a threatening manner. Tobin turned around to confront Steven about what he had said, and Steven ran into his residence.**

**QUESTION: TOBY MAKES A CLAIM THAT STEVEN PAUL YELLED AT HIM IN A "THREATENING" MANNER. NO ONE ELSE SAW THIS AND. IT WAS NEVER REPORTED TO THE POLICE. HE CLAIMS THAT WHEN HE (TOBY) CONFRONTED STEVEN HE RAN INTO HIS RESIDENCE. SO WHO WAS CONFRONTING WHO? WHO WAS ESCALATING (TOBY) AND WHO WAS DE-ESCALATING/AVOIDING (STEVEN PAUL)? IN ADDITION, TOBY DOES NOT VOLUNTEER THAT HE, HIMSELF, HAD BEEN ARRESTED AT THE BENTLEY HOTEL FOR FIGHTING WITH ANOTHER INDIVIDUAL.**

**Tobin and Beth both stated they believed Steven was progressing into becoming a menace in the neighborhood and worried if he had firearms in his possession what he might do with them.**

**QUESTION: AGAIN, WHERE ARE THE FACTS THAT STEVEN PAUL WAS A "MENACE" TO ANYONE? WHY UNSUBSTANTIATED FAKE CLAIM THAT THEY "WORRIED" IF STEVEN PAUL HAD FIREARMS. WHERE ARE THE FACTS? TOBY AND HIS WIFE BETH KNEW DAVID THE SHOOTER, ARE TOBY AND BETH TRYING TO HELP DAVID'S FICTITIOUS SELF DEFENSE CLAIM TOO.**

At 12:05 am Det. Rowe made contact with the resident at 1825 Highland Road, Colleen Donlevy-Burns. I swore Donlevy-Burns in and performed a recorded interview. Donlevy-Burns stated she knew of both parties and was neighbors with Steven.

Donlevy-Burns stated Steven had erratic behavior and was not very friendly with her. One day she found coffee spilled on her steps to her front door. While outside she observed Steven out there and asked if he knew anything about the coffee being spilled. She said he "spit" in her direction on the ground then went back into his residence.

**QUESTION: ONCE AGAIN, WHAT IS CONSIDERED "ERRATIC" BEHAVIOR? HE WAS NOT FRIENDLY WITH HER. OK, SO WHAT ELSE DID STEVEN PAUL DO? SHE CLAIMS THAT SHE FOUND COFFEE SPILLED ON THE STEPS TO HER FRONT DOOR AND SHE ASSUMED IT WAS STEVEN. WHERE ARE THE FACTS THAT STEVEN PAUL SPILLED THE COFFEE? STEVEN PAUL DIDN'T EVEN DRINK COFFEE. HE SPIT ON THE GROUND WHEN ACCUSED OF THIS AND WENT INSIDE. OK? OTHER THAN BEING UNFRIENDLY AND NOT BEING APPRECIATIVE OF HER FALSE ACCUSATION, WHAT IS THE ISSUE HERE?**

Investigative Supplement from Det. Luis Ojeda #1795-

**On 9/24/22, I was called to assist in a homicide investigation that occurred on the...David Gregory was approached by Steven Colon in an aggressive manner and an altercation ensued. During this altercation, Colon grabbed David's shirt and punched him in the chest. David became afraid he would be seriously hurt or killed and produced a small caliber pistol. David proceeded to shoot Colon once in the torso ending the altercation. Colon was transported to Sarasota Memorial Hospital where he succumbed to his would and died.**

**QUESTION: WHERE IS THE PROOF THAT THIS NARRATIVE BY DAVID GREGORY IS FACTUAL? WE ONLY HAVE DAVID GREGORY'S FALSE SELF SERVING SELF DEFENSE CLAIM. WHY WAS THIS NARRATIVE NOT CHALLENGED IN ANY MEANINGFUL WAY BY THE LEAD DETECTIVES IN THE CASE? NAMELY KING AND OJEDA. WHY DURING THE INTERVIEWS WITH DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND HIS WIFE AMY DID THESE DETECTIVES ACTIVELY ASSIST DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND AMY WITH THIS ESTABLISHING THIS FALSE SELF DEFENSE NARRATIVE THROUGH THEIR INTENTIONAL USE OF LEADING**

**QUESTIONS DURING THEIR “INTERVIEWS”?**

At 11:03 am Det. Ojeda stated that **Det. King and I conducted an interview with Amy Gregory...Amy gave an account of the incident and the events surrounding it. Following the interview, I was directed to take photographs of Amy Gregory...**

At 11:46 am Det. Ojeda stated that **Det. King and I conducted an interview with David Gregory...David gave an account of the incident and the events surrounding it. Following the interview, I was directed to take photographs of David Gregory...**

At 1:07 pm Det. Ojeda stated that **Det. King and I conducted an interview with the family of the decedent, Steven Colon. Steven Colon (father) and Paola Colon (mother) along with their two children, Isabella, and Juliet Colon. Due to technical equipment difficulties only the first few minutes were audio recorded.**

**QUESTION: WHY IS THIS INTERVIEW WITH THE FAMILY ON THE DAY OF THE SHOOTING NOT AVAILABLE? TECHNICAL DIFFICULTIES? WHY IS THIS THE ONLY INTERVIEW WHERE THE RECORDING WAS SUPPOSEDLY LOST? VERY ODD AND QUESTIONABLE TO SAY THE LEAST.**

**The family spoke about Steven’s mental history. They stated Steven had been diagnosed with Asperger syndrome. They stated he had always had issues in social settings and was very smart and hyper focused on things. They added Steven had therapy for most of his life until recently when he decided to take a more “holistic approach” on his own. Steven’s parents stated he had been using THC to self-medicate. Paola and Steven Sr. stated Steven was a very good athlete throughout his school career. They stated Steven enjoyed exercising and would often go on walks around the neighborhood. Paola and Steven Sr. said Steven and his grandparents with whom he lived, had been contacted about his working out at all hours of the night and early morning. He would play music and make loud noises disturbing the neighbors. Paola Colon said she had to have Steven move in with her parents to his current address when he began to get physical with her, shoving and pushing her. Paola stated her son had been staying with her parents for approximately 1.5-2 years now.**

**Steven’s oldest sister, Isabella, stated they had a very close relationship. Isabella said she had noticed Steven getting worse and more erratic in his behavior. When asked if Steven would ever get aggressive with others, she stated no. She said Steven preferred to be left alone to avoid conflict. Isabella said it was not in Steven’s nature to be aggressive towards others unless he was provoked. The family described Steven as getting increasingly paranoid.**

**Steven Sr. and Paola denied Steven would’ve been aggressive with anyone or fight. They stated he would rather shy away from confrontation.**

**QUESTION: IT IS RATHER INTERESTING THAT DET. OJEDA DOES NOT INCLUDE ANY INFORMATION IN HIS SUMMARY ABOUT THE FAMILY STATING THAT DAVID (THE SHOOTER) HAD BEEN THREATENING TO SHOOT STEVEN PAUL IN THE MONTHS, WEEKS AND DAYS LEADING UP TO THE SHOOTING. WHY WAS THAT EXCLUDED? IT IS ALSO RATHER INTERESTING THAT DETECTIVE OJEDA DOES NOT INCLUDE ANY INFORMATION ABOUT STATEMENTS MADE TO THE FAMILY BY HE AND DET. KING ABOUT THIS BEING A STAND YOUR GROUND CASE. LITERALLY, MOMENTS AFTER SPEAKING TO THE SHOOTER AND HIS WIFE AND ESSENTIALLY AIDING AND SUPPORTING THEM IN THEIR FALSE SELF DEFENSE CLAIM NARRATIVE.**

On 10/11/22-10/14/22 Det. Ojeda stated that he took sworn interview statements from each of the 4 Paramedics/Firefighters that responded to the scene and provided care to Steven Paul. Essentially the statements were blanket statements (as led by Det. Ojeda) by all 4 individuals that they each followed all "standard" protocols while on scene and during transport of Steven Paul to the hospital.

**QUESTION: WHY WAS THE QUESTIONING OF THE PARAMEDICS DONE IN SUCH A WAY AS TO ONLY OBTAIN REPEATED PRE-DETERMINED OUTCOMES OR STATEMENTS? DETECTIVE OJEDA ESSENTIALLY STATES TO EACH OF THE 4 PARAMEDICS, REPEAT AFTER ME DID YOU FOLLOW ALL "STANDARD" PROTOCOLS? YES, OF COURSE WE DID. HOWEVER, WHEN VIEWING THE PHOTOS OF THE CRIME SCENE, STEVEN PAUL IS SHOWN BEING CARRIED LIKE A "SACK OF POTATOES" BY SEVERAL INDIVIDUALS AND OFFICERS WITH A COMPLETE LACK ANY SORT OF BRACING, BACKBOARD OR SUPPORT OF ANY KIND. THIS, EVEN THOUGH THE EXTENT OF STEVEN PAUL'S INJURIES (BOTH INTERNAL AND TO HIS SPINE) WERE LIFE THREATENING.**

Investigative Supplement from Det. Patrick Bassett #1510-

At 7:44 am Det. Bassett was contacted by Sgt. J. Friday via text message to assist with the shooting investigation. Det. Bassett claims he was unaware of the text until 9:43 am. Det. Bassett finally arrived on scene at 10:14 am. Det. Bassett stated that after meeting with Sgt. Friday and other on scene personnel, he began to canvass the neighborhood, attempting to contact residents on Shoreland Dr. and Highland Rd.

**Det. Bassett made contact with Susan Marie Gordos at 19 Shoreland Dr. Ms. Gordos said she was not aware of the incident but was somewhat familiar with the involved parties. She said she had never seen any specific interactions between the involved parties but described Amy and David Gregory as nice friendly people. She also described Mr. Colon as being "on the spectrum". Ms. Gordos said she has seen them while she is out walking.**

**QUESTION: ONCE AGAIN, SUSAN MARIE GORDOS LIVED ON SHORELAND DRIVE. SHE DID NOT EVEN LIVE ANYWHERE CLOSE TO WHERE STEVEN PAUL LIVED. HOWEVER SHE DESCRIBED MR. COLON AS BEING "ON THE SPECTRUM?" SHE HAD NEVER MET**

**STEVEN PAUL, YET SHE MAKES SUCH A CLAIM? Where did SHE get this information? LIKELY, From David GREGORY (THE SHOOTER) as well? WHY WOULD SHE BE TOLD THIS BY DAVID (THE SHOOTER)? AGAIN, IT APPEARS THAT DAVID IS CONTINUING TO BUILD A CASE WITH ALL HIS NEIGHBORS FOR HIS FUTURE FALSE SELF DEFENSE CLAIM.**

**Det. Bassett made contact with Howard Lewis Well at 23 Shoreland Dr. Mr. Wells said he was aware of the incident but did not witness anything. He also said he was somewhat familiar with the involved parties. He said he had interacted with the Gregory's and they were a "nice old couple". He said he hadn't interacted with the other involved party (Steven Paul), but offered that hearsay indicated and or suggested he was "psychotic".**

**QUESTION: ONCE AGAIN, HOWARD LEWIS LIVED ON SHORELAND DRIVE. HE ALSO DID NOT EVEN LIVE ANYWHERE CLOSE TO WHERE STEVEN PAUL LIVED. HE HAD NEVER INTERACTED WITH STEVEN PAUL, BUT OFFERED HEARSAY THAT INDICATED AND OR SUGGESTED THAT STEVEN PAUL WAS "PSYCHOTIC"? HE HAD NEVER MET STEVEN PAUL, YET HE MAKES SUCH A CLAIM? ONCE AGAIN, Where did HE get this information? LIKELY, From David GREGORY (THE SHOOTER) as well? WHY WOULD HE BE TOLD THIS BY DAVID (THE SHOOTER)? AGAIN, IT APPEARS THAT DAVID IS CONTINUING TO BUILD A CASE WITH ALL HIS NEIGHBORS FOR HIS FUTURE FALSE SELF DEFENSE CLAIM.**

**Det. Bassett made contact with Svetlana Todorova Baiamonte and John Baiamonte at 46 Shoreland Dr. While Mrs. Baiamonte did hear some metal clanging around the time of the incident but did not witness anything. She also said she didn't have any other information to provide on the involved parties. Mr. Baiamonte did not have any direct witness account of the incident this morning but was somewhat familiar with the involved parties. He offered that Mr. Colon was "not with it".**

**QUESTION: ONCE AGAIN, THESE NEIGHBORS LIVED ON SHORELAND DRIVE. THEY ALSO DID NOT EVEN LIVE ANYWHERE CLOSE TO WHERE STEVEN PAUL LIVED. THEY HAD NEVER INTERACTED WITH STEVEN PAUL, BUT MR. BAIAMONTE OFFERED THAT MR. COLON WAS "NOT WITH IT"? HE HAD NEVER MET STEVEN PAUL, YET HE MAKES SUCH A CLAIM? ONCE AGAIN, Where did HE get this information? LIKELY, From David GREGORY (THE SHOOTER) as well? WHY WOULD HE BE TOLD THIS BY DAVID (THE SHOOTER)? AGAIN, IT APPEARS THAT DAVID IS CONTINUING TO BUILD A CASE WITH ALL HIS NEIGHBORS FOR HIS FUTURE FALSE SELF DEFENSE CLAIM.**

**Det. Bassett was contacted via phone by Mr. Hietalati of 1795 Highland Rd in reference to the Ring Camera at this residence. Mr. Hietalati advised that he had reviewed the information on his camera and that it didn't record any information during the time in question...He also advised that the camera did have audio, but that the audio didn't record unless it was tripped by motion first.**

**QUESTION: MANY TIMES NEIGHBORS DON'T WANT TO GET INVOLVED. REGARDLESS OF WHAT MR. HIETALATI CLAIMS, WHY WAS THERE NO SEARCH WARRANT EXECUTED**

TO RING.COM FOR ANY POTENTIAL VIDEO OR EVIDENCE CAUGHT ON CAMERA BY THIS DEVICE BY DET. KING?

Det. Bassett was contacted via phone by Steven Brownfield of 112 Shoreland Dr. He advised that he didn't witness the incident. He also said that anything he had to offer was hearsay. The hearsay he did offer was that many were fearful of Mr. Colon due to him being threatening, confrontational, and a nuisance. He described the Gregory's as the nicest people in the world.

ONCE AGAIN, THIS NEIGHBOR LIVED ON SHORELAND DRIVE. HE ALSO DID NOT EVEN LIVE ANYWHERE CLOSE TO WHERE STEVEN PAUL LIVED. HE HAD NEVER INTERACTED WITH STEVEN PAUL, AND STATED THAT ANYTHING HE HAD TO OFFER WAS HEARSAY. BUT HE THEN OFFERED HEARSAY THAT MANY WERE FEARFUL OF MR. COLON DUE TO HIM BEING THREATENING, CONFRONTATIONAL, AND A NUISANCE. HE HAD NEVER MET STEVEN PAUL AND HAD NEVER HAD ANY ENCOUNTERS WITH HIM, YET HE MAKES SUCH A CLAIM? ONCE AGAIN, *Where did HE get this information? LIKELY, From David GREGORY (THE SHOOTER) as well? WHY WOULD HE BE TOLD THIS BY DAVID (THE SHOOTER)? AGAIN, IT APPEARS THAT DAVID IS CONTINUING TO BUILD A CASE WITH ALL HIS NEIGHBORS FOR HIS FUTURE FALSE SELF DEFENSE CLAIM*

At 1:20 am Det. Bassett stated I transported the Gregory's back to their residence from Sheriff's Office Headquarters. I did notice that both were very upset about what occurred, as visible and expressed. David also was complaining about how sore his left arm was.

QUESTION: BOTH AMY AND DAVID CONTINUING THEIR ATTEMPTS TO DRAW SYMPATHY AFTER THEIR INTERVIEWS AT POLICE HEADQUARTER. WAS DAVID (THE SHOOTER) RIGHT HANDED OR LEFT HANDED? WHY WAS AN OBVIOUS BUT NECESSARY QUESTION, SUCH AS THIS, NEVER ONCE ASKED BY DET. KING OR DET. OJEDA DURING THE INTERVIEWS?

## Forensics/Crime Scene Reports Analysis

### Introduction:

The forensic and crime scene reports from the incident involving Steven Paul Colon's death present a series of procedural actions and narratives that raise critical questions regarding the initial investigative approach and the propagation of a biased narrative against Steven Paul. This analysis delves into these aspects, highlighting the inconsistencies and potential prejudices that may have influenced the investigation's direction from its onset.

### Analysis of Crime Scene and Forensic Reports:

Initial Crime Scene Response:

- CSA Lauren Wafer's report, noting her arrival and the briefing by Deputy Patella, introduces a prejudicial element early in the investigation. The emphasis on Steven Paul's alleged mental health issues and purported aggressive tendencies, as narrated by Deputy Patella, underscores a predisposed bias. The origin of this narrative, likely rooted in statements by Gary Osgood, sets a concerning precedent for investigative impartiality. The legal scrutiny must question the appropriateness of embedding such unverified character assessments into the crime scene evaluation, potentially tainting the objectivity required in a homicide investigation.

Discrepancies in Witness Narratives:

- The report's account of Gary Osgood's location and observations during the incident contradicts his own statement to Detective Vinopal, indicating significant discrepancies in the factual recounting of events. The physical impossibility of Osgood's witnessing the incident from his reported location demands a critical legal examination of the accuracy and reliability of initial witness statements and the investigatory reliance on these accounts.

Evidence Collection and Analysis:

- The discovery of a single cartridge case, alongside personal items of Steven Paul, without corresponding evidence of a second shot, directly contradicts multiple witness accounts of hearing two gunshots. This discrepancy raises profound questions regarding the handling and search for ballistic evidence. A thorough legal review should encompass the methodologies employed in the forensic examination, the completeness of the evidence collection, and the implications of missing evidence on the self-defense narrative.

Narrative Continuity and Investigative Bias:

- The consistent repetition of a narrative portraying Steven Paul as the aggressor, informed by initial statements to law enforcement and subsequently echoed in crime scene reports, illustrates a potentially prejudicial loop. This narrative, seemingly accepted without critical challenge, may have unduly influenced the investigative direction and the perception of Steven Paul's actions during the incident. Legal analysis must consider the impact of such narrative continuity on the investigation's impartiality and the resultant legal conclusions.

Forensic Interpretations and Conclusions:

- The interpretation of forensic findings, including the state and placement of evidence at the scene, must be reevaluated in light of the investigative biases highlighted. The legal examination should extend to the forensic methodologies applied, the interpretation of physical evidence in the context of the alleged altercation, and the potential for alternate scenarios that align with the objective evidence collected.

**Recommendations for Legal Actions and Reevaluation:**

Independent Forensic Review:

- An independent forensic review by external experts is imperative to assess the integrity and completeness of the evidence collection and analysis. This review should aim to identify any gaps or inconsistencies in the forensic methodology and evidence interpretation that may affect the case's understanding.

Investigative Process Scrutiny:

- A comprehensive legal scrutiny of the investigative process, focusing on the initial acceptance and propagation of a potentially biased narrative against Steven Paul, is essential. This scrutiny should examine the protocols for witness statement collection, the criteria for evidence prioritization, and the measures in place to ensure investigative impartiality.

Reevaluation of Legal Conclusions:

- The accumulated evidence, alongside identified investigative and forensic inconsistencies, necessitates a reevaluation of the legal conclusions drawn in the case. This reevaluation should critically assess the self-defense claim within the context of all available evidence, including a reassessment of witness credibility, the sequence of events leading to the shooting, and the potential for alternative interpretations of the incident.

## **Conclusion:**

The forensic and crime scene reports in the case of Steven Paul Colon's death reveal a complex interplay of evidence, witness narratives, and potential investigative biases. A detailed legal analysis underscores the need for a comprehensive reevaluation of the case, emphasizing the necessity for forensic integrity, investigative impartiality, and the critical examination of all narratives and evidence. Justice for Steven Paul Colon demands a transparent, objective, and thorough legal examination to ensure that all facets of the case are explored and evaluated with the utmost diligence and fairness.

## **Forensics/Crime Scene Reports**

Crime Scene Report Narrative from CSA Lauren Wafer #3126-

She responded to the scene at 8:41am and remained until 12:19pm. She stated that upon her arrival she was advised by Dep. Patella that he and Dep O'Brien discovered Steven Paul in the ditch near the Highland Rd and Westview Dr. intersection. They removed him from the ditch and began life saving measures until EMS arrived and took over. EMS continued for 20 minutes before leaving for Sarasota Memorial Hospital. At that time Steven Paul had a pulse.....She also was given the narrative from Dep. Patella that Steven Paul supposedly had mental health issues and had recently been known to have attempted to fight with residents of the neighborhood."

**QUESTION: WHY DID DEP. PATELLA FEEL THE NEED TO MENTION THAT STEVEN PAUL SUPPOSEDLY HAD MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES AND HAD BEEN "KNOWN" TO HAVE**

ATTEMPTED TO FIGHT WITH RESIDENTS OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD. HOW AND WHERE DID THIS NARRATIVE ORIGINATE SO EARLY IN THE INVESTIGATION? ONE WOULD HAVE TO INFER THAT THIS FALSE NARRATIVE WAS PROVIDED BY GARY OSGOOD AS HE WAS THE FIRST PERSON TO SPEAK TO DEP. PATELLA ONCE HE ARRIVED ON SCENE. GARY OSGOOD APPARENTLY WAS ALREADY CREATING THE FALSE BIASED NARRATIVE THAT STEVEN PAUL WAS NOT ONLY THE AGGRESSOR BUT THAT HE HAD SUPPOSEDLY FOUGHT WITH OTHERS AND WAS ALSO A PERSON WITH MENTAL PROBLEMS. NONE OF WHICH WAS VERIFIED AT ALL. WHY WAS THIS THE FALSE NARRATIVE FROM THOSE INVOLVED IN THE INFANCY STAGES OF THIS INVESTIGATION? WHY DID DEP. PATELLA REPEAT THIS FALSE UNPROVEN NARRATIVE THAT STEVEN PAUL HAVING MENTAL ISSUES AND BEING THE AGGRESSOR WITH EVERYONE WHO SHOWED UP TO THE CRIME SCENE AND WHO HE CAME IN CONTACT WITH DURING THIS INVESTIGATION? THIS FALSE NARRATIVE FED TO DEP. PATELLA BY GARY OSGOOD (WHO DID NOT PARTICULARLY CARE FOR STEVEN PAUL) AND SUBSEQUENTLY FED TO EACH AND EVERY PERSON INVOLVED WITH THIS INVESTIGATION WAS NEVER CHALLENGED IN ANY MEANINGFUL WAY AND CREATED A CONCERN FOR BIAS IN THIS INVESTIGATION AND TAINTED THE COLLECTIVE INVESTIGATIVE PROCESS. ALSO WHY DID GARY OSGOOD FEEL IT NECESSARY TO IMMEDIATELY BEGIN SHARING THIS FALSE NARRATIVE WITH OFFICERS AND INVESTIGATORS? WAS THERE ANY POSSIBILITY THAT GARY OSGOOD WAS INVOLVED OR KNEW THIS SHOOTING WAS GOING TO OCCUR AND WAS ASSISTING DAVID AND AMY GREGORY IN CREATING A FALSE NARRATIVE FOR SELF DEFENSE?

**Detective Vinopal advised the following three complainants:**

**Amy Gregory, David Gregory and Gary Osgood.**

**Deputy Patella advised that David and Amy Gregory had been out walking their dog early in the morning 9/24/22. Gary Osgood was inside his residence when he heard a verbal argument and a gunshot when he looked outside, he witnessed the decedent stumble into the ditch.**

QUESTION: WHY DID DEP. PATELLA ADVISE CSA WAFER THAT GARY OSGOOD WAS INSIDE HIS RESIDENCE WHEN HE HEARD A VERBAL ARGUMENT AND A GUNSHOT WHEN HE LOOKED OUTSIDE, HE WITNESSED THE DECEDENT STUMBLE INTO THE DITCH. EVERYTHING ABOUT THE STATEMENT FROM DEP. PATELLA IS SUSPECT AT BEST. SEEING HOW FAR AWAY GARY LIVED FROM THE SCENE OF THE SHOOTING AND THE FACT THAT HE LIVED IN A BACK ROW OF CONDOS BESIDES, IT IS SIMPLY NOT POSSIBLE THAT GARY COULD HAVE EITHER HEARD A VERBAL ARGUMENT OR SUBSEQUENTLY SEEN STEVEN PAUL STUMBLE INTO THE DITCH FROM HIS HOME. IN GARY OSGOOD'S OWN WITNESS STATEMENT TO DET. VINOPAL HE CLAIMS THAT HE WAS WALKING HIS DOGS ON WESTVIEW DR (NOT AT HOME), THAT HE HEARD 2 GUNSHOTS (NOT 1), THAT HE HEARD SOMEONE (DAVID GREGORY) YELL "MOTHERFUCKER" AND HE SAW SOMEONE (STEVEN PAUL) STUMBLE AND FALL. GARY OSGOOD CLAIMS THAT HE PASSED THE AREA BUT DID NOT SEE STEVEN PAUL IN THE

DITCH BECAUSE GARY CLAIMED THAT HE THOUGHT STEVEN PAUL HAD STUMBLED ON THE OPPOSITE SIDE (EAST SIDE) OF HIGHLAND RD. GARY ALSO CLAIMED THAT HE DID NOT KNOW WHERE STEVEN PAUL WAS, IN FACT, LOCATED WHEN HE FIRST CHECKED THE SCENE IN THE AREA WHERE THE SHOOTING HAD OCCURRED. HOW IS IT POSSIBLE THAT GARY OSGOOD DID NOT SEE NOR DID HIS 3 DOGS SENSE STEVEN PAUL IN THE DITCH ACCORDING TO HIS WITNESS STATEMENT TO DET. VINOPAL. WHY ARE DEP. PATELLA STATEMENTS TO CSA WAFER ABOUT GARY OSGOOD SO COMPLETELY DIFFERENT FROM GARY OSGOOD'S OWN STATEMENTS TO DETECTIVE VINOPAL DURING HER INTERVIEW WITH GARY HIMSELF?

On the west side of Highland Rd. near Westview Dr. in the street, I observed there to be a cartridge case, blood, a patch of grass and a baseball cap. In the ditch near the intersection of the roads, I observed there to be a pair of "slide" style sandals.

CSA Wafer photo-marked the areas of the crime scene as follows:

"A": Silver colored "Sig 380 auto" cartridge case

"B": Cluster of red-brown staining (swab, blood, collected)

"C": Black and white colored "Nike" slide sandals

"D": Cluster of grass, Black and white colored "Adidas" baseball-style hat

DISTANCE BETWEEN "A" (CARTRIDGE CASE) & "B" (BLOOD ON THE ROAD) AND ON THE WEST SIDE OF THE ROAD. WAS WALKING WITH SLIDES ON. NOT THE TYPE OF FOOTWEAR YOU WOULD TYPICALLY WEAR IF YOU ARE LOOKING FOR TROUBLE AND LOOKING FOR CONFRONTATION WITH OTHERS.

Dep. Patella indicated that the decedent was located in the ditch along the west side of Highland Rd., to the northeast corner of 19 Westview Dr. Upon removing him from the ditch, the area marked was where the decedent's head had been placed and the decedent's feet were toward the south.

Upon arrival at the secondary crime scene, CSA Wafer describes the following "I observed there to be a firearm of David Gregory and magazine which contained THREE silver colored "Sig 380 auto" cartridges. The magazine was on the table to the left of the firearm. The magazine is a 5-capacity magazine. I rendered the firearm "safe" and did not observe a cartridge in the chamber, nor did none eject from the chamber, when the slide was pulled back. I completed a visual and metal detector search for any additional cartridges on the lawn near the victim's residence, and a visual search in the surrounding concrete and pavement areas: all searches for additional cartridges yielded a negative result.

QUESTION- THREE SEPARATE WITNESSES (CLOSEST TO THE SHOOTING) STATED CLEARLY THAT THEY HEARD 2 GUNSHOTS. SO, IF THERE WERE 5 ROUNDS TO BEGIN

WITH (1 IN THE CHAMBER) OR 6 ROUNDS TO BEGIN WITH (1 IN THE CHAMBER) WHERE IS THE MISSING SPENT CARTRIDGE AND THE OTHER MISSING ROUND? WHAT DID DAVID GREGORY DO WITH THE MISSING SPENT CARTRIDGE AND MISSING ROUND AND WHY? DID DAVID GREGORY GET RID OF THE MISSING CARTRIDGE AND MISSING ROUND AFTER THE CRIME HAD BEEN COMMITTED? IT WOULD APPEAR TO BE INCREASINGLY MORE DIFFICULT TO CLAIM SELF DEFENSE WITH 2 SHOTS FIRED RATHER THAN 1. WAS THERE AN ATTEMPT TO GET RID OF THE MISSING CARTRIDGE(S) TO MAKE IT APPEAR THAT ONLY 1 SHOT HAD BEEN FIRED RATHER THAN 2?

After processing the crime scene, CSA Wafer stated the following: "Upon my arrival to the CSU Lab, I met with Det. King. He advised David Gregory was disabled and that the decedent had grabbed onto the front of his shirt in a threatening manner."

QUESTION- WITHOUT A SHRED OF DEFINITIVE PROOF, WHY IS THE SELF SERVING NARRATIVE FROM DAVID, THE SHOOTER, BEING DISCUSSED, AS FACT, WITH CSA WAFER AT THIS TIME IN THE INVESTIGATION BY DET. KING? ALSO WHAT RELEVANCE DOES THE FACT THAT DAVID GREGORY IS CLAIMING THAT HE IS ALLEGEDLY DISABLED HAVE AT THIS POINT IN THE CASE INVESTIGATION AND WHY DID DET. KING FEEL OBLIGATED TO SHARE THIS INFORMATION WITH CSA WAFER? THE APPARENTLY BIASED NARRATIVE FROM THE SHOOTER THAT STEVEN PAUL WAS THE AGGRESSOR AND NOT DAVID GREGORY HIMSELF WAS ALREADY IN PLAY FROM THE INITIAL BEGINNINGS OF THIS INVESTIGATION. WHY WAS THIS NARRATIVE NOT CHALLENGED IN ANY SUBSTANTIVE WAY BY DETECTIVE KING? IF THE SHOOTER SAYS STEVEN PAUL WAS THE AGGRESSOR, THEN APPARENTLY IT MUST BE TRUE, RIGHT? IT SHOWS IMMEDIATE BIAS IN THIS INVESTIGATION TOWARDS STEVEN PAUL AS THE AGGRESSOR, RATHER THAN DAVID GREGORY AS THE AGGRESSOR. IT IS VERY POSSIBLE THAT DAVID GREGORY WAS, IN FACT, THE AGGRESSOR AND NOT STEVEN PAUL AT ALL. WHY, WAS IT THE CASE THAT DEP. PATELLA, DET. VINOPAL DET. KING WERE SO CONVINCED, AT THE START OF THIS INVESTIGATION, THAT THERE WAS NO POSSIBILITY THAT DAVID GREGORY WAS THE AGGRESSOR AND THEY FED THIS NARRATIVE TO EVERYONE INVOLVED WITH THE CASE THAT CAME THEIR WAY?

Crime Scene Report Narrative from CSA Adrienne Walls #3075-

"The decedent's clothing was taken out of the wet packages and dried. The clothing included a gray hooded Adidas size L sweatshirt...gray Nike size L athletic shorts..., an empty earbuds case that was white in color and came from the left shorts pocket..."

QUESTION: STEVEN PAUL WOULD GENERALLY WALK WITH EARBUDS, WOULD LIKELY INDICATE HE WOULD BE LISTENING TO MUSIC AND NOT LOOKING FOR A CONFRONTATION. IS IT POSSIBLE THAT STEVEN PAUL TURNED AROUND ON WESTVIEW DR. ONCE/WHEN HE REALIZED HIS EARBUDS WERE MISSING FROM THE CASE AND HE WAS ATTEMPTING TO GO BACK HOME TO RETRIEVE THEM BEFORE

**BEING CONFRONTED BY DAVID AND AMY GREGORY?**

Crime Scene Report Narrative from CSA Candace Matthews #3041-

Upon her arrival on scene at 9:13 am, she met CSA Wafer, Dep. Patella ID 2426, and Det. Vinopal ID 3085. I was advised Steven Colon...had died.

**She also was given the following narrative from Dep. Patella and Det. Vinopal:** "I was further advised he (Steven Paul) had approached David and Amy Gregory while they were on a walk, an altercation occurred, and David Gregory shot Steven Colon. Steven Colon was reported to be the aggressor and he had previously started altercations with David and Amy Gregory."

**QUESTION- WHY WAS THE NARRATIVE FROM GARY OSGOOD (AS PROVIDED TO DET. VINOPAL AND DEP. PATELLA) THAT STEVEN PAUL WAS THE SUPPOSED "AGGRESSOR", THAT THERE WAS AN "ALTERCATION" PRIOR TO THE SHOOTING, THAT STEVEN PAUL HAD PREVIOUSLY STARTED ALTERCATIONS WITH DAVID AND AMY GREGORY THE NARRATIVE FROM THE MINUTE THE INVESTIGATION BEGAN. WHY WAS THIS NARRATIVE NOT CHALLENGED IN ANY WAY? IT WOULD SEEM THAT THIS NARRATIVE BEING REPEATED OVER AND OVER AGAIN TO EACH AND EVERY PERSON INVESTIGATING THIS CRIME CREATED A POTENTIAL FOR INVESTIGATIVE BIAS AND SET THE COURSE FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE INVESTIGATION. IF GARY OSGOOD TELLS DEP. PATELLA AND DET. VINOPAL THAT STEVEN PAUL WAS THE AGGRESSOR (EVEN THOUGH IN HIS INTERVIEW GARY OSGOOD NEVER STATES THAT HE ACTUALLY SAW ANY ALTERCATION, THE SHOOTING OR THE SHOOTER. APPARENTLY, HE HEARD TWO GUNSHOTS, HE ONLY SAW STEVEN PAUL STUMBLE AND FALL AND THEN HE HEARD DAVID GREGORY YELL MOTHERFUCKER). APPARENTLY SINCE DET. VINOPAL AND DEP. PATELLA HEARD IT FROM GARY OSGOOD, THEN STEVEN PAUL MUST HAVE BEEN THE AGGRESSOR RIGHT? IT SHOWS IMMEDIATE BIAS IN THIS INVESTIGATION TOWARDS STEVEN PAUL AS THE AGGRESSOR, RATHER THAN DAVID GREGORY AS THE AGGRESSOR. IT IS VERY POSSIBLE THAT DAVID GREGORY WAS, IN FACT, THE AGGRESSOR AND NOT STEVEN PAUL AT ALL. WHY, WAS IT THE CASE THAT DEP. PATELLA, DET. VINOPAL DET. KING WERE SO CONVINCED, AT THE START OF THIS INVESTIGATION, THAT THERE WAS NO POSSIBILITY THAT DAVID GREGORY WAS THE AGGRESSOR AND THEY FED THIS NARRATIVE TO EVERYONE INVOLVED WITH THE CASE THAT CAME THEIR WAY?**

# **Medical Examiner Report Analysis**

## **Introduction:**

The Medical Examiner's report on Steven Paul Colon's death, resulting from a gunshot wound, provides critical forensic evidence that directly challenges the narrative posited by the shooter, David Gregory. This analysis scrutinizes the autopsy findings in the context of the claimed self-defense shooting, juxtaposing them against the alleged circumstances and evaluating their implications for the legal proceedings.

### **Analysis of Autopsy Findings:**

#### **Gunshot Wound Characteristics:**

- The absence of soot deposition, gunpowder stippling, or a muzzle stamp around the entrance wound starkly contradicts the assertion of a close-range defensive shooting. Forensic evidence suggesting a distance of over four feet between Gregory and Colon at the time of the shooting undermines the narrative of an immediate physical threat necessitating the use of lethal force.

#### **Trajectory and Wound Path:**

- The bullet's path, traveling from right to left and in a downward angle, suggests that Colon was not facing Gregory in a manner consistent with an aggressive confrontation. This trajectory might indicate Colon was turning away or not directly engaging Gregory, challenging the portrayal of Colon as the aggressor.

#### **Toxicology Results:**

- The clean toxicology report, with the exception of a presumptive positive for cannabinoids, dispels any insinuations of drug-induced aggressive behavior by Colon. The typical relaxant effects of cannabis further detract from the aggressor narrative constructed by the shooter.

### **Concerns Raised in Herm Colon's Letter:**

#### **Mischaracterization of Mental Health Status:**

- Herm Colon's denial of providing information regarding Steven Paul's schizophrenia highlights a critical issue of misinformation or miscommunication within the investigation. The inclusion of unverified mental health claims in the autopsy report, without substantial evidence, may have biased the investigation and the public perception of the victim.

#### **Discrepancies in Narrative Accounts:**

- The letter addresses significant inconsistencies between the narratives provided to the Medical Examiner by law enforcement and the known facts of the case. The reliance on Detective Vinopal's account, which appears to align closely with the shooter's version of events, necessitates a reevaluation of the information sources and their impact on the investigative conclusions.

## **Recommendations for Legal Actions and Re-evaluation:**

### **Independent Review of Autopsy Findings:**

- An independent forensic analysis should be conducted to reassess the autopsy findings, particularly focusing on the gunshot wound's characteristics and trajectory. This review should aim to establish a more accurate representation of the shooting dynamics, free from the initial investigative biases.

### **Clarification and Correction of Medical Records:**

- The Medical Examiner's office should be urged to review and, if necessary, correct the case summary to accurately reflect verified information regarding Steven Paul Colon's mental health status and the circumstances surrounding his death. This includes addressing the concerns raised in Herm Colon's letter regarding the portrayal of events and the inclusion of unsubstantiated claims.

### **Legal Scrutiny of Investigative and Forensic Processes:**

- The legal system must critically examine the processes by which forensic evidence was interpreted and the extent to which it influenced the overall investigation. This scrutiny should extend to evaluating the sources of the narratives included in the Medical Examiner's report and their alignment with the objective evidence.

## **Conclusion:**

The autopsy report and subsequent analysis reveal discrepancies and biases that significantly impact the legal understanding of Steven Paul Colon's death. The evidence challenges the narrative of self-defense provided by the shooter, suggesting that the circumstances of the shooting may not have been accurately represented. A comprehensive legal review, informed by forensic expertise and an unbiased examination of all available evidence, is imperative to ensure justice and accountability in this case.

## **Medical Examiner Report**

### **REPORT OF AUTOPSY-**

Gunshot wound of the abdomen

" The entrance wound is in the right superior aspect of the abdomen, 49 inches superior to the right heel and 2 ½ inches to the left of the midline, inferior to the costal margin. **The wound is a**

1/2 inch in diameter round perforation. The surrounding skin has no soot deposition, gunpowder stippling, or muzzle stamp.”

QUESTION- IF THE NARRATIVE OF THE SHOOTER WAS THAT HE WAS BEING ATTACKED AND SHOT, IN DEFENSE, AT CLOSE RANGE, WHY WAS THERE ABSOLUTELY NO SOOT DEPOSITION, GUNPOWDER STIPPLING OR A MUZZLE STAMP ON THE ENTRANCE WOUND? THESE FORENSICS WOULD INDICATE THERE WAS OVER 4 FOOT OF DISTANCE BETWEEN DAVID GREGORY (THE SHOOTER) AND STEVEN PAUL (THE VICTIM). STEVEN PAUL WAS NOT SHOT AT CLOSE RANGE. THE FORENSICS TELL A COMPLETELY DIFFERENT STORY.

“ The wound perforates the superior right aspect of the abdomen, perforating the inferior anterior margin of the right lobe of the liver, and the gallbladder, then perforates the curvature of the duodenum and the head of the pancreas. The path crosses the midline, enters the retroperitoneal soft tissues, fractures the left lateral aspect of the 4<sup>th</sup> lumbar vertebra, and ends within the left retroperitoneal soft tissues including the iliopsoas muscle. There is no exit wound. The direction of the wound path, with respect to the standard anatomic position, is from anterior to posterior, right to left, and slightly superior to inferior.”

QUESTION- IF THE NARRATIVE OF THE SHOOTER WAS THAT HE WAS BEING ATTACKED AND SHOT IN DEFENSE AT CLOSE RANGE WHY WAS THERE NO EXIT WOUND? IF THE SHOOTING HAD OCCURRED AT SUCH CLOSE RANGE THERE MOST CERTAINLY WOULD HAVE BEEN AN EXIT WOUND. ALSO WHY WAS THE ENTRANCE PATH OF THE BULLET COMING IN AT SUCH AN ANGLE FROM THE ENTRANCE AT THE ABDOMEN, TRAVELING FROM RIGHT TO LEFT AND AT A DOWNWARD ANGLE, AS WELL, ENDING AT THE LEFT HIP? WOULD INDICATE THAT DAVID GREGORY (THE SHOOTER) WAS RIGHT HANDED AND SHOT AT STEVEN PAUL (THE VICTIM) AS STEVEN PAUL WAS TURNED AT AN ANGLE AWAY FROM HIS WEAPON. POSSIBLY STEVEN PAUL WAS TURNING TO LEAVE AS HE WAS TRYING TO AVOID DAVID GREGORY BEFORE BEING SHOT.

#### TOXICOLOGY TESTING RESULTS-

Immunoassay Drug Screen

Amphetamines, barbiturates, benzodiazepines, cocaine metabolite, methadone metabolite, opiates- none detected

Cannabinoids- presumptive positive

STEVEN PAUL'S TOXICOLOGY REPORT WAS CLEAN. HE HAD ABSOLUTELY NO DRUGS IN HIS SYSTEM OTHER THAN POSSIBLY CANNABIS. HOWEVER, EVEN IF THAT WERE TO BE THE CASE, MOST UNDERSTAND THAT CANNABIS HAS A RELAXANT EFFECT ON A PERSON WITH MOST CERTAINLY A DELAYED REACTION AND NOT A STIMULANT EFFECT. TOXICOLOGY REPORT COUNTERS THE FALSE NARRATIVE THAT STEVEN PAUL WAS USING STIMULANT DRUGS THAT WOULD HAVE CAUSED AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOR THE MORNING OF THE SHOOTING. SIMPLY NOT TRUE.

*PLEASE REFER TO THE LETTER BELOW WRITTEN TO MICHAEL A. ROGERS ON 2/8/2023 INDICATING NUMEROUS ADDITIONAL CONCERNS WITHIN THE MEDICAL EXAMINER REPORT. IN ADDITION, HERM COLON WAS SPECIFICALLY TOLD BY MICHAEL ROGERS VIA PHONE THAT HE WOULD INCLUDE THIS LETTER AS AN ADDENDUM TO HIS REPORT. IN A SUBSEQUENT FOLLOW UP CALL TO MICHAEL ROGERS FROM HERM COLON REQUESTING AN UPDATED COPY OF THE MEDICAL EXAMINER REPORT WITH THIS LETTER ATTACHED AS AN ADDENDUM, MICHAEL ROGERS SUBSEQUENTLY DENIED THAT HE HAD, IN FACT, HAD MADE SUCH A STATEMENT TO HERM COLON. WHILE IT IS POSSIBLE THAT MICHAEL ROGERS MAY HAVE MISREMEMBERED HIS INITIAL STATEMENT, HERM COLON IS EMPHATIC THAT THE STATEMENT OF DENIAL BY MICHAEL ROGERS THAT HE WOULD INCLUDE THE LETTER AS AN ADDENDUM, IS CATEGORICALLY FALSE.*

2/8/2023

Michael A Rogers

District Twelve Medical Examiner

2001 Siesta Drive, Suite 302

Sarasota FL 34239

Re: Case Summary (Steven Colon- Case #22-01935)

Mr. Rogers,

Please be advised that I am in receipt of your case summary provided to me on 12/19/2022 on the above referenced case regarding my nephew Steven Colon. First and foremost, I would like to thank your office for providing this to me.

After having had an opportunity to completely read and review your case summary, I wanted to take the opportunity to address what I feel are a couple of inconsistencies within the summary itself.

First and foremost, I would like to address the first issue as it relates to the following statement you made in the final paragraph of your report. As such, in the final paragraph of your case summary, you made the following statement:

"On September 26, 2022, at 1340 hours, I was contacted by the decedent's uncle, Herman Colon, who was speaking on behalf of the decedent's father, Steven Colon, who was too emotional to speak to me, and discussed the District Twelve Medical Examiner's involvement. Mr. Colon advised his nephew suffered from schizophrenia and was not sure if he was taking any medication. I informed Mr. Colon that his nephew died from complications from a gunshot wound of the abdomen. I informed Mr. Colon to contact the Sarasota County Sheriff's Office for additional details pertaining to the preliminary autopsy results."

Please know that I categorically deny having made any such statement or advising that my nephew suffered from schizophrenia as I did not know that to be, in fact, the case nor am I in any position whatsoever to opine as to any medical condition my nephew may or may not, in fact, have had. Neither then, nor at any time since, was I in a position to know of or opine on Steven's psychological condition. In fact, no information has come to light since his death to confirm that statement you made in your summary. It appears you must have mischaracterized the contents of our conversation as, in fact, I could not nor would not be in any such position to make such a definitive statement. Yes, I do agree that I was not sure if he was taking any medication but I will also agree that I was in no position to know if, in fact, he actually needed such. Again, because I am in no position to know that. In fact, it is my understanding that my nephew's toxicology reports came back absolutely clean which to me would indicate just that. Nothing more and nothing less. Without having that knowledge, for me to infer anything regarding medications or the need for medications would be completely reckless. For your summary to include this alleged hearsay as part of your findings without any confirmation of the same is also quite concerning to me as well.

In addition to addressing the first issue mentioned above, I also would like to address a second issue as it relates to the following statement you made in the third paragraph of your report. As such, in the third paragraph of your case summary, you made the following statement:

"Detective Vinopal further related that the decedent, who lives in the neighborhood, allegedly accosted and attacked a married couple who were going for a walk in the neighborhood. The male was carrying a Diamondback Firearms .380 caliber semiautomatic handgun for personal protection. When the decedent attacked the male, he drew his gun and shot him one time in the abdomen. The couple called 911 and returned to their home where he secured the weapon, then returned to the scene to wait for the arrival of the Sarasota County Sheriff's Office."

To say that your characterization or that of Detective Vinopal of what actually transpired during the shooting of my nephew who, in fact, was completely defenseless is riddled with inconsistencies and potential mistruths is an understatement to say the least. I am not sure if Detective Vinopal's statements as they were related to you is speaking on her own behalf, speaking on the behalf of other officers/first responders who were actually on the scene or speaking on the behalf of the individual(s)/perpetrator(s) that shot my nephew. However, based on review of the actual police incident reports from that day; the above scenario, in many aspects, seems highly unlikely. In fact, it is clearly unlikely this scenario played out due to the fact that the first arriving officer indicated in their police report that the assailant was not present. Also there were further corroborating reports made as to the police on scene having to first search for the assailant and then, in fact, after locating the assailant at his home, demanding he get on the ground and finally making a formal arrest there. Not at the scene. Why you would choose to include the narrative of Detective Vinopal as described to you as your sole source, when it is not known in what capacity or on whose behalf Detective Vinopal is speaking and also

when at the time of this summary, additional police reporting was also available to you to question the accuracy of Detective Vinopal's initial statements is extremely concerning to say the least. Again, the likelihood of the scenario that Detective Vinopal related to you actually having played out in the manner in which you describe in your case summary seems highly unlikely.

At this point, I would respectfully ask for the sake of full reporting, completeness and accuracy of your case summary, that it include that there was a lack of information by medical or family history any veracity to a notion of schizophrenia. And further, clarification of Detective Vinopal's narrative to include additional police reporting after investigation that was contrary or inconsistent with Detective Vinopal's narrative. We believe this is important because it appears that the initial accusatory narrative could only have been obtained from the self-serving statements of the shooter. We feel this clarification is also important because we have reason to believe, based on additional information as well, that it also very plausible that this shooting could very well have, in fact, been a premeditated act on the part of the shooter in complete juxtaposition to the narrative as described by Detective Vinopal. I respectfully ask that your case summary be corrected to reflect this letter or at the very least I would ask that this letter be added to your report as an addendum.

By the way, I am attaching a photograph of my nephew, Steven Paul Colon, as a reminder to you and to everyone reading this letter that his life mattered. Let's not forget about or lose sight of the fact that a life was needlessly taken here. A beautiful life.

I await your response.

Thank you, in advance, for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Herm Colon



# Police Investigation Files Analysis

## Introduction:

The investigation into the shooting incident involving David Gregory and Steven Paul Colon reveals significant issues with the collection and examination of key evidence. This document analyzes the actions taken regarding the subpoena for Ring.com video/audio records and the subpoenas for David Gregory's medical records, evaluating their impact on the integrity of the investigation.

## Subpoena for Ring Camera Data:

### **Missed Opportunity for Critical Evidence Collection:**

- The necessity for a search warrant, as outlined by Ring.com's response to the subpoena request, posed a challenge not effectively met by Detective Meghan Vinopal and Detective King. Their apparent inaction in not securing a search warrant or even requesting the preservation of the footage marks a significant oversight. This evidence could have been crucial in providing an unbiased account of the events before, during, and after the incident, potentially clarifying conflicting witness statements and the narrative presented by the shooter.

### **Implications for Investigative Integrity:**

- The failure to secure video and audio evidence raises concerns about the thoroughness of the investigation and suggests a potential negligence in preserving key evidence. This lapse may have critically hindered the quest for a comprehensive understanding of the incident, leaving pivotal insights into the event unexplored.

## David Gregory's Medical Records Subpoena:

### **Discrepancies and Absence of Disability Evidence:**

- Subpoenas issued for David Gregory's medical records were intended to verify his claims of a severe disability. The absence of medical consultations or treatments from 2014 up to the shooting starkly contradicts Gregory's claims of a debilitating condition. This inconsistency questions the legitimacy of Gregory's portrayal of his physical state at the time of the incident and his claimed need for using lethal force.

### **Relevance and Investigation of Medical History:**

- The investigation's focus on an orthopedic specialist's records and the absence of relevant neurospinal records, alongside the irrelevant inclusion of dental records, might reflect an investigative misstep. The emphasis on dental records, in particular, appears disconnected from the case's core issues.

## **Recommendations for Investigative Review and Actions:**

### **Independent Evaluation of Investigative Practices:**

- An independent evaluation should be conducted to determine whether the investigation adhered to expected standards in evidence collection, especially regarding the lack of any serious attempt at obtaining a warrant to obtain Ring camera footage and the proper documentation of Gregory's claimed disability.

### **Reassessment of the Case Based on Evidence Gaps:**

- The evident gaps in securing Ring camera footage and the unverified claims of Gregory's disability necessitate a reassessment of the case. This reassessment should contemplate the effect of these evidence gaps on the interpretation of events and the validity of the self-defense claim.

### **Scrutiny of Gregory's Disability Claims:**

- The discrepancies in Gregory's medical history and the investigation's failure to corroborate his disability claims require careful scrutiny. This scrutiny should explore how these inconsistencies affect Gregory's defense credibility and consider if other motives or capacities could have influenced the incident.

## **Conclusion:**

The approach to subpoenas for Ring camera data and David Gregory's medical records highlights critical concerns regarding the investigation's comprehensiveness and objectivity into the death of Steven Paul Colon. The lack of effort to secure vital video and audio evidence, along with the unquestioned acceptance of Gregory's disability claims without adequate medical evidence, calls for a thorough review. Ensuring all relevant evidence is considered is essential for the pursuit of justice with integrity and diligence.

## **Ring Camera Subpoena**

On 10/4/22, a subpoena was issued to Ring.com for the video and audio records for a Ring Doorbell Video device located at the entrance door of Kelsie Lloyd located at 1845 Highland Rd, Osprey FL (home is directly in front of where the shooting occurred and where the forensics team located one of the shell casings along with drops of blood on the road). The subpoena requested video and audio records for the date of the shooting as well as both the day before and after the shooting. Ring.com responded on 10/5/22, via e-mail to Detective Meghan Vinopal citing case law that the subpoena was not in and of itself sufficient, solely as the means to request the video and audio records. Ring.com indicated that in order to provide the requested video and audio content, Ring.com must first receive a search warrant. Ring.com also indicated that the sheriff's office could additionally send a preservation request to Ring.com for any/all

video and audio content be preserved while the appropriate warrant and legal process is pursued.

*QUESTIONS- DET. VINOPAL ADVISED DET. KING VIA EMAIL THAT A SEARCH WARRANT WAS REQUIRED AND WAS BEING REQUESTED BY RING.COM TO OBTAIN THE VIDEO AND AUDIO RECORDS. DET. KING WAS ALSO ADVISED PER THE LETTER FROM RING.COM THAT HE COULD SIMPLY REQUEST THAT RING.COM PRESERVE ANY/ALL VIDEO AND AUDIO RECORDS WHILE THE SEARCH WARRANT PROCESS WAS PURSUED. APPARENTLY, IT APPEARS THAT DET. KING AND DET. VINOPAL DID NEITHER? APPARENTLY NEITHER DET. KING NOR DET. VINOPAL TOOK ACTION TO REQUEST THE RETENTION OF ANY/ALL VIDEO AND AUDIO RECORDS BY RING.COM NOR DID THEY PURSUE A SEARCH WARRANT. IF VIDEO AND AUDIO ARE CRITICAL ELEMENTS TO ANY CASE SUCH AS THIS, WHY IS IT THAT NEITHER DET. KING NOR DET. VINOPAL PURSUED THIS WHEN REQUESTED TO DO SO BY RING.COM? IF NOT DONE, IT WOULD SEEM TO BE MALFEASANCE ON THE PART OF BOTH DETECTIVES.*

#### **David Gregory Medical Records Subpoena**

On 10/21/22, multiple subpoenas were issued for medical records (for the period of 1/2017 thru 10/20/2022) from the following physicians of the shooter David Gregory:

Dr. Brian Schofield, MD, Schofield

Schofield, Hand & Bright Orthopedics

Sarasota FL

*QUESTIONS: NO MEDICAL RECORDS WERE FOUND DURING THE INITIAL DATE RANGE PROVIDED. THE FIRST SUBPOENA RESPONSE INDICATED NO VISITS BETWEEN 1/2017 AND 10/2022. A SUBSEQUENT SECOND SUBPOENA WAS ISSUED TO DR. SCHOFIELD EXPANDING THE DATE RANGE TO INCLUDE 1/2012 TO 12/13/2022. MEDICAL RECORDS INDICATED SOME SORT OF MRI COMPLETED ON 10/2014 AND 11/2014. QUESTION: IF DAVID GREGORY WAS CURRENTLY CLAIMING SUCH A SEVERE DISABILITY WITH CURRENT EXCRUCIATING PAIN, WHY NO VISITS SINCE 2014? ALSO, WHY WAS IT THAT DAVID GREGORY HAD BEEN TURNED DOWN AND DENIED DISABILITY BENEFITS MULTIPLE TIMES?*

Dr. Michael A King

Neuro Spinal Associates

Bradenton FL

No medical records were provided during the date range provided.

***QUESTION: IF DAVID GREGORY WAS CURRENTLY CLAIMING SUCH A SEVERE DISABILITY WITH CURRENT EXCRUCIATING PAIN, WHY NO MEDICAL RECORDS?***

Dr. Scott Middleton, DMD

Middleton Oral Surgery

Sarasota FL

MEDICAL RECORDS WERE PROVIDED AND SHOWED SOME TYPE OF ORAL WORK PERFORMED ON 7/27/21. OVER A YEAR BEFORE THE SHOOTING. ALSO DENTAL RECORDS ARE ESSENTIALLY IRRELEVANT TO THIS CASE.

# Analysis of Witnesses and Neighborhood Interviews

## Introduction:

This analysis delves into the intricate details surrounding the shooting of Steven Paul Colon by David Gregory, highlighting significant investigative oversights and biases. Given the substantial evidence from witness interviews and neighborhood canvasses, there's a strong basis for the State Attorney, Karen Fraivillig, to reopen the case. This report meticulously examines the inconsistencies, potential prejudices, and overlooked evidence that call into question the initial ruling of the shooting as a justified act of self-defense under Florida's "stand your ground" law.

## Investigative Oversights and Delays:

- Interview Delay with Dayna Purcell: The investigation's first major flaw is the significant delay in interviewing Dayna Purcell, who lived near the incident site. Her testimony, which notably mentions hearing two gunshots, was only obtained a month after the event. This delay raises questions about the thoroughness of the investigative process and the potential loss of crucial immediate reactions and observations.
- Multiple Gunshots: Purcell's account, corroborated by Gary Osgood and Sherry Pazzanese, indicating two gunshots, directly challenges Gregory's single-shot self-defense narrative. The investigation failed to pursue the implications of multiple shots, which could indicate excessive force or a second intention beyond self-defense.

## Character Assassination and Reliance on Hearsay:

- Dependence on Neighborhood Hearsay: The investigation heavily relied on hearsay, especially regarding Steven Paul's mental health and behavior. This approach seems to have unfairly biased the investigation against Steven Paul from the outset, undermining the neutrality required in such cases.
- Unverified Narratives: Narratives painting Steven Paul in a negative light were accepted without substantial evidence, primarily based on accounts from individuals with known biases against him. This uncritical acceptance of character assassination may have colored the investigation's findings.

## Overlooked Evidence and Precedents:

- Prior Threats and Hostility: The investigation inadequately addressed Gregory's previously expressed threats towards Steven Paul, including a specific threat to harm him, which was known among the neighbors. This critical oversight neglects a potential premeditated motive behind the shooting, contrary to the self-defense claim.

- Absence of Confrontation: Witness accounts describe an absence of verbal or physical confrontation before the shots were fired. This contradicts the narrative of self-defense and suggests that the shooting may not have been a necessary response to an immediate threat.

### **Investigative Biases and Narrow Focus:**

- Failure to Explore Gregory's Motive: The investigation's focus seemed narrowly confined to substantiating Gregory's self-defense claim, without adequately considering alternative motives or the history of animosity between Gregory and Steven Paul. This one-sided approach neglected the exploration of a potentially premeditated action by Gregory.
- Discrepancies in Witnesses' Observations: Witnesses did not observe any aggressive behavior from Steven Paul immediately before the shooting, nor did they report any interaction that could justify a fear for personal safety on Gregory's part. These observations are critical in assessing the validity of the self-defense claim.

### **Conclusion and Recommendations:**

The collective evidence, marked by investigative delays, reliance on biased hearsay, overlooked motives, and contradictions in the self-defense narrative, presents a compelling case for reevaluation. These findings suggest that the initial investigation may have been influenced by biases and did not fully explore all possible motives and actions leading to the tragic shooting of Steven Paul Colon.

### **Call to Action:**

Given the detailed examination of witness accounts and the critical analysis of the investigative process, it is imperative for State Attorney Karen Fraivillig to reconsider the initial findings. A comprehensive reevaluation of the case, considering all evidence and testimonies, is necessary to ensure justice for Steven Paul Colon. This case demands a thorough and unbiased examination to ascertain the true nature of the incident and to hold those accountable to the fullest extent of the law.

## Dayna Purcell Interview

10/28/22 at 2:00 pm- Dayna Purcell neighbor at 1855 Highland Rd, Osprey

QUESTION: THIS INTERVIEW DID NOT OCCUR UNTIL OVER A MONTH AFTER THE SHOOTING. WHY DID IT TAKE SO LONG FOR DET. KING TO INTERVIEW THIS KEY WITNESS?

Interviewed by Det. Nathan King #2399

Dayna Purcell stated the following:

Um, so, Saturday morning I had just gotten up. Was literally standing right here at the door and I was bent down putting the leash on the dog and I heard two gunshots. And I looked up out the window at the top of the door and I saw Amy and David Gregory, they were almost like right on that side of the driveway so they were—they were walking towards the bottom of my driveway. And, um, David was looking over his shoulder and so I opened the door and David told me to call the police.

QUESTION: *DAYNA PURCELL WAS ONE OF THE KEY WITNESSES LOCATED CLOSEST TO THE SHOOTING. SHE HEARD 2 GUNSHOTS. NOT ONE. SHE IS THE FIRST OF THREE KEY WITNESSES THAT HEARD 2 GUNSHOTS. IT IS DEFINITIVELY MORE DIFFICULT TO FALSELY CLAIM SELF DEFENSE WHEN YOU FIRE TWICE VERSUS ONLY ONCE. WHAT DID DAVID DO WITH THE SECOND MISSING SPENT CARTRIDGE THAT HAD BEEN FIRED AT STEVEN PAUL AND ALSO THE SUBSEQUENT ROUND IN THE CHAMBER AFTER THE SHOOTING? ALSO, DURING HER INITIAL CALL TO 911, DAYNA ONLY MENTIONS SEEING "ONE OF MY NEIGHBORS WALKING DOWN THE ROAD WITH HIS DOG" REFERRING TO DAVID, THE SHOOTER. NO MENTION OF THE WIFE BEING PRESENT WAS MADE DURING HER INITIAL 911 CALL. WHY AND WHAT VERSION IS CORRECT?*

So, I closed the door. I came inside. I called 911 and then that was it. I had no idea that—I didn't know what had happened, you know what I mean.

I didn't see the other guy (Steven Colon). Um, so that's the gist of it.

It was probably like 7:15 maybe.

Det. King- Okay. And when you heard the two shots and you—so within a few seconds David tells you—to call and then you immediately called—911—okay. So I'm just trying to get the time that you called 911. It was about the same time that you were told to call?

Yeah

Det. King- All right. So, when you seen them two walking, uh, they were walking towards that Shoreland?

Yeah

Det. King- what—was he calm, was he—what was his demeanor as far as what you-

Yeah, I mean, he picked up his dog and like I said, just was walking that way and just like I said, I saw him look over his shoulder.

Det. King- Like down the street?

Uh-huh. Well, back

Det. King- Back over

--In that direction.

Det. King- How fast or slow were they walking?

Uh, at a—I mean, at a good rate. It wasn't slow.

Det. King- Okay. Did you, uh did you have any indication that he was involved in something or?

No, I mean my initial thought, like I heard gunshots, I didn't see anyone else, so I was concerned for them. I thought, you know what I mean, something had happened to them.

Det. King- Did you see David with anything in his hands?

No.

His Dog

Det. King- Was he carrying it?

Uh-huh.

Det. King- Okay. Uh, what about Amy, you see anything?

And she had her dog—the other dog on the leash and they were just walking that way.

Det. King- Did you know David and Amy prior to that?

Yes.

Det. King- You ever speak to them?

All the time.

You know? I knew that David carried a gun. Um--

Det. King- How would you know that?

He (David) kinda—like when we first moved into the neighborhood, my son was seven at the time and, um, I remember asking him if it was like a safe neighborhood. And he kinda like one of these, like well, you're safe with me around.

Det. King- So he's pretty open about –that he carried?

Yeah

Det. King- Um, did you know Steven Colon?

No.

I had never seen him until literally the night before

Det. King- The night before the shooting?

Yeah

Um, it was probably—probably about 8, 8:30 that night, the night before and we don't- there's no streetlights on this street and I was walking and I was down in the back of the neighborhood over near Shoreland Park and in the stretch it's like really completely—it's like pitch black.

And, we passed each other on the street and was like he just kinda came out of the darkness 'cause it was so black. It was so dark out so he just passed me and, you know, I said "oh, hi" like—'cause I thought it was a neighbor. And, um, he didn't say anything. He had a hood on. And I—he—to be honest, he like kinda sketched me out 'cause we- you know, we all look—all of us know each other around here. And so I just like looked back and I was like who is that, you know what I mean. And then just came home.

Det. King- No response from him (Steven)?

No response

Det. King- What time was that?

Un, it was probably about 8:30

Det. King- Um, so you never—he never said anything, did it seem like he was, uh, had like music going when you—when you passed him that night?

I have—honestly no idea.

QUESTION: STEVEN PAUL WAS WALKING AT 8:30 AT NIGHT AND HE DIDN'T SAY ANYTHING IN PASSING HIS NEIGHBOR. SO WHAT EXACTLY IS THE ISSUE HERE AND WHAT IS DET. KING TRYING TO INFER HERE?

Det. King- Did you hear—when you were standing here at the door before the gunshots, did you hear any kind of yelling or anybody talking—

**Uh-uh (voice intonation indicates Dayna Purcell was saying NO SHE DID NOT HEAR ANY YELLING BEFORE THE GUNSHOTS).**

QUESTION: DAVID GREGORY WAS YELLING PROFANITIES AT THE TOP OF HIS LUNGS AT STEVEN PAUL AFTER SHOOTING HIM. Det. King never asked Dayna Purcell whether she heard any yelling AFTER THE GUNSHOTS...WHY NOT? DAYNA PURCELL HEARS NO SCREAMING OR CONFRONTATION before THE SHOOTING. SO where was the alleged unprovoked confrontation that David the shooter claims occurred before the shooting? IF YOU ARE TO BELIEVE DAVID'S AND AMY'S FALSE NARRATIVE, APPARENTLY Steven Paul must have attacked David before the shooting very, very, very quietly AND ALSO FOR NO APPARENT REASON. JUST A COMPLETELY RANDOM AND UNPROVOKED ATTACK ON DAVID. This false narrative from David (the shooter) and his wife makes absolutely no sense.

## Gary Osgood (HOA President) Interview

9/24/22 at 8:51 am- Gary Osgood neighbor at 1801 Highland Rd, Osprey

Interviewed by Det. Meghan Vinopal #3085

Gary Osgood stated the following:

Det. Vinopal- All right. Tell me, from the time you woke up, you said you were walking your dog?  
Go ahead.

Yes, I woke up. Um, I came out of the driveway. Um, David and Amy were walking their dogs, um, so I went—they—they were just past my driveway, um, walking towards the Bentley Hotel. So, our dogs don't get along. So, I walked to the left, um, and walked around the block. I was just heading back up, um—I forget what the name of that street is, uh, West(view)

I was walking up the street coming back towards Highland Road.

Um, and I was probably somewhere between 4 and 500 feet , um, in front of me when I heard 2 gunshots. And I saw

Un, I saw who—I saw Steven fall, like, stumble forward. Um, I thought it was on the opposite side of the street when I saw it, but I, so that's when I called 911, and I said "I heard gunshots." I heard two gunshots, and I heard "Motherfucker." And then I saw Steven falling, I thought he had fallen over here. So, when I came up with the dogs, I didn't see anything going on there. I didn't see anything going on. So, I brought the dogs home, but then I came back out, um, and that's when I walked across—I walked a little bit further down the street and found Steven gasping for breath in the ditch.

QUESTION: GARY OSGOOD WAS ONE OF THE KEY WITNESSES LOCATED CLOSEST TO THE SHOOTING. HE HEARD 2 GUNSHOTS. NOT ONE. HE IS THE FIRST OF THREE KEY WITNESSES THAT HEARD 2 GUNSHOTS. IT IS DEFINITIVELY MORE DIFFICULT TO FALSELY CLAIM SELF DEFENSE WHEN YOU FIRE TWICE VERSUS ONLY ONCE. WHAT DID DAVID DO WITH THE SECOND MISSING SPENT CARTRIDGE THAT HAD BEEN FIRED AT STEVEN PAUL AND ALSO THE SUBSEQUENT ROUND IN THE CHAMBER AFTER THE SHOOTING? GARY OSGOOD IS ALSO A KEY WITNESS THAT HEARS THE PROFANITIES (MOTHERFUCKER) BEING YELLED OUT BY DAVID GREGORY AT STEVEN PAUL AFTER THE SHOOTING. IF DAVID WAS FALSELY CLAIMING SELF DEFENSE THEN HIS ABHORRENT BEHAVIOR AFTER THE SHOOTING ALSO IS DIRECT CONFLICT WITH A FALSE NARRATIVE OF SELF DEFENSE. IT IS GARY OSGOOD'S CONTENTION THAT HE HEARD "MOTHERFUCKER" AND HE SAW STEVEN PAUL STUMBLE AND FALL. GARY OSGOOD CLAIMS THAT HE PASSED THE AREA BUT DID NOT SEE STEVEN PAUL IN THE

DITCH. HOWEVER, GARY PASSED WITH 3 DOGS IN TOW LITERALLY FEET AWAY FROM WHERE STEVEN PAUL HAD FALLEN. HOW IS IT EVEN POSSIBLE THAT GARY OSGOOD DID NOT SEE NOR DID HIS 3 DOGS SENSE STEVEN PAUL IN THE DITCH ACCORDING TO HIS WITNESS STATEMENT TO DET. VINOPAL? THE SCENARIO THAT HE DID NOT SEE STEVEN PAUL IN THE DITCH IMMEDIATELY AFTER THE SHOOTING SEEMS HIGHLY UNLIKELY. THE QUESTION IS WHY DID GARY PUT HIS DOGS AWAY FIRST RATHER THAN ASSISTING STEVEN PAUL DURING AN OBVIOUS LIFE AND DEATH SITUATION?

Det. Vinopal- Did you see anything with Amy—uh David?

I did not—see David and Amy at—that point, no. Um, I didn't see them. I didn't see them shoot. Um, I didn't see that. I just saw Steven falling and falling in—I guess he had fallen into the ditch. I thought it was only at—from where I was I—thought it was the other side of the street.

Um, and that's when—that—and the officers showed up just about that time.

QUESTION: GARY OSGOOD CLAIMS HE DIDN'T SEE DAVID OR AMY GREGORY SHOOT STEVEN PAUL. How THEN is IT possible that Gary Osgood did not see THIS ASPECT OF THE SHOOTING, YET HE STILL KNEW WHO WAS RESPONSIBLE FOR SHOOTING STEVEN PAUL AND ALSO HAD THE WHEREWITHAL TO INDICATE TO THE POLICE THAT ARRIVED FIRST ON SCENE THAT DAVID AND AMY GREGORY WERE, IN FACT, THE SHOOTERS?

And they parked down here. And I had just found Steven and pointed to Steven, and they came over and—

Det. Vinopal- Okay, um was Steven by himself?

He was by himself.

Det. Vinopal- What about David and Amy?

Uh, I don't remember what they were wearing at all.

Det. Vinopal- Okay. And, um, is this a normal routine for your guys?

Yeah. Yeah. We see each other walking with the dogs a lot.

Det. Vinopal- What about David and Amy?

Uh, I don't remember what they were wearing at all.

Det. Vinopal- And what time did you come out of your house?

Um, let's see. I'm tryin' to remember. I was tryin' to get out early to get to work a little early today. I would say it was probably—I would say it would be 10 minutes before the 911 call.

Det. Vinopal- Okay. And where does David and Amy live?

Uh, you know, I'm not sure. I think it's one of the units here in the back.

I don't think they live in the front. They live just—I see them walking up this strip of grass, usually going home. So, I think they live in the back.

QUESTION: GARY OSGOOD REFERENCES THE FACT THAT DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND HIS WIFE MAY USUALLY CUT THROUGH THE YARD OF THE FIRST LINE OF CONDOS BORDERING HIGHLAND RD. TO GET TO THEIR HOME IN THE REAR SECTION OF CONDOS. WHY DID DAVID AND AMY NOT CHOOSE THIS ROUTE TO GET BACK TO THEIR HOME THAT MORNING AS THEY TYPICALLY WOULD DO? ESPECIALLY WHEN THEY CLAIMED THAT THEY WERE IN SUCH FEAR OF WHAT STEVEN PAUL WOULD DO. THEIR PATH HOME THAT MORNING MAKES ABSOLUTELY NO SENSE WHEN JUXTAPOSED WITH THEIR STATEMENTS OF BEING FEARFUL AND TRYING TO AVOID STEVEN PAUL BECAUSE HE WAS ALWAYS LOOKING TO FUCK WITH THEM (THEIR OWN WORDS).

Det. Vinopal- And then, um, tell me a little bit about Steve...

Um, he's caused a lot of problems for us in the association. Um, he's—he's mentally ill. Um, he's been living here for probably about two years. Um, doesn't usually talk to anybody.

QUESTION: GARY OSGOOD NOW BEGINS WITH HIS FALSE NARRATIVE DURING HIS INTERVIEW WITH THE POLICE ABOUT STEVEN PAUL BEING MENTALLY ILL IN MUCH THE SAME WAY THAT HE HAD BEEN DOING FOR QUITE SOME TIME WITH ALL THE NEIGHBORS. HE ALONG WITH TOBY, TOBY'S WIFE AND DAVID AND HIS WIFE AMY EXPENDED A GREAT DEAL OF TIME TALKING ABOUT STEVEN PAUL AND CREATING THE HOSTILE ENVIRONMENT THAT EVENTUALLY LED TO STEVEN PAUL'S SHOOTING AT THE HANDS OF DAVID GREGORY. SO NOW HE SPINS FALSE NARRATIVE THAT STEVEN PAUL IS MENTALLY ILL BUT DOESN'T USUALLY TALK TO ANYBODY. SO HOW DOES GARY KNOW THIS AND WHERE ARE HIS FACTS THAT STEVEN PAUL WAS MENTALLY ILL? GARY'S SECOND STATEMENT THAT HE DOESN'T USUALLY TALK TO ANYBODY IS ALSO IN COMPLETE CONTRADICTION TO THE FALSE NARRATIVE WAS THAT STEVEN PAUL WAS CONFRONTATIONAL. STEVEN PAUL DIDN'T TALK TO ANYBODY. IN FACT, HE AVOIDED PEOPLE.

Um, we just had our driveway completely regraded, and everybody had to move. This was just last week.

Um, everybody had to move their cars out for that to happen. Uh, Steven wouldn't move his car. ...He very rarely left the house um, except for walking around. Sometimes at night, late at night, he'd be walking around. Um doesn't talk to anybody. I went in—when we were tryin' to get him to move his car, um, I called his family to reach out for help from his family. Um, his mother came over. Um, and we actually had the officers with us that day. Um, we went into the house, an um, she was banging on the door upstairs, tryin' to get Steven to come out. She was assuming he was upstairs locked in his room, uh, because he would never answer the door. And , uh, so, just as we were leaving the house, he was—he came out of the garage right in front of us. So, she said, "Steven, why are you making something so simple being so difficult?" and, um, she said—he had his keys in his hand. She said, "Give me your keys." And he gave her the keys. And then he decided he wanted 'em back And at that point, she wasn't gonna give 'em back. And then he shoved her. And—

And, um, then his mother got in the car and took off, and then he took off running after his mom.

Um, and then he did comply and park his car down at Bentley's 'cause I saw him the next day walking down, and I saw his car at Bentley's.

QUESTION: SO HERE IS THE STORY, ONCE AGAIN, ABOUT STEVEN PAUL NOT HAVING MOVED HIS CAR WHEN THE DRIVEWAY WAS BEING RESURFACED. DID GARY OR HIS MOM EVEN KNOW IF STEVEN PAUL WAS AWARE OF THE WORK BEING DONE? DID GARY EVEN KNOW IF IT WAS STEVEN PAUL'S INTENT TO NOT COOPERATE OR THAT IT WAS JUST SOMETHING THAT OCCURRED WITHOUT ANY ILL INTENT ON THE PART OF STEVEN PAUL. THEN THE FOLLOWING DAY STEVEN PAUL DID, IN FACT, COOPERATE AND PARKED HIS CAR AT THE BENTLEY HOTEL AND WALKED HOME. SO MOM CAME, THE CAR GOT MOVED. THE NEXT DAY THE CAR WAS MOVED AGAIN. SO WHY THE NECESSITY FOR SUCH A HUGE AMOUNT OF DRAMA, CALLING OF THE POLICE BY GARY AND WHATNOT SURROUNDING THIS EVENT? ONE WOULD IMAGINE THAT ANYONE, NOT JUST STEVEN PAUL, MIGHT HAVE GOTTEN ANNOYED BY GARY'S ACTIONS IN NOT ONLY CALLING HIS MOM BUT ALSO CALLING THE POLICE ON STEVEN PAUL. DID GARY NEED TO CALL THE POLICE AFTER HAVING ALREADY CALLED HIS MOM FOR ASSISTANCE IN MOVING THE CAR? CALLING THE POLICE SEEMED TO BE A BIT OF UNNECESSARY OVER-REACTION ON GARY OSGOOD'S PART.

Um, oh, the—the part that I probably should add is when I did go in the house with his mother there was a—a section on the—the house was immaculate, but there was a section on the countertop with a lot of pill bottles and, um, a tray with something in it. I not sure exactly what it was. It looked like something maybe to—maybe to smoke with. I don't know. Um, then there was a spoon with powder in it laying on the counter. So, I don't know what that was, I don't know if—

--it was steroids or—or—or what. I don't know

QUESTION: GARY OSGOOD NOW CONTINUES ON WITH HIS FALSE NARRATIVES ABOUT STEVEN PAUL AND MAKES BLATANT FALSE INFERENCES TO ILLICIT DRUG USE OR STEROID USE. MUCH THE SAME WAY THAT HE HAD BEEN DOING FOR QUITE SOME TIME WITH ALL THE NEIGHBORS. HE ALONG WITH TOBY, TOBY'S WIFE AS WELL AS DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND HIS WIFE AMY EXPENDED A GREAT DEAL OF TIME TALKING ABOUT STEVEN PAUL AND CREATING THE HOSTILE ENVIRONMENT THAT EVENTUALLY LED TO STEVEN PAUL'S SHOOTING AT THE HANDS OF DAVID GREGORY. SO NOW HE SPINS FALSE NARRATIVE THAT STEVEN PAUL IS A DRUG USER. THIS CLAIM IS FALSE AS STEVEN PAUL WAS TAKING ATHLETIC SUPPLEMENTATION IN THE FORM OF POWDERS AND AS WELL AS HIMALAYAN SALT. ALSO GARY DOES MAKE THE STATEMENT THAT THE HOUSE WAS IMMACULATE. APPARENTLY THIS PART OF HIS STATEMENT GOT OVERLOOKED BECAUSE THE FALSE RUMORS THAT WERE BEING SPREAD BY DAVID THE SHOOTER, GARY AND OTHERS IS THAT THE HOUSE WAS BEING DAMAGED BY STEVEN PAUL. STEVEN PAUL'S TOXICOLOGY REPORT WAS CLEAN. THIS IS IN COMPLETE CONTRADICTION TO THOSE FALSE NARRATIVES THAT SEEMED TO BE SPREAD TO ALL THE NEIGHBORS BY GARY, DAVID AND AMY AS WELL AS TOBY AND HIS WIFE.

Det. Vinopal- Okay, And, um, how do you know he has mental issues?

Um, because his—his parent—it—the unit is owned by his grandparents.

Um, his mother, um, kicked him out of the house, and his grandparents took him in so he wouldn't be on the street. Um, then they haven't, they—they can't control him. I know he assaulted his grandfather last summer, um, and his arm was broken. Um, his grandfather told me that he nearly killed him. I don't know how—you know, I don't know if—that was an exaggeration or not...they are seasonal people.

QUESTION: GARY OSGOOD NOW CONTINUES ON WITH HIS FALSE NARRATIVE ABOUT STEVEN PAUL ASSAULTING HIS GRANDFATHER. MUCH THE SAME WAY THAT HE HAD BEEN DOING FOR QUITE SOME TIME WITH ALL THE NEIGHBORS. HE ALONG WITH TOBY, TOBY'S WIFE AND DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND HIS WIFE AMY EXPENDED A GREAT DEAL OF TIME SPREADING RUMORS AND SPREADING FALSE NARRATIVES ABOUT STEVEN PAUL AND CREATING THE HOSTILE ENVIRONMENT THAT EVENTUALLY LED TO STEVEN PAUL'S SHOOTING AT THE HANDS OF DAVID GREGORY.

They're (the grandparents) in New York. So, Steven, for the last—I'm not sure if it's two or three summers has been in the house alone.

So, we have a mentally ill person living in a house alone. Um, my neighbor Sherry, said he was up all night long lifting weights...

GARY OSGOOD CONTINUES WITH HIS FALSE NARRATIVE ABOUT STEVEN PAUL BEING MENTALLY ILL AND NOW HE THROWS IN THE FACT THAT HE LIFTS WEIGHTS AND MAKES NOISE AND THAT HE HAD APPARENTLY BEEN TOLD BY SHERRY PAZZANESE

*THE NEIGHBOR THAT HE HAD BEEN WORKING OUT THE NIGHT BEFORE THE SHOOTING. STEVEN PAUL WAS AN ATHLETE. THAT IS WHAT HE DID. IT WAS PART OF HIS FITNESS ROUTINE. SO BESIDES MAKING TOO MUCH NOISE WITH THE WEIGHTS, WHAT WAS THE REAL ISSUE?*

It's Sherry, um, Pazzanese.

Det. Vinopal- Do you know how that is spelled?

Um, let me look it up in my phone. Uh, 'cause she actually saw Steven fall as well at the same time I did.

She was on her—her porch having her coffee.

Det. Vinopal- Did you hear any arguing, anything like that, besides the gunshots?

I did not hear anything before that...

Det. Vinopal- Okay. And then, um, so, you know he has mental issues. Has anybody else had a confrontation besides his mom with him before—in the neighborhood?

Yes, Um, David and Amy have, he has, um, from what I understand, completely unprovoked, has spit on them.

Um, much before, like, probably—it was months ago if not a year.

*GARY OSGOOD NOW CONTINUES WITH SPREADING DAVID GREGORY'S FALSE NARRATIVE ABOUT A PRIOR UNPROVOKED SPITTING INCIDENT DAVID THAT OCCURRED ABOUT A YEAR AGO. IS GARY OR ANYONE AWARE THAT WHEN TAKING HIMALAYAN SALT AS PART OF A NUTRITIONAL SUPPLEMENT ROUTINE THAT SPITTING IS SOMETHING THAT IS OFTEN UNAVOIDABLE? YES, STEVEN PAUL WOULD SPIT. WAS HE SPITTING AT OTHER PEOPLE? NO. WAS IT NECESSARY AND OFTEN UNAVOIDABLE? YES.*

Um, he also—my other neighbor Tobi, um, a few weeks ago was taking out his trash, and he knows who Steven is and—all that, and he didn't—didn't speak to him at all. Any they—I guess they kinda passed each other a couple of times bringing out the trash---And, um, Steven—and Tobi is a big guy. And—Steven called him a pussy. And so, Tobi said, um “What'd you call me motherfucker?” And, um, he kinda took off after Steven, and Steven just bolted.

He's had a lot of confrontations. Yes.

*QUESTION: AGAIN, MORE RUMORS FROM GARY AND TOBY. NO ONE WITNESSED THIS INCIDENT AND EVEN WHEN TOBY BEGAN TO SPREAD THIS STORY AMONGST THE NEIGHBORS NO ONE SAW IT. TOBY CLAIMS THAT STEVEN RAN AWAY. IF THE*

NARRATIVE IS THAT STEVEN PAUL IS SUPER CONFRONTATIONAL, WHY DID STEVEN PAUL NOT CONFRONT TOBY AT ALL BUT INSTEAD CHOSE TO LEAVE AND "RUN" AWAY BACK INTO HIS HOME? WHO WAS THE AGGRESSOR, TOBY OR STEVEN? DID THE POLICE EVEN REALIZE OR MADE AWARE THAT TOBY, HIMSELF, HAD BEEN ARRESTED AT THE BENTLEY HOTEL FOR FIGHTING WITH ANOTHER INDIVIDUAL?

Det. Vinopal- with people.

Yes.

Det. Vinopal- Okay, Um, David and Amy, uh, do you know that they carry? Have they ever spoke to you—like, are they scared of Steve? Like, do they—what's their relation?

So, I have to be 100 truthful. Um—and yes, David, carries.

Det. Vinopal- So, you know that for a fact? He always carries?

Yes.

Um, it's—I—I know for a fact that he's always carried since Steven has assaulted them and Steven—took—like, one time took, like a fighting stance like he was gonna—wanted to box with David.

Um, so, yes, David, um, has—has carried—walking his dogs ever since.

QUESTION: HOW DOES GARY OSGOOD KNOW ALL OF THIS INFORMATION? HE OBVIOUSLY HAS SPOKEN WITH DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND HIS WIFE. GARY STATES THAT SINCE THESE "CONFRONTATIONS" WITH STEVEN PAUL, DAVID CARRY A CONCEALED WEAPON. THIS STATEMENT BY GARY OSGOOD CLEARY INDICATES INTENT AND PREMEDITATION ON DAVID GREGORY'S PART. IF GARY OSGOOD HAD ALREADY BEEN MADE AWARE OF THE FACT THAT DAVID WAS NOW CARRYING A GUN WHY DID GARY NOT CONTACT THE POLICE WITH ANY CONCERNs REGARDING THE POTENTIAL FOR ESCALATED VIOLENCE ON THE PART OF DAVID GREGORY, AT ANY POINT, PRIOR TO THE DAY OF THE SHOOTING?

Det. Vinopal- So, there's been issues with them, with Steven, David and Amy before?

Yes.

Det. Vinopal- And you—how many times do you think?

Um, at least two, that I know of.

And I know that they called, um, police once when—when Steven spit on them. Um—

They came and said they couldn't do anything because they didn't see it.

GARY OSGOOD CONTINUES ON WITH SPREADING DAVID GREGORY'S FALSE NARRATIVE ABOUT A PRIOR UNPROVOKED SPITTING INCIDENT DAVID THAT OCCURRED ABOUT A YEAR AGO. DOES GARY OR ANYONE EVEN QUESTION THE VERACITY OF DAVID'S CLAIMS SURROUNDING THIS SUPPOSED SPITTING INCIDENT? SO DAVID AND AMY CALLED THE POLICE AND THE POLICE DIDN'T DO ANYTHING BECAUSE IT MORE THAN LIKELY DID NOT OCCUR IN THE WAY THAT DAVID AND AMY CLAIM. DAVID THE SHOOTER AND HIS WIFE AMY DON'T GET WHAT THEY FEEL IS ACTION FROM THE POLICE SO THEY ESCALATE THINGS ON THE DAY OF THE SHOOTING AND DAVID DECIDE TO TAKE MATTERS INTO HIS OWN HANDS, HANDLE THE MATTER AND GET RID OF THE "PROBLEM" (STEVEN PAUL) BY SHOOTING HIM.

Det. Vinopal- D you know how long ago that was?

Um, I want to say it was probably last summer.

Det. Vinopal- And are your friends with them? Is that how you know, like, all this information, Mom, Dad?

No, just from—I'm—I'm actually the HOA president.

Det. Vinopal- Besides, you know—do you know what type of mental—issues he has?

And the family's never said it out. I mean, I've heard that they think it—I'm pretty sure it's schizophrenia.

Um, that—that's been—that's been spoken, but no one's actually given me an exact medical diagnosis.

QUESTION: HOW DOES GARY OSGOOD KNOW ANY OF THIS TO MAKE SUCH CLAIMS? MORE SPECULATION WITHOUT ANY FACTS TO SUBSTANTIATE IT.

Det. Vinopal- So Mom's never told you exactly what?

No, But—I mean, she knows he has mental issues. I mean, she was—you know, when we—she came last week, uh, the day Steven—you know, tryin' to get Steven to move his car.

She was, basically, begging the officer, you know, "What do I do to get this kid help?"

QUESTION: ONCE AGAIN, HOW DOES GARY OSGOOD KNOW ANY OF THIS TO MAKE SUCH CLAIMS? CONTINUED SPECULATION WITHOUT ANY FACTS TO SUBSTANTIATE IT.

Det. Vinopal- recaps the interview with Gary Osgood... So you went to—around 10-15 minutes before the 911 call, you came outside with your dog. You saw, David and Amy. And then you guys had to separate because the dogs--

Yeah, They went one way. I went the other, and I went around the block.

They went—...they went towards the Bentley Hotel.

Det. Vinopal- Okay. And then you went towards us?

Towards this way. Yeah, towards where we are right now

Det. Vinopal- Okay. Which is in front of 1855 (Highland).

Yeah.

Det. Vinopal- So, you went this way. Okay. And then, um, you went back around, right?

Uh-huh.

Det. Vinopal- You didn't come this way again?

Uh, no. I went back around. Yep.

SO GARY OSGOOD'S PATH THAT MORNING WAS HE EXITED HIS CONDO DRIVEWAY, SAW DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND AMY HIS WIFE AND HE TOOK A LEFT HEADING SOUTH ON HIGHLAND RD. HE THEN WENT TO THE END OF HIGHLAND AND TURNED RIGHT ONTO SHORELAND DRIVE THEN CONTINUED ALL THE WAY AROUND IN A CIRCULAR PATTERN BY TURNING RIGHT ONTO WESTVIEW DRIVE AND CONTINUING TO TRAVEL EAST ON WESTVIEW UNTIL HE APPROACHES THE AREA WHERE STEVEN PAUL HAD FALLEN IN THE DITCH AFTER BEING SHOT BY DAVID GREGORY. HE CLAIMS NEITHER HE SAW NOR HIS DOGS HEARD, SENSED OR SAW SEE STEVEN PAUL IN THE DITCH, EVEN THOUGH THEY PASSED WITH LITERAL FEET OF STEVEN PAUL GASPING FOR AIR WHILE DYING IN THE DITCH. HE THEN GOES THROUGH THE INTERSECTION AT THE STOP SIGN AT WESTVIEW AND HIGHLAND. HE TURNS LEFT ONTO HIGHLAND THEN MAKES another QUICK RIGHT ONTO THE CONDO DRIVEWAY TO PUT HIS DOGS AWAY AT HIS HOME. HE THEN CLAIMS THAT HE CAME BACK OUT AND THAT IS WHEN HE SUPPOSEDLY "DISCOVERED" STEVEN PAUL IN THE DITCH GASPING FOR AIR.

Det. Vinopal- Okay. You went back around. And then you hear, you said, two gunshots?

Two gunshots and "Motherfucker."

QUESTION: ONCE AGAIN, Gary Osgood was one of the key witnesses located closest to the shooting. **He heard 2 gunshots. not one. He is the first of three key witnesses that heard 2 gunshots. it is definitively more difficult to falsely claim self defense when you fire twice versus only once.** What did David do with the second missing spent cartridge that had been fired at Steven Paul and also the subsequent round in the chamber after the shooting? GARY OSGOOD IS ALSO A KEY WITNESS THAT HEARS THE PROFANITIES (MOTHERFUCKER) BEING YELLED OUT BY DAVID GREGORY AT STEVEN PAUL AFTER THE SHOOTING. IF

DAVID WAS FALSELY CLAIMING SELF DEFENSE THEN HIS ABHORRENT BEHAVIOR AFTER THE SHOOTING ALSO IS DIRECT CONFLICT WITH A FALSE NARRATIVE OF SELF DEFENSE. IT IS GARY OSGOOD'S CONTENTION THAT HE heard "motherfucker" and he saw Steven Paul stumble and fall.

Det. Vinopal- Screaming? Anything like that?

**I didn't hear any screaming before that, no.**

QUESTION: LIKE THE OTHER WITNESS, GARY OSGOOD ALSO HEARS DAVID GREGORY YELLING PROFANITIES AT STEVEN PAUL AFTER SHOOTING HIM. GARY OSGOOD ALSO HEARS NO SCREAMING OR CONFRONTATION BEFORE THE SHOOTING. SO WHERE WAS THE ALLEGED UNPROVOKED CONFRONTATION THAT DAVID THE SHOOTER CLAIMS OCCURRED BEFORE THE SHOOTING? IF YOU ARE TO BELIEVE DAVID'S AND AMY'S FALSE NARRATIVE, APPARENTLY STEVEN PAUL MUST HAVE ATTACKED DAVID BEFORE THE SHOOTING VERY, VERY, VERY QUIETLY AND ALSO FOR NO APPARENT REASON. JUST A COMPLETELY RANDOM AND UNPROVOKED ATTACK ON DAVID. THIS FALSE NARRATIVE FROM DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND HIS WIFE MAKES ABSOLUTELY NO SENSE.

## Sherry Pazzanese Interview

9/26/22 at 2:40 pm- Sherry Pazzanese neighbor at 1815 Highland Rd, Osprey

Interviewed by Det. Nathan King #2399 and Det. Luis Ojeda #1795

Sherry Pazzanese stated the following:

Det. King- Okay. Just go ahead and in your own words tell me what you saw, what you heard.

Okay. I—I got up and I went to my lanai 'cause I wanted to say hi to the neighbor (Gary), I heard him go by with his dogs. As I was standing there having my coffee I heard two, sounded like cap guns going off. I looked up and I saw two individuals standing there. I, at first, thought it was the young boy, "cause he's tall, the young kid down the street. I thought it was him and kids on their way to school. I wasn't even thinking that it was Saturday; there's no school. I saw one of the guys, men, fall on his knee, and then I lost sight of him behind a tree. I went to the restroom after that, came back and went downstairs and went outside right when the police came, and they were taking the individual out of the ditch.

QUESTION: SHERRY PAZZANESE WAS ONE OF THE KEY WITNESSES LOCATED CLOSEST TO THE SHOOTING. **SHE HEARD 2 GUNSHOTS. NOT ONE. SHE IS THE FIRST OF THREE KEY WITNESSES THAT HEARD 2 GUNSHOTS. IT IS DEFINITIVELY MORE DIFFICULT TO FALSELY CLAIM SELF DEFENSE WHEN YOU FIRE TWICE VERSUS ONLY ONCE.** WHAT DID DAVID DO WITH THE SECOND MISSING SPENT CARTRIDGE THAT HAD BEEN FIRED AT STEVEN PAUL AND ALSO THE SUBSEQUENT ROUND IN THE CHAMBER AFTER THE SHOOTING? SHERRY PAZZANES ALSO STATES THAT AFTER SHE HEARD THE 2 GUNSHOTS SHE LOOKED UP AND SAW THE TWO INDIVIDUALS STANDING THERE. IT APPEARS THAT THERE WAS MORE THAN LIKELY NO CONFRONTATION, AS THERE WAS NO YELLING. SECONDLY, THEY WERE BOTH STANDING AT THAT MOMENT INDICATING THAT MORE THAN LIKELY THERE WAS ALSO NO PHYSICAL ALTERCATION THAT WAS OCCURRING. SHE THEN SAW ONE OF THE GUYS (STEVEN PAUL) FALL ON HIS KNEE AFTER BEING SHOT.

Det. King- Okay. Um, did you see anything happen prior to the—what you heard—what you described as the cap guns going off? Did you hear anything like whether they were arguing or what the two men were doing?

I heard nothing. No interaction between two of them, and I didn't see any altercations between two of them. I just saw them together, and then right away they were apart and he went out on his knee.

QUESTION: LIKE THE OTHER WITNESS, SHERRY PAZZANESE ALSO HEARS NO SCREAMING OR CONFRONTATION BEFORE THE SHOOTING. SHE STATES THAT SHE SAW THEM STANDING THERE TOGETHER AND THEN RIGHT AWAY THEY WERE APART

AND HE (STEVEN PAUL) WENT OUT ON HIS KNEE. SO WHERE WAS THE ALLEGED UNPROVOKED CONFRONTATION THAT DAVID THE SHOOTER CLAIMS OCCURRED BEFORE THE SHOOTING? IF YOU ARE TO BELIEVE DAVID'S AND AMY'S FALSE NARRATIVE, APPARENTLY STEVEN PAUL MUST HAVE ATTACKED DAVID BEFORE THE SHOOTING VERY, VERY, VERY QUIETLY AND ALSO FOR NO APPARENT REASON. JUST A COMPLETELY RANDOM AND UNPROVOKED ATTACK ON DAVID. THIS FALSE NARRATIVE FROM DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND HIS WIFE MAKES ABSOLUTELY NO SENSE.

Det. King- You heard the shot, and then it drew your attention down the street to the—road, and you seen two men standing there?

Yeah.

Det. King- Did you—were they face to face? Was one walking away at that time?

Yes. One was coming this way and the other—that's why they were—that's what I saw. A baseball—I don't know if they had—someone had a baseball cap on, I'm pretty sure.

Det. King- Okay. And then you seen that—that person walk away, or did you see how he got to his knee?

He kind of stumbled.

I mean, he went, like, a little bit to the left and went down on one knee, and that the last thing I saw. And then I tried to see what else was happening and I lost sight of 'em.

Det. King- You said 'cause there's a bush there or a big--

There's a big bush there.

Det. King- Okay. Um, and you didn't hear anything or see anything prior to the shots go off?

I heard nothing. Nothing.

QUESTION: LIKE THE OTHER WITNESS, SHERRY PAZZANESE ALSO HEARS NO SCREAMING OR CONFRONTATION BEFORE THE SHOOTING. SHE STATES THAT SHE SAW THEM STANDING THERE TOGETHER AND THEN RIGHT AWAY THEY WERE APART AND HE (STEVEN PAUL) WENT DOWN ON HIS KNEE. SO WHERE WAS THE ALLEGED UNPROVOKED CONFRONTATION THAT DAVID THE SHOOTER CLAIMS OCCURRED BEFORE THE SHOOTING? IF YOU ARE TO BELIEVE DAVID'S AND AMY'S FALSE NARRATIVE, APPARENTLY STEVEN PAUL MUST HAVE ATTACKED DAVID BEFORE THE SHOOTING VERY, VERY, VERY QUIETLY AND ALSO FOR NO APPARENT REASON. JUST A COMPLETELY RANDOM AND UNPROVOKED ATTACK ON DAVID. THIS FALSE NARRATIVE FROM DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND HIS WIFE MAKES ABSOLUTELY NO SENSE.

Det. King- So you know Steven. So what do you know about Steven?

I know Steven pretty well because I'm pretty close to his grandparents, Aldo and Palma, that live right behind us. And I know—I'll be honest with you, Friday night he was up all night. I have a problem. I've complained about him numerous times. He lifts weights in the garage, and he drops them, and bang, my whole unit, our unit, the next-door neighbor—shakes every time it happens. My dog freaks out, thinking it's thunder. So I got no sleep 'cause he was up all night with those weights.

QUESTION: SHERRY PAZZANESE COMPLAINS ABOUT STEVEN PAUL LIFTING WEIGHTS AND DROPPING THEM AND MAKING NOISE THAT DISTURBS HER AND HER DOG. YES, STEVEN PAUL DID LIFT WEIGHTS AND MAYBE HE MADE TOO MUCH NOISE. STEVEN PAUL WAS AN ATHLETE. THAT IS WHAT HE DID. IT WAS PART OF HIS FITNESS ROUTINE. SO BESIDES MAKING TOO MUCH NOISE WITH THE WEIGHTS, WHAT WAS THE REAL ISSUE? GRANTED IF IN SHERRY PAZZANESE'S SHOES, ONE MIGHT BE UPSET WITH THAT. HOWEVER, OTHER THAN THE USE OF HIS WEIGHTS WAS THE LARGER ISSUE WITH STEVEN PAUL? DID HE EVER SPEAK TO SHERRY PAZZANESE? DID SHE EVER SPEAK TO HIM?

Yeah. I saw him Friday evening walking the streets.

It was right when the sun started going down 'cause I was out with my dog, and he went right between me and my two girlfriends and he never says hello. He never—he just walks.

Um, baseball cap 'cause he had a hoodie. He's constantly wearing a hoodie.

And he always has earphones 'cause I watch him put his (earphones on)—

QUESTION: SHERRY PAZZANESE MENTIONS THAT SHE AND HER TWO GIRLFRIENDS WERE OUTSIDE ON THE DRIVEWAY. STEVEN PAUL ALWAYS HAS EARPHONES ON. STEVEN PAUL WALKS BETWEEN THREE OLDER WOMEN AND DOES NOT SAY HELLO. OK. SO WHERE IS THE PROBLEM? WHAT IS THE THREAT?

Det. King- so he's—he's known to walk around the neighborhood.

Yes.

QUESTION: SHERRY PAZZANESE MENTIONS THAT STEVEN PAUL IS KNOWN TO WALK AROUND THE NEIGHBORHOOD. OK. SO WHERE IS THE PROBLEM? WHAT IS THE THREAT? WHAT IS THE ISSUE HERE?

Det. King- Okay. What all—have you heard anything else about Steven? Maybe—any encounters with any of the other neighbors or he—or--?

Just hearsay. With the other neighbors.

Det. King- Okay, You never had any contact with him?

No.

Det. King- Do you know the other—the other person that was out there that, um--

Yeah. I know him and his wife. I've known them for –as long as I've lived here 'cause--

Det. King- Have they ever spoken about—Steven?

Yes.

Det. King- Any incidences with them?

Yeah. Something about one night—this is what I remember—that he spit at 'im. Spit at his face. And he said something about their dogs and there was—and he yelled at him. There was an argument. That's all I heard.

I never witnessed anything.

SHERRY OSGOOD NOW CONTINUES WITH SPREADING DAVID GREGORY'S FALSE NARRATIVE ABOUT A PRIOR UNPROVOKED SPITTING INCIDENT DAVID THAT OCCURRED ABOUT A YEAR AGO. SHERRY EVEN STATES THAT WHAT SHE IS SAYING IS JUST HEARSAY FROM THE OTHER NEIGHBORS. DOES SHERRY GET THIS INFORMATION FROM DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND HIS WIFE AMY? GARY OSGOOD, OR TOBY AND HIS WIFE BETH? ONCE AGAIN, IS SHERRY OR ANYONE AWARE THAT WHEN TAKING HIMALAYAN SALT AS PART OF A NUTRITIONAL SUPPLEMENT ROUTINE THAT SPITTING IS SOMETHING THAT IS OFTEN UNAVOIDABLE? YES, STEVEN PAUL WOULD SPIT. WAS HE SPITTING AT OTHER PEOPLE? NO. WAS IT NECESSARY AND OFTEN UNAVOIDABLE? YES. DOES SHERRY OR ANYONE EVEN QUESTION THE VERACITY OF DAVID'S CLAIMS SURROUNDING THIS SUPPOSED SPITTING INCIDENT A YEAR PRIOR? SO DAVID AND AMY CALLED THE POLICE AND THE POLICE DIDN'T DO ANYTHING BECAUSE IT MORE THAN LIKELY DID NOT OCCUR IN THE WAY THAT DAVID AND AMY CLAIM. DAVID THE SHOOTER AND HIS WIFE AMY DON'T GET WHAT THEY FEEL IS ACTION FROM THE POLICE SO THEY ESCALATE THINGS ON THE DAY OF THE SHOOTING AND DAVID INSTEAD DECIDES TO TAKE MATTERS INTO HIS OWN HANDS, HANDLE THE MATTER AND GET RID OF THE "PROBLEM" (STEVEN PAUL) BY SHOOTING HIM.

He's had a problem with Toby about three weeks ago, the one that lives in the corner.

Det. King- Steven did, had a problem with Toby?

Yes. He was called—called him a name and –'cause Toby called me up 'cause it was right in my back yard. He goes, "Did you hear all that?" I said, "No, I didn't. I didn't hear anything". And they had a little—he said "What did you say to me?" And he called him

these names. And he went—he said he wouldn't go near the door 'cause he didn't know if that kid had a gun or what the hell's gonna happen. I hate to say it. All of us that are hear are kind of afraid of that kid.

Det. King- How did he treat other people in the neighborhood?

Just wouldn't talk to 'em. Wouldn't—you can scream at him, yell his name. He wouldn't look at you. He'd give you a filthy look. He just

Det. King- Any, uh, that you know of that he, like, confronted anybody with anything or would he ever do that or--

No. The only time I know is that he just yelled at Toby in the back.

That's 'cause Toby told me.

QUESTION: ONCE AGAIN, MORE OF THE SAME RUMORS FROM TOBY. SHERRY DID NOT HEAR OR WITNESS THIS INCIDENT. IN FACT, NO ONE WITNESSED THIS INCIDENT AND EVEN WHEN TOBY BEGAN TO SPREAD THIS STORY AMONGST THE NEIGHBORS NO ONE SAW IT. TOBY CLAIMS THAT STEVEN RAN AWAY. IF THE NARRATIVE IS THAT STEVEN PAUL IS SUPER CONFRONTATIONAL, WHY DID STEVEN PAUL NOT CONFRONT TOBY AT ALL BUT INSTEAD CHOSE TO LEAVE AND "RUN" AWAY BACK INTO HIS HOME? WHO WAS THE AGGRESSOR, TOBY OR STEVEN? DID THE POLICE EVEN REALIZE OR MADE AWARE THAT TOBY, HIMSELF, HAD BEEN ARRESTED AT THE BENTLEY HOTEL FOR FIGHTING WITH ANOTHER INDIVIDUAL?

Det. King- David—did David or Amy talk about—did they have any fear of what—what he—what he's been doing to them or—

QUESTION: WHY IS DET. KING ASKING LEADING QUESTIONS? WHY DID DET. KING NOT ASK SHERRY ABOUT WHETHER SHE KNEW AND/OR DAVID HAD TOLD HER HE CARRIED A WEAPON?

The only thing David ever said to me was, "I can't do anything. I'm—I have problems with my neck? And everything. I'm an old man. I can't—you know, I can't get in a fight with this kid."

QUESTION: SO HERE WE HAVE SHERRY PAZZANESE BEING PROMPTED BY DET. KING BY THE USE OF A LEADING QUESTION TO CONFIRM THAT DAVID AND AMY WERE IN FEAR. WE ALSO NOW HAVE SHERRY SHARING THE HAVE THE FALSE NARRATIVE THAT DAVID PROVIDED TO HER WHERE HE OFTEN CLAIMED THAT HE WAS AND TOO OLD AND DISABLED IN ORDER TO GAIN SYMPATHY FROM THE NEIGHBORS. THIS IS THE SAME FALSE NARRATIVE DAVID (THE SHOOTER) USED DURING HIS POLICE INTERVIEWS IN ORDER TO GAIN THEIR SYMPATHY AS WELL AFTER THE SHOOTING.

Det. King- His grandparents ever talk about are they—are they afraid of him, or is there any problems or abuse maybe that happened—

**QUESTION: WHY IS DET. KING ASKING LEADING QUESTIONS LIKE THIS?**

**Yeah. That's the only thing I ever heard. But I did hear through another neighbor that the kid broke Aldo's arm one time.**

Det. King- He did?

**The grandfather. I did hear that. I don't know how much truth—**

**QUESTION: EVEN THOUGH SHERRY STATES SHE HEARD THIS FROM ANOTHER NEIGHBOR AND SHE DOESN'T KNOW HOW MUCH TRUTH THERE IS TO IT, SHERRY IS NOW REPEATING THE SAME FALSE RUMORS FROM GARY OSGOOD AND TOBY AND CONTINUES ON WITH THE FALSE NARRATIVE ABOUT STEVEN PAUL ASSAULTING HIS GRANDFATHER. MUCH THE SAME WAY THAT GARY AND TOBY HAD BEEN DOING FOR QUITE SOME TIME WITH ALL THE NEIGHBORS. HE ALONG WITH TOBY, TOBY'S WIFE AND DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND HIS WIFE AMY EXPENDED A GREAT DEAL OF TIME SPREADING RUMORS AND SPREADING FALSE NARRATIVES TO ALL THE NEIGHBORS (INCLUDING DAVID THE SHOOTER AND AMY HIS WIFE) ABOUT STEVEN PAUL AND CREATING THE HOSTILE ENVIRONMENT THAT EVENTUALLY LED TO STEVEN PAUL'S SHOOTING AT THE HANDS OF DAVID GREGORY.**

## **Kelsie Lloyd Interview**

The interview conducted by Det. Nathan King with Kelsie Lloyd on October 27, 2022, serves as a pivotal piece of evidence in the case against David Gregory for the shooting of Steven Paul Colon. Kelsie Lloyd's testimony not only reveals a direct threat made by Gregory against Steven Paul but also underscores a significant delay in collecting crucial eyewitness accounts. This delay raises questions about the thoroughness and urgency of the investigation.

### **Major Points Highlighted in Kelsie Lloyd's Testimony:**

1. Delayed Interview: The interview with Kelsie Lloyd, a critical witness, occurred over a month after the incident. This delay in gathering key testimonies could have compromised the freshness and accuracy of the witness's recollections.

2. Direct Threat: Kelsie Lloyd recounted a specific threat made by David Gregory towards Steven Paul, wherein Gregory stated, "That kid's got one time with me and I'll put a bullet in him." This statement is crucial as it directly indicates Gregory's intent and premeditation, challenging the narrative of self-defense and suggesting a vendetta against Steven Paul.

3. Lack of Prior Interaction: Lloyd confirmed she had never seen Steven Paul nor had any direct interactions with him, countering any implication that Steven Paul was broadly confrontational or aggressive within the neighborhood.

4. Gregory's Aggressive Behavior: Lloyd described Gregory's behavior as aggressive and overly involved in neighborhood affairs, painting a picture of a man who sought out conflict. This characterization of Gregory aligns with the threat he made against Steven Paul and suggests a predisposition towards using violence.

5. Inconsistencies in Gregory's Statements: The interview reveals inconsistencies in Gregory's portrayal of his reasons for carrying a firearm. Despite claiming self-defense, Gregory's prior statement about putting a bullet in Steven Paul indicates a willingness to use lethal force preemptively rather than defensively.

6. Community Perception: Lloyd's testimony sheds light on the community's perception of Gregory as someone who could be "slightly unhinged" and prone to inserting himself into conflicts, further questioning the justification of his actions as self-defense.

### **Implications for the Case:**

Kelsie Lloyd's testimony is critical for several reasons. Firstly, it provides direct evidence of Gregory's premeditated hostility towards Steven Paul, which is essential for establishing motive and intent. Secondly, the testimony challenges the credibility of Gregory's self-defense claim by revealing a history of aggressive behavior and a specific threat made against Steven Paul.

Moreover, the delayed interview with Lloyd and the lack of follow-up on collecting potential video evidence from Lloyd's Ring camera highlight significant investigative oversights. Such delays and omissions in gathering evidence could have impacted the investigation's outcome and the initial decision not to press charges against Gregory.

### **Conclusion:**

The detailed analysis of Kelsie Lloyd's interview underscores the necessity for a comprehensive reevaluation of the case against David Gregory. Lloyd's account provides compelling evidence of a premeditated threat against Steven Paul, challenging the narrative that Gregory acted solely in self-defense. This testimony, combined with the investigative shortcomings identified, strongly supports the need for further legal action to ensure justice for Steven Paul Colon.

#### **10/27/22 at 1:09 pm- Kelsie Lloyd neighbor at 1845 Highland Rd, Osprey**

**QUESTION: THIS INTERVIEW DID NOT OCCUR UNTIL OVER A MONTH AFTER THE SHOOTING. WHY DID IT TAKE SO LONG FOR DET. KING TO INTERVIEW THIS KEY WITNESS?**

Interviewed by Det. Nathan King #2399

#### **Kelsie Lloyd stated the following:**

Det. King- Okay. Um, on the—on the day of, uh, September 24<sup>th</sup>, were you home at the time?

**No.**

Det. King- Okay. Um, and then you said that you, uh, learned about the—an incident that occurred in front of your house—by somebody that called you.

Yeah, I had a couple of text messages and a phone call by my neighbor Dayna who was gonna be looking after my mom who was staying here to watch my dog. And that's when I first became aware. I think it was about 8 am after the incident.

Det. King- Okay. Did Dayna say anything about what happened? Or, what was her words?

Yeah. Like, she was just like a lot cursing. She's from Boston. So—just a lot of cursing and pretty much just like she killed him—or, “He killed him; he killed him, “ be like--

Det. King- Did she say names?

Uh, she says, David. Yeah. But, I mean, I pretty much knew because , like I said, the week before the other incident with all the cops being in the neighborhood we had all been talking about it.—

Um, which would have been when—the reason why I'm concerned is because that's when he made the statement to me.

QUESTION: *KELSIE LLOYD IS YET ANOTHER NEIGHBOR THAT DAVID GREGORY (THE SHOOTER) MADE THREATENING REMARKS ABOUT SHOOTING STEVEN PAUL TO PRIOR TO SHOOTING.*

Det. King- Okay. Um, and how do you know David? Do you—do you know his wife too?

Amy. Yeah. Um, I actually lived beside them. I lived on that back road with—them for the first year. Um, so I just recently moved up here in June.

Det. King- And how do you know Steven?

I do not know him. I only was aware of him because of my client Erica Garland, which is his older cousin.

Det. King- You never had any run-ins in the neighborhood with him, either with talking to him or--

Never seen him, ever.

Det. King- When Dayna text you that David had—had killed him, did you know who--

Oh, yeah.

Det. King- Okay. Um, on the—on the day of, uh, September 24<sup>th</sup>, were you home at the time?

No.

Det. King- Um, do you know of any incidents, um, where Steven has, you know, um, maybe confronted other neighbors or any—anything like that?

I mean, this is only just like gossip—

He said/she said. But it was—you know, there's been times where he allegedly spit on another neighbor in those—in that little housing development—um he lives in. But to my knowledge, it was never really outside of his little block—

--because, like I said, I've never seen him. I walk day and night. I, you know, wake up early and I go to bed late. So I've never seen him out. But that's really it. Them other issues, because of Erica, I was aware of, like what happened internally with the family.

Yeah. Erica Garland. And she's the one that's been like really wanting me to talk to you guys because of how it happened.

It's like—my premonition came true six days later, which is why it's awful to me.

Det. King- And what do you know about David and Amy? Like, what are they like? What's—anything with—any—confrontation with them with other people in the neighborhood or?

He (David) gets worked up about things, you know. There was a girl that lived in this house, um, who had some issues like drinking and being drunk on the front yard or whatever and there would be some drama. Um, and he would kind of get worked up about any—like—kind of like neighborhood watch type of vibes, you know. But he kind of made it a little bit more like—I don't know. He was more aggressive. I don't know. I've

Det. King- His business, maybe?

Yeah. He made it his business, like. And that's literally verbatim what I told Erica about the last situation, is like he's kind of making it his business to, like, watch this kid.

And—and he did that with kind of everybody.

QUESTION: WHY DID DAVID (THE SHOOTER) FEEL IT NECESSARY TO INVOLVE HIMSELF IN OTHER'S BUSINESS THROUGHOUT THE NEIGHBORHOOD? KELSIE LLOYD MENTIONS THAT DAVID GREGORY (THE SHOOTER) MADE IT "HIS BUSINESS TO, LIKE, WATCH THIS KID (STEVEN PAUL)? GOES TO MOTIVE AND PREMEDITATION.

Det. King- Do you know if his, um—any—do you know of—of his confrontations with Steven in the past? Do you know about those?

No. No I—only recently just heard about the—

Apparently he was, uh—uh, confronted before. But again, I've walked with David and he's never mentioned anything prior.

QUESTION: WHY IS DET. KING, ONCE AGAIN, ASKING LEADING QUESTIONS?

Det. King- How long ago was this are you talking or you walked with him?

Okay. So I would say maybe a week to two week before the incident, max.

Uh, no. This was like in the middle of the night. I was walking my dog at like 12 am. And David scared the crap out of me 'cause he was walking as well and he didn't have a flashlight or anything.

And so we ran into each other out in the pitch black. And then we just ended up walking together, um, this circle, this small circle around the houses. And we were just talking, you know—while we where walking.

QUESTION: KELSIE MENTIONS THAT DAVID GREGORY (THE SHOOTER) "SCARED THE CRAP OUT OF ME" AS SHE WAS WALKING HER DOG AT 12 AM. APPARENTLY DAVID DID APPEARS OUT OF THE DARK WITH NO FLASHLIGHT OR ANYTHING. DURING HIS INTERVIEW WITH DETECTIVES, DAVID GREGORY (THE SHOOTER) CLAIMS THAT STEVEN PAUL DID THIS TO HIM. OR WAS IT ACTUALLY THE OTHER WAY AROUND THAT DAVID ACTUALLY WAS THE ONE TO SURPRISE STEVEN PAUL OUT OF THE DARKNESS?

Det. King- Okay. He never mentioned Steven?

Um, like, yeah. He—he called him like—you know, like a knucklehead or just like whatever. Uh, like he's—he's equally aggressive and prejudice about a lot of things and that's why, like, I really didn't take a ton of note of, like, that conversation that night 'cause he's made racial comments and prejudice type of things where like I—I like—I don't entertain.

So I don't even—I don't even remark back to whatever he's saying. So they'll be little snippy things like that. I mean, He'll just be like this neighborhood's like going down the drain or whatever 'cause there's been a few things that have been going on. And he's he made comments of like, "I'm ready to F'n move. And he curses a lot, uh, which again is not my personality and I don't like listening to the aggressiveness of it.

So, you know, like me and him, like, he's not my favorite person. But because of our dogs and he loves—I mean, he'll come up to my window and like interact with my dog through the window.

That's how much he's like an animal lover. So, on that note, like, I was fine with him. But as a person, like, I would—steer clear of him.

QUESTION: KELSIE MENTIONS THAT DAVID GREGORY (THE SHOOTER) WOULD MAKE RACIAL COMMENTS AND PREJUDICE TYPE OF THINGS THAT SHE DID NOT LIKE. SHE ALSO CLAIMS THAT DAVID MADE COMMENTS ABOUT THE "NEIGHBORHOOD'S LIKE GOING DOWN THE DRAIN" AND THAT HE STATED "I'M READY TO F'N MOVE". SHE STATES THAT DAVID (THE SHOOTER) CURSES A LOT, AND SHE DID NOT LIKE HIS AGGRESSIVE PERSONALITY. KELSE ALSO MENTIONS THAT SHE APPARENTLY TOLERATED DAVID (THE SHOOTER) WITH REGARDS TO THE DOG BUT "AS A PERSON, I WOULD STEER CLEAR OF HIM".

Det. King- Did he (David) ever talk about his, uh—any kind of disabilities that he might have, any physical ailments or struggles or anything with—

I think he did, but when I first moved in, you know, about two years ago, like when I lived back there beside him. Um, but, no, not really. ...Um, and then he talks a lot of politics and stuff like that, which, again, I wasn't into. But---

Det. King- But nothing of his physical—

Uh-uh. (meaning no)

QUESTION: *WHY IS DET. KING, ONCE AGAIN, ASKING LEADING QUESTIONS?*

Det. King- Nothing, Okay.

No.

Det. King- Um, anything with Amy. You talk with Amy about any—anything regarding the neighborhood or--

It was usually just pleasantries with Amy. She's very quiet and smiley and happy and he's like the polar opposite. Well, he's pleasant too—sometimes.

Det. King- When you were walking with him at night two weeks ago, um you said he didn't say anything about Steven? Any—kind of fears that he had about anything going on in the neighborhood that, you know—

QUESTION: *WHY IS DET. KING, ONCE AGAIN, ASKING LEADING QUESTIONS?*

No. Like—And I feel like that would have been the time 'cause I mentioned like how spooky and how dark it was when we were walking.

And, like, I mean, if he had gotten into an incident with him like—like what I was told it was in a nighttime experience, he didn't mention it at that time

So, yeah. No. We just were talking about drama that was going on in the neighborhood and he gets all fussy about it, but nothing like

QUESTION: *WHY IS DET. KING, ONCE AGAIN, ASKING LEADING QUESTIONS? KELSIE STATES THAT DAVID (THE SHOOTER) MADE NO MENTIONS OF FEARS THAT DAVID SUPPOSEDLY HAD ABOUT WALKING IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD, EVEN WHEN WALKING AT NIGHTTIME WHEN HE CAME IN CONTACT WITH KELSIE ON THEIR ENCOUNTER ON THE ROAD*

Det. King- Okay. Nothing he was concerned with. Never mention, uh—

maybe concern—

with Steven even coming up to him or anything?

**Well, just—he basically makes it known that, like, he carries a weapon. And if anybody—tries anything**

QUESTION: KELSIE LLOYD IS YET ANOTHER NEIGHBOR THAT DAVID GREGORY (THE SHOOTER) MADE THREATENING REMARKS ABOUT SHOOTING STEVEN PAUL TO PRIOR TO SHOOTING.

Det. King- Is this when he said—made the statement about Steven?

**No. It was—It was, um—the day that the—police were actually actively outside still.**

Det. King- So when he does—he does talk about he does carry—a gun

**Yeah**

Det. King- Does he ever say why or for whatever—reason? What does he talk about when he says he has a gun?

**Like, I—I kind of characterize it as just like my right banter type of deal.**

Det. King- So he's a proud gun owner, would you—I don't wanna put any words in your mouth, but is it like

**Yeah. Like, he's- like he prides himself.**

**So it would just come like, you know, this is my rights. I feel, like. And he was not afraid to tell you that he does. And he's not afraid to tell you, like, that he's not afraid to use it, you know. Not like in an intimidating way. But if he was talking to a less confident person, it would probably be intimidating.**

QUESTION: KELSIE LLOYD IS YET ANOTHER NEIGHBOR THAT DAVID GREGORY (THE SHOOTER) MADE THREATENING REMARKS ABOUT SHOOTING STEVEN PAUL TO PRIOR TO SHOOTING. DURING DAVID'S INTERVIEW WITH DETECTIVES DAVID TELLS A COMPLETELY CONTRADICTORY STORY WHEN HE FALSELY CLAIMED THAT ONLY CARRYING HIS WEAPON FOR COYOTES NOT TO USE ON PEOPLE. HOWEVER DAVID (THE SHOOTER) NEVER MENTIONS COYOTES TO KELSIE BUT DAVID DOES, INSTEAD, TELL KELSIE THAT HE CARRIES A WEAPON AND IF ANYONE TRIES "ANYTHING" HE'S NOT AFRAID TO USE IT. DAVID'S (THE SHOOTER) WORDS TO DETECTIVES "**THAT'S THE ONLY REASON I HAD A GUN. IT WASN'T FOR PEOPLE FOR GOD SAKE'S. COMPLETE CONTRADICTION ON WHY HE WAS CARRYING THE GUN. IT WAS FOR PEOPLE. THE FALSE NARRATIVE FROM DAVID (THE SHOOTER) WAS COMPLETE AND UTTER NONSENSE.**

Det. King- Yeah. Okay. Okay. So tell me about, um, when he mentioned something about Steven and –and about having a gun.

So this—I only really wanna talk about this most recent time ‘cause that’s the time that it caused me to call Erica—was the first. Um, he had made other comments in the past—

Yeah, About Steven, specifically. Like, just passing, again, like, more or less, an aggressiveness. Like almost like he’s a—rotten kid, you know. That you wish you could, like, you know—put a hurting on or like, you know, like discipline him, almost, like.

Almost like just like annoyed neighbors—like somebody needs to get this kid. But he’s always made like a—he has always made reference to Steven throughout these last two years, but, again, in a more general sense, more or less, like—again, it just felt like that banter of like his just aggressive nature. Like, that he doesn’t have patience for people like Steven...

Det. King- Okay, But the comment you’re gonna talk about—you said it was different.

Yeah, This one—was significantly different in the fact--

Det. King- So what does he—when does he say this?

This is—I wish I knew that date of like when he got called on the week before. But it was that day, daylight. It was--Ye

Det. King- Well, Steven got called on?

Yeah. Because he wouldn’t move his vehicle. They were trying to do something with the gravel back there.

Det. King- His mom came out there and another neighbor.

And he pushed her and--

Yeah. So it was that day. And so that’s what we were talking about. And I was shocked that he pushed his mom, but—but I also know how, like those things work. It’s like an autism thing. When you get—feel like you’re getting pushed into a corner by authorities, start screaming and—act out. So I have an understanding of those things....So, anyway, I don’t remember if we had walked away separately or if it was later that evening that I was walking with David. And I feel like Amy was there, but the dogs—they’ve got two different dogs. So I feel like she was just like either further down or she had—sometimes they’ll leave each other and she’ll walk back in and he’ll walk one of the dogs longer.

So, anyway, one way or the other, I ended up with him by myself. And he basically just said like—I don’t remember if it was because either the cop cars were still out or why it came up. But he basically just said like, “That kid’s got one time with me and I’ll put a

bullet in him.” And when he said that so specific to me, that was way different than all the other like passing comments. So I called Erica like..I came inside and immediately called her.

QUESTION: KELSIE LLOYD IS YET ANOTHER NEIGHBOR THAT DAVID GREGORY (THE SHOOTER) MADE THREATENING REMARKS ABOUT SHOOTING STEVEN PAUL TO PRIOR TO SHOOTING. DURING DAVID’S INTERVIEW WITH DETECTIVES DAVID TELLS A COMPLETELY CONTRADICTORY STORY WHEN HE FALSELY CLAIMED THAT ONLY CARRYING HIS WEAPON FOR COYOTES NOT TO USE ON PEOPLE. HOWEVER DAVID (THE SHOOTER) CLEARLY THREATENS STEVEN PAUL’S LIFE WITH HIS STATEMENT TO KELSIE. DAVID THE SHOOTER TELLS KELSIE “THAT KID’S GOT ONE TIME WITH ME AND I’LL PUT A BULLET IN HIM”. IF THIS STATEMENT DOESN’T SPEAK TO DAVID’S INTENT, MOTIVE AND PREMEDITATION PRIOR TO THE SHOOTING, THEN WHAT DOES? ALSO AND AGAIN, DURING DAVID’S INTERVIEW WITH DETECTIVES DAVID TELLS A COMPLETELY CONTRADICTORY STORY WHEN HE FALSELY CLAIMED THAT ONLY CARRYING HIS WEAPON FOR COYOTES NOT TO USE ON PEOPLE. HOWEVER DAVID (THE SHOOTER) NEVER MENTIONS COYOTES TO KELSIE BUT DAVID DOES, INSTEAD, TELL KELSIE THAT HE CARRIES A WEAPON AND IF ANYONE TRIES “ANYTHING” HE’S NOT AFRAID TO USE IT. DAVID’S (THE SHOOTER) WORDS TO DETECTIVES “THAT’S THE ONLY REASON I HAD A GUN. IT WASN’T FOR PEOPLE FOR GOD SAKES”. COMPLETE CONTRADICTION ON WHY HE WAS CARRYING THE GUN. IT WAS FOR PEOPLE. THE FALSE NARRATIVE FROM DAVID (THE SHOOTER) WAS COMPLETE AND UTTER NONSENSE.

I was like, hey, man like—I was like I’m—“I’m sure you probably know what’s going on with your cousin down the street. The cops got called on him again. I just want you to know that that neighbor that I told you about” –I have mentioned it to her before. I was like, “This time it just seems a little bit more, like, pointed and it almost seems like he has it out for him,” was pretty much verbatim what I told her.

I was like, “ I just have a really bad feeling. This guy carries a gun. I don’t know why he has an issue with your cousin.” I mean, I wasn’t aware of any personal interaction between the two of them.

And I was just like I don’t know. Like, to me, it—I think what I said to her was, like, “To me, it seems like he’s looking for a reason.”

That’s why, when it happened, my heart just was like—and again, I knew exactly who she was talking about when Dayna called me. I knew that she was talking about Steven and I knew she was talking about David. Like, there was just zero question in my head.

Det. King- And it—and he never said anything about any kind of confrontations they’ve had together.

No. And—and I feel like he would have because he loves talking crap, you know.

Again, it went along with his personality. It just was just one of those things where I was like, ooh, that felt like serious that time.

Det. King- But he never said why he would do that?

Uh-uh.

Det. King- Just if he ever messed with him or--

No. I would have told Erica like, hey, like he's messing with the wrong person, you know.

I would have told her because that's how I feel about him. I just feel like he's like slightly unhinged, you know.

Like if he—tried something with him—he wouldn't even—he wouldn't hesitate.

And that's some of the things that he said in the past. Like, he wouldn't hesitate. Like it—like you mess with—me, you're gonna—get shot

QUESTION: HERE KELSIE CLEARLY STATES THAT SHE FELT THAT THAT DAVID (THE SHOOTER) WAS "SLIGHTLY UNHINGED".

Det. King- He didn't say why. He didn't say there was a reason, like, to defend—himself?

Uh-Uh. No. Cause like I said, if I felt like, uh, there was anything that had happened between the two of them, I would have told Erica...

QUESTION: WHY IS DET. KING, ONCE AGAIN, ASKING LEADING QUESTIONS AND OBVIOUSLY TRYING TO STEER KELSIE INTO A STATEMENT OF SELF DEFENSE HERE

Det. King- Okay, Do you know of David having any issues with anybody else in the neighborhood like, uh, any confrontations or any—or is this. Is this isolated between David and Steven, like?

No. Like he—he tends to be a little, uh—well, he has had other like run-ins, was like maybe cussing somebody out or telling somebody about themselves. Uh, but again, that was all hearsay. Like, I was kind of surprised there was like one or two other people. But, um, a guy that owns a lawn company on the other side of the neighborhood I'm pretty good terms with, and he mentioned, you know, that David can get a little worked up.

QUESTION: HERE KELSIE STATES THAT DAVID HAS CLAIMED TO HAVE HAD RUN-INS WITH OTHERS OR STEVEN PAUL. BUT IT WAS HEARSAY KELSIE STATES. ONCE AGAIN, DAVID SPENDING TIME SPREADING THE FALSE NARRATIVE ABOUT STEVEN PAUL LIKELY WITH THE INTENT TO BOLSTER A FALSE SELF DEFENSE CLAIM IN THE FUTURE. SHE ALSO MENTIONS OTHERS THAT HAVE MENTIONED THAT DAVID CAN GET "WORKED UP".

Det. King- So when, um, Dayna called you, you looked immediately at your cameras. And then you- you couldn't- you could see the live stuff. You seen our personnel out there at the time?

Yeah. And, unfortunately, where my car was parked—my car and then my mom's car—and my car's pretty big. So—Yeah. It kind of shielded, um pretty much anything to the ??? I could see this tree and I could see pretty much of this like ??? right here.

Actually, I took a photo, if you wanna see it.

Det. King- You took a photo during the time?

Uh-huh. I screenshotted the Ring footage. So, I mean you could see a good bit, um, 'cause I can actually move the Ring, so I could actually angle it to—see over there.

QUESTION: *WHERE IS THE RING VIDEO FOOTAGE THAT KELSIE PROVIDED TO DET. KING. WHY DID DET. KING NOT FOLLOW UP WITH THE SEARCH WARRANT WHEN RING RESPONDED TO THE SUBPOENA FOR THE RING FOOTAGE AND REQUESTED A SEARCH WARRANT TO PROVIDE THE NECESSARY VIDEO AND AUDIO FOOTAGE? THIS VIDEO EVIDENCE IS CRITICAL AND IMPORTANT EVIDENCE. WHERE IS THE EFFORT ON THE PART OF DETECTIVES TO INVESTIGATE THE CASE PROPERLY, THOROUGHLY AND COMPLETELY?*

## **Tobin and Beth Johnston (HOA Secretary) Interview**

### Introduction

The interview conducted with Tobin (TJ) and Beth Johnston (BJ) by Det. Andrew Rowe on September 24, 2022, regarding the shooting of Steven Paul Colon by David Gregory, demands careful scrutiny for its portrayal of Steven Paul and the role of Tobin in an aggressive interaction. Their testimonies present unsubstantiated allegations against Steven Paul and must be challenged for their credibility and relevance to the case.

### **Key Points from the Johnston's Testimony:**

1. Unsubstantiated Allegations: The Johnstons' account largely consists of anecdotal evidence and rumors about Steven Paul's behavior, with no concrete evidence to support their claims of his supposed aggression or confrontational nature. This reliance on hearsay and speculation undermines the objectivity and reliability of their statements.
2. Tobin Johnston's Aggression: A critical incident highlighted in the interview is Tobin's own admission of aggression towards Steven Paul, where Steven allegedly called him a derogatory term, and Tobin responded by approaching him in a threatening manner. Steven's reaction to flee rather than confront Tobin directly contradicts the portrayal of Steven as aggressive, instead suggesting he was more inclined to avoid conflict.
3. Characterization of Steven Paul: The Johnstons' portrayal of Steven Paul as a reclusive and potentially violent individual is based on their personal observations and hearsay from others, including a contentious interpretation of Steven's behavior (e.g., pacing and looking at Tobin). This narrative is biased and lacks substantiation from neutral or supportive witnesses.
4. Speculation on Substance Use: The interview veers into speculative territory with discussions about possible drug use by Steven Paul, based on second-hand observations of his household by others. This speculative narrative was not corroborated with factual evidence, such as a toxicology report, and serves to unjustly vilify Steven Paul's character.
5. Failure to Challenge Aggressive Behavior: The police interview does not sufficiently challenge the aggressive behavior displayed by Tobin Johnston nor the unfounded nature of the allegations made by him and his wife. The lack of critical questioning regarding their claims and Tobin's own aggressive tendencies reflects a potential bias in the investigative process.
6. Hostile Environment: The interview underscores a hostile environment created by certain members of the neighborhood, including the Johnstons, towards Steven Paul. This environment, fueled by rumors and aggressive encounters, may have contributed to a biased perception of Steven Paul's character and actions.

### **Conclusion:**

The interview with Tobin and Beth Johnston provides a perspective steeped in personal bias and unsubstantiated claims against Steven Paul Colon. Tobin Johnston's own admission of aggressive behavior towards Steven, coupled with the lack of concrete evidence to support their allegations, challenges the credibility of their testimony. This interview highlights the need for a thorough re-examination of the case, with a focus on objective evidence and the potential influence of a prejudiced neighborhood narrative on the investigation. It's imperative that the legal system critically evaluates the motivations and credibility of all witnesses, especially those displaying hostility towards the victim, to ensure justice is served without bias.

**9/24/22 at 11:31 am- Tobin and Beth Johnston neighbors at 1799 Highland Rd, Osprey**

Interviewed by Det. Andrew Rowe #2187

**Tobin and Beth Johnston stated the following:**

Det. Rowe- Um, so, uh, the parties involved are David Gregory and Steven Colon. Um, and the reason we're talkin' to you is you live basically next door to Steven. And, uh, so I kinda want to get your take on who David is as a person first.

**TJ: Uh, I've—I don't know how long I've met David but it's probably been around a year.**

**BJ: a year is fair.**

**TJ: I've met him in the street. He walks his dogs with his wife pretty much four or five times a day.**

Det. Rowe- Uh, what'—uh , what do you know about Steven?

**TJ: Um, I know Steven's family. I know his grandparents. I know his mother. Uh, and I know his mother has talked to me about Steven and asked me to try and reach out to him, um, that he doesn't talk to anybody. Uh, which I never really did try to do because when I saw him, he would just dead stare and walk away from me. Uh, so, that was okay with me. Um, I have been walking in the neighborhood before where he has pulled up in his vehicle and stopped beside me, and he put his window down and just stared at me, um, and then drives away real slow. Um, I've seen him walking all hours of the night, uh, around the neighborhood. And about three weeks ago—**

QUESTION: ONCE AGAIN, OTHER SUPPOSED INCIDENCES FROM TOBY THAT NO ONE ELSE SAW OR WITNESSED. A STORY THAT TOBY MORE THAN LIKELY ALSO FELT COMPELLED TO SHARE WITH ANY OF THE NEIGHBORS HE CAME IN CONTACT WITH. A STORY THAT CONTINUED WITH THE TOXIC RUMOR MILL SPREAD BY TOBY AND HIS WIFE, GARY OSGOOD AND DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND HIS WIFE THROUGHOUT THE NEIGHBORHOOD ABOUT STEVEN PAUL PRIOR TO THE SHOOTING THAT CREATED THE

HOSTILE ENVIRONMENT THAT ULTIMATELY LED TO DAVID GREGORY SHOOTING STEVEN PAUL.

TOBY STATES THAT STEVEN PAUL DOESN'T TALK TO ANYBODY. HE ALSO CLAIMS THAT STEVEN PAUL WOULD SOMETIMES STARE AND WALK AWAY. HE CLAIMS THAT STEVEN PAUL PASSED HIM WITH HIS CAR, LOOKED AT HIM AND THEN DROVE AWAY REAL SLOW. SO WHAT WAS THE ISSUE?

TJ: Well, three weeks ago, I'm bringin' my trash in. I made the corner. I know he's behind me draggin' his can. And I didn't even look at him. He has his EarPods in, and he's draggin' in his can...I'm just about past that garage door, and he yells, "You fuckin' pussy." And I turned around, and I said, "What did you say?" And I started towards him, and he ran in his house.

QUESTION: ONCE AGAIN, MORE OF THE SAME SUPPOSED INCIDENT FROM TOBY. A STORY THAT TOBY FELT COMPELLED TO SHARE WITH ANY OF THE NEIGHBORS HE CAME IN CONTACT WITH. A STORY THAT CONTINUED WITH THE TOXIC RUMOR MILL SPREAD BY TOBY AND HIS WIFE, GARY OSGOOD AND DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND HIS WIFE THROUGHOUT THE NEIGHBORHOOD ABOUT STEVEN PAUL PRIOR TO THE SHOOTING THAT CREATED THE HOSTILE ENVIRONMENT THAT ULTIMATELY LED TO DAVID GREGORY SHOOTING STEVEN PAUL. WHEN ASKED BY TOBY AFTER THIS ALLEGED INCIDENT, SHERRY PAZZANESE DID NOT HEAR OR WITNESS THIS INCIDENT. IN FACT, NO ONE IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD WITNESSED THIS INCIDENT AND EVEN WHEN TOBY BEGAN TO SPREAD THIS STORY AMONGST THE NEIGHBORS NO ONE SAW IT. TOBY STATED THAT STEVEN PAUL HAD HIS EARPODS IN. TOBY CLAIMS THAT STEVEN RAN AWAY. IF THE NARRATIVE IS THAT STEVEN PAUL IS SUPER CONFRONTATIONAL, WHY DID STEVEN PAUL NOT CONFRONT TOBY AT ALL BUT INSTEAD CHOSE TO LEAVE AND "RUN" AWAY BACK INTO HIS HOME? WHO WAS THE AGGRESSOR, TOBY OR STEVEN? DID THE POLICE EVEN REALIZE OR MADE AWARE THAT TOBY, HIMSELF, HAD BEEN ARRESTED AT THE BENTLEY HOTEL FOR FIGHTING WITH ANOTHER INDIVIDUAL?

TJ: Um, so, he didn't come—he didn't approach me. He ran from me. Uh, and I haven't really seen him since.

BJ: Um, so, I'm the secretary of our HOA.

BJ: So, last week we had a major driveway project going on. ..So um, and we know this would be an issue. Everybody was notified in ample time, uh, cars needed to be removed...

BJ: So, last—last week he refused. Um, we knocked on—Gary knocked on his door quite a few times. He did not come out.

TJ: And Gary asked me to be there backing him up 'cause he wasn't sure if it would become violent.

TJ: So, uh, I just stood over at the far house. And I—he never came to the door anyway. But he was—um, and Gary's not the toughest guy in the world. So, he just uh—He wanted a backup.

TJ: And she (Beth the wife) said she'll go, and I said, "No, You can't go." Uh, "cause I—well, I won't let her walk the dog at night because of him for the last six months.

QUESTION: IF STEVEN PAUL NEVER SPOKE TO ANYONE, WHY THE NEED FOR TOBY TO ACT AS A BODYGUARD FOR GARY OSGOOD? EVEN TOBY'S WIFE BETH (A FEMALE) HAD VOLUNTEERED AND WAS WILLING TO GO UP TO STEVEN PAUL'S HOUSE HERSELF AND ASK IF STEVEN PAUL COULD MOVE HIS CAR. APPARENTLY BETH DIDN'T MIND AND BETH DID NOT APPEAR TO BE AFRAID OF STEVEN. THIS IS COMPLETE CONTRADICTION OF THE FEAR OF STEVEN PAUL FALSE NARRATIVE BY THESE TWO MEN. APPARENTLY, GARY NEEDED BACKUP FROM TOBY. WHY, IF APPARENTLY BETH (A FEMALE) HAD ALREADY VOLUNTEERED AND WAS MORE THAN WILLING AND ABLE TO ADDRESS THE SITUATION HERSELF?

Det. Rowe- So—other than the trash can incident, is there any?

TJ: That's all that happened to me. Now I have sat down with his grandfather when he was still here, which was probably six months ago.

TJ: Uh, his grandfather waved me over, who—his grandfather's very nice. And, uh, said, "Oh, sit down." He's Italian, and he's like, "Sit down. Have some wine"...And, uh, Steven pulled up, saw me, and backed out of the driveway, and never came back. I said, "What—What's up with that?" And he goes, "Oh, He won't come near if somebody's here."

QUESTION: STEVEN PAUL SEES TOBY, BACKS OUT OF THE DRIVEWAY. STEVEN PAUL'S GRANDFATHER MENTIONS THAT STEVEN PAUL WON'T COME NEAR IF SOMEBODY'S AT THE HOUSE. SO, IF STEVEN AVOIDED OTHERS, WHY THE FALSE NARRATIVE THAT STEVEN PAUL WAS A MENACE TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD AND WAS THREATENING TO OTHERS?

TJ: Um, so, then his grandfather had his arm in, like, a cast...like a brace.

TJ: And, uh, evidently, he mentioned that Steven had pushed him and did that.

QUESTION: THIS IS A COMPLETELY FALSE NARRATIVE THAT TOBY CONTINUED TO GOSSIP SPREAD ALL OVER THE NEIGHBORHOOD. STEVEN PAUL DID NOT PUSH AND DID NOT BREAK OR INJURE HIS GRANDFATHER'S ARM. STEVEN'S GRANDFATHER HAS A HEART CONDITION WITH HIGH BLOOD PRESSURE. STEVEN'S GRANDFATHER TAKES BLOOD THINNERS AND OTHER HEART MEDICATIONS THAT CREATE SITUATIONS

WHERE HE IS VERY FEEBLE AND HAS OFTEN HAS POOR BALANCE WHEN WALKING CAUSING STEVEN PAUL'S GRANDFATHER TO FALL AND INJURE HIMSELF ON REPEATED OCCASIONS FROM BOTH HIS HEART CONDITION AND POOR CIRCULATION THROUGHOUT HIS SYSTEM AS WELL AS OCCASIONALLY TO HIS BRAIN RESULTING IN POOR MOTOR BALANCE AND FALLING. IT HAD ABSOLUTELY NOTHING TO DO WITH STEVEN PAUL.

YET ANOTHER STORY THAT TOBY MORE THAN LIKELY ALSO FELT COMPELLED TO SHARE WITH ANY OF THE NEIGHBORS HE CAME IN CONTACT WITH. A STORY THAT CONTINUED WITH THE TOXIC RUMOR MILL SPREAD BY TOBY AND HIS WIFE, GARY OSGOOD AND DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND HIS WIFE THROUGHOUT THE NEIGHBORHOOD ABOUT STEVEN PAUL PRIOR TO THE SHOOTING THAT CREATED THE HOSTILE ENVIRONMENT THAT ULTIMATELY LED TO DAVID GREGORY SHOOTING STEVEN PAUL.

TJ: And—and there's an Asian lady who was out here this morning I talked to who lives back here in these—older. And she said—she saw him walkin', pacin' up and down—uh—uh, Steven pacin' up and down this street—early, like, before the incident—for a while. So, he must've been out there early doin' laps.

QUESTION: THE TERM 'PACIN' WAS A TERM THAT HAD BEEN USED BY BOTH TOBY AND HIS WIFE BETH AS WELL AS DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND THE SHOOTER'S WIFE AMY. IT IS QUITE INTERESTING THE EXACT SIMILARITIES IN DIALOGUE ABOUT A SIMPLE ACT OF WALKING BEING DESCRIBED AS 'PACIN'. HOW OFTEN DID TOBY, DAVID AND AMY SPEAK BEFORE THE SHOOTING? HOW MANY FALSE RUMORS ABOUT STEVEN PAUL DID TOBY SHARE WITH DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND HIS WIFE PRIOR TO THE SHOOTING THAT CREATED SUCH A TOXIC AND HOSTILE ENVIRONMENT THAT ULTIMATELY LED TO DAVID GREGORY SHOOTING STEVEN PAUL? AND WHY?

BJ: Yeah, it sounded like they had a confrontation in the street last night. Sherry, who lives directly in front of Steven. Um, they were talking in a group, and he kinda walked through their circle.

TJ: Yeah. He—he, like, walked through their circle, like, rushed through their circle.

BJ: But didn't—I don't think anything was said or—anything, but he was strangely walking about last night. And then she Sherry was up throughout the night because of the pounding of the (referring to the weights)—so, it sounds like—he was up—the last 12 to 15 hours for him he's been—pacing the neighborhood.

Det. Rowe- Does he, uh—do you think he is possible involved in narcotics, uh, what—doin' narcotics or anything?

QUESTION: WHY IS DET. ROWE ASKING LEADING QUESTIONS?

BJ: We can't say for sure.

TJ: I can't say for sure, but I know when the parking incident happened, when the police were here, his mother went in the house, and she said there were spoons and powdery substance layin' over the kitchen. But the police never went in.

BJ: Was he taking steroids? We don't know.

TJ: Yeah.

BJ: We can't say yes, he was.

TJ: But only from what—

BJ: We just can't say that.

QUESTION: TOBY NOW REPEATS THE FALSE NARRATIVE PROVIDED TO HIM BY GARY OSGOOD ABOUT STEVEN PAUL AND MAKES BLATANT FALSE INFERENCES TO ILLICIT DRUG USE OR STEROID USE. MUCH IN THE SAME WAY THAT TOBY AND GARY HAD BEEN DOING FOR QUITE SOME TIME WITH ALL THE NEIGHBORS. GARY OSGOOD ALONG WITH TOBY, TOBY'S WIFE AS WELL AS DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND HIS WIFE AMY EXPENDED A GREAT DEAL OF TIME TALKING ABOUT STEVEN PAUL AND CREATING THE HOSTILE ENVIRONMENT THAT EVENTUALLY LED TO STEVEN PAUL'S SHOOTING AT THE HANDS OF DAVID GREGORY. SO NOW TOBY CONTINUES SPINNING THE FALSE NARRATIVE THAT STEVEN PAUL IS A DRUG USER. THIS CLAIM IS FALSE AS STEVEN PAUL WAS TAKING ATHLETIC SUPPLEMENTATION IN THE FORM OF POWDERS AND AS WELL AS HIMALAYAN SALT. IN ADDITION, STEVEN PAUL'S TOXICOLOGY REPORT CAME BACK CLEAN. THIS IS IN COMPLETE CONTRADICTION TO THOSE FALSE NARRATIVES THAT SEEMED TO BE SPREAD TO ALL THE NEIGHBORS BY GARY, DAVID AND AMY AS WELL AS TOBY AND HIS WIFE.

Det. Rowe- Was Steven kind of a well-built gentleman?

TJ: He's thin. Um—6 foot.

BJ: Tall. He's tall and skinny.

## Colleen Donlevy-Burns Interview

Colleen Donlevy-Burns' interview with Detective Andrew Rowe regarding her interactions and perceptions of Steven Paul Colon and David Gregory provides an additional layer of complexity

to the case. Her statements reveal her own biases and the broader neighborhood dynamics that contributed to a hostile environment for Steven Paul.

### **Key Observations from Donlevy-Burns' Testimony:**

1. **Subjective Diagnosis:** Donlevy-Burns' attempt to diagnose Steven with a "chemical imbalance" or suggest he might be "schizophrenic or bipolar" based on her limited, non-professional observations is not only inappropriate but also indicative of the stigmatization Steven faced within the community. Her description of Steven's behavior and demeanor contributes to a narrative that unjustly paints him as a threat without substantial evidence.

2. **David Gregory's Influence:** Donlevy-Burns confirms that David Gregory communicated to her about previous issues with Steven, aligning with Kelsie Lloyd's account that David actively involved himself in neighborhood disputes, portraying himself as a sort of enforcer. This behavior by David suggests a premeditated effort to rally neighborhood sentiment against Steven, reinforcing a narrative of Steven as a problem that needed to be dealt with.

3. **Coffee Incident and Note:** The incident involving coffee spilled on Donlevy-Burns' porch and a note left at her door, while minor, is crucial in understanding the tendency to blame Steven for negative occurrences without evidence. Her admission that she does not know who was responsible contradicts the narrative that Steven was a source of unwarranted mischief, highlighting a pattern of baseless accusations against him.

4. **Hostility from the HOA:** The mention of the homeowners association's (HOA) issues with Steven, particularly regarding the car and driveway work, illustrates an organized community effort to police Steven's actions. This collective animosity likely exacerbated the isolation and targeting of Steven, underscoring an environment where he was blamed for infractions without due process.

5. **Contradiction in Behavior:** Donlevy-Burns' claim that Steven would spit and slam doors upon seeing her, while also never speaking to her, presents a contradiction that needs further examination. Her portrayal of Steven as both aggressively dismissive and silently indifferent suggests a biased interpretation of his actions, possibly influenced by the prevailing neighborhood sentiment.

6. **Absence of Direct Confrontation:** Despite the negative portrayal, Donlevy-Burns acknowledges that Steven never verbally assaulted or directly confronted her, contradicting the narrative of him as confrontational. This acknowledgment is critical in challenging the unfounded allegations against Steven and suggests that the neighborhood's perception may be significantly influenced by hearsay and bias.

### **Conclusion:**

Colleen Donlevy-Burns' interview contributes to a narrative that Steven Paul was unjustly vilified within his community, with neighbors quick to attribute negative incidents to him without evidence. The interview underscores the importance of scrutinizing the motivations and biases of witnesses who contributed to a hostile environment for Steven. It further illuminates the role of David Gregory in perpetuating a negative image of Steven, potentially as a means to justify his own actions. This analysis calls for a more nuanced understanding of neighborhood dynamics and the impact of collective bias on the investigation into Steven Paul's shooting.

**9/24/22 at 12:05 pm- Colleen Donlevy-Burns neighbor at 1825 Highland Rd, Osprey**

Interviewed by Det. Andrew Rowe #2187

**Colleen Donlevy-Burns stated the following:**

Det. Rowe- Okay. Um, what about Steven, Steven lives next door to you—in a technical sense, um, can you kinda describe Steven to me?

**Uh, his physical appearance or his personality?**

Det. Rowe- Just Steven.

**Steven? I would say Steven probably had a chemical imbalance in his brain.**

**Because he maybe was schizophrenic or bipolar. He would never look at you in your eye. He would never acknowledge you. Um, he's—he was kinda scary. Um, there's one time I saw somebody had thrown coffee on my front porch and he was walking into his house and I said. "Hey," you know, "Steven, can you tell me, did you see who was at my porch." And he turned around and he just spit and then he slammed his door on me—slammed his door. Um, he's—I've passed by him in the, uh—when he's been in his car. We've looked at each other and he just—he has an empty space inside his head when you look at him.**

Det. Rowe- Kinda like a blank stare?

**A blank stare.**

**QUESTION: COLLEEN DONLEVY-BURNS ALSO BEGINS WITH THIS FALSE NARRATIVE DURING HER INTERVIEW WITH THE POLICE ABOUT STEVEN PAUL BEING MENTALLY ILL IN MUCH THE SAME WAY THAT GARY OSGOOD, TOBY AND HIS WIFE BETH AND DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND HIS WIFE AMY HAD BEEN DOING FOR QUITE SOME TIME WITH ALL THE NEIGHBORS. GARY ALONG WITH TOBY, TOBY'S WIFE AND DAVID AND HIS WIFE AMY EXPENDED A GREAT DEAL OF TIME TALKING ABOUT STEVEN PAUL AND CREATING THE HOSTILE ENVIRONMENT THAT EVENTUALLY LED TO STEVEN PAUL'S SHOOTING AT THE HANDS OF DAVID GREGORY. SO NOW WE ALSO HAVE COLLEEN SPINNING THE FALSE NARRATIVE THAT STEVEN PAUL WAS SOMEHOW MENTALLY ILL**

*BECAUSE HE NORMALLY DID NOT TALK TO ANYBODY AND KEPT TO HIMSELF. SO HOW DOES COLLEEN KNOW THIS AND WHERE ARE HER FACTS THAT STEVEN PAUL WAS MENTALLY ILL, SCHIZOPHRENIC OR BIPOLAR? A DIAGNOSIS OF MENTAL ILLNESS, SIMPLY BECAUSE HE WOULD NOT ACKNOWLEDGE HER OR LOOK AT HER "IN THE EYE"?*

Det. Rowe- Okay. Um, so are—are you aware of any altercations between David and Steven in the past? Whether David told you about it, you witnessed it, Steven told you about it or you heard it from other people?

I know David has told me that Steven has hassled him before.

Well, we just recently had our gravel, um, regraded and I've gotta admit, I was getting—....it was ticking me off he wouldn't move his car.

Because I didn't want—'cause we get flooding. And here we're getting it fixed and the kid wouldn't move the car and so when I was out there to get my mail I said, "Hey, hi, David" He asked how it was and I said, "Ahh, that kid won't move his car." And he goes, "Oh, yeah, I've had problems with him too."

Det. Rowe- So that was last week?

That was—yeah, right—right when we were getting our gravel graded—last week. This past week.

QUESTION: COLLEEN DONLEVY-BURNS ALSO SEEMS KNOWS DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND SPOKE TO HIM ABOUT THE FINAL INCIDENT THE WEEK PRIOR TO THE SHOOTING WHERE SHE COMPLAINS TO DAVID ABOUT STEVEN PAUL NOT MOVING HIS CAR FOR THE DRIVEWAY WORK. DAVID APPARENTLY SHARED WITH COLLEEN HIS NARRATIVE ABOUT HAVING SUPPOSED PROBLEMS WITH STEVEN PAUL IN THE PAST. DAVID GREGORY SPENT A GREAT DEAL OF TIME TALKING TO ALL OF THE NEIGHBORS ABOUT STEVEN PAUL AND PAINTING HIM IN A BAD LIGHT BECAUSE OF A SUPPOSED INCIDENT HE HAD WITH STEVEN PAUL. WHY IS DAVID DOING THIS REPEATEDLY WITH EVERY NEIGHBOR HE SPEAKS TO? *it appears likely that DAVID is SPREADING THE FALSE NARRATIVE AROUND THE NEIGHBORHOOD, IN A PREMEDITATED WAY, IN ORDER TO BUILD HIS NEIGHBORHOOD SUPPORT AND A CASE FOR A FALSE SELF DEFENSE CLAIM IN THE FUTURE.*

Det. Rowe- Okay, Um, I talked to some other neighbors and they stated that—you told me about the coffee on your door, have you have any notes?

Yeah, I did have a note once.

Det. Rowe- What would that note say?

Um, you know, I was gonna take a picture but I don't think I did, though. Um, it—I can't really remember. It wasn't threatening. It just had something to deal with age. Um, it was written in very neat handwriting.

Det. Rowe- And it—you believe that Steven may have put it there?

Oh, I have no idea who did it. I'm not gonna say—who did it.

*QUESTION: IF COLLEEN DONLEVY-BURNS HAD NO IDEA WHO SPILLED COFFEE ON HER STEPS LEADING TO HER DOOR AND SHE HAS NO IDEA WHO LEFT A NOTE ON HER DOOR, WHY IS THE NEIGHBORHOOD NARRATIVE THAT COLLEEN THOUGHT IT WAS STEVEN PAUL THAT DID THIS? IS IT SIMPLY BECAUSE STEVEN PAUL JUST HAPPENED TO BE OUTSIDE WHEN SHE NOTICED IT? COLLEEN DOES AT LEAST STATE TO DET. ROWE THAT SHE HAS NO IDEA WHO DID IT.*

Det. Rowe- Okay, Um, as of recently, though, you haven't seen him—have—does—does Steven walk around at night? Does he—and is he—is he confrontational with people or is it just?

He does come out at night. He's never—other than totally ignore me and spit and if he see me, slams the door the minute he sees me. Um, he's never come talk—he's never said anything to me.

Det. Rowe- Okay. So he's never yelled at you...

No.

*QUESTION: COLLEEN DONLEVY-BURNS ACKNOWLEDGES THAT STEVEN PAUL HAS NEVER SAID ANYTHING TO HER? WHERE IS THE ISSUE?*

## Penelope and Maida Nichols Interview

Penelope and Maida Nichols' interview with Detective Andrew Rowe sheds light on the broader narrative surrounding David Gregory, Steven Paul, and the community's perceptions. Their statements reveal the influential role David played in shaping the community's view of Steven and underscore the complexity of neighborhood dynamics leading up to the tragic incident.

Central to this analysis is David Gregory's admission to Penelope Nichols about a week prior to the shooting. Gregory confided in Nichols about a past altercation with Steven Paul, expressing a regretful wish that he had possessed a gun during that encounter. This statement is not just a casual remark but a glaring red flag pointing towards a deeply rooted animosity and a predisposition towards resolving disputes with Steven through lethal means.

This revelation aligns disturbingly with Kelsie Lloyd's testimony, where Gregory explicitly voiced a willingness to resort to violence against Steven Paul, stating he would put a bullet in him if provoked. The congruence between these two independent accounts from different neighbors not only corroborates the narrative of Gregory's aggressive predisposition towards Steven but also raises serious questions about the legitimacy of Gregory's self-defense claim in the shooting.

The significance of Gregory's prior comment cannot be overstated. It suggests a premeditated hostility and a readiness to escalate to deadly force, undermining any subsequent claims of self-defense. This readiness to employ lethal measures, discussed openly with neighbors, indicates a level of intent and forethought that goes beyond the spur-of-the-moment reaction purported in self-defense situations.

Furthermore, Gregory's proactive dissemination of negative narratives about Steven to the community, including unfounded allegations and personal grievances, served to isolate Steven and vilify him in the eyes of his neighbors. This systematic character assassination, coupled with Gregory's expressed regret over not being armed during a previous encounter, paints a picture of a man laying the groundwork for justifying potential violent actions against Steven.

The interview with Penelope and Maida Nichols, therefore, is not just a recounting of community gossip but a crucial piece of testimony that sheds light on David Gregory's mindset and intentions leading up to the fatal encounter. The prior threatening comment made by Gregory is a pivotal piece of evidence that challenges the self-defense narrative and suggests a premeditated antagonism towards Steven Paul.

By analyzing these testimonies in conjunction, it becomes evident that David Gregory's actions and words in the weeks leading up to the shooting were not those of a concerned neighbor acting in self-defense but rather of an individual who had harbored violent intentions towards Steven Paul. This analysis calls for a deeper scrutiny of Gregory's motivations and the circumstances surrounding the incident, fundamentally questioning the self-defense claim and pointing towards a more sinister narrative of premeditation.

### **Key Observations from the Nichols' Testimony:**

1. **Community Perception Shaped by David Gregory:** Penelope Nichols' account confirms that David Gregory actively communicated his grievances and altercations with Steven Paul to neighbors, including incidents involving construction disturbances and late-night confrontations. This behavior aligns with other neighbors' accounts, suggesting David's significant role in cultivating a negative image of Steven within the community.

2. **Discrepancies in David's Narratives:** The variations in David's stories about confrontations with Steven, as relayed to different neighbors, raise questions about their veracity and consistency. Penelope's recounting of a supposed 2 am altercation, where David allegedly felt threatened by Steven, contrasts with other versions presented, highlighting potential embellishments or alterations in David's retelling of events.

3. **Lack of Direct Knowledge:** Penelope admits to never having met Steven or witnessed any problematic behavior firsthand, relying entirely on hearsay and David's accounts. This reliance on secondhand information is a common theme among neighbors, underscoring the power of narrative in shaping perceptions without direct evidence.

4. **David's Role within the Community:** Despite living in a rental community separate from Steven's homeowner-occupied condos, David positioned himself as a de facto authority figure or neighborhood watch, involving himself in matters outside his immediate living area. This self-appointed role may have contributed to tensions and the escalation of conflicts with Steven.

5. **Threatening Remarks and Intent:** **Penelope's recounting of David's statement about wishing he had a gun during a previous encounter with Steven is particularly troubling. It suggests a premeditated hostility towards Steven and a willingness to resort to violence, further supported by David's aggressive posture when discussing the incident. These remarks are critical in understanding David's mindset and intentions leading up to the shooting.**

6. **Community Dynamics and Isolation:** The Nichols' interview highlights a community dynamic where rumors, hearsay, and the narratives of a few individuals significantly influenced perceptions of Steven Paul. The lack of direct interactions or efforts to understand Steven's situation contributed to his isolation and vilification, facilitated by the spread of unsubstantiated allegations.

### **Conclusion:**

The interview with Penelope and Maida Nichols contributes to a composite picture of a neighborhood influenced by David Gregory's active dissemination of negative portrayals of Steven Paul. These narratives, often accepted without scrutiny or firsthand knowledge, played a crucial role in framing Steven as a community pariah. The inconsistencies in David's accounts, combined with his threatening remarks about Steven, underscore the importance of critically examining the motives and credibility of those who shaped the narrative leading up to Steven Paul's tragic shooting. This analysis suggests a need for a deeper investigation into the role community dynamics and individual actions played in escalating tensions, with a particular focus on David Gregory's influence and intentions.

**9/24/22 at 10:14 am- Penelope and Maida Nichols neighbors at 1835 Highland Rd, Osprey**

Interviewed by Det. Andrew Rowe #2187

**Penelope and Maida Nichols stated the following:**

Det. Rowe- Okay. So, before we went on the record, you—you were tellin' me you know some sort of history between David and Steven. So, if you can kinda go into what you know, what you were told, and what you have seen and heard?

**PN: Okay. We're—we're a small community of dog owners here. So we're all out walking our dogs. And I was coming home the back way, and David was out with his elder dogs, um, sitting in front of his porch. And they were doing some construction next door in the condos where—I don't even know his name**

Det. Rowe- Steven.

**PN: Steven lives. I've—I've never met him. I don't even know what he looks like. Um, and he was causing problems with the construction workers. David was relating the story about how he wouldn't even move his car for the heavy machinery to**

*YET AGAIN, ANOTHER NEIGHBOR THAT KNOWS ABSOLUTELY NOTHING ABOUT STEVEN PAUL. SHE HAD NEVER EVEN SEEN STEVEN PAUL BEFORE. YET WAS GIVEN THIS ALL OF THIS NARRATIVE BY DAVID (THE SHOOTER) THE WEEK BEFORE THE SHOOTING TOOK PLACE. ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF DAVID EXPENDING A GREAT DEAL OF TIME AND ENERGY WITH HIS FALSE NARRATIVES ABOUT STEVEN PAUL WITH ALL OF THE NEIGHBORS.*

Det. Rowe- Do you remember when this conversation took place.

**PN: About a week ago.**

Det. Rowe- Okay. All right. So, you're talking to David about a week ago about Steven.

**PN: About Steven causing problems over there. And then he related to me that he had an altercation at 2 am where, um, he—where Steven charged him while he was walking his elder dog.**

*QUESTION: PENELOPE KNOWS DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND SPOKE TO HIM ABOUT THE FINAL INCIDENT THE WEEK PRIOR TO THE SHOOTING WHERE HE DISCUSSES STEVEN PAUL NOT MOVING HIS CAR FOR THE DRIVEWAY WORK BEING DONE IN THE HOME OWNER OCCUPIED CONDOS . DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND PENELOPE LIVE IN A COMPLETELY SEPARATE RENTAL CONDO SECTION. THESE TWO SECTIONS OF*

CONDOS HAVE NOTHING TO DO WITH ONE ANOTHER. one SECTION IS OWNER OCCUPIED (WHERE STEVEN LIVED) THE OTHERS ARE RENTALS OWNED BY AN OUT OF STATE LANDLORD (WHERE PENELOPE AND DAVID THE SHOOTER LIVED). DAVID APPARENTLY SHARED WITH PENELOPE HIS NARRATIVE ABOUT HAVING SUPPOSED PROBLEMS WITH STEVEN PAUL IN THE PAST. YET AGAIN, DAVID GREGORY SPENT A GREAT DEAL OF TIME TALKING TO ALL OF THE NEIGHBORS ABOUT STEVEN PAUL AND PAINTING HIM IN A BAD LIGHT BECAUSE OF AN ALLEGED INCIDENT HE SUPPOSEDLY HAD WITH STEVEN PAUL. WHY IS DAVID DOING THIS REPEATEDLY WITH EACH AND EVERY NEIGHBOR HE SPEAKS TO? *it appears likely that DAVID is SPREADING THE FALSE NARRATIVE AROUND THE NEIGHBORHOOD, IN A PREMEDITATED WAY, IN ORDER TO BUILD HIS NEIGHBORHOOD SUPPORT AND A CASE FOR A FALSE SELF DEFENSE CLAIM IN THE FUTURE.*

Det. Rowe- Does David walk far, uh, from his residence or does he kinda just--

**PN: He usually goes to the corner there. Sometimes they—they go, um, up by Park—Park Drive,...the next street up.**

**PN: he and his wife usually go out many times during the day, and sometimes he goes out late at night with—with the elder dog.**

Det. Rowe- The—do they ever normally walk together?

**PN: Sometimes they walk together. Sometimes, uh, he walks alone, the dogs.**

Det. Rowe- Okay, And his—he lives, basically, behind you.

**PN: David behind me.**

Det. Rowe- He normally

**PN: They always walk through.**

Det. Rowe- He walks through your yard, on a normal occasion?

**PN: Yes.**

Det. Rowe- Okay, Uh, just to get back there?

**PN: Just to but get back there, come to get their mail, or to walk their dogs. Next to David is a lady, Linda, who has, um, a medium size dog, so they're—they go cut through.**

Det. Rowe- they don't normally just go out that little back street there?

**PN: Sometimes they might. Just—but just often we see them going back and forth.**

QUESTION: PENELOPE WHOSE HOME WAS IN FRONT OF DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND HIS WIFE AMY CONFIRMS THAT DAVID AND AMY WOULD GENERALLY CUT THROUGH HER YARD AS THEY TRAVELED TO AND FROM HIGHLAND RD. GARY OSGOOD ALSO REFERENCES THE FACT THAT DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND HIS WIFE USUALLY CUT THROUGH THE YARD OF THE FIRST LINE OF CONDOS BORDERING HIGHLAND RD. TO GET TO THEIR HOME IN THE REAR SECTION OF CONDOS. WHY DID DAVID AND AMY NOT CHOOSE THIS ROUTE TO GET BACK TO THEIR HOME THAT MORNING AS THEY TYPICALLY WOULD DO? eSPECIALLY WHEN THEY CLAIMED THAT THEY WERE IN SUCH FEAR OF WHAT STEVEN PAUL WOULD DO. THEIR PATH HOME THAT MORNING MAKES ABSOLUTELY NO SENSE WHEN JUXTAPOSED WITH THEIR STATEMENTS OF BEING FEARFUL AND TRYING TO AVOID STEVEN PAUL BECAUSE HE WAS ALWAYS LOOKING TO FUCK WITH THEM (THE SHOOTER AND HIS WIFE'S OWN WORDS).

Det. Rowe- So, David told you that the kid or gentleman at 1819 was causing issues with --

PN: He didn't give me an address, no. But he spoke of the—how many times the sheriffs have been here for—because he's disturbing the peace. Late at night, he works out. David was telling me he's throwin' his weights around, um, he's very uncooperative. And he said, you know, he goes—when he goes off hs meds, he's a nut case.

Det. Rowe- Okay. Um, so, you said Steven confronted him, David, one night about--

PN: He said he charged him. But he--

Det. Rowe- And that was about 2 in the morning, you said?

PN: Yes. That's what he told me.

DAVID TELLS PENELOPE THE SUPPOSED FIRST INCIDENT OCCURRED AT 2 IN THE MORNING. YET DAVID TELLS THE DETECTIVES A COMPLETELY DIFFERENT STORY ABOUT THIS "ALLEGED" INCIDENT. DURING THE CONVERSATION WITH DETECTIVES, DAVID (THE SHOOTER) CLAIMS HE WAS WITH HIS WIFE AMY AND IT WAS 10:30 PM. AMY GREGORY'S STORY WHEN INTERVIEWED IS YET ANOTHER VERSION OF TIME AND EVENTS. WHAT IS THE TRUTH HERE??

Det. Rowe- And what was his statement about that incident?

PN: He said, um—I'm trying to recall exactly what he said, ...but generally, he said, "If I had had a gun on me, I would have shot him."

QUESTION: YET AGAIN, DAVID GREGORY SPENT A GREAT DEAL OF TIME TALKING TO ALL OF THE NEIGHBORS ABOUT STEVEN PAUL AND PAINTING HIM IN A BAD LIGHT BECAUSE OF AN ALLEGED INCIDENT HE SUPPOSEDLY HAD WITH STEVEN PAUL. WHY IS DAVID DOING THIS REPEATEDLY WITH EACH AND EVERY NEIGHBOR HE SPEAKS TO? IS DAVID SPREADING THE FALSE NARRATIVE AROUND THE NEIGHBORHOOD, IN A

*PREMEDITATED WAY, IN ORDER TO BUILD HIS NEIGHBORHOOD SUPPORT AND A CASE FOR A FALSE SELF DEFENSE CLAIM IN THE FUTURE?*

*DAVID ALSO MAKES COMMENTS THREATENING STEVEN PAUL'S LIFE. HE STATES IF HE HAD HAD A GUN ON HIM, HE WOULD HAVE SHOT STEVEN PAUL DURING THE SUPPOSED INCIDENT A YEAR AGO. THIS STATEMENT IS COMPLETELY INCONSISTENT WITH DAVID'S CONTENTION DURING HIS INTERVIEW THAT HE ALWAYS CARRIED A GUN, EVEN PRIOR TO THE CHANCE MEETING WITH STEVEN PAUL ONE YEAR PRIOR TO THE ACTUAL SHOOTING. WHY WERE THESE THREATENING COMMENTS MADE REGARDING SHOOTING STEVEN PAUL COMPLETELY DISREGARDED BY THE DETECTIVES IN this CASE? GOES TO INTENT. GOES TO PRE-MEDITATION.*

Det. Rowe- Is David part of the HOA?

**MN: Like a board member or anything like that?**

**PN: We don't have a board. No. We're all rentals here.**

*DAVID AND PENELOPE LIVE IN THE SECTION OF CONDOS THAT ARE RENTALS (NON OWNER OCCUPIED). AND OWNED BY AN OUT OF STATE LANDLORD. STEVEN PAUL LIVED IN THE OWNER OCCUPIED CONDOS. COMPLETELY SEPARATE CONDOS. WHY DID DAVID (THE SHOOTER) SEE FIT TO INVOLVE HIMSELF IN THE AFFAIRS OF THE OWNER OCCUPIED CONDOS WHEN THESE CONDOS HAD ABSOLUTELY NOTHING TO DO WITH HIM?*

Det. Rowe- Okay, Um, so, David—everybody kinda knows David in the--

**PN: Everybody.**

**PN: He's (David), like, the ... We don't have a lot of men in this—So—So, he's—he's one of the men that we have in here.**

Det. Rowe- He's (David) ever been—confrontational with anybody?

**PN: Never. But if he's—when he told me that story and he was threatened by this kid, uh, I saw him fur up a bit.**

**You know, I mean, I saw him get really kinda, uh, you know, really, he said, "If he comes near me again--."**

QUESTION: YET AGAIN, PENELOPE EXPLAINED THAT DAVID (THE SHOOTER) SHOWED HIS ANGER BY "FURRING UP A BIT" AS HE WAS SPEAKING TO HER ABOUT STEVEN PAUL AND DAVID (THE SHOOTER) WAS ALREADY MAKING THREATENING COMMENTS TO NEIGHBORS ABOUT SHOOTING STEVEN PAUL THE WEEK PRIOR TO THE SHOOTING. WHY WERE THESE THREATENING COMMENTS MADE REGARDING

*SHOOTING STEVEN PAUL COMPLETELY DISREGARDED BY THE DETECTIVES IN this CASE? GOES TO INTENT. GOES TO PRE-MEDITATION.*

Det. Rowe- Yep. And what about Steven down the street? Have you had any interactions with Steven?

**PN: I—no. I've never, ever—I don't even know who he is.**

Det. Rowe- Okay. Uh, have you personally witnessed him be, uh, an issue in the neighborhood?

**PN: I've heard stories about**

Det. Rowe- But you have never witnessed--

**PN: No, I have not.**

*QUESTION: YET AGAIN, ANOTHER NEIGHBOR THAT KNOWS ABSOLUTELY NOTHING ABOUT STEVEN PAUL YET WAS GIVEN THIS ALL OF THIS FALSE NARRATIVE BY DAVID (THE SHOOTER). INCLUDING, THREATS DAVID MADE ABOUT SHOOTING STEVEN PAUL ONE WEEK PRIOR TO THE SHOOTING.*

## **Melania Binder Interview**

Melania Binder's eyewitness account, as documented by Det. Andrew Rowe, provides a compelling narrative that directly contradicts the story presented by David Gregory and his wife Amy regarding their encounter with Steven Paul Colon. Binder's observations offer a chilling counter-narrative that supports claims made by other witnesses, including Kelsey Lloyd and Penelope Nichols, and underscores the aggressive demeanor of David Gregory, hinting at premeditation and challenging the self-defense claim.

### **Observations of Aggression and Confrontation:**

Melania Binder's testimony begins with her hearing a loud explosion-like noise early in the morning, which prompts her to open her door. Immediately, she hears a man, identified as David Gregory, yelling with considerable anger. Although she could not see David clearly due to her angle, she distinctly heard him expressing intense frustration, using phrases like "I'm pissed." This emotional outburst from David, especially in the aftermath of firing the shots, starkly contrasts with his and Amy's depiction of the incident as one where they were passive victims of aggression from Steven.

### **Physical Separation Between the Parties:**

Binder notes a significant physical distance between Steven, whom she describes as a "young boy" running away, and David Gregory. This separation challenges David's narrative of feeling imminently threatened by Steven's actions, suggesting instead that Steven was attempting to retreat from the confrontation. Furthermore, Melania's inability to recall the exact words but her clear memory of the tone and intensity of David's yelling provides insight into his aggressive and confrontational demeanor post-incident.

### **Discrepancies and Community Perception:**

While Melania admits to not knowing Steven personally, her account discredits the negative portrayal of him by some neighbors, influenced by David Gregory. She expresses shock at the neighborhood siding with David and denigrating Steven, highlighting a disturbing community bias seeded by unfounded allegations of mental health issues and aggressive behavior towards others. Melania's statement that she witnessed David yelling obscenities at Steven, who was silent and fleeing, further dismantles the narrative of Steven as the aggressor.

### **Contradictory Narratives and Witness Perception:**

Binder's interpretation of the event as a familial dispute rather than a violent confrontation underscores the confusion and misinterpretation of the events leading to and following the shooting. Her expectation of a father-son altercation rather than a neighborly dispute with fatal consequences reflects the ambiguity and chaos of the moment as perceived by an onlooker without prior context of the individuals' history.

### **Analysis:**

Melania Binder's account is a critical piece of testimony that aligns with other witness accounts suggesting David Gregory's aggressive behavior and premeditated threats towards Steven Paul. Her observations challenge the self-defense narrative and support the theory of David as the instigator of the confrontation. This account, coupled with others, paints a complex picture of community dynamics, personal biases, and the tragic escalation of a neighborhood dispute into a fatal shooting.

Her testimony not only questions the validity of David Gregory's self-defense claim but also highlights the need for a deeper investigation into his prior interactions and threats towards

Steven Paul. The alignment of her account with those of Kelsey Lloyd and Penelope Nichols emphasizes a pattern of behavior from David Gregory that is aggressive and confrontational, significantly contributing to the understanding of the incident's context and the dynamics leading up to it.

**9/24/22 at 10:53 am- Melania Binder neighbor at 1823 Highland Rd, Osprey**

Interviewed by Det. Andrew Rowe #2187

**Melania Binder stated the following:**

Det. Rowe- Okay. Um, Let's see here. And we were talking briefly, you said you worked for the state attorney's office in Sarasota?

**Yes, I'm a temporary, uh—I'm on, uh, that 'cause, uh unemployment company's payroll but I work since 23<sup>rd</sup> of August for—state attorney's office.**

Det. Rowe- Okay. Uh, we're talking about the incident that occurred just outside your residence here this morning. Uh, you were briefly telling me you may have witnessed it kinda sort of. Uh, so can you kinda tell me again what happened, that what you heard, what you saw and everything that transpired afterwards?

**Okay. So, I don't know exactly what time was it, around 7:00 in the morning.**

**I just woke up and I wanted to do laundry so, I was right about here in the hallway when I heard a terrible sound like—like an explosion.**

**So, I was right next to the door so I opened the door and what I—I heard the man (David)—so, I didn't quite see the man because he was further to the left from my angle of view.**

*MELANIA HEARS DAVID (THE SHOOTER) SCREAMING AND SWEARING AT STEVEN PAUL AT THIS POINT IMMEDIATELY AFTER SHOOTING HIM. MELANIA ALSO CONFIRMS THAT THERE WAS SEPARATION AND DISTANCE BETWEEN THE VICTIM (STEVEN PAUL) AND DAVID (THE SHOOTER).*

**I just saw a young boy, uh, running, not too fast and he looked okay. And I heard—I don't remember the—the words but somebody was very pissed and he said, "I'm pissed," and something and he was yelling with all his power. And I didn't see him exactly. I even think he was laying down like this, I don't know.**

*MELANIA CONFIRMS THAT DAVID GREGORY (THE SHOOTER) WAS "YELLING WITH ALL HIS POWER" AT STEVEN PAUL AND SAYING "I'M PISSED, I'M PISSED". THIS BEHAVIOR, ONCE AGAIN, GOES TO DAVID'S STATE OF MIND DURING THE SHOOTING. DAVID (THE SHOOTER) WAS NEVER IN FEAR AS HE FALSELY CLAIMED OVER AND OVER AGAIN. HIS*

ABHORRENT ACTIONS AND BEHAVIOR AND CHOICE OF WORDS AFTER THE SHOOTING WERE COMPLETELY INCONSISTENT WITH HIS CLAIM THAT HE WAS FROZEN IN FEAR FOR HIS LIFE. DAVID GREGORY'S FALSE NARRATIVE THAT HE WAS FROZEN IN FEAR FOR HIS LIFE AND HAD NO OTHER OPTION BUT TO SHOOT STEVEN PAUL IS COMPLETE AND UTTER NONSENSE.

ALSO APPEARS THAT MELANIA NOTICED DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AS HE WAS BENDING DOWN TO PICK UP AND COLLECT HIS DOG (AND ONE OF THE SPENT SHELLS THAT WENT MISSING?) AFTER THE SHOOTING.

Det. Rowe- Who was laying down?

**The man. (David)**

**The man was farther away and then I saw a young boy running. A tall, young boy. I don't know his age but he looked like a teenager.**

MELANIA CONFIRMS AGAIN THAT THERE WAS SEPARATION and DISTANCE BETWEEN THE VICTIM (STEVEN PAUL) AND DAVID (THE SHOOTER).

**And then I saw—I went inside and I decided I'm sleepy and I went to bed and then I heard the helicopters and—much later I came outside and heard from the neighbors what happened.**

Det. Rowe- Okay. Uh, so the young boy that you saw running, have you ever seen him before?

**No. No, I've never seen him. Even if I live here I don't go outside. I don't have a dog. I don't—I mean, I just say hello to my neighbors but I don't go in the street like them...**

YET AGAIN, ANOTHER NEIGHBOR THAT KNOWS ABSOLUTELY NOTHING ABOUT STEVEN PAUL. she had never even seen steven paul before.

**...but, now that they said who was the other man, I know him because I see him around—like walking his dogs every day.**

**I just—he—I just see him and his wife always they are walking the dogs and he's always holding the little dogs in his arms.**

Det. Rowe- Have you ever spoken with him?

**We—we just—I just let—he just let me pet his dogs.**

QUESTION: MELANIA STATES THAT DAVID (THE SHOOTER) WOULD LET HER PET HIS DOGS. WHY DID DAVID ALLOW MELANIA TO PET HIS DOGS, YET DAVID HAD SUCH A PROBLEM WHEN STEVEN PAUL ATTEMPTED TO PET HIS DOGS AS WELL? WHY SUCH A COMPLETELY NEGATIVE RESPONSE FROM DAVID TO STEVEN PAUL'S ATTEMPT TO PET

HIS DOGS? WHERE WAS THE SUPPOSED THREAT IN THAT (STEVEN PAUL) WHEN DAVID HAD ABSOLUTELY NO PROBLEM WITH MELANIA DOING THE SAME EXACT THING? WHY DID DAVID YANK HIS DOG AWAY FROM STEVEN PAUL IN SUCH A VIOLENT AND ABUSIVE WAY A YEAR AGO AND ON THE DAY OF THE SHOOTING WHEN HIS DOGS APPROACHED STEVEN PAUL? THE DOGS OBVIOUSLY FELT COMFORTABLE WITH APPROACHING STEVEN PAUL A YEAR AGO AND ALSO IN THE MOMENTS JUST BEFORE THE SHOOTING. THIS COMPLETELY CONTRADICTS DAVID'S (THE SHOOTER) FALSE NARRATIVE THAT THE DOGS WERE GOING CRAZY BECAUSE HE FALSELY CLAIMED THE DOGS SENSED DAVID WAS "IN TROUBLE" (DAVID'S OWN WORDS DURING HIS POLICE INTERVIEW). THIS IS A COMPLETELY FALSE NARRATIVE ON THE PART OF THE SHOOTER.

Det. Rowe- Okay. Just in a passing thing?

**It's a passing thing....**

Det. Rowe- All right. So you don't really know this gentleman—uh, you don't know much of his history in the neighborhood, you just—see him and his wife walking their dogs?

**No, I'm—I'm shocked that the neighbors are on his (David the shooter) side and they say bad things about this boy that I never saw. They say—they say he has mental problems, that he's under medication and how bad he is, that he's a bully, that he's harassing everybody**

QUESTION: ONCE AGAIN WE HAVE YET ANOTHER INTERVIEWEE BEGINNING WITH STATEMENTS THAT SHE HAD HEARD FROM THE NEIGHBORS THIS FALSE NARRATIVE ABOUT STEVEN PAUL BEING MENTALLY ILL AND THAT STEVEN PAUL WAS SUPPOSEDLY BULLYING AND HARASSING EVERYONE. IN MUCH THE SAME WAY THAT GARY OSGOOD, TOBY AND HIS WIFE BETH AND DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND HIS WIFE AMY HAD BEEN DOING FOR QUITE SOME TIME WITH ALL THE NEIGHBORS. GARY ALONG WITH TOBY, TOBY'S WIFE AND DAVID AND HIS WIFE AMY EXPENDED A GREAT DEAL OF TIME TALKING ABOUT STEVEN PAUL AND CREATING THE HOSTILE ENVIRONMENT THAT EVENTUALLY LED TO STEVEN PAUL'S SHOOTING AT THE HANDS OF DAVID GREGORY.

Det. Rowe- But you've never witnessed any of that?

**No, I've never witnessed any—anyone and this morning—well the other guy (David) was saying horrible words and the boy was saying nothing. He was just running away.**

QUESTION: MELANIA STATES THAT SHE NEVER WITNESSED STEVEN PAUL DO ANYTHING TO ANYONE. MELANIA THEN FURTHER STATES THAT DAVID GREGORY (THE SHOOTER) WAS SCREAMING HORRIBLE WORDS AT STEVEN PAUL AND THE BOY (STEVEN PAUL) WAS SAYING ABSOLUTELY NOTHING. THIS BEHAVIOR, ONCE AGAIN, GOES TO DAVID'S STATE OF MIND DURING THE SHOOTING. DAVID (THE SHOOTER) WAS NEVER IN FEAR AS HE FALSELY CLAIMED OVER AND OVER AGAIN. HIS

*ABHORRENT ACTIONS AND BEHAVIOR AFTER THE SHOOTING WERE COMPLETELY INCONSISTENT WITH HIS CLAIM THAT HE WAS FROZEN IN FEAR FOR HIS LIFE. DAVID GREGORY'S FALSE NARRATIVE THAT HE WAS FROZEN IN FEAR FOR HIS LIFE AND HAD NO OTHER OPTION BUT TO SHOOT STEVEN PAUL IS COMPLETE AND UTTER NONSENSE.*

Det. Rowe- Uh, have you seen cop cars in the area, uh recently a lot? Our—the sheriff's cars, have you ever seen 'em come to the—any houses around here lately?

**No, but the –the neighbor said that they called the cops on the—on the young boy but I never—No. No, I've never seen**

*YET AGAIN, ANOTHER NEIGHBOR THAT KNOWS ABSOLUTELY NOTHING ABOUT STEVEN PAUL YET WAS GIVEN THE SAME FALSE NARRATIVES ABOUT STEVEN PAUL FROM DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND HIS WIFE AMY THAT THEY APPARENTLY HAD GIVEN TO EVERYONE ELSE IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD AS WELL.*

Det. Rowe- Uh, you were able to—were you inside or outside when you were looking at everything?

**I was outside.**

Det. Rowe- Okay. So you were outside your door and you kinda saw a young boy running—away as you heard—

**Yeah. And he looked fine.**

Det. Rowe- As you heard someone else yelling?

**Yeah, yelling like and saying bad words that I don't remember, only that—I'm pissed. I'm pissed or something.**

*MELANIA CONTINUES TO CONFIRM THAT DAVID GREGORY (THE SHOOTER) WAS SCREAMING BAD WORDS AT STEVEN PAUL AND SAYING "I'M PISSED, I'M PISSED". THIS BEHAVIOR, ONCE AGAIN, GOES TO DAVID'S STATE OF MIND DURING THE SHOOTING. DAVID (THE SHOOTER) WAS NEVER IN FEAR AS HE FALSELY CLAIMED OVER AND OVER AGAIN. HIS ABHORRENT ACTIONS AND BEHAVIOR AND CHOICE OF WORDS AFTER THE SHOOTING WERE COMPLETELY INCONSISTENT WITH HIS CLAIM THAT HE WAS FROZEN IN FEAR FOR HIS LIFE. DAVID GREGORY'S FALSE NARRATIVE THAT HE WAS FROZEN IN FEAR FOR HIS LIFE AND HAD NO OTHER OPTION BUT TO SHOOT STEVEN PAUL IS COMPLETE AND UTTER NONSENSE.*

Det. Rowe- And you saw the—the boy run away and that was pretty much it for you and you just went back to bed?

**Yeah, I—I decided that it's just a fight between a father and he son.**

Det. Rowe- Okay. So you thought—it was just a family fight going on?

**Yes, I thought it was a family fight. I thought it's a father pissed off at his son.**

## **Robin and Richard Henry Interview**

Robin and Richard Henry's interview with Det. Andrew Rowe provides additional insight into the community dynamics and the perception of both David Gregory and Steven Paul Colon. Their account, while less direct in witnessing the incident, aligns with the broader narrative of misunderstanding and hearsay that surrounded Steven Paul, further complicating the portrait of interactions leading up to the tragic event.

### **Observation of the Incident:**

Robin Henry, present on her porch around the time of the shooting, reported hearing what she initially thought was a car backfiring, later recognized as a gunshot. This momentary engagement with the incident underscores the sudden and shocking nature of the event for the neighborhood, marking a definitive point of change in the community's atmosphere.

### **Minimal Interaction with David Gregory:**

The Henrys' interaction with David Gregory was limited to mere acknowledgments through waves, highlighting a superficial layer of community engagement that didn't extend into deeper familiarity or understanding. This lack of close interaction is a common thread among neighbors, reflecting a community where profound divides and lack of genuine connection allowed for misunderstanding and fear to fester.

### **Perception of Steven Paul Colon:**

The Henrys' account of Steven Paul is primarily characterized by hearsay and distant observations, painting him as a reclusive and misunderstood figure within the neighborhood. Richard Henry's attempt to greet Steven, met with silence, and the recounting of Steven's refusal to move his car for driveway work, as told through the HOA president Gary's experience, contributes to a narrative of Steven as uncooperative. However, Robin Henry explicitly states she never witnessed Steven being aggressive, directly challenging the vilifying rumors that circulated about him.

### **Rumors and Hearsay:**

The interview significantly highlights the role of rumors and hearsay in shaping the neighborhood's perception of Steven Paul. Discussions of alleged threats against his grandparents and supposed confrontations with David Gregory, as heard from Toby, underscore a community quick to pass judgment based on incomplete and unverified accounts. This reliance on hearsay rather than direct knowledge or understanding contributed to a hostile environment, ultimately culminating in the tragic shooting.

### **Analysis:**

The Henrys' testimony adds to the complex tapestry of neighborhood dynamics that set the stage for the confrontation between David Gregory and Steven Paul Colon. While they offer no direct evidence of aggression on Steven's part, their recounting of rumors and secondhand stories illustrates how perceptions were shaped more by gossip than reality. This environment of suspicion and fear, fueled by unsubstantiated claims and a lack of genuine community connection, provides a backdrop against which the tragedy unfolded.

Their interview, consistent with others, suggests a narrative where Steven Paul was largely misunderstood and maligned based on hearsay rather than fact. It also points to a community where lack of direct engagement and reliance on rumors contributed to a climate of fear and misunderstanding, complicating the circumstances that led to the fatal incident.

**9/24/22 at 11:08 am- Robin and Richard Henry neighbors at 1827 Highland Rd, Osprey**

Interviewed by Det. Andrew Rowe #2187

**Robin and Richard Henry stated the following:**

Det. Rowe- Okay. So we're discussing –today, we're discussing a gentleman by the name of David and a gentleman by the name of Steve. Are you familiar with those two individuals?

**Richard Henry: Well I heard, uh—now David all I know him by is walking his little dog.**

Det. Rowe- Okay. And the other gentleman that we're talking about is—Steve who lives at 1819.

**Richard Henry: Yeah, he's –he's a tool. Uh, I don't know how to put that.**

Det. Rowe- let's start with this morning. Did you guys hear anything this morning?

**Robin Henry: Yes, I did. I was up and I heard a gunshot and I thought was a car backfiring.**

**Richard Henry: She did. But we were just right here.**

Det. Rowe- Okay. You were on your porch?

**Robin Henry: Yes, I was. He was asleep.**

Det. Rowe- Uh, about what time do you think that was?

**Robin Henry: About 7:15.**

Det. Rowe- Um, so, let's go and do a little bit of history with David first. So the guy with the dogs. Have you—have you had any, uh, contact with David?

**A wave...that's about it.**

Det. Rowe- Uh, so let's talk about Steven, the gentleman that lives at 1819. Uh, what kind of history can you provide me on Steven?

**Robin Henry: Well we—at—for instance we were just getting our whole, um—all the condos here, getting our driveways, uh, redone.**

**Robin Henry: And he refused to move his car And so they had the police come over and try to get him up, um, and Gary, our president of the HOA he went over there and he said, "Come on, get up." And he wouldn't move and, um apparently went...And I guess the mother came over and—well Gary can tell you a little more but he said it wasn't pretty.**

**Richard Henry: All I—I met—I tried to meet the guy (Steven) when we—we just moved here a couple of years ago and the first time I met him he had a hoody on, hey, how you doing, just no response, that kind of person.**

Det. Rowe- Have you ever seen him be aggressive with anybody in the neighborhood?

**Robin Henry: No, because—he's—I haven't**

**QUESTION: AT THIS POINT, WE CAN ALL AGREE THAT STEVEN PAUL KEPT TO HIMSELF AND DID NOT ENGAGE IN CONVERSATION WITH THE NEIGHBORS. ROBIN HENRY ALSO CONFIRMS SHE HAD NEVER SEEN STEVEN PAUL BE AGGRESSIVE WITH ANYONE IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD.**

**Richard Henry: I've just heard. (reference to rumors)**

Det. Rowe- Has there been—and you don't know of any issues with any other residences-residents here?

**Robin Henry: Um, I know—with Gary. That's hearsay**

**Richard Henry: I've heard but—I've heard some like threats but, you know, that's just talking—at the pool. That's hearsay.**

**Richard Henry: It was—like I've heard he's threatened his own, uh, grandparents.**

**Robin Henry: Oh, and also, he was—I don't know if he was threatening –David.**

**Richard Henry: Oh, and also, he was—I don't know if he was threatening—I think I heard he was threatening David too. I've heard about that.**

**Robin Henry: that they've had some run ins.**

**Richard Henry: They've had some run ins.**

Det. Rowe- They have had run ins?

**Robin Henry: But that is just hearsay. We heard it—from Toby.**

**Richard Henry: Yeah, it's hearsay.**

**QUESTION: YET ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF NEIGHBORS THAT DID NOT KNOW STEVEN PAUL WHATSOEVER, YET WERE PROVIDED THE SAME COMPLETELY FALSE NARRATIVE THAT TOBY CONTINUED TO GOSSIP SPREAD ALL OVER THE NEIGHBORHOOD. STEVEN PAUL DID NOT IN ANY WAY, SHAPE OR FORM THREATEN HIS GRANDPARENTS.**

**YET ANOTHER STORY THAT TOBY MORE THAN LIKELY ALSO FELT COMPELLED TO SHARE WITH ANY OF THE NEIGHBORS HE CAME IN CONTACT WITH. A STORY THAT CONTINUED WITH THE TOXIC RUMOR MILL SPREAD BY TOBY AND HIS WIFE, GARY OSGOOD AND DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND HIS WIFE THROUGHOUT THE NEIGHBORHOOD ABOUT STEVEN PAUL PRIOR TO THE SHOOTING THAT CREATED THE**

*HOSTILE ENVIRONMENT THAT ULTIMATELY LED TO DAVID GREGORY SHOOTING STEVEN PAUL.*

## **Challenging the Self-Defense Claim: A Detailed Analysis of the Amy Gregory's Interview (The Shooter's wife)**

### **Introduction**

An in-depth examination of Amy Gregory's interview reveals significant contradictions and questionable claims regarding the shooting incident involving her husband, David Gregory, and Steven Paul. This analysis aims to scrutinize the inconsistencies and implications within her narrative that challenge the credibility of the self-defense justification.

### **Marital Status and Identity Questions**

- Inconsistencies in Identity: The ambiguity surrounding Amy Gregory's use of her maiden or previously married name raises questions about her credibility and the clarity of her relationship with David Gregory.

### **Decision to Engage Despite Claimed Fear**

- Contradictory Behavior: Amy's account of choosing to follow Steven Paul, despite expressing fear of him, contradicts expected avoidance behavior, suggesting a willingness to confront rather than evade a perceived threat.

### **Framing of the Victim**

- Shifting Characterization: The alteration in referring to Steven Paul from "the kid" to "the guy" appears as an attempt to justify the shooting by portraying the encounter as more threatening than initially indicated.

### **Anticipation of Conflict**

- Preparation for Confrontation: The narrative of previous encounters leading to David Gregory's decision to carry a gun suggests an expectation of conflict with Steven Paul, undermining the spontaneity element of self-defense.

### **Discrepancies with Forensic Evidence**

- Forensic Evidence Conflict: The description of the confrontation's location and progression significantly conflicts with forensic evidence, indicating that David Gregory might have been the aggressor, which challenges the self-defense claim.

### **Community Perception and Mental Health Speculations**

- Unsubstantiated Allegations: Amy Gregory's portrayal of Steven Paul as a community threat based on hearsay rather than direct evidence attempts to retroactively justify their fear, without concrete substantiation.

### **Narrative Inconsistencies**

- Flawed Account: The inconsistencies in Amy Gregory's recounting of the incident, especially when juxtaposed with forensic findings, raise doubts about the legitimacy of the self-defense argument.

### **Questioning the Immediacy of Threat**

- Lack of Direct Threat: The absence of a direct and immediate threat from Steven Paul at the moment preceding the shooting questions the validity of using self-defense as a justification.

### **Motivation and Sentiment towards Steven Paul**

- Underlying Motive: Expressions of fear and a community desire for Steven Paul's removal, coupled with the decision-making leading up to the incident, suggest a potential motive behind the confrontation.

## **Conclusion**

The detailed analysis of Amy Gregory's interview exposes significant contradictions and omissions that challenge the self-defense claim in the shooting of Steven Paul. The strategic framing of Steven Paul, the decision to engage, and the inconsistencies with forensic evidence necessitate a reevaluation of the incident's portrayal, indicating an alternative narrative that led to the tragic outcome.

### **9/24/22 at 11:15 am- Amy Gregory, 1847 Highland Rd, Osprey at Sheriff's office**

Interviewed by Det. Nathan King #2399 and Det. Luis Ojeda #1795 (others in the room Amber, victim's advocate)

#### **Amy Gregory stated the following:**

Det. King- Do you have a Florida license?

**Amy Gregory: I do.**

Det. King- Okay. And is it Gregory?

**Amy Gregory: Yeah.**

Det. King- Go ahead and spell that for me.

**Amy Gregory: Well, the lady says it's gonna be under ??(maiden or previously married name?)**

**Amy Gregory: (maiden or previously married name??). Yes sir. And it would be Gregory. Or (maiden or previously married name?? on my license.**

Det. King- Not Gregory?

**Amy Gregory: No. It's—yeah. It's still in my (maiden or previously married name?)**

**QUESTION: IF AMY GREGORY IS/HAS BEEN MARRIED TO DAVID GREGORY (THE SHOOTER), WHY IS AMY GREGORY STILL USING HER MAIDEN NAME OR HER PREVIOUSLY MARRIED NAME ON HER LICENSE? IS AMY ACTUALLY MARRIED TO DAVID GREGORY OR NOT?**

Det. King- Okay. All right. All right, Amy. Just—in your own words, can you just tell—let's—what—what we're gonna do is I just want you to tell us what happened today... So just happened today, what—what—about what time it was that you—whatever you guys did.

**Amy Gregory: Um, I think it was about 6:30. Um, we were about to take the puppies out for a walk, and, uh, when we come through, we always take right. So we just went our normal way, and we're always nervous, 'cause we know that kid (Steven) lives in those condos. So, we walked past, and we heard one of the other guys (Gary) that lives in there come around with his dogs. 'Cause they all three started barking. So they came around and we said, Good morning. He started walking the other way, and then maybe a minute later, the kid comes walking down the driveway.**

Det. King- I'm sorry—I'm sorry. When you say "the kid," who's that?

**Amy Gregory: Uh, the guy that attacked David. Yeah.**

QUESTION: WHY DID AMY GREGORY FEEL THE NEED TO CORRECT HERSELF WHEN QUESTIONED BY THE DETECTIVE? AT FIRST SHE REFERS TO STEVEN PAUL AS "THE KID". SHE THEN IMMEDIATELY CORRECTS HERSELF AND CALLS STEVEN PAUL "THE GUY". AMY OBVIOUSLY FELT THAT STEVEN PAUL WAS A KID AND NOT AN ADULT. BUT THEN SHE SUBSEQUENTLY CALLS HIM THE GUY TO MAKE THE SHOOTING APPEAR MORE LEGITIMATE. IT IS A BIT HARDER TO JUSTIFY THE SHOOTING OF AN INNOCENT KID RATHER THAN AN ADULT. HENCE THE REASON, IT APPEARS, THAT SHE IMMEDIATELY CORRECTS HER FREUDIAN SLIP.

THIS WAS THE FIRST CONFIRMATION OF THE FACT THAT DAVID GREGORY (THE SHOOTER) AND HIS WIFE AMY NORMALLY CUTTING THROUGH THE NEIGHBORS YARD TO GET ONTO HIGHLAND RD. WHY DID THEY CHOOSE TO FOLLOW STEVEN PAUL THAT MORNING, INSTEAD OF TAKING NORMAL PATH CUTTING BACK THROUGH THE NEIGHBORS YARD ON THEIR WAY HOME TO AVOID STEVEN PAUL BECAUSE OF THEIR "SUPPOSED" FEAR OF STEVEN PAUL? THEIR NARRATIVE ABOUT WHAT HAPPENED THAT MORNING IS IN COMPLETE CONTRADICTION TO WHAT SHE CLAIMS WAS THEIR SUPPOSED FEAR OF STEVEN PAUL. THAT THEY WERE IN FEAR OF WHAT HE "MIGHT DO". THIS FALSE NARRATIVE BY THE WIFE OF THE SHOOTER IS ABSOLUTE NONSENSE.

THIS WAS ALSO THE FIRST CONFIRMATION OF THE FACT THAT SHOOTER AND HIS WIFE SPOTTED STEVEN PAUL FIRST BEFORE STEVEN PAUL EVEN NOTICED THEM. AS YOU WILL FIND THE SHOOTER AND HIS WIFE CERTAINLY HAD PLENTY OF OPPORTUNITY TO AVOID SHOOTING STEVEN PAUL. THE SHOOTER AND HIS WIFE INSTEAD CHOSE TO FOLLOW STEVEN PAUL ON HIGHLAND RD RATHER THAN AVOID HIM ALTOGETHER. THIS RESULTED IN A SUPPOSED UNPROVOKED ATTACK ON DAVID. THIS FALSE NARRATIVE MAKES ABSOLUTELY NO SENSE AND MORE THAN LIKELY IS COMPLETELY UNTRUE.

Amy Gregory: Um, so then he (Steven Paul) comes walking out and he's—anytime he's outside, you know he's (Steven) looking for trouble. So then it was like he (Steven) was trying to follow the other guy (Gary). And then the other guy (Gary) went around the block. So it's like he turned around to go down the other street, like he was gonna cut him off.

Det. King- Is that Westview?

Amy Gregory: I think that's Westview.

*THIS WAS CONFIRMATION FROM THE SHOOTER'S WIFE OF THE PATH THAT STEVEN PAUL TRAVELED THAT MORNING. SO APPARENTLY, STEVEN PAUL EXITED THE DRIVEWAY OF THE OWNER OCCUPIED CONDOS WHERE STEVEN PAUL RESIDED AND WALKED OUT ONTO HIGHLAND ROAD. HE DID NOT SEE THE SHOOTER OR HIS WIFE WHEN HE EXITED THE DRIVEWAY AND STEVEN PAUL TOOK HIS USUAL PATH AND TOOK A LEFT HEADING SOUTH ON HIGHLAND RD. STEVEN PAUL THEN TOOK A RIGHT ONTO WESTVIEW OF THE FACT THAT DAVID GREGORY (THE SHOOTER) AND HIS WIFE AMY NORMALLY CUTTING THROUGH THE NEIGHBORS YARD TO GET ONTO HIGHLAND RD.*

Det. King- And who's this other guy that you're talking about?

Det. King- Yeah. The other—the guy—so you don't know the guy who was walking the dog? You don't know his name?

Amy Gregory: I don't know his name.

Amy Gregory: Um, but I know where they live.

Det. King- Okay. So Steven's going after the guy (Gary) you don't know.

Amy Gregory: Exactly.

Amy Gregory: So then I guess he (Steven) can't find him (Gary) going down Westview. So then he (Steven) turns and he starts heading our way, and that always makes us nervous. So we just keep walking our dogs. So he ends up that time just passing. And he started—he—he was just walking down the road. So we just continued going our way, and then you turn around, and then it's almost like he's got his sights on us now. He's turned around and he's walking our way. So we just continue what we're doing 'cause we know how crazy he is. And the he—uh, the—the only way I can explain it is he's almost like a buzzard circling, because what he'll do is he'll walk towards you in a huff, and it's almost like he bows himself out. So he'll walk towards you. He got in the middle of us and spit and he passed me, then he always does his little look around. He does a quick

circle. And then each time he passes, it gets shorter and closer. That's—that's how he's always done it. He did that this morning. And we tried to just walk our dogs.

What I remember seeing, I had (my dog) in one area. David was with (his dog) in the other. Steven walked past David—staring at him the whole time. Then he spits. He goes by me, then he turns around. He goes back by David and he's just staring at him. The next thing I know, I'm looking at David and I turn around. Steven is past David just a little bit, and then does on of his abrupt turns around—turnaround. And all I hear is, What the fuck? And that's all I hear. And he's walking toward David the whole time. I heard David—I don't know if he said, Back the fuck off, or something, and then all I can see is the guy. It looked like he was either swinging at David—it looked like he—they were facing each other. It looked like he pushed David but it looked like he was taking his arm to—trying to go around his neck. Almost like he was gonna try to pull him down. And then that's when I heard the gunshot.

Det. King- Okay. Okay. Let's—we're gonna back up a little bit here.

Um, so you guys—when you guys step out front from your—from your—from your place, you go out into the—out to the road.

Um, so you guys—when you guys step out front from your—from your—from your place, you go out into the—out to the road.

Um, do you—uh, are you guys walking either direction down, uh, Highland or are you guys just—standing there like near the grass—with the dogs.

**Amy Gregory: No. We're walking**

Det. King- Okay. Okay. Which—which direction are you?--

**Amy Gregory: So we always, like we live in a little alleyway. So we always—there's a little cut-through to get to Highland.**

**So we always cut through there and then we carry the dogs to the right. Because if we don't carry them, they won't walk far enough. So we—always carry them down to the corner.**

QUESTION: AT THIS POINT AMY GREGORY IS EXPLAINING THAT SHE AND DAVID (THE SHOOTER) ALWAYS CUT THROUGH THE NEIGHBOR'S YARD IN FRONT OF THEIR CONDO TO GET TO HIGHLAND RD. ONCE THEY COMPLETE THE CUT-THROUGH THEY TAKE A RIGHT ONTO HIGHLAND HEADING NORTH. IF AMY AND DAVID (THE SHOOTER) WERE SO AFRAID OF STEVEN PAUL WHY DID THEY NOT CHOOSE THIS PATH ON THE WAY HOME AND GO BACK HOME THROUGH THE SAME NEIGHBOR'S YARD. WHY DID THEY INSTEAD CHOOSE TO FOLLOW STEVEN PAUL DOWN HIGHLAND RD WHEN THERE WAS CLEARLY A PATH OF AVOIDANCE AVAILABLE TO THEM. THIS DIRECTLY

*CONTRADICTS HER NARRATIVE ABOUT SUPPOSEDLY ALWAYS BEING FEARFUL OF WHAT STEVEN PAUL. ABSOLUTE NONSENSE.*

Det. King- Okay. So—So Highland, I—I think Highland runs north and south, right?

**Amy Gregory: Yes.**

Det. King- Okay. So you turned to go north.

**Amy Gregory: We turn to go north.**

Det. King- Okay. Towards Westview is on the corner?

**Amy Gregory: Yes. Like—when—at the cut-through at our house, here's Highland like at the cut-through. There's Westland—Westview right there.**

**So we take a right.**

Det. King- Okay. Okay. And where were you at then, when you—when you seen—Steven?

**Amy Gregory: When we saw Steven?**

**So after you take a right, the drive to get into their condos is right there on the right. We had already past that.**

**We're a little past that. That's when we heard the other guy (Gary) and his dogs coming down the drive to go for a walk.**

Det. King- And what—what drive was that?

**Amy Gregory: Their drive. Their—their gravel drive.**

**Yeah. So he's (Gary) walking out that way and we just say, Good morning. And then that guy (Gary) takes his three dogs and goes the opposite way, just so they don't bark.**

Det. King- Southbound on Highland?

**Amy Gregory: Exactly.**

**So then after that, Steven—we're—we had stopped to put the dogs down so they could start doing their business, then we could start our walk. And we looked up and we saw Steven coming down his driveway and it's almost like he was looking for that guy (Gary) 'cause I know they don't get along either.**

Det. King- I know there are several that go into this gravel driveway, so is Steven coming out of the driveway, just like the man that was walking the three dogs?

**Amy Gregory: Exactly.**

Det. King- Does he look at you guys? Does he see--?

Amy Gregory: Not at that point.

He did not look our direction that point.

He just went and it was like he was beelining, trying to find the other dude (Gary). So when he didn't find him—

QUESTION: AT THIS POINT AMY GREGORY IS FALSELY CLAIMING THAT STEVEN PAUL MUST HAVE HAD ILL INTENTIONS BECAUSE HE CHOSE TO WALK THAT MORNING AND APPARENTLY CAME OUT TO WALK AFTER GARY OSGOOD HAD ALREADY LEFT THE AREA AFTER HAVING TURNED RIGHT ONTO SHORELAND AT THE VERY END OF HIGHLAND (INTERSECTION AT THE SOUTH END).

Det. King- You didn't see him after for a few minutes?

Amy Gregory: Uh-uh. I mean we didn't see the guy (Gary) walking the puppies. Steven, we could see him cause we keep our eye on him. He was walking toward the direction the other guy (Gary) went but the other guy (Gary) turned the corner. So it looked like Steven wanted to cut him off at the pass, so he came back and started walking down Westview. Because then they would intersect.

QUESTION: AT THIS POINT AMY GREGORY IS FALSELY CLAIMING THAT STEVEN PAUL MUST HAVE HAD ILL INTENTIONS BECAUSE HE CHOSE TO WALK THAT MORNING AND APPARENTLY CAME OUT TO WALK AFTER GARY OSGOOD HAD ALREADY LEFT THE AREA AFTER HAVING TURNED RIGHT ONTO SHORELAND AT THE VERY END OF HIGHLAND (INTERSECTION AT THE SOUTH END). SO STEVEN PAUL INITIALLY DID NOT SEE DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND AMY GREGORY AND HE EXITED HIS DRIVEWAY, TOOK A LEFT AND BEGAN WALKING SOUTH ON HIGHLAND RD, WENT PAST THE INTERSECTION WITH WESTVIEW, BUT AFTERWARD TURNS AROUND AND HEAD BACK NORTH. SHE THEN CLAIMS THAT STEVEN PAUL TURNS LEFT AND HEADS DOWN WESTVIEW DRIVE INSTEAD. SHE INJECTS HER OWN FALSE OPINION THAT STEVEN PAUL, ONCE AGAIN, MUST HAVE HAD ILL INTENTIONS AND THAT IT "LOOKED LIKE STEVEN PAUL WANTED TO CUT HIM (GARY OSGOOD) OFF AT THE PASS BECAUSE HE WOULD INTERSECT WITH GARY OSGOOD AT THE END OF WESTVIEW AND SHORELAND AS GARY OSGOOD COMPLETED HIS FULL CIRCLE. A SIMPLER EXPLANATION WAS THAT STEVEN PAUL IN HIS ATTEMPT TO AVOID AMY AND DAVID (THE SHOOTER) TURNED DOWN WESTVIEW INSTEAD OF CONTINUING TO HEAD IN THEIR DIRECTION AS DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND AMY WERE SITUATED NEAR THE EXIT TO STEVEN PAUL'S CONDO DRIVEWAY ENTRANCE AT THIS POINT. STEVEN PAUL AVOIDS THEM FOR THE FIRST TIME.

Det. King- Yeah. They would merge. Okay.

**Amy Gregory: For some reason, Steven walked back down Westview, and then he saw us. And I felt like that's when he's like, Oh, Okay. Well, I'll fuck with these guys.**

QUESTION: SO AT THIS POINT STEVEN PAUL DECIDED TO AVOID AMY AND DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND HE HEADS WEST DOWN WESTVIEW DRIVE AND THEN STEVEN PAUL EITHER GOES TO THE END OF WESTVIEW OR HE PAUSES AT SOME POINT ON WESTVIEW AND TURNS BACK AROUND HEADING EAST ON WESTVIEW BACK TOWARDS THE INTERSECTION AT HIGHLAND. IT IS AT THIS POINT THAT AMY GREGORY CLAIMS THAT THIS IS WHEN STEVEN PAUL SAW THE BOTH OF THEM. SHE INJECTS HER OWN FALSE OPINION THAT STEVEN PAUL, ONCE AGAIN, MUST HAVE HAD ILL INTENTIONS TOWARDS THEM AND WAS HEADING TOWARDS THEM BECAUSE AS SHE FALSELY CLAIMED "AND I FELT LIKE THAT'S WHEN HE'S LIKE, OH, OKAY. WELL, I'LL FUCK WITH THESE GUYS. A COMPLETELY INVENTED AND MADE UP NARRATIVE IN THE SHOOTER'S WIFE MIND. HOW IN THE WORLD WOULD SHE KNOW WHY STEVEN PAUL DECIDED TO HEAD BACK TOWARDS HIS HOME? REMEMBER STEVEN PAUL ALWAYS PUT IN HIS APPLE EARPODS WHENEVER HE WALKED. SO A VERY SIMPLE EXPLANATION THAT MAKES PERFECT SENSE IS THAT STEVEN PAUL WAS TRYING TO HEAD BACK HOME TO RETRIEVE HIS EARBUDS AFTER HE REALIZES THAT THEY ARE MISSING FROM THE CASE IN HIS POCKET. BY THE WAY, AMY GREGORY'S USE OF PROFANITY TO EXPLAIN THIS FALSE NARRATIVE IS QUITE INTERESTING FOR A WOMAN WHO CLAIMS TO BE SUCH A WALLFLOWER WHO IS SO FROZEN WITH FEAR.

Det. King- Were you guys still heading north or were you still stopped with the dogs?

**Amy Gregory: We were kind of stopped with the dogs. And then at some point, we did start heading south, like heading back home.**

Det. King- To your—yep.

**Amy Gregory: On our normal route.**

Det. King- Past Westview again.

**Amy Gregory: Past Westview again, and then we got right past Westview and that's when Steven, I guess he just decided he wanted to come fuck with us. So then he started walking this way, and that's when he started doing is he's—he'll pass.**

Det. King- He walked fast past—so he's—he will end up walking past you guys?

QUESTION: SO AT THIS POINT AMY AND DAVID (THE SHOOTER) ARE ON THE OPPOSITE SIDE OF THE STREET AND THEY DECIDE TO STOP ON HIGHLAND AT THE INTERSECTION WITH WESTVIEW. THIS IS WHERE, UPON SEEING THE BOTH OF THEM ESSENTIALLY BLOCKING HIS PATH BACK HOME. AMY IS JUST PAST WESTVIEW AND DAVID IS TRAILING BEHIND STILL JUST NORTH OF THE INTERSECTION OF WESTVIEW AND HIGHLAND. HERE IS WHERE, IT MAKES PERFECT SENSE THAT STEVEN PAUL WOULD HAVE, ONCE AGAIN, DECIDED TO AVOID AMY AND DAVID (THE SHOOTER) FOR

YET A SECOND TIME AND STEVEN PAUL NOW HEAD HEADS SOUTH ON HIGHLAND RD IN AN EFFORT TO GET AWAY FROM AMY AND DAVID (THE SHOOTER). SHE INJECTS HER OWN FALSE OPINION THAT STEVEN PAUL, ONCE AGAIN, MUST HAVE HAD ILL INTENTIONS TOWARDS THEM AND WAS HEADING TOWARDS THEM BECAUSE AS SHE FALSELY CLAIMED "THAT'S WHEN STEVEN, I GUESS HE JUST DECIDED HE WANTED TO COME FUCK WITH US. SO THEN HE STARTED WALKING THIS WAY, AND THAT'S WHEN HE STARTED DOING IS HE'S HE'LL PASS. YES. STEVEN PAUL HAD NO OPTION BUT TO PASS THEM IN AN EFFORT TO AVOID THEM AND PASS THEM HEADING SOUTH AS HE MORE THAN LIKELY DID NOT FEEL COMFORTABLE WITH DAVID ESSENTLY BLOCKING HIS PATH BACK TO HIS DRIVEWAY AND HIS HOME. ONCE AGAIN, BY THE WAY, AMY GREGORY'S CONTINUED USE OF PROFANITY TO EXPLAIN THIS FALSE NARRATIVE IS QUITE INTERESTING FOR A WOMAN WHO CLAIMS TO BE SUCH A WALLFLOWER WHO IS SO FROZEN WITH FEAR.

Amy Gregory: Yeah.

He'll walk past

Det. King- Did he look at you? Did he say anything?

Amy Gregory: Um, I don't look at him. We learned a long time ago just don't make eye contact with him.

QUESTION: STEVEN PAUL DOES HIS USUAL WHERE HE SAYS ABSOLUTELY NOTHING TO THEM. DOES THIS LIKE A PERSON THAT WAS LOOKING TO CONFRONT AND "FUCK WITH THEM" AS SHE CONTINUES TO FALSELY CLAIM? COMPLETELY CONTRADICTORY.

Det. King- What was he wearing?

Amy Gregory: His hoodie—his normal hoodie, a hat, and

Det. King- Okay. And, uh, pants, shorts?

Amy Gregory: Uh, shorts

Um, he's got glasses.

Det. King- Okay. Okay. So he's—now he's now passed—walking past you guys—faster than you guys or whatever.

Amy Gregory: Yeah. 'Cause we're stopped.

Det. King- Okay. Tell me what he does once he gets past you.

Amy Gregory: So once he gets past me, I guess he just decides he wants to turn around again. And I see him go past me, I guess he just decides he wants to turn around again. And I see him go past me, and I'm keeping my eye on him. And he's doing one of his

passes where he's getting closer, and then he'll turn, he'll get closer, and he'll turn and he'll get closer.

Det. King- Okay.

Amy Gregory: Just to intimidate you. So the last time I saw him turn around is when he came to David and I saw him coming at David.

QUESTION: SO AMY GREGORY CONTINUES WITH THE FALSE NARRATIVE THAT STEVEN PAUL WAS PASSING THEM TO "INTIMIDATE" THEM. MUCH SIMPLER EXPLANATION IS THAT STEVEN PAUL WAS FOR THE THIRD TIME, TRYING TO AVOID THE BOTH OF THEM AS THEY FOLLOWED HIM (NOT THE OTHER WAY AROUND) SOUTH DOWN HIGHLAND ROAD. WHY IS IT THAT AMY AND DAVID (THE SHOOTER) CONTINUED TO FOLLOW STEVEN DOWN HIGHLAND ROAD? IF THEY WERE SO CONCERNED AND AFRAID OF STEVEN PAUL, THEY COULD HAVE VERY SIMPLY CUT THROUGH THE NEIGHBOR'S YARD AND AVOIDED HIM ALTOGETHER. YET, AMY AND THE SHOOTER, INSTEAD CHOSE TO FOLLOW STEVEN PAUL. WHY?

Det. King- Okay. Okay. So how many passes did he do? So he does one, the initial pass, turns around--

Amy Gregory: I think that time, he had only passed us that one time on that strip, I wanna say. I know he passed us twice somewhere on the street.

QUESTION: AMY GREGORY CLAIMS THAT SHE KNOWS THAT STEVEN PAUL PASSED THEM TWICE SOMEWHERE ON HIGHLAND RD. HOW IS THIS POSSIBLE IF AMY AND DAVID WERE NOT FOLLOWING BEHIND STEVEN PAUL?

Det. King- Did you ever get past the, uh, drive that come—that you come out of to get onto Highland? You—did you make it down to the end?

Amy Gregory: We made it almost to Shoreland.

QUESTION: AGAIN, HOW IS IT POSSIBLE THAT SHE ALMOST MADE IT TO SHORELAND IF SHE WASN'T FOLLOWING STEVEN PAUL?

Det. King- Okay. Then did you turn around and come back or?

Amy Gregory: No. We always go—our walk is heading south on Highland. We get to the end of Shoreland, we turn, and then we go back into our—our—condo that—our unit—that way.

Det. King- Okay. Kind of go around—the block. Okay.

Amy Gregory: Yes. So just—like a little circle.

QUESTION: WHY IS IT THAT AMY AND DAVID (THE SHOOTER) CONTINUED TO FOLLOW STEVEN DOWN HIGHLAND ROAD? IF THEY WERE SO CONCERNED AND AFRAID OF STEVEN PAUL, THEY COULD HAVE VERY SIMPLY CUT THROUGH THE NEIGHBOR'S YARD AND AVOIDED HIM ALTOGETHER. YET, AMY AND THE SHOOTER, INSTEAD CHOSE TO FOLLOW STEVEN PAUL SOUTH ON HIGHLAND RD. WHY? COMPLETELY CONTRADICTS HER NARRATIVE ABOUT BEING FEARFUL OF WHAT STEVEN PAUL "MIGHT DO"

Det. King- Okay. Okay. So tell me about when he (Steven)—you said that he walked in—he walked in between you guys.

Amy Gregory: No. It was like I was here, David was here.

Det. King- On the other side of the road you mean. You guys (David and Amy) were on opposite sides of the road?

Amy Gregory: We're (David and Amy) on the same side of the road.

Det. King- But how does he get in between you?

Amy Gregory: Steven is on the other side. By in between, I mean, kind of when he got in between where we were standing—not in between us.

QUESTION: SO HERE IS THE SUPPOSED SECOND PASS THAT AMY GREGORY CLAIMS OCCURRED THAT MORNING. WHERE AMY CLAIMS THAT STEVEN PAUL "GOT IN BETWEEN WHERE WE WERE STANDING" WHY IS SHE TRYING TO IMPLY THAT SOMEHOW "GOT IN BETWEEN" THE TWO OF THEM, WHEN STEVEN PAUL WAS ON THE OPPOSITE SIDE OF HIGHLAND ROAD? CLEARLY NOT A THREAT.

Uh-uh. So we're here, Steven's walking this way. When he gets about between us, I hear his normal (sound effect), and he spits at us. Or he spits in our direction. I can't say he spits at us. It's always in our direction.

Det. King- Okay. How far was that spit, like—from you or from—from David?

Amy Gregory: Um, I don't know. It was probably in between—had no chance of hitting either of us. It was just—one of his intimidation, I'm here.

QUESTION: SO STEVEN PAUL SPITS ON THE GROUND. SHE FALSELY CLAIMS THAT HE SPIT BECAUSE "IT WAS JUST-ONE OF HIS INTIMIDATION, I'M HERE". THIS IS AMY GREGORY APPARENTLY ACTING LIKE A KAREN AND OVER-REACTING TO A SIMPLE SPIT ON THE GROUND. SHE STATES THAT THE SPIT HAD NO CHANCE OF HITTING EITHER OF THEM. A SIMPLER EXPLANATION IS THAT STEVEN PAUL WAS CLEARING HIS

*THROAT OF THE HIMALAYAN SALTS THAT HE TOOK AS PART OF HIS ATHLETIC NUTRITIONAL SUPPLEMENT ROUTINE. AGAIN, WHERE IS THE THREAT?*

Det. King- Okay. And—and you made the comment, “have always done this.” He’s done this to—this same type of behavior--

**Amy Gregory: I've called the police on him before.**

Det. King- Okay. For doing this type of--

**Amy Gregory: To me.**

**Yeah. Oh. Yeah. –walks by, keeps walking, turns to—Oh, yeah. That's his pattern. I've called the police on him--**

Det. King- I’m just getting the—‘cause you did say “he always” has done that.

Okay. Okay. So he spits and then once he does the final—does he—he say, What the fuck? And is that when he turns around?

**Amy Gregory: No. What I remember is, “cause I was looking at David and David and I were still separated. I was looking at David and I look up and David had turned—he has passed David but then he looked around, and he turned around then he came straight at David saying, What the fuck?**

Det. King- Okay. So how close does—does he get to David?

*QUESTION: SO HERE IS WHERE AMY GREGORY'S STORY BEGINS TO FALL SHORT OF THE TRUTH. BASED ON FORENSICS, STEVEN PAUL WAS SHOT ON THE OPPOSITE SIDE OF THE STREET. HOW DID THIS HAPPEN, BECAUSE DAVID GREGORY WAS THE AGGRESSOR, NOT THE OTHER WAY AROUND. DAVID GREGORY WENT ONTO STEVEN PAUL'S SIDE OF THE ROAD. NOT THE OTHER WAY AROUND. THE BULLET CASING AND THE BLOOD PATTERN IN THE ROADWAY INDICATE THIS CLEARLY.*

*SHE CLAIMS THAT STEVEN PAUL PASSED DAVID BUT THEN LOOKED AROUND. AT THIS MOMENT, AMY GREGORY, COMPLETELY FAILS TO MENTION THAT AT THIS POINT DAVID (THE SHOOTER) WAS ABUSING HIS DOG AND THAT DAVID HAD SENT THE DOG FLYING DOWN THE STREET SIDEWAYS SCREAMING. REFER TO DAVID'S INTERVIEW WHERE HE, HIMSELF, DESCRIBED WHAT HAPPENED TO HIS DOG AS HE FORCEFULLY YANKS THE DOG'S CHAIN AND SENDS THE DOG FLYING DOWN THE STREET SIDEWAYS SCREAMING IN ORDER TO RETRIEVE HIM AS THE DOG CURIOUSLY APPROACHES STEVEN PAUL ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THE ROAD. DAVID (THE SHOOTER) DID NOT LIKE, FOR ONE MOMENT, THE FACT THAT HIS OWN DOG WAS APPROACHING STEVEN PAUL AND SO DAVID TELLS THE DETECTIVES IN HIS INTERVIEW THE FOLLOWING:*

"What had happened is, you know, the dog is on the ground, a little—a little dog. He said something, the dog thought it was an invitation to—to come.

And I tried to get the cord and actually—goddamn, it's so terrible 'cause I tried to get the dog and I couldn't. And I missed him, and the poor little fucker went sliding down the street. He's sideways, and he's screaming. He's a little toy dog. And I stood up. I was like, "Dude, leave us the fuck alone." And that's when he—when it happened, and—and then, after I—I—I grabbed the dog."

NOW, DO THESE WORDS WHICH CAME FROM DAVID'S (*THE SHOOTER*) OWN MOUTH SOUND, EVEN REMOTELY, LIKE THE WORDS OF A DOG LOVER TO YOU? DAVID WAS CALLING HIS OWN DOG "THE POOR LITTLE FUCKER AND HOW THE DOG WENT SLIDING DOWN THE STREET AS HE'S SIDEWAYS AND HE'S SCREAMING. DAVID WAS ABUSING HIS DOG AT THIS POINT. I'M SURE STEVEN PAUL WAS (AS ANYBODY WOULD BE) CONCERNED OVER THE ABUSIVE TREATMENT OF THE DOG BY DAVID IN HIS FURIOUS ATTEMPT TO YANK THE TOY DOG AWAY AS THE DOG APPROACHED STEVEN PAUL (AS DOGS OFTEN DO) ONTO STEVEN PAUL'S SIDE OF THE STREET.

DAVID (*THE SHOOTER*) HAD ABSOLUTELY NO PROBLEM WITH HIS DOG APPROACHING OR BEING PETTED BY OTHER NEIGHBORS. AS ATTESTED BY THE TESTIMONY OF MELANIA BINDER. MELANIA BINDER'S PERSONALITY WAS SIMILAR IN SOME RESPECTS WITH THE FACT THAT SHE KEPT TO HERSELF. YET WHEN MELANIA BINDER ATTEMPTS TO PET DAVID'S DOG, DAVID HAS NO ISSUE. HOWEVER, WHEN STEVEN PAUL, WHO EQUALLY KEPT TO HIMSELF, ATTEMPTED THE SAME OR THE DOG APPROACHED STEVEN PAUL, DAVID WAS INCENSED AT STEVEN PAUL AND HIS OWN DOG. THIS IS KEY TO THE FALSE NARRATIVE THAT AMY AND DAVID GREGORY CONTINUE TO SPIN ABOUT WHAT HAPPENED THAT MORNING. DAVID (*THE SHOOTER*) CAME OVER TO STEVEN PAUL'S SIDE OF THE ROAD AND SHOT HIM AS HE WAS INCENSED ABOUT HIS OWN DOG APPROACHING STEVEN PAUL AND SUBSEQUENTLY STEVEN PAUL ATTEMPTING TO ASSIST THE SMALL DOG AS HE WAS BEING FORCEFULLY YANKED AND ABUSED BY AN ENRAGED DAVID.

Amy Gregory: Oh, very close. He pushed him.

Det. King- Like, how far? Like this far, or is he even closer?

QUESTION: DAVID GREGORY WAS INCENSED ABOUT HIS DOG APPROACHING STEVEN PAUL. DAVID GREGORY YANKS HIS DOG AND ABUSES HIS DOG. DAVID THEN GOES ACROSS THE STREET ON STEVEN PAUL'S SIDE OF THE ROAD TO GET HIS DOG AFTER ABUSING THE DOG. AFTER THE DOG IS ABUSED, GOES FLYING DOWN THE ROAD SIDEWAYS AND IS SCREAMING AND THE DOG IS IN OBVIOUS DISTRESS. SOMEONE SAYS "WHAT THE FUCK?" WAS IT STEVEN PAUL OR WAS IT DAVID THAT SAYS THIS? AND WHY? WHO PUSHES WHO? IS IT EVEN POSSIBLE TO CONSIDER THAT DAVID, WAS IN FACT, THE AGGRESSOR AND NOT THE OTHER WAY AROUND. DAVID'S BEHAVIOR THAT MORNING, NOT ONLY WITH HIS DOG, BUT GOING OVER TO STEVEN PAUL'S SIDE

OF THE ROAD, AND HIS BEHAVIOR BOTH BEFORE AND AFTER THE SHOOTING, WITH DAVID (THE SHOOTER) SCREAMING FOUL LANGUAGE WITH ALL HIS MIGHT (AS MELANIA BINDER DESCRIBES DAVID'S BEHAVIOR) AT STEVEN PAUL EVEN AFTER HAVING SHOT HIM SEEMS TO INDICATE A VERY HIGH LIKELIHOOD THAT THE AGGRESSOR WAS NOT STEVEN PAUL AT ALL BUT THE AGGRESSOR WAS, IN FACT, DAVID (THE SHOOTER).

Amy Gregory: Oh—oh, he's like--

Det. King- Face-to-face?

Amy Gregory: Uh, to—and yeah. And face-to-face.

Det. King- To David. Okay.

And what's happening then?

Amy Gregory: Um, that's when I heard, I think it was Steven say, What the fuck? And then I think David said something, but then I—I saw Steven push, and then that's when he went to (indicating) grab around.

Det. King- Steven grabbed around him.

Amy Gregory: Steven went to grab around—

QUESTION: DAVID GREGORY WAS INCENSED ABOUT HIS DOG APPROACHING STEVEN PAUL. DAVID GREGORY YANKS HIS DOG AND ABUSES HIS DOG. DAVID THEN GOES ACROSS THE STREET ON STEVEN PAUL'S SIDE OF THE ROAD TO GET HIS DOG AFTER ABUSING THE DOG. AFTER THE DOG IS ABUSED, GOES FLYING DOWN THE ROAD SIDEWAYS AND IS SCREAMING AND THE DOG IS IN OBVIOUS DISTRESS. SOMEONE SAYS "WHAT THE FUCK?" WAS IT STEVEN PAUL OR WAS IT DAVID THAT SAYS THIS? AND WHY?

*IS IT EVEN REMOTELY POSSIBLE TO CONSIDER THAT DAVID AT THIS POINT PULLED HIS WEAPON OUT ON STEVEN PAUL AND STEVEN PAUL WAS ATTEMPTING TO PROTECT AND DEFEND HIMSELF AFTER SEEING THE GUN?*

Det. King- Did he get around him, his neck or his body or anything?

Amy Gregory: I only saw his arm kind of come halfway around and that's when I heard the shot.

Det. King- Okay.

Amy Gregory: And then that's when he kind of backed off.

Det. King- So once you heard one—you heard one shot?

Amy Gregory: One.

Det. King- Okay. And what did—what did Steven do at that point?

Amy Gregory: At that point, he just kind of backed off, and he's like, Okay, dude. So I—and I didn't even know at that time that he was shot. Like, I even asked my husband, ...Because Steven was walking the other way at that time.

But then he ended up falling in the ditch.

QUESTION: AMY GREGORY CONVENIENTLY LEAVES OUT SPECIFIC DETAILS ABOUT DAVID'S AGGRESSIVE POSTURE AND LANGUAGE AFTER HAVING SHOT STEVEN PAUL. DAVID (THE SHOOTER) WAS HEARD BY MULTIPLE WITNESSES YELLING PROFANITIES AT STEVEN PAUL AFTER HAVING SHOT HIM. WHY IS AMY CONVENIENTLY LEAVING THIS PART OF THE STORY OUT? MAYBE, BECAUSE SHE DOESN'T WANT TO PAINT DAVID AS THE AGGRESSOR. WHICH DAVID (THE SHOOTER) MORE THAN LIKELY WAS THE AGGRESSOR AND NOT THE OTHER WAY AROUND AS THEY MOST DEFINITELY WANT EVERYONE TO BELIEVE.

Det. King- Okay. So he was walking past Westview—walking towards Westview, and that's when he fell in the ditch.

Was he walking away or was he running? Did he—what's—Did it seem like he was shot or?

Amy Gregory: He (Steven) was just walking. That's why—And that's why I was like—I didn't really know what just happened.

Det. King- And when you seen that, what was David doing? Did David—did you see David with a gun?

Amy Gregory: Yeah. Then I saw the gun. He was getting (his dog) and he was picking up (his dog) and he—that's when we were like, "let's get home. We gotta call the police." And then we just walked home.

Det. King- Okay. Did you see any—any—anybody else walking around that might have seen it or--

Amy Gregory: So the neighbor—at the yard I was in, the neighbor I don't know if she was out before all this happened, or if she heard something. But she popped out. So what I remember is that David came, and we were heading home, and he's like, "We gotta call the police." She was outside her door, so I don't know when she came out, but I looked at her and I said, "Call the police." And then we continued around—

QUESTION: SO THIS IS THE POINT WHERE AFTER THE SHOOTING OF STEVEN PAUL, AMY AND DAVID (THE SHOOTER) ATTEMPT TO FLEE THE SCENE BUT ARE INTERRUPTED BY DAYNA PURCELL AS THEY ATTEMPT TO LEAVE. AFTER HAVING

*BEEN SPOTTED BY THE NEIGHBOR AND LEFT WITH NO OTHER CHOICE, AMY GREGORY MAKES A STATEMENT TO THE NEIGHBOR TO CALL THE POLICE.*

*HOWEVER, THIS IS ANOTHER AREA OF CONTRADICTION, AS AMY CLAIMS SHE TOLD DAYNA TO CALL THE POLICE HERSELF. DAYNA PURCELL, HOWEVER, CLAIMS THAT DAVID (THE SHOOTER), HIMSELF, TOLD HER TO CALL THE POLICE NOT AMY. DAVID ALSO LIES TO THE DETECTIVES AND CLAIMS THAT HE DID NOT SEE A NEIGHBOR COME OUT THAT MORNING, YET OBVIOUSLY DAYNA SPECIFICALLY STATED OTHERWISE.*

Det. King- Do you know her name? But you're the one that told her to call the police or did David tell her?

**Amy Gregory: I don't—we both did.**

Det. King- Okay. Is it Dayna? Does that sound right?

I just have a report of she was told by David to call.

Anybody else that was around that you looked around and seen anybody?

**Amy Gregory: No.**

Det. King- Okay. So you go home—you go to your home. Do you go inside your home? What do you do when you get there?

**Amy Gregory: We went inside the home. David took the clip out. Made sure the gun was empty. Put it down. No. He did that—I can't remember if he did that outside or inside. But I went in just to get the phone so we could call the police.**

**And then we came back out on the porch to just wait.**

Det. King- Did you call 911

**Amy Gregory: I did**

Det. King- Okay. And you made the report.

**Amy Gregory: I did.**

Det. King- Okay. How far away would you say when, um, Steven went up to David how far away are you at that point? When he approached and they were in each other's face?

**Amy Gregory: So, um, probably from me—I mean possibly the other side of the hall.**

**We were kind of a ways away. 'Cause he had (his dog)—and I had (my dog)**

Det. King- Okay. And are you—are you facing the back side of Steven or are you, uh back behind David?

**Amy Gregory: Back at David.**

Det. King- So you seen Steven's face looking at David. All right.

**Amy Gregory: Yes.**

Det. King- So—okay. Just wanted to see where your vantage—now were you guys on the same side of the road? Are you on the same side of the road?

**Amy Gregory: At that point, I was on the right side, and they were toward—more toward the left side.**

*QUESTION: AMY CLEARLY STATES THAT DAVID AND STEVEN PAUL WERE ON THE OPPOSITE SIDE OF THE ROAD AT THIS POINT. THE SIDE THAT STEVEN PAUL HAD BEEN WALKING ON. WHY WAS DAVID ON STEVEN PAUL'S SIDE OF THE ROAD IF THE FALSE NARRATIVE WAS THAT STEVEN PAUL WENT AFTER DAVID UNPROVOKED? COMPLETE NONSENSE AND THE FORENSICS CONTRADICT THIS FALSE NARRATIVE. WHY DID THE FORENSIC EVIDENCE SHOW THAT THE SHOOTING OCCURRED ON STEVEN PAUL'S SIDE OF THE ROAD? IF DAVID WAS ON STEVEN PAUL'S SIDE OF THE ROAD BEFORE THE SHOOTING, WHO WAS THE AGGRESSOR? THE FALSE STORY DOESN'T HOLD UP TO THE ACTUAL EVIDENCE.*

Det. King- Okay. And so is—if I was David was—is David—then you got Steven looking at him. If David looking at Westview or is he looking at the street, the other street? You know what I'm saying?

**Amy Gregory: No. He would be facing toward Westview.**

Det. King- And the Steven's looking the opposite direction.

**Amy Gregory: Exactly.**

Det. King- So we got David looking north, and Steven looking south. I just wanna get a picture of

**Amy Gregory: Yeah.**

*QUESTION: HERE DET. KING IS ASKING WHAT DIRECTION DAVID (THE SHOOTER WAS FACING AND WHAT DIRECTION STEVEN PAUL WAS FACING? YES, DAVID WOULD HAVE BEEN FACING TOWARDS WESTVIEW SINCE STEVEN PAUL HAD ALREADY GONE PAST HIM AND TURNED AS THE DOG APPROACHED STEVEN ON STEVEN'S SIDE OF THE*

ROAD AND THEN THE SUBSEQUENT ABUSE OF THE DOG BY DAVID OCCURRED JUST PRIOR TO AN ENRAGED DAVID SHOOTING STEVEN PAUL.

Det. King- Okay. Um, 'cause then—then he like turn—then Steven turned around and walked towards Westview where he finally fell into the ditch?

**Amy Gregory: Exactly.**

Det. King- Um, so tell me—just tell me what about these incidences that you were like, how long have you known this Steven?,

**Amy Gregory: Probably started, um, I don't know, year and a half ago maybe. Our first incident with him, he basically did the same thing. We were out walking the dogs, and, uh, we just saw somebody walking down the street, and you know, didn't pay any mind to him. And then we noticed that like he wouldn't—he wasn't moving. He was just kind of walking straight at us. And this is our first encounter with him. He's just walking straight at us, and David's like, "Do you think we should move, or do you think—is this like, chicken or something?**

**Do we move? And so Steven waits until he gets probably from you to me—and he just stares at us and does one of his sharp turns, and goes the other way. Well, then, he comes back out at that—his gravel driveway—**

**We had just passed that. He comes back out, starts calling (the dog) like he wants our dog to come to him. And David turned around and he's like "Man, don't call my dog." So then Steven bowed up to him at that point. He's even bowed up to me asking me if I want a piece of him**

QUESTION: THIS IS THE SUPPOSED FIRST INCIDENT ALMOST A YEAR PRIOR TO THE SHOOTING WHERE DAVID (THE SHOOTER) WAS INCENSED THAT HIS DOG WAS APPROACHING STEVEN PAUL AND MORE THAN LIKELY STEVEN PAUL RECIPROCATED BY ATTEMPTING TO PET THE DOG AS THE DOG APPROACHED. DAVID (THE SHOOTER) WAS INCENSED BY THIS IN MUCH THE SAME WAY THAT DAVID WAS INCENSED ABOUT THE DOG APPROACHING STEVEN PAUL THE MORNING HE SHOT HIM.

THIS REACTION IS PURE OVERREACTION ON DAVID'S PART. THIS IS THE FIRST INCIDENCE WHERE DAVID BECOMES INCENSED AND TELLS STEVEN PAUL "MAN, DON'T CALL MY DOG". ANY PERSON, NOT JUST STEVEN PAUL, WOULD BE OFFENDED BY DAVID'S AGGRESSIVE POSTURE TOWARDS THEM FOR SIMPLY REACHING OUT TO PET THE DOG.

YET MELANIA BINDER AND OTHER NEIGHBORS WERE ALLOWED TO PET DAVID (THE SHOOTER)'S DOG WITH NO AGGRESSIVE POSTURE FROM DAVID? WHY THE OVER-REACTION AND THE AGGRESSIVE POSTURE TO THIS SIMPLE ACT FROM DAVID?

WHERE WAS THE THREAT?

Det. King- You say "bow up." Describe it. What does that mean?

**Amy Gregory: Like—like coming at you, like this (indicating) "You want a piece of me?"**

Det. King- And does he get—how far does he get when he does it?

**Amy Gregory: Um, with me, he didn't get close. He just kind of walk—like, pushed toward me.**

Det. King- Is this—during your first encounter?

**Amy Gregory: This is the first one.**

Det. King- Okay. He did that to you and to David on the same first—encounter.

**Amy Gregory: Yep.**

Det. King- And does—how close does he get to David when he does that?

**Amy Gregory: About the same. About—like this.**

Det. King- Like, this distance? So three or four feet maybe?

**Amy Gregory: Yeah**

Det. King- Does he, uh, say any other words to you, like, other than, You want some of this?

**Amy Gregory: Um, not really. No. Not that first time that I can remember. Um, and then that's when he—after he did that, he's like "Come here.". He's trying to call our dogs over to him.**

Det. King- Okay. How—What's your guys'—what's David's reaction, and what's your reaction to that when he does—

**Amy Gregory: Fear. That's why I went—**

**QUESTION: SO STEVEN PAUL SUPPOSEDLY CALLED THE DOGS OVER TO HIM? WAS IT POSSIBLE THAT THE DOGS SIMPLY APPROACHED STEVEN PAUL ON THEIR OWN? WHERE WAS THE THREAT?**

Det. King- You guys don't say nothing to him?

**Amy Gregory: No. All we did was went home, and that's the first time I called the police. Because like--**

Det. King- And how long ago was that first encounter?

QUESTION: SO WHERE WAS THE THREAT AND WHAT EXACTLY WAS THE NEED TO CALL THE POLICE? THE DOGS MORE THAN LIKELY APPROACHED STEVEN PAUL ON THEIR OWN AND WILLINGLY. AGAIN, IT APPEARS, LIKE AN OVERBLOWN REACTION FROM AMY AND DAVID (THE SHOOTER) TO A VERY COMMON SITUATION.

Amy Gregory: Year and, uh—a year

Det. King- Okay. And then how many have you had after this?

Amy Gregory: This will probably be our fourth with him, that I can recall.

Det. King- And they—have they all been—did you—did you report all these to—the sheriff? Have you reported any of them?

Amy Gregory: I reported the first one.

And that first encounter with him is when we decided that—and just hearing the stories about things he's done, and just a terror to the neighborhood that's when David thought, You know what? I'm at least gonna be protected in case he tries to do something to you.

QUESTION: HERE IS THE FIRST TIME AMY ADMITS THAT THEY HAD BEEN HEARING ALL THE FALSE RUMORS AND STORIES THAT HAD BEEN SPREAD ABOUT STEVEN PAUL BY THE LIKES OF THE GARY OSGOOD, TOBY AND HIS WIFE AND DAVID AND AMY THEMSELVES THAT HAD BEEN MALICIOUSLY SPREAD AROUND THE NEIGHBORHOOD. “STORIES ABOUT THINGS HE'S DONE, AND JUST A TERROR TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD”

HERE IS ALSO THE FIRST TIME THAT AMY TRUTHFULLY STATES THAT DAVID TELLS HER “YOU KNOW WHAT? I'M AT LEAST GONNA BE PROTECTED IN CASE HE TRIES TO DO SOMETHING TO YOU” THIS IS WHEN DAVID INTENTIONALLY STARTED CARRYING A GUN. NOT FOR COYOTES WHICH WAS THE ORIGINAL FALSE NARRATIVE THAT DAVID AND AMY SPUN UP. HERE IS WHERE AMY CLEARLY STATES THAT DAVID COMMUNICATED HIS INTENTIONS AND MOTIVATION TO CARRY A GUN. DAVID (THE SHOOTER) WAS CARRYING A GUN BECAUSE HE INTENDED TO USE IT FOR STEVEN PAUL. DAVID LIES TO DETECTIVES AND FALSELY CLAIMS HE WAS NOT CARRYING A GUN FOR PEOPLE BUT FOR COYOTES. ONCE AGAIN, ABSOLUTE NONSENSE.

Det. King- After that first time, he started carrying?

Amy Gregory: Uh-huh (indicating yes)

AGAIN, AMY GREGORY CONFIRMS THAT DAVID (THE SHOOTER) STARTED CARRYING AFTER THE SUPPOSED “FIRST” INCIDENT WITH STEVEN PAUL NOT BEFORE. ALSO NOT FOR COYOTES WHICH WAS THE ORIGINAL FALSE NARRATIVE THAT DAVID AND AMY SPUN UP. HERE IS WHERE AMY CLEARLY STATES THAT DAVID COMMUNICATED HIS INTENTIONS AND MOTIVATION TO CARRY A GUN. DAVID (THE SHOOTER) WAS CARRYING A GUN BECAUSE HE INTENDED TO USE IT FOR STEVEN PAUL. DAVID LIES

**TO DETECTIVES AND FALSELY CLAIMS HE WAS NOT CARRYING A GUN FOR PEOPLE BUT FOR COYOTES. ALSO DAVID, FALSELY CLAIMS THAT HE STARTED CARRYING BEFORE THE SUPPOSED "FIRST" INCIDENT WITH STEVEN PAUL. ALL INCONSISTENT STATEMENTS AND ONCE AGAIN, ABSOLUTE NONSENSE.**

Det. King- Okay. And how does he-where does he usually carry that?

**Amy Gregory: Usually, he'll have it, um, I think in a –I think in his waist...**

Det. King- Like, he carries it, like, in a –in a holster inside of his waistband? Is it in a holster or is it just--

**Amy Gregory: No. I think it's just in his waistband.**

Det. King- Uh, does he carry—how often does he carry it?

**Amy Gregory: Did he do that before Steven's encounter?**

**Uh-uh. (indicating no)**

**AGAIN, AMY GREGORY CONFIRMS THAT DAVID (THE SHOOTER) DID NOT CARRY A GUN BEFORE THE SUPPOSED FIRST ENCOUNTER WITH STEVEN PAUL. STARTED CARRYING AFTER THE SUPPOSED "FIRST" INCIDENT WITH STEVEN PAUL NOT BEFORE. ALSO NOT FOR COYOTES WHICH WAS THE ORIGINAL FALSE NARRATIVE THAT DAVID AND AMY SPUN UP.**

Det. King- Okay. So since the first time Steven had—he was like, I need to--

**Amy Gregory: I mean, he did it because—he did a few times because we would have coyotes in the neighborhood. Um, so he would have it with him in case we ran into a coyote walking at night.**

**SO HERE, UPON REALIZING THAT SHE MAY HAVE MADE AN INCRIMINATING STATEMENT SHE TRIES TO MENTION COYOTES. HOWEVER, SHE MENTIONS COYOTES AT NIGHT NOT DURING THE DAY. EVEN IF THIS WAS THE CASE, WHICH IS HIGHLY DOUBTFUL, COYOTES ARE RARELY SEEN DURING THE DAY AT THE PARK. AFTER SPEAKING WITH A PARK RANGER WHO HAD BEEN ON THE JOB FOR NEARLY A YEAR OR MORE, WHEN ASKED WHETHER THE PARK RANGER HAD EVER PERSONALLY SEEN A COYOTE, THE ANSWER WAS A DEFINITIVE NEVER. SO THIS NARRATIVE ABOUT COYOTES IS HIGHLY SUSPECT TO SAY THE LEAST. ESPECIALLY SINCE THIS WAS DURING THE DAY.**

Det. King- Okay. That first encounter, were you—were—were you intimidated by Steven?

**Amy Gregory: Very.**

*QUESTION: WHY IS DET. KING ASKING SUCH A LEADING QUESTION AT THIS POINT IN THE INTERVIEW?*

Det. King- And then today's incident, what—what would you—what were you feeling? Like--

**Amy Gregory: Fear**

Det. King- Okay. That—Do something to—to one of you?

**Amy Gregory: Yeah.**

*QUESTION: WHY IS DET. KING CONTINUING TO ASK SUCH A LEADING QUESTIONS?*

**It's a given. If he's outside, he's gonna do something.**

Det. King- Yeah.

*QUESTION: HOW DOES AMY AUTOMATICALLY ASSUME THIS? THIS IS A RATHER BIG ASSUMPTION ON HER PART AND A FALSE ONE AT THAT.*

**Amy Gregory: He's gonna mess with somebody, he's gonna do as much as he can. If he—if you see him outside, you need to be afraid. He's pushed his grandmother down the staircase.**

*QUESTION: MORE ASSUMPTIONS ON AMY GREGORY'S PART. WHY DOES THIS FALSE NARRATIVE GO UNCHALLENGED BY THE DETECTIVES? ALSO STEVEN PAUL NEVER PUSHED HIS GRANDMOTHER DOWN THE STAIRCASE. THIS IS A COMPLETE FABRICATION AS WELL.*

Det. King- Okay. So you said four—this is the fourth, the first time. What happened on the other—the two and third thing?

**Amy Gregory: It's just the basic same old things. The little intimidation as he walks toward you—**

Det. King- So the other two times he does the same exact thing with--

**Amy Gregory: Same thing**

Det. King- bows—bows up?

**Amy Gregory: Bows up.**

*QUESTION: SO APPARENTLY STEVEN PAUL WALKING TOWARDS SOMEONE OR THEM, NO MATTER IF IT IS ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THE ROAD, IS AN ATTEMPT TO INTIMIDATE. ONCE AGAIN, HOW DOES AMY GREGORY, MAKE THIS ASSUMPTION. THIS IS ABSOLUTE NONSENSE AS WELL.*

Det. King- Gets in your face or her—his face?

**Amy Gregory: Kind of walks fast towards you, and then when he gets about this far from you, does that quick (indicating), and he'll spit.**

Det. King- Okay. But not at you guys, just—toward

**QUESTION: HERE AMY GREGORY MENTIONS SPITTING. STEVEN PAUL DID NOT SPIT AT ANYONE. SINCE WHEN IS SPITTING ON THE GROUND AS YOU ARE WALKING TOWARDS SOMEONE COMPLETELY ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THE ROAD AND A CRIME? SIMPLE EXPLANATION WAS THAT STEVEN PAUL WOULD OFTEN NEED TO SPIT TO CLEAR OUT THE NUTRITIONAL SUPPLEMENTS AND HIMALAYAN SALT HE WAS TAKING FOR HIS ATHLETIC WORKOUT REGIMEN.**

**Amy Gregory: Toward us. Yes.**

Det. King- Does he say anything?

**Amy Gregory: Um, he'll mumble.**

**QUESTION: SO APPARENTLY STEVEN PAUL, AMY CLAIMS WOULD "MUMBLE". SHE NEVER, IN FACT, CONFIRMS THAT STEVEN PAUL SAID ANYTHING WHATSOEVER TO THEM. WHAT IS THE ISSUE HERE?**

**Yeah. But you can't really make out what he's saying.**

**QUESTION: SO APPARENTLY STEVEN PAUL WALKING TOWARDS SOMEONE OR THEM, NO MATTER IF IT IS ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THE ROAD, IS AN ATTEMPT TO INTIMIDATE. ONCE AGAIN, HOW DOES AMY GREGORY, MAKE THIS ASSUMPTION. THIS IS ABSOLUTE NONSENSE AS WELL.**

Det. King- What—what—what is wrong—do you know what's wrong with him? Do you--

**Amy Gregory: Uh-Uh (indicating no)**

**QUESTION: WHY IS DET. KING ASKING SUCH A LEADING QUESTION? WHAT THE HECK KIND OF QUESTION IS THIS FROM A DETECTIVE?**

Det. King- What do you think? It is?

**Amy Gregory: Uh, he's crazy.**

QUESTION: WHY IS DET. KING ASKING AMY GREGORY TO SPECULATE HERE? HER RESPONSE, WITH NOT A SHRED OF FACTS OR EVIDENCE, IS "UH, HE'S CRAZY". ABSOLUTE NONSENSE.

He's been taken in and--

Det. King- Do you know of anything that he's done to somebody else, maybe a neighbor and done the same thing? Or is it just you—is he targeting you guys?

Amy Gregory: Oh, no. He targets a lot of people out there. If you talk to anybody in that condo area, you'll find out. The police have been out there numerous times for him.

QUESTION: WHY IS DET. KING ASKING CONTINUING WITH LEADING QUESTIONS?

Det. King- Okay. Okay. And so you say he talks to himself.

Amy Gregory: Yeah. He'll—just kind of mumble to himself.

Det. King- Anything else about his behavior or any kind of incidents you've had with him? So each of these other after the first time, David started carrying a handgun for protection.

Amy Gregory: Uh-huh. (indicating yes)

QUESTION: WHY IS DET. KING ASKING CONTINUING TO ASK LEADING QUESTIONS?

Det. King- Okay. Um, has David ever made any comments about, you know, the encounters you had with him? Like--

Amy Gregory: No. Just that it freaked him out as much as it freaked me out. You know? I mean we're 50-60 year old people. We don't--

Det. King- Yeah.

Amy Gregory: need a 20-year old guy

Det. King- No.

Amy Gregory: coming up. We don't know what he's gonna do. We've heard the stories about what he's done. He's not stable. He shouldn't be in that neighborhood. You have fear walking your own puppy in your own neighborhood. That's not good.

Every time just to walk your puppy and you gotta worry if this dude's gonna come down the driveway?

QUESTION: HERE IS THE FIRST INCIDENCE WHERE AMY MAKES A CLEAR STATEMENT ABOUT MOTIVE IN THIS CASE. "WE'VE HEARD THE STORIES ABOUT WHAT HE'S DONE. HE'S NOT STABLE. HE SHOULDN'T BE IN THAT NEIGHBORHOOD". ASIDE FROM THE RUMOR, INNUENDO AND FALSEHOODS SPREAD AROUND THE NEIGHBORHOOD BY THE LIKES OF GARY OSGOOD, TOBY AND BETH JOHNSTON AS WELL AS DAVID AND AMY GREGORY WHAT DEFINITIVE FACTS DOES SHE HAVE ABOUT ANY OF THIS WHATSOEVER?

ACCORDING TO AMY SHE CLEARLY OPINES AND STATES THAT STEVEN PAUL SHOULDN'T BE IN THAT NEIGHBORHOOD. WHO GIVES AMY AND DAVID THE RIGHT TO MAKE SUCH AN ASSESSMENT OF WHO SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO BE IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD.

Det. King- No..No..You don't have to live like that.

Amber (victim advocate)- No.

QUESTION: HERE IS THE BEGINNINGS OF DET. KING AS WELL AS AMBER (VICTIM ADVOCATE) PIVOTING TOWARDS SUPPORTING AND SHOWING AGREEMENT AMY GREGORY'S FALSE NARRATIVE.

**Amy Gregory: No. But nothing's ever done about it. Nothing's ever done about it. And it's sad.**

Amber (victim advocate)- Yeah.

**Amy Gregory: But he's just as fearful as me.**

Det. King- Who's that?

**Amy Gregory: David.**

Det. King- David. Yeah.

Det. King- What has he said, uh, before about it?

**Amy Gregory: The only thing he said is, Man, I'm a 60 year old man with a...and.... That kid will kill me.**

Det. King- He's got a disability?

**Amy Gregory: Yes.**

QUESTION: WHY IS DET. KING ASKING CONTINUING TO ASK LEADING QUESTIONS? WHAT DOES A DISABILITY HAVE TO DO WITH AN COMPLETELY UNNECESSARY AND AVOIDABLE SHOOTING OF ANOTHER HUMAN BEING?

Det. King- He said that—that man will kill me?

**Amy Gregory: Oh, he's said it before. He's like, "If he hits me, he'll kill me."**

QUESTION: MORE LEADING QUESTIONS...

Det. King- Uh-huh (indicating yes). Did you have anything? (asking Det. Ojeda)

Det. Ojeda- Have you guys, um, ever been outside and not only he brings his—his gun for coyotes or whatever, but do you guys have your cell phones with you when you go out there?

**Amy Gregory: Not usually.**

QUESTION: WHY IS DET. OJEDA NOT ASKING ANY FOLLOW UP QUESTIONS? WHY IS IT THAT DAVID (HE SHOOTER) AND AMY HIS WIFE WHO CLAIMS TO BE TERRIFIED OF WALKING THE STREETS BECAUSE STEVEN PAUL MIGHT COME OUT AND DO SOMETHING TO THEM "NOT USUALLY" CARRY A CELL PHONE? IT WOULD SEEM RATHER OBVIOUS TO MOST EVERYONE THAT CARRYING A CELL PHONE WHEN YOU ARE SUCH INCREDIBLE FEAR WHEN WALKING YOUR DOGS WOULD BE AN ABSOLUTE NECESSITY. THIS WAY YOU CAN CALL THE POLICE IF NECESSARY. IN ADDITION, BOTH AMY AND DAVID WOULD OFTEN WALK ALONE AS WELL. A WOMAN IN SUCH FEAR FOR HER LIFE NOT ONLY WALKING ALONE BUT WITHOUT A CELL PHONE? SERIOUSLY? AGAIN HER FALSE NARRATIVE ABOUT BEING IN FEAR IS COMPLETE NONSENSE.

Det. Ojeda- Okay. When he was walking past you, did he say anything this time, or was he just walking past you aggressively, like you were describing it?

**Amy Gregory: He was just doing the walk aggressively.**

**Then like staring right at you as he's doing it.**

**'cause he wants to make sure you know he's there.**

QUESTION: WHY IS DET. OJEDA NOW ASKING LEADING QUESTIONS? WHY IS HE ASKING A QUESTION AND FRAMING IT AS "WALKING PAST YOU AGGRESSIVELY". WHO GETS TO MAKE THE DETERMINATION OF WHAT "WALKING AGGRESSIVELY" LOOKS LIKE AND WHY THE USE OF THE WORD "AGGRESSIVELY" BY DET. OJEDA? WHAT KIND OF QUESTIONING IS THIS?

Det. King- What was the difference about this—this incident than it was the last three?

**Amy Gregory: The difference is that the guy actually came up on David.**

**QUESTION: HERE AMY GREGORY CLAIMS THAT STEVEN PAUL "CAME UP ON DAVID". THIS IS AMY GREGORY'S VERSION OF EVENTS. HOWEVER THE EVIDENCE IN THIS CASE CLEARLY SHOWS THE OPPOSITE. THAT DAVID GREGORY CAME UP ON STEVEN. THE SHOOTING TOOK PLACE AND SPENT GUN CARTRIDGE WAS ON THE SIDE OF THE**

ROAD WHERE STEVEN PAUL WAS WALKING. WHAT WAS DAVID (THE SHOOTER) DOING APPROACHING STEVEN PAUL ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THE STREET. IT SHOWS THAT DAVID (THE SHOOTER) WAS MORE THAN LIKELY THE AGGRESSOR AND NOT THE OTHER WAY AROUND AS AMY GREGORY FALSELY CLAIMS.

Det. King- Uh-huh (indicating yes)

Amy Gregory: The other times, he's not.

This time, he did.

Det. Ojeda- You said he pushed David?

Amy Gregory: Uh-huh (indicating yes)

Det. Ojeda- Has that ever happened before?

Amy Gregory: No.

Det. Ojeda- Did David say anything to you when you guys—when he started doing his walk?

Amy Gregory: No. Cause we were kind of separated. We were both just—we know to keep our eye on him. Just to watch him, just to make sure—all we want him to do is just walk past, not say anything. Don't make eye contact. Just let the dude go home. That's all we want anytime we see him.

Det. Ojeda- And has that worked in the past?

QUESTION: AMY AND DAVID (THE SHOOTER) HAD ALREADY SEEN STEVEN PAUL AT THIS POINT. WHY IS IT THAT DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND AMY ARE SEPARATED AT THIS POINT ON THE OPPOSITE SIDE OF THE ROAD FROM STEVEN. IT WOULD APPEAR CONTRADICTORY TO HER NARRATIVE THAT BOTH SHE AND DAVID WERE IN FEAR OF STEVEN PAUL. WHY DID THEY FOLLOW BEHIND STEVEN PAUL ON HIGHLAND RD.? WHY DID THEY NOT TAKE THE USUAL CUT-THROUGH THE NEIGHBOR'S YARD TO GET HOME. IF ALL THEY WANTED WAS FOR STEVEN PAUL TO "WALK PAST, NOT SAY ANYTHING. DON'T MAKE EYE CONTACT. JUST LET THE DUDE GO HOME" HOW IS IT THAT DAVID (THE SHOOTER) WAS ON STEVEN PAUL'S SIDE OF ROAD. ANY WHY? THE FORENSICS EVIDENCE PAINTS A COMPLETELY DIFFERENT NARRATIVE. ONE WHERE DAVID (THE SHOOTER) APPROACHED STEVEN PAUL COMPLETELY ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THE ROAD. ALL OF THESE ACTIONS, ON THE PART OF DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND AMY, ARE COMPLETELY IN CONTRADICTION TO THE FALSE NARRATIVE OF BEING FEARFUL OF STEVEN PAUL.

Amy Gregory: I mean, yeah. He's usually—the last few times, he's just kind of sauntered past and done his look around like he wants to come back, but--

Det. King- So the other three times were just, like, one approach to intimidate—and then leaves. This one was different--

**Amy Gregory: This one was different.**

Det. King- because he came back a couple of times.

**Amy Gregory: Uh-huh, uh-huh (indicating yes, yes)**

Det. Ojeda- And he actually put hands on your husband?

**Amy Gregory: Uh-huh.**

**From what I saw.**

**QUESTION: DAVID (THE SHOOTER) WAS ON THE COMPLETELY OPPOSITE SIDE OF THE ROAD APPROACHING STEVEN PAUL. IS IT EVEN REMOTELY POSSIBLE, AND MORE THAN LIKELY AND PLAUSIBLE, THAT DAVID WAS THE AGGRESSOR AND PUT HIS HANDS ON STEVEN PAUL. COMPLETELY THE OPPOSITE OF THE SELF SERVING AND MORE THAN LIKELY FALSE NARRATIVE PUT FORWARD BY AMY GREGORY THE SHOOTER'S WIFE.**

Det. King- Okay. Is there anything else you can think of about his behavior today or even in the past, that would be important to this investigation?

**Amy Gregory: I don't know. I just—I know he has mental issues. Uh, I know that--**

Det. King- Is that just from your watching his behavior—you knew?

**Amy Gregory: Watching his behavior—**

**Hearing the neighbors, just hearing what they've been through with him here and how they'll come and take him for three days. I guess the—however long you can take somebody when you wanna calm them down for three days. He'll be gone for three days, but then he's back. And then the—the cops are always out there.**

**QUESTION: ALL HEARSAY. ALL NEIGHBORHOOD GOSSIP. ALL FABRICATIONS OF THE TRUTH.**

Det. King- What neighbors—do you the neighbor's names that you're talking about has dealt with him before?

**Amy Gregory: Um, I don't know their names.**

**QUESTION: AMY GREGORY MAKES THESE OUTRAGEOUS STATEMENTS WITH NO FACTS OR NAMES OF NEIGHBORS TO SUPPORT HER FALSE NARRATIVE.**

Det. King- Do you—do you know his mom and dad? Any of his family members? His grandma?

Amy Gregory: Uh-uh (no), the only thing, um, that we've been told is that's his grandparents' place. I guess they're snowbirds.

So he stays in it when they're not there, and I don't know when they go back and forth. I don't. But I do know that he has pushed his grandma down the staircase, he's pulled a knife on his grandfather. So he's not stable.

QUESTION: AGAIN ALL HEARSAY. ALL NEIGHBORHOOD GOSSIP. ALL FABRICATIONS OF THE TRUTH. MOST OF THESE STORIES WERE FABRICATED A SPREAD AROUND THE NEIGHBORHOOD BY GARY OSGOOD, TOBY AND BETH JOHNSTON AS WELL AS DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND AMY. STEVEN PAUL NEVER PUSHED HIS GRANDMA DOWN ANY STAIRCASE NOR PULLED A KNIFE ON HIS GRANDFATHER.

Det. King- Yeah.

Det. Ojeda- Has he been physical with anyone else in the neighborhood that you've heard of?

Amy Gregory: I don't know. Uh, not that I've heard of. I know that they'll, you know—he's got one guy he was messing with, but I—the guy's just too much bigger than him. And so the only story we heard about that was when Steven started messing with the other guy, I guess he came out and he's like, Hey, you big pussy. And then the other guy turned around and he said, Who the fuck are you talking to? And Steven, uh, like, sauntered away, and that's all I've heard.

QUESTION: AGAIN MORE HEARSAY. MORE NEIGHBORHOOD GOSSIP COMING FROM TOBY JOHNSTON. NO-ONE EVER WITNESSED THIS ALLEGED INCIDENT WITH TOBY OTHER THAN TOBY HIMSELF.

Det. King- I have nothing further...Um, so, yeah. We're gonna, um, talk to David now. Um—um, it's a tragic situation today that, you know, that's—you know, should never even have happened...

You know, um, you don't deserve for this to happen like this.

To be fearful of living in a place and with somebody else and--

Amy Gregory: I know. We can't—can't even walk our dogs—without, you know, is he gonna come out? Is he gonna come out? And everybody in the neighborhood is like that. I mean, I don't know if they're fearful like us. I don't know what all their dealings have been with him, but everybody in the neighborhood talks about him and wanting him gone.

Because he's so crazy.

**QUESTION: HERE IS ANOTHER STATEMENT FROM AMY WHERE SHE MAKES ANOTHER CLEAR STATEMENT ABOUT MOTIVE IN THIS CASE. WHEN COMMENTING ABOUT THE NEIGHBORHOOD SHE STATES "I MEAN, I DON'T KNOW IF THEY'RE FEARFUL LIKE US. I DON'T KNOW WHAT ALL THEIR DEALINGS HAVE BEEN WITH HIM, BUT EVERYBODY IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD TALKS ABOUT HIM AND WANTING HIM GONE".**

**SHE ONCE AGAIN, SPINS THE FALSE NARRATIVE ABOUT FEAR.**

Det. King- Yeah.

Um, you don't have to be fearful anymore. Okay?

**Amy Gregory: Okay.**

**QUESTION: WHY IS DET. KING MAKING SUCH AN OUTRAGEOUS STATEMENT TO THE WIFE OF THE SHOOTER AT THIS POINT IN THIS INVESTIGATION? THIS BEHAVIOR AND STATEMENTS LIKE THIS TO A PRIME SUSPECT IN A SHOOTING ON THE PART OF DET. KING BORDERS ON MALFEASANCE.**

Amber (victim advocate)- For sure. You didn't wake up this morning and think this was gonna happen, for—that's for sure.

Amber (victim advocate)- Um, yeah. I'm—I'm gonna give you—both you and your husband my card. That way you have—and I'll check in with you frequently to see how you're doing.

**QUESTION: WHY IS AMBER MAKING SUCH AN OUTRAGEOUS STATEMENT TO THE WIFE OF THE SHOOTER AT THIS POINT IN THIS INVESTIGATION? THIS BEHAVIOR AND STATEMENTS LIKE THIS TO A PRIME SUSPECT IN A SHOOTING ON THE PART OF AMBER BORDERS ON MALFEASANCE.**

Amber (victim advocate)- What kind of doggies do you have?

Amber (victim advocate)-Oh, I love ... (referring to the type of dog)

**Amy Gregory: He's so cute. He was actually at that cut-through where we go to walk--**

Amber (victim advocate)-There are days, uh, that's for sure. So but find—yeah, find comfort and solace in the dogs 'cause they'll tell us something's up. So they'll probably be extra lovey dovey.

**QUESTION: AMY GREGORY MAKES ANOTHER STATEMENT ABOUT THE CUT-THROUGH AT THE NEIGHBOR'S YARD. ONCE AGAIN, IF AMY AND DAVID (THE SHOOTER) WERE SO FEARFUL OF STEVEN PAUL, WHY DID THEY NOT USE THIS CUT THROUGH TO AVOID STEVEN PAUL AFTER SEEING HIM ON HIGHLAND RD. WHY INSTEAD DID THEY CHOOSE TO FOLLOW BEHIND STEVEN PAUL INSTEAD ALL THE WAY DOWN CLOSE TO THE END OF HIGHLAND AND SHORELAND?**

**Amy Gregory: What does happen now?**

Amber (victim advocate)-Um, they're gonna talk to your husband now, and I met—I met David as well. So they'll talk to David.

Amber (victim advocate)-Yeah. But we keep you posted, both of you guys throughout the whole process. Um, if, uh, we need anything, we can always come to you as well. That way you don't have to come all the way up here.

Amber (victim advocate)-That way it—yeah. It's you feel more comfortable in your home instead of one of these rooms.

**QUESTION: WHY IS AMBER MAKING SUCH STATEMENTS TO THE SHOOTER'S WIFE? "WE KEEP YOU POSTED, BOTH OF YOU GUYS THROUGHOUT THE WHOLE PROCESS." "UM, IF, UH, WE NEED ANYTHING, WE CAN ALWAYS COME TO YOU AS WELL. THAT WAY YOU DON'T HAVE TO COME ALL THE WAY UP HERE" ALSO THAT THEY CAN DO THINGS "IF YOU FEEL MORE COMFORTABLE IN YOUR HOME INSTEAD OF ONE OF THESE ROOMS." THIS BEHAVIOR AND STATEMENTS LIKE THIS TO A PRIME SUSPECT IN A SHOOTING ON THE PART OF AMBER BORDERS ON MALFEASANCE.**

**Amy Gregory: I can't believe it came to this.**

Amber (victim advocate)-Uh-huh. Well, it sounded like, as you said, like maybe something was maybe wrong with him that totally—and—

**QUESTION: WHY IS AMBER THE VICTIM'S ADVOCATE NOW OPINING AND MAKING STATEMENTS ABOUT SOMETHING "WAS WRONG WITH HIM" WHEN REFERRING TO STEVEN PAUL. AMBER HAS ABSOLUTELY NO EVIDENCE OR FACTS TO BACK UP SUCH A STATEMENT TO THE SHOOTER'S WIFE. ESSENTIALLY LEANING IN TO THE FALSE AND SELF SERVING STATEMENTS OF THE SHOOTER'S WIFE.**

**Amy Gregory: He's—and he's so unstable. And everybody is fearful of him—and David even mentioned not long ago to Sherry, he's like, Well you guys have an HOA you know. You guys can get him out of there.**

Amber (victim advocate)-Yeah... Uh-huh.

**QUESTION: HERE IS A THIRD STATEMENT FROM AMY WHERE SHE MAKES ANOTHER CLEAR STATEMENT ABOUT MOTIVE IN THIS CASE. WHEN COMMENTING ABOUT THE NEIGHBORHOOD SHE STATES "AND EVERYBODY IS FEARFUL OF HIM—AND DAVID EVEN MENTIONED NOT LONG AGO TO SHERRY, HE'S LIKE, WELL YOU GUYS HAVE AN HOA YOU KNOW. YOU GUYS CAN GET HIM OUT OF THERE." GETTING RID OF STEVEN PAUL FROM THE NEIGHBORHOOD WAS A CLEAR MOTIVE IN THIS CASE.**

**AND YET, ONCE AGAIN, AMY SPINS THE FALSE NARRATIVE ABOUT FEAR.**

## **Challenging the Self-Defense Claim/Detective/Detective and Sheriff's Office Personnel Investigative Negligence: A Detailed Analysis of the David Gregory's First Interview (The Shooter)**

**9/24/22 at 11:49 am- David Gregory , 1847 Highland Rd, Osprey at Sheriff's office (1<sup>st</sup> interview)**

Interviewed by Det. Nathan King #2399 and Det. Luis Ojeda #1795 (others in room, Amber (victim's assistant, Sergeant Friday, Deputy Jackson Stroud #3087)

**David Gregory stated the following:**

Det. Ojeda- (unintelligible) just not very confident, but it's gonna—capture our interview. You know what I mean?...If you need anything at all these guys are gonna be here. Okay. (leaves room)

**David Gregory: ...Oh. Goddamn. I'm freezing my fucking ass off. Oh, fuck me. Well. Oh, boy. ...Okay.**

**QUESTION: APPEARS THAT DAVID (SHOOTER) STARTS OFF HIS INTERVIEW BY CLAIMING THAT HE IS FREEZING, WHEN THE MORE LIKELY EXPLANATION IS THAT HE IS SUFFERING FROM A CASE OF NERVES AND SHAKING AS THE INTERVIEW BEGINS. HE CERTAINLY DOESN'T WANT TO APPEAR NERVOUS AND GUILTY AND SO HE PASSES HIS NERVES OFF AS "I'M FREEZING" INSTEAD.**

*THE PATTERN OF EXTREME FOUL LANGUAGE FROM DAVID (THE SHOOTER) BEGINS.*

Det. King- Okay. Are you David? Hey, Detective King. Sorry to have to meet you on these circumstances.

Det. King- We're—like I said, we're gonna go talk to your wife. Okay. We're gonna get—get that side. Then, we'll come over, and we will have a—talk with you.

Det. King- Okay. We'll try to get to you as fast as we can. All right. (leaves room)

**David Gregory: Great. I'm sorry, baby. (unintelligible) fuck with the (unintelligible). Sorry baby. I can't believe I'm going to (unintelligible). (unintelligible). Oh, my goodness.**

Sgt. Friday- Hey, how you doin'? I'm Sergeant Friday with the Sheriff's Office. Would you like a different chair?...I mean, I can get you one that's got cushion and reclines.

**David Gregory: No. It's just—it is what it is.**

**My arms are like four inches around, yeah. It's terrible.**

**Goddammit. (grabs shoulder). Ouch.**

**Yeah. I'm just having (unintelligible) man. It's—the—the**

Sgt. Friday- The shooting pain.

**David Gregory: Yeah. I'm sorry guys.**

Sgt. Friday- It's okay. You're good. You're good. Is it—is it anything you need an ambulance for?

**David Gregory: I don't believe so. I just—I live like this, dude. I really do.**

**David Gregory: This has been going on for a year and a half.**

**David Gregory: I mean, these biceps are completely fried.**

**David Gregory: I'm positive I'm not having a heart attack.**

Sgt. Friday- Um, just because I didn't...I—I know what he—I don't know exactly what he's going through, but I had the same issue with mine. (leaves room)

**QUESTION: DAVID (THE SHOOTER) BEGINS HIS POLICE INTERVIEW WITH AN IMMEDIATE PLAY FOR SYMPATHY FROM THE DETECTIVES. DAVID BEGINS BY FEIGNING INJURY TO HIS SHOULDER. DAVID GOES FURTHER BY CLAIMING "THIS HAS BEEN GOING ON FOR A YEAR AND A HALF" AND "I MEAN, THESE BICEPS ARE COMPLETELY FRIED".**

David Gregory: Why did this happen to me? Jesus. unintelligible) at all. (unintelligible) got to happen. God sakes. God, he's obviously (unintelligible). Fuck. I'm gonna die aren't I? I hope that kid is okay. God dammit I just wanted my arm fixed and to be working. Fuck. It's driving me crazy being in this fucking place. Can't wait. I can't believe it.

David Gregory: I love you Amy. I'm so sorry. Goddammit. This is gonna suck for the rest of my life, isn't it, isn't it. Oh, I'm hurtin' Oh, that chair don't work that good. Mm, mm, boy I gotta pee. This is crazy. I'm sorry guys. Can I go to the bathroom again? I'm so sorry. I guess I gotta quit drinking that fucking water. Is that the return or the air. Goddamn. Fuck, fuck, fuck. Gimme a cup.

David Gregory: They're gonna lock me up for life 'cause this kid was picking on me, goddammit. I'm exhausted. Guys, can I please go to the bathroom, guys, please? I'm so tired.

QUESTION: DAVID (THE SHOOTER) CONTINUES HIS POLICE INTERVIEW WITH AN MORE PLAY FOR SYMPATHY FROM THE DETECTIVES. "GOD DAMMIT I JUST WANTED MY ARM FIXED AND TO BE WORKING. FUCK." MORE FEIGNED INJURY.

DAVID (THE SHOOTER) MAKES THE STATEMENT "THEY'RE GONNA LOCK ME UP FOR LIFE 'CAUSE THIS KID WAS PICKING ON ME, GODDAMMIT. HERE DAVID CLEARLY STATES THAT HE FEELS HE IS GOING TO GO TO JAIL FOR WHAT HE DID. WHY WOULD HE FEEL THIS WAY IF HE SUPPOSEDLY DID NOTHING WRONG THAT MORNING? WHEN REFERENCING STEVEN PAUL HE ALSO REFERS TO HIM AS "THIS KID". OBVIOUSLY DAVID (THE SHOOTER) FELT HE HAD SHOT A KID NOT AND AN ADULT. THE FALSE NARRATIVE OF SELF DEFENSE IS VERY QUESTIONABLE IN THIS CASE.

THE PATTERN OF EXTREME FOUL LANGUAGE FROM DAVID (THE SHOOTER) CONTINUES.

David Gregory: I'm sorry guys.

David Gregory: Yeah. Oh, fuck. Fuckin' freezing. Oh. I can't fucking believe this. Goddammit. This sucks. This sucks. (unintelligible) this suck. Goddammit. God fucking damn. Oh. I can't believe this. All righty. Oh, fuck. Oh, God. Oh, fuck.

David Gregory: Goddammit. No god. Holy fucking God. I can't fucking believe this. I miss my puppies..Alrighty, I guess I better. Goddammit. This sucks, this sucks. (unintelligible) sucks. Goddammit. God, fucking damn. God damn it. Oh.

Det. King- 01:33:32 All right, David? (comes back in the room after interview with Amy)

David Gregory: I need to pee before we get going here, do you mind?

David Gregory: It must be nerves.

QUESTION: DAVID (THE SHOOTER) CONTINUES TO CLAIM THAT HE IS FREEZING, WHEN THE MORE LIKELY EXPLANATION IS THAT HE IS CONTINUING TO SUFFER FROM A CASE OF NERVES AND SHAKING AS THE INTERVIEW BEGINS. HE CERTAINLY DOESN'T WANT TO APPEAR NERVOUS AND GUILTY AND SO HE PASSES HIS NERVES OFF AS "I'M FREEZING" INSTEAD.

**01:34:00 leaves room; 01:35:09 returns**

**David Gregory: Fuck.**

Det. King- You cold, David?

**David Gregory: I'm freezing my ass off.**

QUESTION: DAVID (THE SHOOTER) CONTINUES TO CLAIM THAT HE IS FREEZING, WHEN THE MORE LIKELY EXPLANATION IS THAT HE IS CONTINUING TO SUFFER FROM A CASE OF NERVES AND SHAKING AS THE INTERVIEW BEGINS. HE CERTAINLY DOESN'T WANT TO APPEAR NERVOUS AND GUILTY AND SO HE PASSES HIS NERVES OFF AS "I'M FREEZING" INSTEAD.

Det. King- we're gonna read you your Miranda Rights. You ever had those read to you before?

**David Gregory: Yeah, when I was younger.**

QUESTION: APPARENTLY DAVID (THE SHOOTER) HAS BEEN ARRESTED BEFORE AS HE CLEARLY STATED HE HAD BEEN READ HIS MIRANDA RIGHTS IN THE PAST. WHAT WAS HE ARRESTED FOR AND HOW MANY TIMES?

Det. King- Um, okay. I—I know—I know that you have history with this—this—this man.

**David Gregory: Yes, sir.**

Det. King- Okay, um, that you were dealing with today. Um, what I want to first talk to you about is what happened today. And then, we're gonna go back, and we're gonna talk about the past that you might've had, the other—the other incidents that you might've had with him. Okay. So, today, can you just go ahead and tell in your own words.

What—what time was it? And what happened?

**David Gregory: walking the dogs. Uh, what time? I have no idea. It was early. Um, we were walking the dogs early morning poop. Um, and we were down on the second block--, and we saw him come out. He came out to the street, walking. And so, we just kept on going in the direction we were going because you know, with the last prior two times with him, we didn't want a run-in. And, um, he went down that street, and came**

back up, walked down the street, walked down past us, which was out of his way. And, I was with the one dog and Amy was with the other dog. And he walked by, and he spit at me twice. And I didn't say a word. I just let him go. And then, uh, he walked past, and he yelled something. I don't know what he yelled, but that got my dog to move toward him. And then I went, I grabbed the dog. It was freaking out 'cause I was in trouble. And by that time, he had come up to me and had me by the shirt. And I pushed him away. And that's when I got the pistol and shot him. (unintelligible). That was it.

David Gregory: He came back out of his way. He spit at me twice. Walked past, said something. I have no idea what it was. And then, things escalated from there. And here we are.

QUESTION: DAVID (THE SHOOTER) CONTINUES HIS POLICE INTERVIEW WITH AN MORE PLAY FOR SYMPATHY FROM THE DETECTIVES. "GOD DAMMIT I JUST WANTED MY ARM FIXED AND TO BE WORKING. FUCK." MORE FEIGNED INJURY.

DAVID (THE SHOOTER) MAKES THE STATEMENT "THEY'RE GONNA LOCK ME UP FOR LIFE 'CAUSE THIS KID WAS PICKING ON ME, GODDAMMIT. HERE DAVID CLEARLY STATES THAT HE FEELS HE IS GOING TO GO TO JAIL FOR WHAT HE DID. WHY WOULD HE FEEL THIS WAY IF HE SUPPOSEDLY DID NOTHING WRONG THAT MORNING? WHEN REFERENCING STEVEN PAUL HE ALSO REFERS TO HIM AS "THIS KID". OBVIOUSLY DAVID (THE SHOOTER) FELT HE HAD SHOT A KID NOT AN ADULT. DAVID (THE SHOOTER) OBVIOUSLY KNEW HE HAD SHOT A KID. THE QUESTION ONE WOULD HAVE TO ASK IS THAT IF DAVID (THE SHOOTER) KNEW HE WAS DEALING WITH A KID WAS THERE ANY CONSIDERATION FOR THE FACT THAT HE STEVEN PAUL WAS A KID BEFORE SHOOTING HIM? THE FALSE NARRATIVE FROM DAVID FOR SELF DEFENSE IS VERY QUESTIONABLE IN THIS CASE BASED ON HIS OWN STATEMENTS.

DAVID (THE SHOOTER) GOES ON TO DESCRIBE HIS SELF SERVING VERSION OF WHAT HAPPENED THE MORNING HE SHOT STEVEN PAUL. LEAVING OUT MANY DETAILS FROM THE EVENTS OF THAT MORNING. SO HIS DOG APPROACHED STEVEN PAUL, ON THE OPPOSITE SIDE OF THE ROAD, AND DAVID HIMSELF APPROACHED STEVEN PAUL, NOT THE OTHER WAY AROUND. DAVID CLAIMS THAT STEVEN PAUL "YELLED SOMETHING. I DON'T KNOW WHAT HE YELLED, BUT THAT GOT MY DOG TO MOVE TOWARD HIM. AND THEN I (DAVID) WENT, I GRABBED THE DOG. IT (THE DOG) WAS FREAKING OUT 'CAUSE I WAS IN TROUBLE. AND BY THAT TIME, HE HAD COME UP TO ME AND HAD ME BY THE SHIRT. AND I PUSHED HIM AWAY. AND THAT'S WHEN I GOT THE PISTOL AND SHOT HIM. THAT WAS IT. THIS VERSION OF EVENTS MAKES ABSOLUTELY NO SENSE. DAVID COMPLETELY FAILS TO MAKE ANY MENTION AT THIS POINT IN HIS SELF SERVING NARRATIVE TO STATE THE FACT THAT HE (DAVID) HIMSELF HAD YANKED IN AN ABUSIVE MANNER ON HIS OWN DOG . HOWEVER IN LATER STATEMENTS FROM DAVID (THE SHOOTER) STATES THE FOLLOWING...

**What had happened is, you know, the dog is on the ground, a little—a little dog. He said something, the dog thought it was an invitation to—to come.**

And I tried to get the cord and actually—goddamn, it's so terrible 'cause I tried to get the dog and I couldn't. And I missed him, and the poor little fucker went sliding down the street. He's sideways, and he's screaming. He's a little toy dog. And I stood up. I was like, "Dude, leave us the fuck alone." And that's when he—when it happened, and—and then, after I—I—I grabbed the dog."

NOW, DO THESE WORDS WHICH CAME FROM DAVID'S (THE SHOOTER) OWN MOUTH SOUND, EVEN REMOTELY, LIKE THE WORDS OF A DOG LOVER TO YOU? DAVID WAS CALLING HIS OWN DOG "THE POOR LITTLE FUCKER AND HOW THE DOG WENT SLIDING DOWN THE STREET AS HE'S SIDEWAYS AND HE'S SCREAMING." DAVID WAS ABUSING HIS OWN DOG AT THIS POINT. I'M SURE STEVEN PAUL WAS (AS ANYBODY WOULD BE) CONCERNED OVER THE ABUSIVE TREATMENT OF THE DOG BY DAVID IN HIS FURIOUS ATTEMPT TO YANK THE TOY DOG AWAY AS THE DOG APPROACHED STEVEN PAUL (AS DOGS OFTEN DO) ONTO STEVEN PAUL'S SIDE OF THE STREET.

YET, DAVID (THE SHOOTER) HAD ABSOLUTELY NO PROBLEM WITH HIS DOG APPROACHING OR BEING PETTED BY OTHER NEIGHBORS. AS ATTESTED BY THE TESTIMONY OF MELANIA BINDER. MELANIA BINDER'S PERSONALITY WAS SIMILAR IN SOME RESPECTS WITH THE FACT THAT SHE KEPT TO HERSELF. YET WHEN MELANIA BINDER ATTEMPTS TO PET DAVID'S DOG, DAVID HAS NO ISSUE. HOWEVER, WHEN STEVEN PAUL, WHO EQUALLY KEPT TO HIMSELF, ATTEMPTED THE SAME OR THE DOG APPROACHED STEVEN PAUL, DAVID WAS INCENSED AT STEVEN PAUL AND HIS OWN DOG. THIS IS KEY TO THE FALSE NARRATIVE THAT AMY AND DAVID GREGORY CONTINUE TO SPIN ABOUT WHAT HAPPENED THAT MORNING. DAVID (THE SHOOTER) CAME OVER TO STEVEN PAUL'S SIDE OF THE ROAD AND SHOT HIM AS HE WAS INCENSED ABOUT HIS OWN DOG APPROACHING STEVEN PAUL AND SUBSEQUENTLY STEVEN PAUL ATTEMPTING TO ASSIST THE SMALL DOG AS HE WAS BEING FORCEFULLY YANKED AND ABUSED BY AN ENRAGED DAVID.

AND THAT HIS "THE LITTLE FUCKER (HIS DOG)" WENT SLIDING DOWN THE STREET. HE'S SIDEWAYS AND HE'S SCREAMING. HE'S A LITTLE TOY DOG. AND I STOOD UP. I WAS LIKE 'DUDE, LEAVE US THE FUCK ALONE. AND THAT'S WHEN HE—WHEN IT HAPPENED, AND—THEN, AFTER I—I—I GRABBED THE DOG' THE MORE LIKELY SCENARIO IS THAT UPON SEEING THIS ABUSE OF THE DOG BY DAVID (THE SHOOTER), STEVEN PAUL AS ANY CONCERNED PERSON WOULD, INTERVENED TO TRY AND ASSIST THE DOG THAT DAVID WAS OBVIOUSLY ABUSING. AGAIN, ALL OF THIS TOOK PLACE ON STEVEN PAUL'S SIDE OF THE ROAD. DAVID AND HIS DOG WERE ON STEVEN PAUL'S SIDE OF THE ROAD. FORENSICS SHOW THAT DAVID (THE SHOOTER) SHOT STEVEN PAUL ON STEVEN PAUL'S SIDE OF THE ROAD. HIS FALSE NARRATIVE IS A COMPLETE SHAM. THIS WAS THE SAME OVER-REACTION THAT OCCURRED A YEAR PRIOR WHEN THIS SAME DOG CAME OVER TO BE PETTED BY STEVEN PAUL AND THAT ENRAGED DAVID (THE SHOOTER).

DAVID (THE SHOOTER), FURTHER CONTINUES WITH HIS FALSE SELF SERVING NARRATIVE THAT STEVEN PAUL SPIT AT HIM TWICE AS HE WALKED BY. SINCE STEVEN

PAUL, WAS COMPLETELY ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THE ROAD, IS THAT EVEN REMOTELY POSSIBLE? THE MORE LIKELY SCENARIO IS THAT STEVEN PAUL SPIT ON THE GROUND AND NOTHING MORE.

DAVID (THE SHOOTER) FURTHER CONTINUES WITH HIS FALSE SELF SERVING NARRATIVE THAT STEVEN PAUL "WALKED PAST, SAID SOMETHING. I HAVE NO IDEA WHAT IT WAS. AND THEN, THINGS ESCALATED FROM THERE. AND HERE WE ARE." DAVID OBVIOUSLY DID NOT KNOW WHAT IF ANYTHING STEVEN PAUL SAID, BUT THINGS ESCALATED FROM THERE. DAVID CLAIMS ESCALATION FROM STEVEN PAUL BUT HAS NO IDEA WHAT STEVEN PAUL SAID? VERY HARD TO BELIEVE THIS HAPPENED IN THIS WAY. WHO WAS THE AGGRESSOR? MORE THAN LIKELY IT WAS DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AS HE WAS THE PERSON WHO APPROACHED STEVEN PAUL AND NOT THE OTHER WAY AROUND. MORE THAN LIKELY STEVEN PAUL WAS SIMPLY TRYING TO AVOID BOTH DAVID AND HIS WIFE AMY THAT MORNING AS HE ALWAYS DID WITH EVERYONE IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD. STEVEN PAUL NEVER SPOKE TO ANYONE. HE NEVER SAID A WORD TO ANYONE AND WOULD ALWAYS AVOID CONVERSATION AND PEOPLE. KNOWING STEVEN PAUL'S TENDENCIES TO AVOID CONTACT WITH OTHERS, IT IS INCREDIBLY DIFFICULT TO BELIEVE THIS FALSE SELF SERVING NARRATIVE FROM DAVID (THE SHOOTER)

DAVID GREGORY ALSO CONVENIENTLY LEAVES OUT SPECIFIC DETAILS ABOUT DAVID'S OWN AGGRESSIVE POSTURE AND LANGUAGE AFTER HAVING SHOT STEVEN PAUL AS WELL. DAVID (THE SHOOTER) WAS HEARD BY MULTIPLE WITNESSES YELLING PROFANITIES AT STEVEN PAUL AFTER HAVING SHOT HIM. WHY IS DAVID CONVENIENTLY LEAVING THIS PART OF THE STORY OUT? MAYBE, BECAUSE DAVID DOESN'T WANT TO PAINT HIMSELF AS THE AGGRESSOR. WHICH DAVID (THE SHOOTER) MORE THAN LIKELY WAS THE AGGRESSOR AND NOT THE OTHER WAY AROUND AS HE AND AMY MOST DEFINITELY WANT EVERYONE TO BELIEVE.

Det. King- Okay. You guys step out of your home. Um, you cut—you cut through, and you get onto Highland. Okay. And you said the second block. What direction would—once you step onto Highland?

David Gregory: We went left. We had already made our right. We—my dog...is...so she won't walk far. So, we carry her to a certain point, and we sit her down every day, five times a day. She's.... She sleeps. She poops. You know. And we walk down the street, make a left up our little alley there, and into our house. And that's—we do that five times a day.

QUESTION: AT THIS POINT DAVID GREGORY IS EXPLAINING THAT HE AND HIS WIFE ALWAYS CUT THROUGH THE NEIGHBOR'S YARD IN FRONT OF THEIR CONDO "FIVE TIMES A DAY" TO GET TO HIGHLAND RD. ONCE THEY COMPLETE THE CUT-THROUGH THEY TAKE A RIGHT ONTO HIGHLAND HEADING NORTH. IF AMY AND DAVID (THE SHOOTER) WERE SO AFRAID OF STEVEN PAUL WHY DID THEY NOT CHOOSE THIS PATH ON THE WAY HOME AND GO BACK HOME THROUGH THE SAME NEIGHBOR'S

YARD. WHY DID THEY INSTEAD CHOOSE TO FOLLOW STEVEN PAUL DOWN HIGHLAND RD WHEN THERE WAS CLEARLY A PATH OF AVOIDANCE AVAILABLE TO THEM. THIS DIRECTLY CONTRADICTS BOTH DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND HIS WIFE AMY'S FALSE NARRATIVE ABOUT SUPPOSEDLY BEING FEARFUL OF STEVEN PAUL. ABSOLUTE NONSENSE.

Det. King- Okay. Before—did you—at what point do you first see him today?

**David Gregory: Um, when he was, uh, well, coming around the corner walking down stairs. There's a guy walking his dogs, and you can tell he—he wanted some business with him 'cause it was one of his neighbors. And then, we just started walking, doing our normal walk.**

Det. King- Okay. Okay. So, we're gonna go back—we're gonna—further back from that. When—when you said—okay, so you're walking—you guys are walking your dog, and you see another neighbor—walking a dog.

QUESTION: DAVID (THE SHOOTER) CONFIRMS HERE MUCH LIKE HIS WIFE ALSO CONFIRMED THAT HE SAW STEVEN PAUL WALKING DOWN HIS STEPS AS HE EXITED HIS GRANDPARENT'S CONDO AND BEGAN HIS WALK THAT MORNING. HOWEVER, STEVEN PAUL HAD NO SEEN DAVID OR AMY AT THIS POINT.

**David Gregory: Yes. It was some guy with dogs (unintelligible).**

Det. King- Okay. But you don't know him at all.

**David Gregory: I wasn't paying attention.**

Det. King- But you see him. Then, you see—do you know—okay. The man that you were dealing with today, what—do you know his name?

**David Gregory: I have no idea.**

Det. King- You don't know who he is.

**David Gregory: No. I know where he lives.**

Det. King- Okay. But you—you've dealt with him multiple times.

**David Gregory: I've had two—two—I've called you guys twice on him..**

Det. King- Okay. Describe him for me. Describe what he was wearing today.

QUESTION: DAVID (THE SHOOTER) CLAIMS THAT HE HAD TWO PRIOR INCIDENCES WITH STEVEN THAT HE CLAIMED HE CALLED THE POLICE ON STEVEN PAUL ON. HIS WIFE CLAIMS THAT ONLY ONE INCIDENT, THE VERY FIRST ONE APPROXIMATELY ONE YEAR PRIOR, HAD BEEN CALLED IN. WAS THIS EVER VERIFIED? WHAT WAS THE

OUTCOME? APPARENTLY, THE POLICE FELT THERE NO NEED FOR FOLLOW UP AND STEVEN PAUL WAS NEVER QUESTIONED ABOUT THESE ALLEGED INCIDENCES. A MORE LIKELY EXPLANATION IS THAT DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND AMY OVER-REACTIONED OR DAVID HIMSELF BECAME CONFRONTATIONAL AND RUDE TO STEVEN PAUL WHEN DAVID TOOK OFFENSE AT HIS DOG APPROACHING STEVEN PAUL AND THEN THEY SUBSEQUENTLY CALLED THE POLICE WHEN THEY WANTED TO CLAIM THE OPPOSITE HAD OCCURRED. THE POLICE IF CALLED NEVER SPOKE TO STEVEN PAUL SO THIS STORY IS A COMPLETELY ONE SIDED SELF SERVING VERSION OF EVENTS.

**David Gregory- Today, he was wearing a hoodie with a baseball hat, um, dark hoodie, gym shorts and tennis shoes, as far as I remember.**

Det. King- Okay. Um, describe his, uh, physical size.

**David Gregory: 6'2", 215, lifts weights, big boy.**

Det. King- So, he's muscular you would say?

**David Gregory: Oh yeah.**

Det. King- Okay. Any—any—any identifying marks, maybe glasses, tattoos?

**David Gregory: Yeah. He had glasses.**

Det. King- What kind of glasses?

**David Gregory: Wire framed glasses. All I know. Clear.**

Det. King- Okay. Um, where—when —when you see Steven, where—where is he at when you first see him, and —and this man with the—with the other dog?

**David Gregory: They're walking down the side street, and I'm like—like we come out here between our place.**

**David Gregory: We make a right, go down (unintelligible) there's a street that goes straight down.**

Det. King- Yeah. Westview.

**David Gregory: Right. Okay. Westview. He was walking down that street.**

QUESTION: DAVID (THE SHOOTER) CONFIRMS HERE MUCH LIKE HIS WIFE ALSO CONFIRMED THAT HE SAW STEVEN PAUL WALKING WESTVIEW DRIVE THAT MORNING.

Det. King- Okay. You seen Steven going towards—the man—that was walking? Okay.

David Gregory: Yeah. And the guy made the corner, then Steven came back up, and went down the street 'cause the next time I saw him, he was coming down the street from that way—which is fine, you know, just—I was hoping he was—out just going for a walk.

Det. King- So, as you—now, he' getting close to you guys, what is –what happens then?

David Gregory: He gets close to us. He walks past us to the end of the street, at the corner. We don't say a word. We're minding our dogs in these people's yard. He walks past, spits. I stop and look. He goes (sound effect), spits at me again.

QUESTION: DAVID (THE SHOOTER) CONFIRMS AT THIS POINT THAT HE AND AMY ARE NOW AT THE CORNER OR WESTVIEW AND HIGHLAND AND STEVEN PAUL PASSES THEM FOR THE "FIRST" TIME AND HEADS SOUTH ON HIGHLAND TOWARDS SHORELAND. SO WHAT DO AMY AND DAVID DO AT THIS POINT? THEY WALK BEHIND AND FOLLOW STEVEN PAUL FROM THE OTHER SIDE OF THE ROAD, SPREAD OUT AS AMY IS FIRST (AND CLOSER) TO STEVEN PAUL AND DAVID LAGS BEHIND.

Det. King- What direction?

David Gregory: At me.

Det. King- Does it hit you?

David Gregory: No.

Det. King- Okay. Where does it land?

David Gregory: Right beside me, on both sides.

QUESTION: DAVID (THE SHOOTER), ONCE AGAIN, CONTINUES WITH HIS FALSE SELF SERVING NARRATIVE THAT STEVEN PAUL SPIT AT HIM TWICE AS HE WALKED BY. SINCE STEVEN PAUL, WAS COMPLETELY ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THE ROAD, IS THAT EVEN REMOTELY POSSIBLE? THE MORE LIKELY SCENARIO IS THAT STEVEN PAUL SPIT ON THE GROUND AND NOTHING MORE.

Det. King- He spits twice.

David Gregory: Twice. Uh-huh. Two loogies. I just--

Det. King- Are you walking at that point or were you--

David Gregory: I'm standing in the driveway with my dog in the grass, and I'm just looking.

David Gregory: And I went like this, and he went (sound effect). I was like—I looked back over this way to make sure he wasn't gonna come up and hit me in the back of the neck

or something. And he spit again. I was just like whatever—whatever. And uh—the, he walked down like a driveway. And then, he started, whatever he said. And then, my ...

Det. King- You don't know what he said?

David Gregory: I have no idea—but it was directed at me 'cause he turned around--

Det. King- So, when he walked away, he gets to one driveway away.

David Gregory: He turns around.

Det. King- And then, turns around and comes back.

David Gregory: And starts saying something to me. That's when the dog started moving. So, I went up like three or four steps to grab the dog and he (Steven) came to me. Yeah. He (Steven)—started moving.

Det. King- How—how close does he get to you on the first approach?

David Gregory: He's grabbing me. He grabs my shirt, punches me in the chest.

QUESTION: DAVID (THE SHOOTER), FALSE SELF SERVING NARRATIVE ABOUT STEVEN PAUL GRABBING HIS SHIRT AND PUNCHING HIM IN THE CHEST COMPLETELY UNPROVOKED IS HIGHLY SUSPECT TO SAY THE LEAST. TO BELIEVE THIS FALSE NARRATIVE IS INCREDIBLY DIFFICULT BECAUSE IT LEAVES OUT A LOT OF DETAIL AND MAKES ABSOLUTELY NO SENSE.

Det. King- He doesn't get in your face, and then, grab you, or does he grab you first?

David Gregory: It was simultaneous.

David Gregory: Uh, he came up. And I was like, "Dude, get away from me." And he grabbed me, pop, and that's when I went back and boom (unintelligible).

Det. King- So, he grabs you by the shirt.

QUESTION: DAVID (THE SHOOTER), CLAIMS TO HAVE SHOT STEVEN PAUL AT CLOSE RANGE AS HE ALLEGEDLY CLAIMS THAT STEVEN PAUL "GRABBED ME, POP..AND BOOM" HE ALSO CLAIMS THAT HE PUNCHED HIM AND THAT IS WHEN HE SHOT STEVEN PAUL. AGAIN THE CLAIM IS FROM DAVID IS THAT HE SHOT STEVEN PAUL AT CLOSE RANGE. IN AN EARLIER STATEMENT DAVID CLAIMS THAT STEVEN PAUL ALLEGEDLY "HAD HIM BY THE SHIRT". HOWEVER THAT IS NOT WHAT THE FORENSICS SHOW. THE FORENSICS COMPLETELY CONTRADICTS THIS CLOSE RANGE STATEMENT. THERE WAS NO STIPPLING OR GUN POWDER RESIDUE AROUND THE

ENTRANCE WOUND OR CLOTHING WHICH WOULD INDICATE A SHOT FROM AT LEAST A DISTANCE OR SEPARATION OF 4 FEET OR GREATER.

David Gregory: Yeah.

Det. King- Okay. With one hand, two hands?

David Gregory: One hand.

Det. King- Okay. And then, he punches you?

David Gregory: He hits me—just, not really, but he hits me. Yeah. He hits me with his right hand in the chest.

QUESTION: DAVID (THE SHOOTER), FALSE SELF SERVING NARRATIVE ABOUT STEVEN PAUL HITTING HIM. DETECTIVE KING ASKS DAVID "AND THEN, HE PUNCHES YOU?" AND DAVID RESPONDS "NOT REALLY, BUT HE HITS ME." DAVID COMPLETELY CONTRADICTS HIMSELF HERE.

David Gregory: He's got ahold of like, here. He hits me.

Det. King- So, he got ahold of you with one hand.

David Gregory: I push him back. Yeah.

Det. King- And then, he punches you with the second, in the chest.

David Gregory: (Nods head up and down.)

Det. King- How hard was it?

David Gregory: No idea. I notice that he punched me. Um, does it hurt now? No. My shoulder is killing me. Does that have something to do with it? I don't know, but, uh—

QUESTION: NOW DAVID (THE SHOOTER), FALSE SELF SERVING NARRATIVE ABOUT STEVEN PAUL PUNCHING HIM. WHEN ASKED BY THE DETECTIVE "AND THEN, HE PUNCHES YOU WITH THE SECOND, IN THE CHEST. HOW HARD WAS IT?" DAVID RESPONDS "NO IDEA. ...UM, DOES IT HURT NOW? NO. MY SHOULDER IS KILLING ME. DOES THAT HAVE SOMETHING TO DO WITH IT?" HERE DAVID DOES NOT INDICATE THAT HIS CHEST HURTS BUT HOWEVER HIS SHOULDER HURTS, BUT NOT SURE IF THAT HAS ANYTHING TO DO WITH IT. SO DAVID FALSELY CLAIMS TO BE PUNCHED IN THE CHEST BUT NO INJURY OR PAIN TO THE CHEST. BUT, HIS SHOULDER IS KILLING HIM?? REALLY, ONCE AGAIN, DAVID COMPLETELY CONTRADICTS HIMSELF HERE.

Det. King- So, he punches you, and then, what?

David Gregory: And then, I shot him.

Det. King- Okay. At what point do you pull out your pistol?

**David Gregory: After he hits me. When he hits me, I'm coming back. I'm like, "Stop." And he's still real aggressive, so I was just like—And I—I just wanted to go home.**

QUESTION: NOW DAVID (THE SHOOTER), FALSE SELF SERVING NARRATIVE ABOUT STEVEN PAUL ALLEGEDLY HITTING HIM AND ALLEGEDLY BEING REAL AGGRESSIVE. ONCE AGAIN, DAVID WAS THE ONE WHO APPROACHED STEVEN PAUL. DAVID WAS THE ONE WHO PRESENTED THE WEAPON. DAVID WAS THE ONE ABUSING HIS DOG. DAVID WAS THE ONE ON STEVEN PAUL'S SIDE OF THE ROAD. DAVID WAS THE ONE WHO 'STOOD UP AND YELLED' AT STEVEN PAUL. BUT SOMEHOW, WE ARE SUPPOSED TO BELIEVE THIS FALSE NARRATIVE THAT STEVEN PAUL WAS THE ALLEGED AGGRESSOR AND ALLEGEDLY PUNCHED DAVID (THE SHOOTER) COMPLETELY UNPROVOKED AND THAT DAVID DID ABSOLUTELY NOTHING AND SAID ABSOLUTELY NOTHING? THIS IS COMPLETE NONSENSE.

Det. King- How many times did you fire?

**David Gregory: One time.**

QUESTION: DAVID CLAIMS THAT HE ONLY FIRED ONCE. HOWEVER 3 SEPARATE WITNESSES HEARD TWO SHOTS THAT MORNING AND THERE WERE ONLY 3 ROUNDS LEFT IN THE WEAPON UPON INSPECTION BY FORENSICS THAT WOULD INDICATE THAT AT LEAST ONE ROUND OR MORE TURNED UP MISSING. WHAT DID DAVID DO WITH THE EXTRA ROUND AND MISSING SPENT SHELL CASING AFTER THE SHOOTING? WHERE IS THE MISSING ROUND AND THE MISSING SPENT SHELL CASING? WHY DID IT TURN UP MISSING? IT WOULD SEEM APPARENT TO DAVID OR ANYONE ELSE THAT IT WOULD MUCH HARDER TO MAKE A CLAIM OF SELF DEFENSE WHEN SHOOTING TWICE RATHER THAN ONCE. HOW IS IT THAT 3 PEOPLE (CLOSEST TO THE CRIME SCENE) HEARD TWO SHOTS NOT ONE (AS FALSELY CLAIMED) THAT MORNING?

Det. King- Okay. Um, and when he punches you, and you pull your pistol out, are you—is he moving forward towards you--

**David Gregory: Yeah.**

Det. King- or is he backing up or?

**David Gregory: He's—he's—he's coming at me the whole time.**

Det. King- Okay. And did you back up at all?

**David Gregory: Yeah. I pushed him, and I was scared to fucking death.**

Det. King- Okay. You were scared. What—what was scaring you?

**David Gregory: We're 60 years old and crippled, dude. Uh, a 10 year old can whip my ass.**

Det. King- Yeah

QUESTION: DAVID (THE SHOOTER) CONTINUES HIS POLICE INTERVIEW WITH MORE PLAY FOR SYMPATHY FROM THE DETECTIVES. "WE'RE 60 YEARS OLD AND CRIPPLED, DUDE. UH, A 10 YEAR OLD CAN WHIP MY ASS." MORE FEIGNED INJURY.

**David Gregory: This guy is big and strong.**

**David Gregory: And he's had problems with many—he pulled a knife on his grandfather. I didn't want any problems—I just wanted to walk my dog.**

Det. King- That's—that's completely understandable, David. Um, okay. So, once you—once you fire, what—what does he do? What does Steven do?

**David Gregory: He goes, "oh, man." And grabs his arm. And I take off running with my dog.**

Det. King- Okay. You guys just get out of there?

**David Gregory: Yeah.**

QUESTION: THIS IS WHERE DAVID AND AMY ATTEMPT TO FLEE THE SCENE OF THE CRIME BEFORE BEING CAUGHT BY DAYNA PURCELL. IT WAS AT THIS TIME THAT SEEING THAT THEY HAD NO OTHER CHOICE THEY YELLED FOR DAYNA TO CALL 911 AND AMY GREGORY SUBSEQUENTLY CALLED 911 AS WELL AS SHE NEEDED TO ENSURE THE FALSE SELF DEFENSE NARRATIVE WAS MADE DURING THAT INITIAL CALL FROM HER. IF DAYNA PURCELL HAD NOT COME OUT AT THAT EXACT MOMENT, IT IS MORE THAN UNLIKELY THAT DAVID AND AMY WOULD HAVE MADE ANY ATTEMPT TO CALL THAT MORNING.

Det. King- Did you ever see him, where he went or?

**David Gregory: No. I didn't even look back. I just told my wife I said, "Call the police. Call an ambulance."**

QUESTION: THIS IS ANOTHER OF DAVID'S COMPLETELY CONTRADICTORY AND FALSE STATEMENTS AS DAYNA PURCELL STATED IN HER TESTIMONY THAT SHE CLEARLY SAW DAVID LOOKING BACK OVER HIS SHOULDER AS HE WAS WALKING FAST DOWN THE ROAD IN HER DIRECTION AFTER HAVING SHOT STEVEN PAUL.

Det. King- Okay. Did you and your wife leave the road together back to the home, or did you go back to the home, and then, she followed?

**David Gregory: Uh, I don't know**

Det. King- You don't remember being with her as you walked back to the home?

**David Gregory: No. She was ahead of me.**

*QUESTION: IF DAVID AND AMY WERE SO AFRAID OF STEVEN PAUL, WHY DID THEY CHOOSE TO FOLLOW BEHIND STEVEN PAUL THAT MORNING ON HIGHLAND HEADING TOWARDS SHORELAND? IF THEY WERE SO IN FEAR, WHY WAS AMY SEPARATED FROM HIM AND WALKING AHEAD AND APPROACHING CLOSER TO STEVEN PAUL INDIVIDUALLY AND SEPARATELY? IF THEY ALWAYS USED THE CUT THROUGH, WHY DID THEY NOT CHOOSE THAT ROUTE, TO AVOID STEVEN PAUL, ON THEIR WAY HOME?*

Det. King- When you got back to home, what'd you—what do you do?

**David Gregory: Stand in the yard, wait for the police.**

Det. King- What'd you do with your pistol?

**David Gregory: Sitting on the table right beside me after I took the clip out, emptied the chamber, and that's it.**

*QUESTION: DAVID CLAIMS THAT HE ONLY FIRED ONCE. HOWEVER 3 SEPARATE WITNESSES HEARD TWO SHOTS THAT MORNING AND THERE WERE ONLY 3 ROUNDS LEFT IN THE WEAPON UPON INSPECTION BY FORENSICS THAT WOULD INDICATE THAT AT LEAST ONE ROUND OR MORE TURNED UP MISSING. WHAT DID DAVID DO WITH THE EXTRA ROUND AND MISSING SPENT SHELL CASING AFTER THE SHOOTING? WHERE IS THE MISSING ROUND AND THE MISSING SPENT SHELL CASING? WHY DID IT TURN UP MISSING? IT WOULD SEEM APPARENT TO DAVID OR ANYONE ELSE THAT IT WOULD MUCH HARDER TO MAKE A CLAIM OF SELF DEFENSE WHEN SHOOTING TWICE RATHER THAN ONCE. HOW IS IT THAT 3 PEOPLE (CLOSEST TO THE CRIME SCENE) HEARD TWO SHOTS NOT ONE (AS FALSELY CLAIMED) THAT MORNING?*

Det. King- Okay. Um, did you tell a neighbor to call 911?

**David Gregory: I didn't tell anybody anything—except for my wife. No.**

Det. King- Okay. We were just—I—I'm—I'm just clarifying because I got word that you had said to a neighbor to call 911. ...

**David Gregory: No. I screamed that at my wife. I—I never saw a neighbor.**

*QUESTION: THIS IS ANOTHER OF DAVID'S COMPLETELY CONTRADICTORY AND FALSE STATEMENTS AS DAYNA PURCELL STATED IN HER TESTIMONY THAT SHE WAS TOLD BY DAVID TO CALL 911.*

Det. King- And—and just describe the pistol for me.

**David Gregory: A small .380**

Det. King- And you own that pistol?

David Gregory: Yes sir.

Det. King- Okay. Do you have, um a concealed carry permit?

David Gregory: Well, we mailed it off. I don't—we—we put it in the mail, but I never—got it back.

Det. King- uh-huh. Okay. Just, uh, describe to me his—the other incidents you had with him in the past. Like—

*QUESTION: WAS DAVID (THE SHOOTER) EVEN PERMITTED TO CARRY A CONCEALED WEAPON ON THE DAY OF THE SHOOTING? IT SEEMS CLEAR THAT DAVID CLEARLY UNDERSTOOD THAT HE WAS CARRYING A GUN THAT HE CLAIMS HE HAD MAILED OFF FOR A PERMIT BUT DID NOT HAVE ANY LEGAL CONFIRMATION THAT HE HAD A LEGAL RIGHT TO EITHER POSSESS OR CARRY A CONCEALED WEAPON. WHEN ASKED WHETHER HE HAD A CONCEALED CARRY PERMIT, DAVID RESPONDS "WELL, WE MAILED IT OFF. I DON'T—WE—WE PUT IT IN THE MAIL, BUT I NEVER—GOT IT BACK. WHY IN THE WORLD WAS DAVID CARRYING A CONCEALED WEAPON THAT MORNING WITHOUT A PERMIT TO DO SO. WHY WAS THERE NO FOLLOW UP FROM THE DETECTIVES TO CONFIRM WHETHER DAVID HAD A PERMIT TO LEGALLY CARRY? THIS IS ABSOLUTELY RIDICULOUS.*

David Gregory: The first time, he—so, he comes out of his driveway. It's 10:30 at night.

Det. King- How long ago was that?

David Gregory: Um, six, eight months, a year ago. Um, he, uh, he got his flashlight on like he's you know, YouTube or TikTok-ing or some of that shit. I don't do that stuff, so I was like, uh, and I kinda laughed, and I told my wife I said, "Just keep moving. He must be filming TikTok or something." And then he turned his phone off. And he came back, and he got in front of me. He started swinging. "You wanna fucking do something about it, buddy? You wanna fucking do something about it?" And I said, "No, I sure don't, dude." And I said, "Come on, baby. Let's go." And we went home, and home quickly. And then the next time we saw him, he came up. He did spit on me. Um, I was—

*QUESTION: THERE APPEARS TO BE MAJOR SECTIONS OF THIS FALSE NARRATIVE THAT IS MISSING FROM DAVID'S STORY ON THIS ALLEGED EVENT APPROXIMATELY A YEAR BEFORE THE SHOOTING. DAVID'S FALSE NARRATIVE MAKES ABSOLUTELY NO SENSE. IT IS 10:30 PM AND STEVEN PAUL HAS HIS FLASHLIGHT ON HIS PHONE ON. DAVID FALSELY ASSUMES AND PLACES A NEFARIOUS INTENT ON THE REASON FOR THE FLASHLIGHT BEING ON. THE MORE LIKELY AND SIMPLE EXPLANATION WAS THAT IT WAS DARK AND STEVEN PAUL WAS USING HIS FLASHLIGHT TO SEE IN THE DARK AS HE WALKED. NOTHING MORE THAN THAT. ALSO WHY IN THE WORLD WOULD SOMEONE YOU HAVE NEVER MET ALLEGEDLY START "SWINGING" AT YOU AND*

ALLEGEDLY MAKING STATEMENTS LIKE "YOU WANNA FUCKING DO SOMETHING ABOUT IT?" SO DAVID (THE SHOOTER) CLAIMS TO BE A BOY SCOUT AND CLAIMS THAT HE DID ABSOLUTELY NOTHING ON HIS END AND THAT THIS SITUATION WAS COMPLETELY UNPROVOKED. VERY HARD TO BELIEVE THIS FALSE NARRATIVE.

ALSO DAVID MENTIONS ABSOLUTELY NOTHING ABOUT HIS DOGS BEING A PART OF THE FIRST ENCOUNTER. IN ADDITION, WHEN DESCRIBING THIS SAME INCIDENT, AMY DOES NOT MENTION ANYTHING ABOUT IT BEING NIGHTTIME. AMY MENTIONED ABSOLUTELY NOTHING ABOUT STEVEN PAUL AND THE FLASHLIGHT ON HIS PHONE. THIS IS AMY GREGORY'S VERSION OF THIS ALLEGED INCIDENT. WHEN JUXTAPOSED WITH DAVID'S VERSION, IT IS CLEAR THAT IN BOTH VERSION IMPORTANT PIECES OF THE STORY ARE MISSING. THE QUESTION IS WHY? WHY ARE THESE VERSIONS SO DIFFERENT AND WHY ARE THEY MISSING CRITICAL PIECES OF INFORMATION WHEN BEING DESCRIBED?? WHY? MORE THAN LIKELY, BECAUSE DAVID OVER-REACTIONED AND BECAME AGGRESSIVE TO STEVEN PAUL IN MUCH THE SAME WAY HE HAD DONE ON THEIR FIRST ENCOUNTER AND FOR THE SAME EXACT REASON. HE BECAME INCENSED WHEN HIS DOG BEGAN APPROACHING STEVEN PAUL AND HE UNNECESSARILY BECAME AGGRESSIVE WITH STEVEN PAUL AS A RESULT ON THIS OCCASION AND ALSO IN THE SAME EXACT WAY ON THE DAY OF THE SHOOTING.

Amy Gregory: Probably started, um, I don't know, year and a half ago maybe. Our first incident with him, he basically did the same thing. We were out walking the dogs, and, uh, we just saw somebody walking down the street, and you know, didn't pay any mind to him. And then we noticed that like he wouldn't—he wasn't moving. He was just kind of walking straight at us. And this is our first encounter with him. He's just walking straight at us, and David's like, "Do you think we should move, or do you think—is this like, chicken or something?"

Do we move? And so Steven waits until he gets probably from you to me—and he just stares at us and does one of his sharp turns, and goes the other way. Well, then, he comes back out at that—his gravel driveway—

We had just passed that. He comes back out, starts calling (the dog) like he wants our dog to come to him. And David turned around and he's like "Man, don't call my dog." So then Steven bowed up to him at that point. He's even bowed up to me asking me if I want a piece of him.

QUESTION: THIS IS THE SUPPOSED FIRST INCIDENT ALMOST A YEAR PRIOR TO THE SHOOTING WHERE DAVID (THE SHOOTER) WAS INCENSED THAT HIS DOG WAS APPROACHING STEVEN PAUL AND MORE THAN LIKELY STEVEN PAUL RECIPROCATED BY ATTEMPTING TO PET THE DOG AS THE DOG APPROACHED. DAVID (THE SHOOTER) WAS INCENSED BY THIS IN MUCH THE SAME WAY THAT DAVID WAS INCENSED ABOUT THE DOG APPROACHING STEVEN PAUL THE MORNING HE SHOT HIM.

THIS REACTION IS PURE OVERREACTION ON DAVID'S PART. THIS IS THE FIRST INCIDENCE WHERE DAVID BECOMES INCENSED AND TELLS STEVEN PAUL "MAN, DON'T CALL MY DOG". ANY PERSON, NOT JUST STEVEN PAUL, WOULD BE OFFENDED BY DAVID'S AGGRESSIVE POSTURE TOWARDS THEM FOR SIMPLY REACHING OUT TO PET THE DOG.

YET MELANIA BINDER AND OTHER NEIGHBORS WERE ALLOWED TO PET DAVID (THE SHOOTER)'S DOG WITH NO AGGRESSIVE POSTURE FROM DAVID? WHY THE OVER-REACTION AND THE AGGRESSIVE POSTURE TO THIS SIMPLE ACT FROM DAVID?

WHERE WAS THE THREAT?

Det. King- Another encounter?

**David Gregory: Yes. This is the second—encounter.**

Det. King- Second time.

**David Gregory: That's when I, uh, and he came out. He--**

Det. King- He spit?

**David Gregory: He walked past, turned around. He's all pissed off about something. God knows what, and spit on me. I told Amy "Get the dogs. Let's go home. Let's go home." And, uh, I told him, I said "You know, we don't want no trouble dude."**

Det. King- Did he spit on you or—spit in your direction?

**David Gregory: Yeah. He spit on me.**

**David Gregory: I think on my leg or my pants right there.**

**And then, uh, we called the police on that one. They said there's nothing they could do.**

QUESTION: THIS IS A SUPPOSED SECOND INCIDENT THAT OCCURRED. THIS TIME WITH HIS DOGS IN THE EQUATION. HOWEVER, WHEN ASKED, AMY NEVER MENTIONS ANY DETAILS ABOUT A SECOND INCIDENT. JUST THAT THERE WERE AT LEAST 4 ALLEGED TIMES. NO DETAILS. NO FACTS. NO CALLS TO THE POLICE. IT IS VERY LIKELY THAT THESE OTHER ALLEGED ENCOUNTERS SIMPLY NEVER HAPPENED AND THEY ARE ONLY SELF SERVING STATEMENTS ON THE BEHALF OF BOTH AMY AND DAVID TO MAKE IT APPEAR THAT THERE WERE "NUMEROUS" ENCOUNTERS WITH STEVEN WHEN THAT WAS NOT THE CASE. OF COURSE, ALL OF THESE ALLEGED INCIDENTS WERE AGGRESSIVE IN NATURE AS WELL FROM STEVEN PAUL AND NEVER IN ANY WAY WAS DAVID OR AMY AGGRESSIVE AT ALL. COMPLETE NONSENSE.

Det. King- Was that first encounter—when he was swinging at you?

David Gregory: Yeah. She called—we called every time.

QUESTION: WHERE WAS THE RECORD OF MULTIPLE ENCOUNTERS AND MULTIPLE CALLS TO THE POLICE. THERE WERE NO MULTIPLE CALLS MORE THAN LIKELY BECAUSE IT SIMPLY NEVER HAPPENED.

Det. King- Okay. How long ago was the second encounter?

David Gregory: Well, just a couple of months after that, I guess. I don't—they've all been just a couple months apart.

David Gregory: I didn't believe we'd ever have problems, just be a pain in the ass.

Det. King- What happened with the third—the third time?

David Gregory: That was today.

Det. King- Okay. So, you had about three?

David Gregory: Well, we did have three.

Det. King- Okay. What were you feeling today when he, uh--

David Gregory: Scared, um, scared, worried.

Det. King- What were you scared of?

David Gregory: Being hurt, being crippled. I mean, I can't carry a gallon of milk, man. If somebody hits me, I'm done, dude. I'm scared of people.

Det. King- Yeah.

David Gregory: I'm—I'm scared. I don't know. I—I've got this...---and my injuries (unintelligible). I've talked to the surgeons, and I've talked to my ... And it's bad. I got nowhere to go but down with this thing. I can't afford the operation.

Det. Ojeda- Yeah. What operation do you need?

Det. Ojeda- Where's that? In your back or—in your ...?

David Gregory: Yeah. It controls this and your legs. I didn't know all this 'til I got hurt. So, I'm—I'm—I don't even drive a car very often. I'm scared of getting in a car wreck. If my neck snaps, I'm—I'm done.

Det. King- Yeah.

Det. King- So, after that first encounter—when did—you started carrying—were you carrying on that first encounter or you always carry?

David Gregory: I always, uh, would carry for, uh, because we live across the street from Oscar Scherer.

David Gregory: And there are, uh, coyotes and bobcats around there, just rampantly. And you're always chasing off coyotes.

Det. King- Oh. Yeah.

David Gregory: That's the only reason I had a gun. It wasn't for people for God sakes.

QUESTION: SO HERE, DAVID CLAIMS HE HAD BEEN CARRYING HIS WEAPON PRIOR TO THE FIRST ALLEGED INCIDENT WITH STEVEN PAUL. HOWEVER AMY GREGORY, HIS WIFE, TELLS A COMPLETELY DIFFERENT AND CONTRADICTORY STORY ABOUT WHEN AND WHY DAVID WAS CARRYING A GUN. THIS GOES TO INTENT AND MOTIVE.

Amy Gregory: I mean, he did it because—he did a few times because we would have coyotes in the neighborhood. Um, so he would have it with him in case we ran into a coyote walking at night.

SO HERE, UPON REALIZING THAT SHE MAY HAVE MADE AN INCRIMINATING STATEMENT SHE TRIES TO MENTION COYOTES. HOWEVER, SHE MENTIONS COYOTES AT NIGHT NOT DURING THE DAY. EVEN IF THIS WAS THE CASE, WHICH IS HIGHLY DOUBTFUL, COYOTES ARE RARELY SEEN DURING THE DAY AT THE PARK. AFTER SPEAKING WITH A PARK RANGER WHO HAD BEEN ON THE JOB FOR NEARLY A YEAR OR MORE, WHEN ASKED WHETHER THE PARK RANGER HAD EVER PERSONALLY SEEN A COYOTE, THE ANSWER WAS A DEFINITIVE NEVER. SO THIS NARRATIVE ABOUT COYOTES IS HIGHLY SUSPECT TO SAY THE LEAST. ESPECIALLY SINCE THIS SHOOTING WAS DURING THE DAY.

Amy Gregory: I reported the first one.

And that first encounter with him is when we decided that—and just hearing the stories about things he's done, and just a terror to the neighborhood that's when David thought. You know what? I'm at least gonna be protected in case he tries to do something to you.

QUESTION: HERE IS THE FIRST TIME AMY ADMITS THAT THEY HAD BEEN HEARING ALL THE FALSE RUMORS AND STORIES THAT HAD BEEN SPREAD ABOUT STEVEN PAUL BY THE LIKES OF THE GARY OSGOOD, TOBY AND HIS WIFE AND DAVID AND AMY THEMSELVES THAT HAD BEEN MALICIOUSLY SPREAD AROUND THE NEIGHBORHOOD. "STORIES ABOUT THINGS HE'S DONE, AND JUST A TERROR TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD"

HERE IS ALSO THE FIRST TIME THAT AMY TRUTHFULLY STATES THAT DAVID TELLS HER "YOU KNOW WHAT? I'M AT LEAST GONNA BE PROTECTED IN CASE HE TRIES TO DO SOMETHING TO YOU" THIS IS WHEN DAVID INTENTIONALLY STARTED CARRYING A GUN. NOT FOR COYOTES WHICH WAS THE ORIGINAL FALSE NARRATIVE THAT DAVID AND AMY SPUN UP. HERE IS WHERE AMY CLEARLY STATES THAT DAVID

COMMUNICATED HIS INTENTIONS AND MOTIVATION TO CARRY A GUN. DAVID (THE SHOOTER) WAS CARRYING A GUN BECAUSE HE INTENDED TO USE IT FOR STEVEN PAUL. DAVID LIES TO DETECTIVES AND FALSELY CLAIMS HE WAS NOT CARRYING A GUN FOR PEOPLE BUT FOR COYOTES. ONCE AGAIN, ABSOLUTE NONSENSE.

Det. King- After that first time, he started carrying?

**Amy Gregory: Uh-huh (indicating yes)**

AGAIN, AMY GREGORY CONFIRMS THAT DAVID (THE SHOOTER) STARTED CARRYING AFTER THE SUPPOSED "FIRST" INCIDENT WITH STEVEN PAUL NOT BEFORE. ALSO NOT FOR COYOTES WHICH WAS THE ORIGINAL FALSE NARRATIVE THAT DAVID AND AMY SPUN UP. HERE IS WHERE AMY CLEARLY STATES THAT DAVID COMMUNICATED HIS INTENTIONS AND MOTIVATION TO CARRY A GUN. DAVID (THE SHOOTER) WAS CARRYING A GUN BECAUSE HE INTENDED TO USE IT FOR STEVEN PAUL. DAVID LIES TO DETECTIVES AND FALSELY CLAIMS HE WAS NOT CARRYING A GUN FOR PEOPLE BUT FOR COYOTES. ALSO DAVID, FALSELY CLAIMS THAT HE STARTED CARRYING BEFORE THE SUPPOSED "FIRST" INCIDENT WITH STEVEN PAUL. ALL INCONSISTENT STATEMENTS AND ONCE AGAIN, ABSOLUTE NONSENSE.

Det. Ojeda- Now, when you carried your gun, did you carry it ready to go with one in the chamber? I mean, you know that.

**David Gregory: Well, yeah. That's the way you carry a gun. You don't carry a gun to load it. I mean you know that.**

QUESTION: HERE DAVID CLAIMS THAT ALWAYS CARRIED HIS GUN WITH ONE IN THE CHAMBER. HE CLAIMS HE ONLY FIRED ONCE. HOWEVER 3 SEPARATE WITNESSES HEARD TWO SHOTS THAT MORNING THERE WAS ONLY 3 ROUNDS LEFT IN THE WEAPON UPON INSPECTION BY FORENSICS THAT WOULD INDICATE THAT AT LEAST ONE ROUND OR MORE TURNED UP MISSING AFTER THE SHOOTING.

Det. Ojeda- Sure. And, uh, when you ended up, today—with this encounter today, and you ended up shooting Steven, how many times did you shoot? Do you—do you recall?

**David Gregory: Just the one.**

QUESTION: DAVID CLAIMS THAT HE ONLY FIRED ONCE. HOWEVER 3 SEPARATE WITNESSES HEARD TWO SHOTS THAT MORNING THERE WAS ONLY 3 ROUNDS LEFT IN THE WEAPON UPON INSPECTION BY FORENSICS THAT WOULD INDICATE THAT AT LEAST ONE ROUND OR MORE TURNED UP MISSING. WHAT DID DAVID DO WITH THE EXTRA ROUND AND MISSING SPENT SHELL CASING AFTER THE SHOOTING? WHERE IS THE MISSING ROUND AND THE MISSING SPENT SHELL CASING? WHY DID IT TURN UP MISSING? IT WOULD SEEM APPARENT TO DAVID OR ANYONE ELSE THAT IT WOULD MUCH HARDER TO MAKE A CLAIM OF SELF DEFENSE WHEN SHOOTING TWICE

RATHER THAN ONCE. HOW IS IT THAT 3 PEOPLE (CLOSEST TO THE CRIME SCENE) HEARD TWO SHOTS NOT ONE (AS FALSELY CLAIMED) THAT MORNING?

David Gregory: Yeah. He wouldn't—he wouldn't let up. I'm just like, "Dude." I mean we're just walking our dogs, just walking our dogs.

Det. Ojeda- Have you heard of Steven having any encounters with anyone else?

David Gregory: With everybody in the neighborhood. You've got records thicker than that pad.

QUESTION: SIMPLY NOT TRUE. ASIDE FROM STEVEN PAUL NOT ENGAGING HIS NEIGHBORS AND POSSIBLY COMING OFF AS DISTANT, STEVEN PAUL HAD NO OTHER ENCOUNTERS WITH ANYONE ELSE. MORE RUMORS AND MORE FALSE NARRATIVES.

David Gregory: If somebody would've done their goddamn job, I wouldn't be talking today.

QUESTION: APPARENTLY DAVID FELT AND MAKES A STATEMENT THAT HAD THE POLICE "DONE THEIR GODDAMN JOB, I WOULDN'T BE TALKING TODAY". HERE DAVID CLAIMS APPEARS TO FEEL COMPELLED TO HAVE TAKEN MATTERS INTO HIS OWN HANDS IN SHOOTING STEVEN PAUL THAT MORNING. AMY AND DAVID ALSO CLAIMED THEY DID NOT TYPICALLY HAVE THEIR CELL PHONES WITH THEM. WHY NOT? THEY FALSELY CLAIMED THEY WERE IN CONSTANT FEAR OF STEVEN PAUL? SO THEY INSTEAD CHOSE TO WALK WITHOUT ANY CELL PHONES AND INSTEAD CARRY A LOADED GUN WITH THE INTENT TO USE IT WITH STEVEN PAUL BECAUSE THE POLICE SUPPOSEDLY HADN'T DONE THEIR "JOBS" A YEAR PRIOR. SURE DOES SOUND LIKE DAVID (THE SHOOTER) WAS ACTING LIKE A BIT OF A VIGILANTE WITH THIS STATEMENT.

David Gregory: Yeah. The fucking guy, he was standing out there last week yelling at a couple of gay guys live there. And then, one guy walked by said, Oh, he was just standing out in the street going, "You fat fucking bastard, I'm gonna kill you. You fat bastard." And I was like Whoa, just me and Amy just kept walking. There's no reason but he does that. He did that, anyway. I don't know if he does it. He did that. I seen him do a lot of stupid shit. I mean, you guys are always out there.

QUESTION: WHY DID GARY OSBORN DESCRIBE THIS SAME INCIDENT WITHOUT ANY MENTION WHATSOEVER OF DAVID'S ALLEGED CLAIMS THAT STEVEN PAUL WAS YELLING AT GARY AND HIS PARTNER. ALSO, DAVID SAYS "YELLING AT A COUPLE OF GAY GUYS", BUT HOW DID DAVID KNOW THIS INTIMATE DETAIL ABOUT GARY WHEN DAVID (THE SHOOTER) CLAIMED TO NOT KNOW WHO GARY WAS? HE ALSO DOESN'T MENTION TO THE DETECTIVES THAT THIS IS THE SAME GARY OSBORN THAT WAS OUT WALKING HIS DOGS THE MORNING OF THE SHOOTING. SEEMS SUSPECT AND ODD AT THE VERY LEAST THAT DAVID KNEW SUCH INTIMATE DETAILS ABOUT GARY BUT YET WHEN SPEAKING ABOUT GARY HE TALKS AS IF GARY WAS JUST ONE OF "A COUPLE

OF GAY GUYS". WHY THE NEED TO PRETEND HE DIDN'T KNOW GARY VERY WELL? GARY ALSO CLAIMED THE SAME. WHY THE FALSE PRETENSE WHEN IT APPEARS VERY LIKELY THAT GARY, TOBY AND DAVID KNEW EACH OTHER AND HAD SPOKEN TO ONE ANOTHER BEFORE THE SHOOTING. IS DAVID HIDING SOMETHING HERE? AND IF SO WHY? DOES DAVID WANT TO MAKE IT APPEAR THAT THERE WAS NO DISCUSSION ABOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF SHOOTING STEVEN PAUL WITH GARY BEFORE THE DAY OF THE SHOOTING. DAVID KNEW INTIMATE DETAILS ABOUT GARY. DAVID KNEW INTIMATE DETAILS ABOUT THE SUPPOSED PROBLEMS WITH GARY'S HOA. GARY KNEW THAT THEIR DOGS DID NOT GET ALONG WITH ONE ANOTHER. GARY KNEW THAT DAVID AND AMY WOULD TYPICALLY CUT THROUGH THE NEIGHBORS YARD TO COME AND GO FROM HIGHLAND RD. GARY KNEW THAT DAVID CARRIED A GUN AND STATED AS SUCH IN HIS INTERVIEW. HOW DID GARY KNOW THESE INTIMATE DETAILS ABOUT DAVID (THE SHOOTER)? HOW DID DAVID (THE SHOOTER) KNOW THESE INTIMATE DETAILS ABOUT STEVEN PAUL? YET, BOTH MEN CLAIM TO NOT KNOW EACH OTHER. BUT HOW DID THEY KNOW THESE INTIMATE DETAILS ABOUT ONE ANOTHER? YET, WHEN ASKED, WHY THE PRETENSE OF NOT KNOWING EACH OTHER?

Det. King- We're almost done. David was there—is there anything else that you think is important for us, um, as investigators—to know—about this kid or any incidents you had in which--

**David Gregory: He's just—he's—he's—I hate it, man. You don't want to see anybody with problems like that. They been—evidently, they couldn't get him help. I don't know, but it was time and time again, the police were out there. Time and time again, he's yelling at everybody. I didn't know he was gonna attack me.**

QUESTION: WHY DID THE POLICE ACCEPT DAVID'S SELF SERVING VERSION OF EVENTS AT FACE VALUE. THE FORENSIC EVIDENCE PAINTS A COMPLETELY DIFFERENT PICTURE OF WHO WAS THE LIKELY AGGRESSOR. THE FORENSICS, EVIDENCE AND WITNESS TESTIMONY FROM THOSE WHO HEARD DAVID SHOUTING OBSCENITIES AT STEVEN PAUL, INDICATE THAT THE MORE LIKELY AGGRESSOR WAS, IN FACT, DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND NOT STEVEN PAUL AT ALL.

Det. King- Did you—did you have your dog in your hand, uh, when you fired the round or did—was it—was the dog placed—back on the ground?

**David Gregory: No. It was on the...**

Det. King- You said you had picked him up at one point.

**David Gregory: Yeah. What had happened is, you know, the dog is on the ground, a little—a little dog. He said something, the dog thought it was an invitation to—to come.**

Det. King- Yeah.

David Gregory: And I tried to get the cord and actually—goddamn, it's so terrible 'cause I tried to get the dog and I couldn't. And I missed him, and the poor little fucker went sliding down the street. He's sideways, and he's screaming. He's a little toy dog. And I stood up. I was like, "Dude, leave us the fuck alone." And that's when he—when it happened, and —and then, after I—I—I grabbed the dog.

Det. King- Grabbed it.

NOW, DO THESE WORDS WHICH CAME FROM DAVID'S (THE SHOOTER) OWN MOUTH SOUND, EVEN REMOTELY, LIKE THE WORDS OF A DOG LOVER TO YOU? DAVID WAS CALLING HIS OWN DOG "THE POOR LITTLE FUCKER AND HOW THE DOG WENT SLIDING DOWN THE STREET AS HE'S SIDEWAYS AND HE'S SCREAMING." DAVID WAS ABUSING HIS OWN DOG AT THIS POINT. I'M SURE STEVEN PAUL WAS (AS ANYBODY WOULD BE) CONCERNED OVER THE ABUSIVE TREATMENT OF THE DOG BY DAVID IN HIS FURIOUS ATTEMPT TO YANK THE TOY DOG AWAY AS THE DOG APPROACHED STEVEN PAUL (AS DOGS OFTEN DO) ONTO STEVEN PAUL'S SIDE OF THE STREET.

DAVID (THE SHOOTER) HAD ABSOLUTELY NO PROBLEM WITH HIS DOG APPROACHING OR BEING PETTED BY OTHER NEIGHBORS. AS ATTESTED BY THE TESTIMONY OF MELANIA BINDER. MELANIA BINDER'S PERSONALITY WAS VERY SIMILAR TO STEVEN PAUL IN SOME RESPECTS WITH THE FACT THAT SHE KEPT TO HERSELF. YET WHEN MELANIA BINDER ATTEMPTS TO PET DAVID'S DOG, DAVID HAS NO ISSUE. HOWEVER, WHEN STEVEN PAUL, WHO EQUALLY KEPT TO HIMSELF, ATTEMPTED THE SAME OR THE DOG APPROACHED STEVEN PAUL, DAVID BECAME INCENSED AT STEVEN PAUL AND HIS OWN DOG. THIS IS KEY TO THE FALSE NARRATIVE THAT AMY AND DAVID GREGORY CONTINUE TO SPIN ABOUT WHAT HAPPENED THAT MORNING. DAVID (THE SHOOTER) CAME OVER TO STEVEN PAUL'S SIDE OF THE ROAD AND SHOT HIM AS HE WAS INCENSED ABOUT HIS OWN DOG APPROACHING STEVEN PAUL AND SUBSEQUENTLY STEVEN PAUL ATTEMPTING TO ASSIST THE SMALL DOG AS HE WAS BEING FORCEFULLY YANKED AND ABUSED BY AN ENRAGED DAVID.

IN DAVID GREGORY (THE SHOOTER)'S OWN WORD HE DESCRIBES HOW HIS DOG, "THE POOR LITTLE FUCKER (HIS DOG) WENT SLIDING DOWN THE STREET. HE'S SIDEWAYS AND HE'S SCREAMING. HE'S A LITTLE TOY DOG. AND I STOOD UP. I WAS LIKE 'DUDE, LEAVE US THE FUCK ALONE. AND THAT'S WHEN HE—WHEN IT HAPPENED, AND—THEN, AFTER I—I—I GRABBED THE DOG" THE MORE LIKELY SCENARIO IS THAT UPON SEEING THIS ABUSE OF THE DOG BY DAVID (THE SHOOTER), STEVEN PAUL AS ANY CONCERNED PERSON WOULD, INTERVENED TO TRY AND ASSIST THE DOG THAT DAVID WAS OBVIOUSLY ABUSING. AGAIN, ALL OF THIS TOOK PLACE ON STEVEN PAUL'S SIDE OF THE ROAD. DAVID AND HIS DOG WERE ON STEVEN PAUL'S SIDE OF THE ROAD. FORENSICS SHOW THAT DAVID (THE SHOOTER) SHOT STEVEN PAUL ON STEVEN PAUL'S SIDE OF THE ROAD. DAVID GREGORY'S FALSE NARRATIVE IS A COMPLETE SHAM. THIS WAS THE SAME OVERREACTION BY THE SHOOTER THAT OCCURRED A YEAR PRIOR WHEN THIS SAME DOG CAME OVER TO BE PETTED BY STEVEN PAUL AND THAT ENRAGED DAVID (THE SHOOTER).

David Gregory: And I took off. I don't know.

THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT MADE BY AMY GREGORY OF AN ALLEGED SIMILAR INCIDENT THAT OCCURRED APPROXIMATELY ONE YEAR EARLIER. SHE DESCRIBES DAVID (THE SHOOTER)'S REACTION AS HE BECAME INCENSED BY WHAT HE THOUGHT WAS STEVEN PAUL SUPPOSEDLY CALLING HIS DOG OVER TO HIMSELF. AMY STATES THAT DAVID (THE SHOOTER) TURNS AROUND AND SAYS TO STEVEN PAUL "MAN, DON'T CALL MY DOG." DAVID REACTED THE SAME WAY ON THE DAY OF THE SHOOTING. IF THIS IN FACT HAPPENED IN THIS WAY, WHY DID DAVID (THE SHOOTER) OVER-REACT IN THIS WAY AND BECOME VERBALLY AGGRESSIVE AND TAKE AN AGGRESSIVE POSTURE TO AN OBVIOUSLY FRIENDLY GESTURE ON THE PART OF STEVEN PAUL TOWARDS HIS DOG? DAVID (THE SHOOTER) HAD ABSOLUTELY NO ISSUE WITH ANYONE ELSE IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD, INCLUDING MELANIA BINDER, WHO STATED THAT DAVID (THE SHOOTER) WOULD ALLOW HER TO PET HIS DOG. MELANIA BINDER IN MUCH THE SAME WAY AS STEVEN PAUL WAS A VERY PRIVATE PERSON WHO SPOKE TO NO ONE IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD. YET, NO AGGRESSIVE POSTURE WAS TAKEN BY DAVID (THE SHOOTER) WITH RESPECT TO ANY OTHER NEIGHBOR GIVEN THE SAME EXACT SET OF CIRCUMSTANCES. WHY DID DAVID (THE SHOOTER) OVER-REACT AND BECOME OVERTLY AGGRESSIVE WITH STEVEN PAUL OVER SUCH AN OBVIOUSLY FRIENDLY GESTURE. AND WHY WAS IT NOT CONSIDERED EVEN POSSIBLE THAT DAVID'S DOG WAS ALSO BEING FRIENDLY (AS DOGS OFTEN DO) AND SIMPLY APPROACHED STEVEN PAUL ON ITS OWN WITHOUT BEING CALLED OVER AT ALL?

Amy Gregory: Probably started, um, I don't know, year and a half ago maybe. Our first incident with him, he basically did the same thing. We were out walking the dogs, and, uh, we just saw somebody walking down the street, and you know, didn't pay any mind to him. And then we noticed that like he wouldn't—he wasn't moving. He was just kind of walking straight at us. And this is our first encounter with him. He's just walking straight at us, and David's like, "Do you think we should move, or do you think—is this like, chicken or something?"

Do we move? And so Steven waits until he gets probably from you to me—and he just stares at us and does one of his sharp turns, and goes the other way. Well, then, he comes back out at that—his gravel driveway—

We had just passed that. He comes back out, starts calling (the dog) like he wants our dog to come to him. And David turned around and he's like "Man, don't call my dog." So then Steven bowed up to him at that point. He's even bowed up to me asking me if I want a piece of him.

WHY DID DAVID (THE SHOOTER) OVER-REACT AND BECOME OVERTLY AGGRESSIVE WITH STEVEN PAUL OVER SUCH AN OBVIOUSLY FRIENDLY GESTURE. AND WHY WAS IT NOT CONSIDERED EVEN POSSIBLE THAT DAVID'S DOG WAS ALSO BEING FRIENDLY

(AS DOGS OFTEN DO) AND SIMPLY APPROACHED STEVEN PAUL ON ITS OWN WITHOUT BEING CALLED OVER AT ALL?

DAVID (THE SHOOTER) HAD ABSOLUTELY NO PROBLEM WITH HIS DOG APPROACHING OR BEING PETTED BY OTHER NEIGHBORS. AS ATTESTED BY THE TESTIMONY OF MELANIA BINDER. MELANIA BINDER'S PERSONALITY WAS VERY SIMILAR TO STEVEN PAUL IN SOME RESPECTS WITH THE FACT THAT SHE KEPT TO HERSELF. YET WHEN MELANIA BINDER ATTEMPTS TO PET DAVID'S DOG, DAVID HAS NO ISSUE. HOWEVER, WHEN STEVEN PAUL, WHO EQUALLY KEPT TO HIMSELF, ATTEMPTED THE SAME OR THE DOG APPROACHED STEVEN PAUL, DAVID BECAME INCENSED AT STEVEN PAUL AND HIS OWN DOG. THIS IS KEY TO THE FALSE NARRATIVE THAT AMY AND DAVID GREGORY CONTINUE TO SPIN ABOUT WHAT HAPPENED THAT MORNING. DAVID (THE SHOOTER) CAME OVER TO STEVEN PAUL'S SIDE OF THE ROAD AND SHOT HIM AS HE WAS INCENSED ABOUT HIS OWN DOG APPROACHING STEVEN PAUL AND SUBSEQUENTLY STEVEN PAUL ATTEMPTING TO ASSIST THE SMALL DOG AS HE WAS BEING FORCEFULLY YANKED AND ABUSED BY AN ENRAGED DAVID.

AND THAT HIS "THE LITTLE FUCKER (HIS DOG)" WENT SLIDING DOWN THE STREET. HE'S SIDEWAYS AND HE'S SCREAMING. HE'S A LITTLE TOY DOG. AND I STOOD UP. I WAS LIKE 'DUDE, LEAVE US THE FUCK ALONE. AND THAT'S WHEN HE—WHEN IT HAPPENED, AND—THEN, AFTER I-I-I GRABBED THE DOG' THE MORE LIKELY SCENARIO IS THAT UPON SEEING THIS ABUSE OF THE DOG BY DAVID (THE SHOOTER), STEVEN PAUL AS ANY CONCERNED PERSON WOULD, INTERVENED TO TRY AND ASSIST THE DOG THAT DAVID WAS OBVIOUSLY ABUSING. AGAIN, ALL OF THIS TOOK PLACE ON STEVEN PAUL'S SIDE OF THE ROAD. DAVID AND HIS DOG WERE ON STEVEN PAUL'S SIDE OF THE ROAD. FORENSICS SHOW THAT DAVID (THE SHOOTER) SHOT STEVEN PAUL ON STEVEN PAUL'S SIDE OF THE ROAD. HIS FALSE NARRATIVE IS A COMPLETE SHAM. THIS WAS THE SAME OVER-REACTION THAT OCCURRED A YEAR PRIOR WHEN THIS SAME DOG CAME OVER TO BE PETTED BY STEVEN PAUL AND THAT ENRAGED DAVID (THE SHOOTER).

Det. King- Yeah. Yeah.

David Gregory: So, now we just wait for the —the rest of my life to be fucked up now, but that's what happened, gentleman. I didn't want anything to happen. The guy is so mean...

Det. King- We haven't talked to his parents yet. Um—

David Gregory: Oh, God.

Det. King- Yeah. I got nothing else.

David Gregory: Son of a bitch.

Det. King- Well, you shouldn't be in fear, okay, of—of going out, and you know, there's no reason you need to—have a guy like this to fear—no. I'm saying you don't—you don't deserve—you and your wife do not need—

**David Gregory: Well you shouldn't—I'm I'm crippled. If—if—if—if I wasn't crippled, I wouldn't carry a piece of paper because before I got hurt, I was**

Det. King- No. I'm saying you don't have to live like this. You don't have to live under fear.

**QUESTION: DET. KING STATES “WELL YOU SHOULDN’T BE IN FEAR, OKAY, OF—OF GOING OUT, AND YOU KNOW, THERE’S NO REASON YOU NEED TO—HAVE A GUY LIKE THIS TO FEAR—NO. I’M SAYING YOU DON’T DESERVE—YOU AND YOUR WIFE DO NOT NEED—NO. I’M SAYING YOU DON’T HAVE TO LIVE LIKE THIS. YOU DON’T HAVE TO LIVE UNDER FEAR.” WHY IS DET. KING MAKING SUCH OUTRAGEOUS STATEMENTS TO DAVID (THE SHOOTER)? THESE STATEMENTS BY DET. KING AT THIS STAGE OF THE INVESTIGATION, BORDER ON MALFEASANCE.**

**QUESTION: DAVID (THE SHOOTER) CONTINUES HIS POLICE INTERVIEW WITH MORE PLAY FOR SYMPATHY FROM THE DETECTIVES. DAVID CONTINUES IN THIS REGARD BY FEIGNING BEING “CRIPPLED, I WOULDN’T CARRY A PIECE OF PAPER BECAUSE BEFORE I GOT HURT”. DAVID’S CLAIMS OF DISABILITY AND BEING CRIPPLED ARE A COMPLETE FABRICATION AS DAVID OFTEN WORE A WEIGHTED VEST WHEN WALKING AROUND THE NEIGHBORHOOD. SOMETHING THAT HIS IMMEDIATE NEXT DOOR NEIGHBOR, LINDA KREMBLASS CAN ATTEST TO. IN ADDITION, DAVID PARTICIPATED MULTIPLE TIMES IN WHAT WERE CALLED MILITARY STYLE RUCKS. THESE ARE EXTENSIVELY LONG RAPID PACE WALKS WHERE THE PARTICIPANTS WOULD WEAR A WEIGHTED VEST OF AT LEAST 20 LBS OR MORE AND IN SOME CASES UPWARDS OF FIFTY POUNDS OR MORE. WEARING THE WEIGHTS WAS A SYMBOLIC GESTURE ON THE PART OF THE PARTICIPANT TO BEAR THE WEIGHT OF THE LOSS OF A MILITARY MEMBER. DAVID PARTICIPATED IN A 31 MILE RUCK THAT HIS ORGANIZATION SPONSORED TO RAISE MONEY. IN THAT 31 MILE RUCK, DAVID WORE DOUBLE THE WEIGHT THAT WOULD TYPICALLY BE CARRIED AS HE CARRIED THE WEIGHT FOR TWO FALLEN SOLDIERS. CRIPPLED? I DON’T THINK SO? THIS IS A COMPLETE FABRICATION AND PLOY BY DAVID TO APPEAR DISABLED TO GAIN SYMPATHY.**

**David Gregory: No I got—to live in prison now.**

Det. King- well, we're not—no.

Det. Ojeda- Why do you say that?

**QUESTION: HERE DAVID (THE SHOOTER) INDICATES THAT “NO, I GOT-TO LIVE IN PRISON NOW.” WHY DID DAVID (THE SHOOTER) FEEL THIS WAY? HE OBVIOUSLY FELT THERE WAS SOME REASON HE WAS GOING TO BE JAILED FOR THIS NEEDLESS AND SENSELESS SHOOTING.**

HOWEVER, DET. KING "WELL, WE'RE NOT-NO." MAKING AN OBVIOUSLY OVERT STATEMENT SEEMINGLY INDICATING THAT DAVID (THE SHOOTER) WAS NOT GOING TO BE PUT IN JAIL. WHEN COUPLED WITH DET. KING'S PRIOR STATEMENT, WHY IS DET. KING MAKING ANOTHER SUCH OUTRAGEOUS STATEMENT TO DAVID (THE SHOOTER)? THIS STATEMENT BY DET. KING AT THIS STAGE OF THE INVESTIGATION, ALSO BORDERS ON MALFEASANCE.

David Gregory: I didn't want to end up—in a wheelchair.

Det. Ojeda- then answer—this question. Why did ya (shoot him)?

David Gregory: Because I didn't want to end up in a wheelchair because a wrong move on me, I'm done. I mean, it's bad. It's real bad. You know, I'm scared of the fucking kid. I'm scared of everybody. I'm scared of you guys. I'm scared of my wife, I'm scared of my wife 'cause I can't defend myself anymore.

David Gregory: That's over for me, and I'm just, you know, I've been dealing with this for a couple of years.

DAVID (THE SHOOTER) CONTINUES HIS POLICE INTERVIEW WITH MORE PLAY FOR SYMPATHY FROM THE DETECTIVES.

THE FOLLOWING IS THE POINT IN THE INTERVIEW WHERE BOTH DET. KING AND DET. OJEDA PIVOT AND BEGIN TO ASSIST DAVID (THE SHOOTER) WITH LEADING QUESTIONS AND PROVIDING HIM CLEAR INDICATIONS THAT THEY ALREADY FELT THAT THIS CASE WAS A CASE OF SELF DEFENSE. COMPLETELY DISAPPOINTING AND OUTRAGEOUS BEHAVIOR ON THE PART OF THESE TWO DETECTIVES.

David Gregory: I just wanted to walk my dogs. That's all I wanted to do was walk my dogs. I'll never see my wife. Jesus fucking Christ. My Amy is gonna hate me. I hate me for—doing this.

Det. Ojeda- Yeah, but I think—you're getting—I think you're getting way ahead of the process.

COMPLETELY OUTRAGEOUS STATEMENTS ON THE PART OF THESE TWO DETECTIVES.

THIS BEHAVIOR ON THE PART OF THESE TWO DETECTIVES BORDERS ON MALFEASANCE.

David Gregory: Oh, man. I watch TV—guys.

Det. King- Yeah, but that—they—they don't—see, that's the problem.

Det. Ojeda- Well—that's—that's—part of the problem.

David Gregory: You know, and—and—and here's another thing. I'm scared to death 'cause I'm hurt. You guys can't—put me in jail.

Det. King- David do you think—you have a right to defend yourself?

*COMPLETELY OUTRAGEOUS STATEMENTS ON THE PART OF THESE TWO DETECTIVES.*

*THIS BEHAVIOR ON THE PART OF THESE TWO DETECTIVES BORDERS ON MALFEASANCE.*

**David Gregory: I—I do. I think so, but if you guys—put me in jail. They're gonna hurt me in there. Look at me.**

Det. Ojeda- Does everyone—does everyone—does everyone have the right to defend themselves, David?

*COMPLETELY OUTRAGEOUS STATEMENTS ON THE PART OF THESE TWO DETECTIVES.*

*THIS BEHAVIOR ON THE PART OF THESE TWO DETECTIVES BORDERS ON MALFEASANCE.*

**David Gregory: I would like to think we do. We should. We should.**

Det. Ojeda- David. I mean—should you—should you be afraid to walk your dogs, David?

*COMPLETELY OUTRAGEOUS STATEMENTS ON THE PART OF THESE TWO DETECTIVES.*

*THIS BEHAVIOR ON THE PART OF THESE TWO DETECTIVES BORDERS ON MALFEASANCE.*

**David Gregory: No, you shouldn't but—sometimes, you are.**

Det. King- Exactly. Yeah.

*COMPLETELY OUTRAGEOUS STATEMENTS ON THE PART OF THESE TWO DETECTIVES.*

*THIS BEHAVIOR ON THE PART OF THESE TWO DETECTIVES BORDERS ON MALFEASANCE.*

**David Gregory: It—it's a sad fucking fact of life. I'm sorry, I don't mean to cus. I'm sorry guys. I—I'm so messed up right now.**

Det. Ojeda- We get—I mean, this isn't—this isn't the first time we've been in here with somebody that's had to defend themselves, and did—did something—did something that they didn't want to do.

Det. King- That had to defend themselves.

*COMPLETELY OUTRAGEOUS STATEMENTS ON THE PART OF THESE TWO DETECTIVES.*

*THIS BEHAVIOR ON THE PART OF THESE TWO DETECTIVES BORDERS ON MALFEASANCE.*

**David Gregory: Uh-huh.**

Det. Ojeda- Did you want to hurt somebody—today, David?

*COMPLETELY OUTRAGEOUS STATEMENTS ON THE PART OF THESE TWO DETECTIVES.*

*THIS BEHAVIOR ON THE PART OF THESE TWO DETECTIVES BORDERS ON MALFEASANCE.*

**David Gregory: No. I wanted to poop my dogs and go home. That's what I wanted to do.**

Det. Ojeda- Okay. All right. Well, David, give us a few minutes, and we'll be right back with ya.

Det. Ojeda- We're almost done with this. Okay.

Det. King- All right. We're almost done.

Det. Ojeda- You good?

**David Gregory: Yeah.**

Det. Ojeda- David, just relax.

**David Gregory: All right.**

Det. Ojeda- Try to get yourself composed. Okay.

Det. Ojeda- We'll be right back with you. Okay. (leaves room).

*SEEMS QUITE APPARENT TO ANYONE WITH ANY COMMON SENSE THAT THESE TWO OFFICERS INTENDED TO TELEGRAPH THEIR INTENTIONS TO AGREE WITH DAVID'S FALSE CLAIM OF SELF DEFENSE AT THIS POINT.*

*COMPLETELY OUTRAGEOUS STATEMENTS ON THE PART OF THESE TWO DETECTIVES.*

*THIS BEHAVIOR ON THE PART OF THESE TWO DETECTIVES BORDERS ON MALFEASANCE.*

**David Gregory: Okay. Fuck. I love you, Amy. And I'm sorry. Oh, my God. Shit. I can't fucking—I can't believe this shit.**

Det. King- (returns to room 02:03:39). All right, David, Hey, one—one last question I have for you. You were describing your injuries that you have, uh, to your arm and stuff, did—did you, um, can you tell us a little bit more about those and what—what's the reason for your arm injury? Do you have a previous incident or?

**David Gregory: I have no idea what happened, how I got it man.**

Det. King- It's just over time?

**David Gregory: Yeah**

Det. King- Something like that.

**David Gregory: Oh, yeah. I guess.**

Det. King- I mean, are you disabled at all? Are you any kind of medical—work that says that you are disabled?

**David Gregory: No. I'm filing because I mean--**

Det. King- Okay. Are you a veteran at all?

**David Gregory: No. My son is.**

Det. King- Your son is, okay. But you had no—you're not—you're not deemed as a you know, disabled, you know, person at all?

**David Gregory: No. I mean**

Det. King- For medical—reassessed.

**David Gregory: uh, soon as they—read these x-rays, I'll be disabled 100 percent (unintelligible).**

Det. King- Yeah.

**David Gregory: I mean, my arms have went from 16 inch biceps—I'm down to like 7.**

Det. King- Yeah. I'm sure you probably are. I'm just asking officially.

**David Gregory: They don't have me on paper yet.**

Det. King- Yet. Yes.

*DAVID (THE SHOOTER) CONTINUES HIS POLICE INTERVIEW WITH MORE PLAY FOR SYMPATHY FROM THE DETECTIVES. MORE FALSE CLAIMS OF DISABILITY FROM DAVID. MORE CLAIMS FROM DAVID THAT HIS "ARMS HAVE WENT FROM 16 INCH BICEPS—I'M DOWN TO LIKE 7." YET, WHEN DAVID APPLIED FOR WORK DISABILITY HE WAS DENIED SEVERAL TIMES PRIOR. HIS CLAIMS OF DISABILITY ARE A COMPLETE FABRICATION AND A PLOY TO GAIN SYMPATHY IN THIS CASE.*

Det. King- Okay. What we're gonna do is we're gonna walk you down. Um, we got another room with you and your wife can be together. And then, we're gonna talk to you about, um, some Marsy's Law paperwork and stuff.

*AGAIN, SEEMS QUITE APPARENT TO ANYONE WITH ANY COMMON SENSE THAT THESE TWO OFFICERS INTENDED TO TELEGRAPH THEIR INTENTIONS TO AGREE WITH DAVID'S FALSE CLAIM OF SELF DEFENSE AT THIS POINT. SO NOW THE DETECTIVES TAKE THE ADDITIONAL STEP AND TELL DAVID (THE SHOOTER) THAT HE WILL BE REJOINED WITH HIS WIFE AMY SO THEY CAN NOW DISCUSS THE DETAILS OF MARSY'S LAW TO EFFECTIVELY PAINT DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND HIS WIFE AMY AS THE SUPPOSED "VICTIMS" IN THIS CASE WHILE STEVEN PAUL, THE ACTUAL VICTIM, IS DEAD. COMPLETELY OUTRAGEOUS.*

## **Challenging the Self-Defense Claim/Leading Questioning by Detectives: A Detailed Analysis of David Gregory's Second Interview (The Shooter)**

**10/19/22 at 1:10 am- David Gregory, 1847 Highland Rd, Osprey at Sheriff's office (2<sup>nd</sup> interview)**

Interviewed by Det. Nathan King #2399 and Det. Luis Ojeda #1795 (others in room, none)

***QUESTION: AFTER THE FIRST INTERVIEWS WITH AMY GREGORY AND DAVID GREGORY (THE SHOOTER) IT BECAME QUITE CLEAR THAT THESE TWO DETECTIVES HAD ALREADY TELEGRAPHED, TO THE SHOOTER AND HIS WIFE, THEIR INTENTIONS TO SUPPORT A VERY QUESTIONABLE AND SELF SERVING FALSE SELF DEFENSE CLAIM ON THE PART OF THE SHOOTER AND HIS WIFE. ONE MONTH LATER, DET. KING AND DET. OJEDA BRING DAVID (THE SHOOTER) IN A SECOND TIME BUT, CURIOUSLY, ARE THE ONLY INDIVIDUALS IN THE ROOM WITH DAVID (THE SHOOTER). WHY IS ABSOLUTELY NO ONE ELSE INVOLVED WITH THIS SECOND INTERVIEW OF DAVID (THE SHOOTER)?***

***TO EVEN THE MOST CASUAL OBSERVER, THE FOLLOWING INTERVIEW IS A COMPLETELY OBVIOUS SERIES OF LEADING QUESTIONS POSED TO DAVID (THE SHOOTER) ON THE PART OF DET. KING AND DET. OJEDA. CLEAR AND OUTRAGEOUS LEADING QUESTION AFTER LEADING QUESTION POSED ON THE PART OF THESE TWO DETECTIVES.***

***THIS BEHAVIOR ON THE PART OF THESE TWO DETECTIVES BORDERS ON MALFEASANCE.***

**David Gregory stated the following:**

Det. King- Okay. Um, David as you know, we like—we—want to come here, and we want to get, um, this second interview from you, um, today regarding, um, the incident, happen, and—just what you know that you can remember of, uh, what you heard about, uh, Steven Colon...

Det. King- Okay. Um, and you spoke about prior that you had multiple, uh, contacts with him while walking your dog. Uh, prior to the incident on September 24<sup>th</sup>, right?

**David Gregory: That is correct.**

Det. King- Okay. Um, you spoke of three other incidences where he pretty much, uh, just displayed the same type of behavior to you?

**David Gregory: Oh, yeah, it was very violent.**

QUESTION: WHY ARE DET. KING AND DET. OJEDA ASKING LEADING QUESTIONS OF DAVID GREGORY (THE SHOOTER)? WHY ARE DET. KING AND DET. OJEDA SOLICITING HEARSAY FROM DAVID (THE SHOOTER) BY ASKING DAVID (THE SHOOTER) TO DISCUSS WHAT HE “HEARD” ABOUT STEVEN PAUL?

COMPLETELY OUTRAGEOUS ON THE PART OF THESE TWO DETECTIVES.

THIS BEHAVIOR ON THE PART OF THESE TWO DETECTIVES BORDERS ON MALFEASANCE.

Det. King- Yeah. Okay. So today, just in your own words, what do you—what did you know about him prior to this—the incident on the 24<sup>th</sup> of September? What did you know about him or any incidents he was involved in, whether it was the police, whether it was involved in his family, whether it was through other neighbors that spoke about him, his behavior? Did you know anything about him?

David Gregory: Um, I—I knew the police were out there multiple times. Um, multiple—um, it was amazing. I had heard that he had broken his grandfather’s arm, and I was told that he kicked his grandmother down the stairs. And those stairs in those places are pretty steep. Um, we were looking at one to buy. But he broke his arm then banged her up real bad. Uh, the neighbor told us that they took the blame for it. They didn’t say that he did it. Um, he, uh, came out and stabbed up the grandparent’s car with a butcher knife, cut all the tires off of it and stuff. Um, and the neighbor came out, and the grandfather and the neighbor were like, of, shit, you know, it’s—

Det. King- Uh-huh (indicating agreement)

David Gregory: Steven again.

MORE LEADING QUESTIONING...

THIS BEHAVIOR ON THE PART OF THESE TWO DETECTIVES BORDERS ON MALFEASANCE.

Det. King- You heard that through the neighbors in the neighborhood?

David Gregory: Yes, yes.

David Gregory: Uh, everything, I heard through the neighbors. And the only thing I ever saw him do other than what concerned us was the—the—the—the gay couple that lives in that complex. I don’t know their names. And they have two little dogs, Pin and Riley. That’s—what their dogs’ names. He was standing in the driveway just yelling at this poor dude. “You fucking fat faggot pussy motherfucker. Come here. Come here you fucking fat motherfucker.” And I grabbed my dog and ran fucking home.

QUESTION: WHY ARE DET. KING AND DET. OJEDA SOLICITING HEARSAY FROM DAVID (THE SHOOTER) BY ASKING DAVID (THE SHOOTER) TO DISCUSS WHAT HE "HEARD" THROUGH THE NEIGHBORS?

HOW IS IT THAT DAVID (THE SHOOTER) REMEMBERS INTIMATE DETAILS SUCH AS THE NAMES OF GARY OSGOOD'S DOGS YET DAVID CAN'T SEEM TO REMEMBER THE OWNER OF THE DOG, GARY OSGOOD'S NAME? DAVID (THE SHOOTER) HAS VERY CLEAR DETAIL OF NAMES IT WOULD APPEAR. DAVID CAN REMEMBER THE DOG'S NAMES BUT NOT THE OWNER'S NAME? WHY IS DAVID (THE SHOOTER) ATTEMPTING TO MAKE IT APPEAR THAT HE DOES NOT KNOW GARY'S NAME OR GARY HIMSELF?

Det. King- And you witnessed this?

David Gregory: I witnessed it. He was standing right in his driveway, and he was, you know, from here to that sheriff's SUV to me, that's you know a long driveway as I saw that, and I listened to him for just a second. I took off home and, you know, put my dogs up, and I came back out on the porch and listened, and he was still berating this cat.

Det. King- Okay. When was—when was that? Do you remember?

David Gregory: That was like a month and a half ago, two months ago.

ONCE AGAIN, DAVID (THE SHOOTER) REFERS TO GARY OSGOOD AS "THIS CAT" RATHER THAN BY HIS NAME. HOW IS IT THAT DAVID (THE SHOOTER) REMEMBERS INTIMATE DETAILS SUCH AS THE NAMES OF GARY OSGOOD'S DOGS YET DAVID CAN'T SEEM TO REMEMBER THE OWNER OF THE DOG, GARY OSGOOD'S NAME? DAVID (THE SHOOTER) HAS VERY CLEAR DETAIL OF NAMES IT WOULD APPEAR. DAVID CAN REMEMBER THE DOG'S NAMES BUT NOT THE OWNER'S NAME? WHY IS DAVID (THE SHOOTER) ATTEMPTING TO MAKE IT APPEAR THAT HE DOES NOT KNOW GARY'S NAME OR GARY HIMSELF?

Det. King- So, if this incident happened in September--

David Gregory: It was—it was

Det. King- Sometime in the summer?

David Gregory: before September—August. Yeah, yeah, it was August, probably. Yeah is very recent.

Det. King- Sometime in the summer?

Det. King- Is this when you were walking your dog, or

Det. King- You were on the road.

David Gregory: Highland. And I kept going on Highland, I mean--

Det. King- Okay. And was this—this was after the—the other incidences you had with him, the three others, ...

**David Gregory: Yeah, yeah. I mean, yeah. I mean—**

*MORE LEADING QUESTIONING...*

**David Gregory: And—and, you know, this is pretty close 'cause he really seemed to—to pick up his—his ticks after that. You know? The late night stuff the neighbors were talking about. I'm always sleeping. I don't know. You know? But throwing his weights out, screaming, keeping the dogs and the neighbors up all night. Just—I mean, all night.**

Det. King- Uh-huh. (indicating agreement)

**David Gregory: Not—not till 2 in the morning, not till 3. Till 6 in the morning, and screaming and lifting weights and (sound effect). I never witnessed any because I'm always at home at 9:00.**

Det. King- So, that was the only incident you—you recall, uh, that you seen Colon and –this other—this couple.

**David Gregory: That is correct.**

Det. King- So, that was the only incident you—you recall, uh, that you seen Colon and –this other—this couple.---you talked about.

**David Gregory: That is correct.**

Det. King- Did you witness him do anything else to any other neighbors?

**David Gregory: Uh, no, Uh—no, I did not. Um.**

*MORE LEADING QUESTIONING...*

*HOWEVER, DAVID GREGORY DENIES WITNESSING STEVEN PAUL “DOING ANYTHING TO ANY OTHER NEIGHBORS”. YES, BECAUSE IT NEVER HAPPENED.*

Det. King- Okay. And what—what all—what else have you heard about anything involving with the—with the police or other neighbors?

**David Gregory: Uh, no. I mean the neighbors you know, they all just talked about what they talked about. Again, I don't know any of their names. I just know their damn dogs. Um, we—we live a –solitary life, you know, because of my son's job. We—we—we keep a hush. And, uh—so, we—yeah, I know the dogs, but that was it. I mean, he was just**

always some issue with that house with him. I mean—again, I don't know. I just heard what people told me.

MORE LEADING QUESTIONING...ASKING DAVID (THE SHOOTER) FOR HEARSAY.

THIS BEHAVIOR ON THE PART OF THESE TWO DETECTIVES BORDERS ON MALFEASANCE.

Det. King- Okay. Okay. What did people tell you about his, um—any kind of violent history with him with other people, whether it was his family or neighbors?

David Gregory: Uh, other than just his family, yeah, that's all I ever heard about.

Det. King- What did—what did you hear?

David Gregory: The—the breaking his grandpa's arm, the kicking his grandma down that big flight of stairs in that place. You know, he sent them both to the hospital. That's what I was told--

Det. King- Okay. A neighbor told you this. Okay.

MORE LEADING QUESTIONING...ASKING DAVID (THE SHOOTER) FOR HEARSAY.

THIS BEHAVIOR ON THE PART OF THESE TWO DETECTIVES BORDERS ON MALFEASANCE.

David Gregory: Right, right.

Det. King- Okay. Did Grandpa or Grandma tell you any of this?

David Gregory: No.

Det. King- Okay. You never talked to them?

David Gregory: No. I never spoken to them in my life.

QUESTION: DAVID (THE SHOOTER) CONFIRMS THAT HE HAD NEVER SPOKEN TO STEVEN PAUL'S GRANDPARENTS TO CONFIRM THE HEARSAY AND FALSE RUMORS HE CLAIMED HE WAS TOLD BY NEIGHBORS.

Det. Ojeda- Have you spoken to them since this incident?

David Gregory: No.no. no. no. We went home to get some clothes and stuff, which—and obviously didn't do a very good job of. And we were walking our dog, and they started creeping behind us in the car, and I mean you could hear the god damn van belt. I was scared to death. My wife was just damn near, you know, puking. She was—they were

right (sound effect). And then we saw a couple people outside, so we bee lined to them and just kept going, got in our car, and headed—and we've not been back since.

Det. King- How long was that after the incident?

David Gregory: Uh, it was a couple of days after the hurricane. We went--

Det. King- After the hurricane. So, about—probably about a week later or something?

David Gregory: Yeah, we had to go down and check on a place, get some clothes. I'm sorry. I'm starting to hurt, guys. Um, and (unintelligible)—and I knew, 'cause when we went down, I was like, look, let's just walk the dogs down here, 'cause we got a sick dog, and it poops like eight times a day. 17. It's got.... So, we were walking down the shore street, the one that goes around the water, and—and I saw where they were cutting down a tree kind of where the incident happened a car, and I recognized the car, and I was, "shit, baby, I think that's them." And sure enough, here they come. And we didn't even--

Det. King- Both Grandma and Grandpa?

David Gregory: Yeah

Det. King- You recognize--

David Gregory: We didn't even look. Well, I did. I just knew the car. I did not look at them

David Gregory: I don't know who was driving it. It was somebody from that family. But, uh, I didn't even looked up. We grabbed our dogs, went back home, go (sound effect), and gone. And then we came back, you know, that—later, and then they were just (sound effect), right behind us. I mean, she'll tell you. It was scary.

Det. King- It was a van? What color van?

David Gregory: No, it was a little Chevy SUV.

QUESTION: THIS STORY BY DAVID IS A COMPLETE FABRICATION. NOW DAVID (THE SHOOTER) SPINS THE FALSE NARRATIVE THAT HE AND HIS WIFE HAD "ALLEGEDGLY" BEEN FOLLOWED BY STEVEN PAUL'S GRANDPARENTS IN THE AFTERMATH OF THE SHOOTING AND HAD TO LEAVE THE NEIGHBORHOOD AS A RESULT. THIS STORY IS A COMPLETE FABRICATION ON THE PART OF DAVID (THE SHOOTER). APPARENTLY THE SHOOTER IS TRYING TO GAIN SYMPATHY BY FURTHER FALSELY PORTRAYING HIMSELF AND HIS WIFE AS A VICTIM.

WHY DOES DAVID (THE SHOOTER) CLAIM TO KNOW WHAT KIND OF CAR THE GRANDPARENTS DROVE? DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND HIS WIFE DID NOT LIVE IN THE SAME CONDO ASSOCIATION AS STEVEN PAUL'S GRANDPARENTS, YET DAVID CLAIMS

TO KNOW WHAT TYPE OF VEHICLE THEY DROVE? WAS HE STALKING THE FAMILY PRIOR TO THE SHOOTING?

David Gregory: Yeah, tiny little thing, not as big as yours, you know, but half the size. But, uh, the paranoia that's in on that was unbelievable.

Det. King- Do you know what Grandma and Grandpa look like?...

David Gregory: Uh, I—I probably—uh, I—I know what everybody that lives there looks like. What exact unit they live in, no, I don't know.

Det. King- You never had any interactions with these guys at all, the—the—grandma and grandpa.

QUESTION: *HOW IS IT THAT DAVID (THE SHOOTER) CLAIMS TO NOT KNOW WHAT UNIT THE GRANDPARENTS LIVED IN, YET KNEW WHAT TYPE OF VEHICLE THEY DROVE AND BOTH DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND HIS WIFE AMY CLAIMED THEY SAY STEVEN PAUL THE MORNING OF THE SHOOTING WALKING DOWN THE GRANDPARENT'S CONDO STEPS PRIOR TO STEVEN PAUL'S WALK THAT MORNING? COMPLETELY INCONSISTENT STATEMENTS. WHY DOES DAVID (THE SHOOTER) CLAIM TO KNOW WHAT KIND OF CAR THE GRANDPARENTS DROVE? DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND HIS WIFE DID NOT LIVE IN THE SAME CONDO ASSOCIATION AS STEVEN PAUL'S GRANDPARENTS, YET DAVID CLAIMS TO KNOW WHAT TYPE OF VEHICLE THEY DROVE? IT WOULD APPEAR THAT DAVID MAY HAVE BEEN STALKING THE FAMILY PRIOR TO THE SHOOTING, IT WOULD BE THE ONLY WAY HE WOULD CLAIM TO KNOW THIS LEVEL OF DETAIL ABOUT THE GRANDPARENT'S VEHICLE.*

David Gregory: Never. Ever.

Det. King- Okay. No—no mom and dad, no--

David Gregory: I didn't even know he had a mom and dad.

David Gregory: We didn't know there was family in town, honestly. The neighbors was like, all of a sudden, family showing up, and mom and dad are there, like, you know—and it's like, didn't even know he had folks. We thought maybe the parents had—their grandparents had taken him in—for whatever reason. But that's—I mean, I don't know.

Det. King- Anything else anybody's ever told you about—about him or his behavior or that you know of?

David Gregory: Just that. I mean, you know, they've all—tell you they sleep with guns and baseball bats behind their doors because of his erratic behavior throughout the middle of the night. You know—he creeps on people.

Det. King- Uh-huh. (indicating agreement).

*MORE LEADING QUESTIONING...ASKING DAVID (THE SHOOTER) FOR HEARSAY.*

*THIS BEHAVIOR ON THE PART OF THESE TWO DETECTIVES BORDERS ON MALFEASANCE.*

Det. King- But any details about the incidences that they had with him?

**David Gregory: No. And again—my conversations with most people are very short because I—I like their dogs. I'm a dog guy. I pet the dogs. ...**

Det. King- You're walking your dog, and then—you just have a short little conversations--

**David Gregory: My son's got a ??? and people don't want us talking about our son. They don't want to know, you know—we got a phone call one night about—talking about being scared.**

**David Gregory: Get a phone call saying, "ISIS is looking for you." True story.**

**David Gregory: "Kill all your social media. Kill all your apps. ISIS is looking for you." How you go to bed (unintelligible) same neighborhood. Eight years. We've had this three time. It's just like, wow.**

Det. King- Yeah.

**David Gregory: And the first time, I kinda got it. Okay. It come in the territory, I guess, because of his job and his security clearance and stuff, but, you know, how in the fuck are they here looking for me?**

QUESTION: NOW DAVID (THE SHOOTER) SPINS THE FALSE NARRATIVE THAT HE ALLEGEDLY RECEIVED 3 CALLS FROM SOME UNKNOWN PERSON TELLING HIM THAT "ISIS IS LOOKING FOR YOU" "KILL ALL YOUR SOCIAL MEDIA. KILL ALL YOUR APPS. ISIS IS LOOKING FOR YOU". MORE THAN LIKELY, THIS STORY IS A COMPLETE FABRICATION ON THE PART OF DAVID (THE SHOOTER). APPARENTLY THE SHOOTER IS TRYING TO GAIN SYMPATHY BY FURTHER FALSELY PORTRAYING HIMSELF AS A VICTIM OF ISIS. COULD IT BE POSSIBLE THAT DAVID (THE SHOOTER) IS SIMPLY TRYING TO COVER HIS TRACKS AND HIS MISREPRESENTATIONS ABOUT BEING DISABLED ON-LINE POST SHOOTING AND WANTS TO FALSELY CLAIM THAT HE NEEDED TO REMOVE ALL HIS SOCIAL MEDIA ETC. BECAUSE SUPPOSEDLY ISIS WAS AFTER HIM. WATCH A BUNCH OF NONSENSE.

Det. King- Yeah.

**David Gregory: Then they told me how, and I was like, wow. I found—out a lot goes on in this world that I don't want to know.**

Det. King- Uh-huh.

David Gregory: But no, I—I—everything I heard about the guy was sheer terror.

ONCE AGAIN, MORE HEARSAY.

Det. King- Okay. And then—your incidences you did have with him--

David Gregory: Just terror. I—I mean, I have never—I'm a grown-ass man, 60 years old, and I have never frozen up from anybody in my life. I've never been in a fight, guys. But—I'm a man.

Det. Ojeda- Yeah.

Det. King- Yeah. Yeah.

David Gregory: And I didn't know what to do. I stood here, scared out of my fucking mind for me and my wife and those dogs. It—It is the most helpless feeling on your fucking planet. It really—I'm sorry I'm cussing. I'm tired. I'm hurt. To be that helpless is terrible.

Det. King- Is that how you felt the day of the incident?

David Gregory: Yeah.

Det. King- Okay. Did you feel that way with the other three incidences...Would you rate the levels of each of those—

MORE LEADING QUESTIONING...

*THIS BEHAVIOR ON THE PART OF THESE TWO DETECTIVES BORDERS ON MALFEASANCE.*

David Gregory: The first two were right there, but that last day, man, something was in the air. You could feel it. He was mean. He was angry. And shit, I don't even know what he was saying to me, but he wouldn't shut up, and he kept saying shit to me. I was just trying to get my fucking dog. It's like, what's he saying. My head's just exploding. And all I could see was that hate, just them black eyes and that (sound effect), and I was (sound effect). And, uh, he did that to us five times. Two times, I forgot about. I still can't even tell you. I ain't even notice them. But yeah, the—the fear that came over me, the worthlessness. I felt like the biggest pussy on the planet. And—and I couldn't do anything about it.

QUESTION: HERE DAVID (THE SHOOTER) STATES, ONCE AGAIN, THAT HE HAD NO IDEA WHAT STEVEN PAUL WAS SAYING TO HIM PRIOR TO SHOOTING HIM. HOW DOES HE JUSTIFY SHOOTING SOMEONE WHEN HE HAD ABSOLUTELY NO IDEA WHAT STEVEN PAUL WAS SAYING? DAVID CLAIMS THAT "I WAS JUST TRYING TO GET MY FUCKING DOG. IT'S LIKE, WHAT'S HE SAYING. MY HEAD'S JUST EXPLODING. AND ALL I COULD SEE WAS THAT HATE, JUST THEM BLACK EYES..."

DAVID (THE SHOOTER) ALLEGEDLY CLAIMS THAT ALL HE COULD SEE "WAS HATE. JUST THEM BLACK EYES". IT KIND OF SOUNDS LIKE DAVID'S DESCRIPTION STEVEN PAUL WAS SERIOUSLY WARPED, TWISTED AND BORDERED ON MENTALLY DERANGED AS WELL AS UNHINGED FROM REALITY ON THE PART OF DAVID (THE SHOOTER) BEFORE HE SHOT STEVEN PAUL.

Det. King- Any why—why couldn't you do anything about it?

David Gregory: Because I was frozen in fear. I would still be frozen in fear if he had never touched me. We would've continued on being terrorized fucked with by this guy. But the minute he lays hands on me, he scared me to death. I didn't know what to do. I can't get away.

Det. King- What—what were you--

David Gregory: Nothing.

Det. King- What were you—what was your fear of?

David Gregory: Dying.

DET. KING ASKED "WHAT WERE YOU—WHAT WAS YOUR FEAR OF?" ONCE AGAIN, MORE LEADING QUESTIONING BY DET. KING... ABSOLUTELY NO FOLLOW UP QUESTIONING ABOUT HIS ALLEGED CLAIM THAT STEVEN PAUL "LAYS HANDS ON ME". NO FOLLOW UP QUESTIONING FOR DETAILS WHATSOEVER.

THIS BEHAVIOR ON THE PART OF THESE TWO DETECTIVES BORDERS ON MALFEASANCE.

David Gregory: I don't know what a crazy man is gonna do to me. I can't defend myself. I have got a back neck???. And you guys—will see that. If he hits here, dude, I'm—I'm toast. They're cutting all this out and replacing it with some kind of fucked up material. My arm is rotten. Don't know. I had all these ?? put in. You know? And something happened, so I go this to deal with, and that's like six grand, and I can't—if he hits me there, then I'm done. I mean, that's—you can ask my wife. She—she's in dentistry.

HERE, ONCE AGAIN, DAVID (THE SHOOTER) IS TRYING TO GAIN SYMPATHY BY FURTHER FALSELY PORTRAYING HIMSELF AS DISABLED. MORE FICTION.

David Gregory: Give me a Kleenex—snotting up over here. You know, it was like the air changed that morning. It was like everything just changed.

David Gregory: And he was so—he was angrier than he ever had been. He never—just that (sound effect), this—it was too intense.

**David Gregory: Still too intense. I can't even go—we tried to go to Cracker Barrel last night, pick up food. I couldn't even stay in there and wait for the food.**

Det. Ojeda- Are you getting help for that? I mean, you can't—

**QUESTION: WHY IS DET. OJEDA EVEN ASKING A QUESTION LIKE THIS?**

**David Gregory: No, I—I work for one of the best organizations? In the United States, the Brian Bill Foundation???. I'm a board member???. You know, we treat veterans with PTSD and traumatic brain injury. We cover all cost, and we treat their wives and family behind them so the whole family can heal.**

**QUESTION: DAVID IS A BOARD MEMBER OF THE BRIAN BILL FOUNDATION A NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATION THAT RAISES MONEY FOR VETERANS AND THEIR FAMILIES DEALING WITH PTSD. WHY IS THERE ABSOLUTELY NO FOLLOW UP QUESTIONS TO ASK DAVID (THE SHOOTER) ABOUT HIS AFFILIATION TO THIS GROUP? WHY IS THERE NO FOLLOW UP ABOUT THE FACT THAT DAVID'S PARTICIPATION IN A 31 MILE RUCK, COMPLETED OVERNIGHT, WHILE ALSO WEARING A VERY HEAVILY WEIGHTED VEST WEIGHED DOWN WITH 50-75 LBS OF WEIGHT TO SYMBOLIZE THE WEIGHT OF THE FALLEN SOLDIERS? WHY IS DAVID'S PARTICIPATION IN THIS 31 MILE RUCK SUBSEQUENTLY REMOVED FROM THE BRIAN BILL FOUNDATION WEBSITE AFTER THE SHOOTING IN AN APPARENT ATTEMPT TO HIDE HIS PARTICIPATION IN THE 31 MILE RUCK? IT WOULD APPEAR THAT DAVID (THE SHOOTER) INTENTIONALLY REMOVED HIS PARTICIPATION IN THIS GRUELING 31 MILE RUCK SO AS TO ELIMINATE EVIDENCE CONTRARY TO HIS FALSE CLAIMS OF BEING SO INCAPACITATED AND DISABLED "THAT A 10 YEAR OLD COULD WHIP MY ASS". COMPLETE FABRICATION AND COMPLETE NONSENSE.**

Det. Ojeda- Sure.

**David Gregory: So, I've got some good therapists. We're gonna start this week.**

Det. Ojeda- That's real good.

**David Gregory: Yeah. None of those I have not told them. I just—I was always on the money side. You know, raising money for events and stuff, and they're the doctors, the ones with the smarts. So, yeah, I talked to her and, you know, we're gonna start this week.**

Det. Ojeda- That's real good.

**QUESTION: WHY IS DET. OJEDA BLATANTLY SYMPATHIZING WITH DAVID (THE SHOOTER) WHO CONTINUES TO ALLEGE A FALSE NARRATIVE OF "VICTIMHOOD" AND "THAT'S REAL GOOD" THAT DAVID IS SUPPOSEDLY SEEKING HELP FROM A THERAPIST.**

David Gregory: Uh, you know, I—like I said, tried going to Cracker Barrel last night, man, it was in there five minutes, I was like, I gotta go. I gotta go home, gotta go home. I was too scared to be outside right now.

Det. King- Yeah.

*HERE, ONCE AGAIN, DAVID (THE SHOOTER) IS TRYING TO GAIN SYMPATHY BY FURTHER FALSELY PORTRAYING HIMSELF AS “TOO SCARED TO BE OUTSIDE RIGHT NOW”. MORE FICTION.*

Det. Ojeda- Are you back at the house yet?

David Gregory: No, we're never going back there. We're—we're my at my mother's house. Poor lady. Mental illness sucks dude.

Det. King- Yeah.

David Gregory: Mental illness sucks. You know, she throws stuff. She gets angry. And then she don't remember. You know? So, we're staying there to take care of her.

David Gregory: So—we shipped her to (somewhere else) for a couple weeks 'cause I just can't deal with my mom?? And this at the same time. She's 84. And when she gets off her meds, man, she goes bananas, throwing shit, throw—you know, my ?? tight. She'll throw a god damn \$100,000 decanter at you...

Det. King- Oh, yeah, no. We've all experienced that with--

Det. Ojeda- Uh.-huh (indicating agreement)

David Gregory: And—and—and I—and I talked to Amy about it. I said, you know, if he's crazy and off his meds, he—god damn.

Det. Ojeda- Yeah.

David Gregory: That's terrible. And I lost my oldest (sister/daughter??) to mental illness. We couldn't keep her on her meds. It's –tough man.

QUESTION: SO APPARENTLY MENTAL ILLNESS RUNS IN DAVID (THE SHOOTER)'S FAMILY. WHY WERE THESE STATEMENTS MADE BY DAVID (THE SHOOTER) NOT FOLLOWED UP ON BY THE DETECTIVES? WHY WERE THERE NO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS ASKED ABOUT MENTAL ILLNESS IN DAVID'S FAMILY. IT WOULD SEEM THAT

*SINCE MENTAL ILLNESS RUNS IN DAVID'S FAMILY THAT THERE IS A VERY REAL POSSIBILITY THAT DAVID (THE SHOOTER), HIMSELF, IS MENTALLY UNSTABLE AS WELL. DAVID'S BEHAVIOR AND STATEMENTS DURING HIS INTERVIEWS SEEM TO INDICATE THAT AS WELL. WHERE WAS THE FOLLOW UP BY THE DETECTIVES HERE?*

Det. King- What do you think—what do you think what was—what was wrong with him? ...

**David Gregory: I have no idea. I'm not a doctor.**

*QUESTION: WHY IS DET. KING EVEN ASKING YET ANOTHER INCREDIBLY RIDICULOUS LEADING QUESTION LIKE THIS?*

*THIS BEHAVIOR ON THE PART OF THESE TWO DETECTIVES BORDERS ON MALFEASANCE.*

Det. King- I know, but--

**David Gregory: I'm just a dumbass.**

Det. King- --but—I know, but what would you—well, how would you describe it?

**David Gregory: Uh, some kind of mental illness.**

Det. King- --Okay.

**David Gregory: Just all I could explain it. I'm 60 years old and was in the ?? for years, and I have never witnessed that kind of behavior in my person.**

Det. King- --Okay. I—I—before I walked out, I know I—I—I asked about the other incidences you had with him prior to the day of the shooting, um, and I asked you about the levels of each one of those

Det. King- --Would—how—how would you describe the—would you just say that they got worse? Were they the same?

**David Gregory: Wanted to—the same. I was terrified out of my mind. There was—**

*MORE LEADING QUESTIONING...*

*THIS BEHAVIOR ON THE PART OF THESE TWO DETECTIVES BORDERS ON MALFEASANCE.*

Det. King- The first two?

**David Gregory: something about that last day, man. He was different.**

**David Gregory: He was angry. It was escalated. It was--**

Det. King- --Okay

David Gregory: And he's never out in the mornings. I didn't even realize that until my wife said, "What the fuck is he doing out?" I was like, "What do you mean?" It's morning. I was like, oh, my God, why is he out, he's—nobody sees him in the daylight. I've never seen him in the daylight. This was the first time—that I can remember.

Det. Ojeda- Was he—do—could you tell—could you smell any alcohol on his breath? Could you smell any—anything on him?

MORE LEADING QUESTIONING...

*THIS BEHAVIOR ON THE PART OF THESE TWO DETECTIVES BORDERS ON MALFEASANCE.*

David Gregory: Smell nothing. No. All I do know—I do mean this is something she'll come back. I mean the neighbor told me, big guy—he said he bought a car off Steven's mother, and said, you know, they were talking, and he knew—when—when the police came over that last time to get Steven to move his car because they were trying to repair their driveway and Steven wouldn't move his car—his mom was there. The police were there. Everybody was there. And he wouldn't come out of the house to move his car. And she came out of the house, and Toby—and this isn't just, you know, what I heard from Toby. Toby said she came out of the house (unintelligible) goes, "God damn, there's white powder, spoons, and needles everywhere."

Det. King- Uh-huh.

David Gregory: That's what Toby said, and I was like, well, then he's a junkie. I don't know. Maybe he's lacked up. He's up all night. Maybe he's doing methamphetamines. I don't—I'm—I'm—I don't even drink. I'm not that guy.

Det. King- Uh-huh.

David Gregory: I don't know. But, uh, it could've been. His mom said it to Toby.

MORE LEADING QUESTIONING...MORE HEARSAY AND RUMORS FROM TOBY.

*WHY WERE THESE STATEMENTS MADE BY DAVID (THE SHOOTER) TAKEN AT FACE VALUE AND NOT CHALLENGED IN ANY WAY BY THESE TWO DETECTIVES?*

Det. King- Have you ever heard him, uh, through—whether it's through the neighbors of him, um, involving any kind of weapon at all?

David Gregory: Yeah, knives. Butcher knives.

David Gregory: You know? And I didn't know what he had in that big ass hoodie. Maybe he had a fucking Glock in there. Maybe he had a knife. Maybe—he had nothing.

MORE LEADING QUESTIONING...

THIS BEHAVIOR ON THE PART OF THESE TWO DETECTIVES BORDERS ON MALFEASANCE.

Det. King- Um, any incidences involving the police?, why—why they were at the grandparent's house--

**David Gregory: Many. More than I can count on**

MORE LEADING QUESTIONING...

Det. King- Was there any—'cause you did talk about each time of these incidences you had with him, that he was saying stuff. Was there anything you remember--

**David Gregory: The first time.**

Det. King- what he was saying? What—what was that he's saying to you?

MORE LEADING QUESTIONING...

**David Gregory: After he put the phone up, the YouTube stuff he was putting, you know, right in my face, I mean, right in my face, I told him I have to go on his YouTube and her TikTok and her something. We'll be all right, and then he just put his phone up and turns around. Do you work out?**

Det. King- Yes

QUESTION: *THE FALSE NARRATIVE FROM DAVID (THE SHOOTER) THAT THERE MUST HAVE BEEN SOME SORT OF NEFARIOUS YOUTUBE OR TIK TOK VIDEO BEING FILMED BY STEVEN PAUL GOES COMPLETELY UNCHALLENGED BY THE DETECTIVES IN THIS CASE. THE MORE LIKELY AND SIMPLE EXPLANATION FOR THE PHONE AND THE LIGHT ON THE PHONE BEING ON WAS THAT THIS ENCOUNTER WAS LATER AT NIGHT AND STEVEN PAUL MORE THAN LIKELY WAS USING THE FLASHLIGHT APP ON HIS PHONE FOR SAFETY AND VISIBILITY AS HE WALKED THAT EVENING.*

**David Gregory: Got—got down on a dragon crouch. You ever done that before? I used to be 44 inch chest. I mean, I've lost my body, guys. You stand like this for 45 minutes, it's make a beast out of anybody.**

Det. King- Yeah

**David Gregory: This dude got down in that stance and started throwing fucking forward punches. Not roundabouts. He was coming at me hard like a fighter, and I fucking froze.**

Det. King- This was the first time you--

**David Gregory: The first time.**

Det. King- He walked up to you and did that move.

**David Gregory: Yeah.**

**David Gregory: He said, "You want to do something about it, motherfucker?"**

Det. King- Like a fighting stance? Like a boxer? Yeah, like--

**David Gregory: Oh, a fighting—yeah. Yeah. Serious MMA shit dude.**

Det. King- And what is he saying to you when he--

**David Gregory: He said, "you want to do something about it, motherfucker?" Then he's swinging at me the whole time.**

Det. King- Do something about what?

**David Gregory: Me being on the road with my dog—**

Det. King- Oh, you didn't say anything to him?

**David Gregory: No. No.**

Det. King- He just came up to you. Okay.

**David Gregory: Came out of the bushes. Those bushes right there at the corner, at the end of the driveway. There's a thicket. You know, them little palm things.**

Det. King- Yeah. Yeah.

**David Gregory: He come right out of them fuckers. And I**

Det. King- How close was he with you?

**David Gregory: turn around and –huh?**

Det. King- How—How close was he to you?

QUESTION: THIS NARRATIVE OF EVENTS FROM DAVID (THE SHOOTER) GOES COMPLETELY UNCHALLENGED FROM THE DETECTIVES. APPARENTLY WE ARE TO BELIEVE THAT STEVEN PAUL JUMPED OUT OF THE BUSHES, PHONE IN HAND, THEN MUST HAVE PUT HIS PHONE AWAY, BECAUSE HE NEEDED TO HAVE HIS HANDS AVAILABLE TO START "THROWING PUNCHES" IN SOME "SERIOUS MMA SHIT" ALL WHILE SAYING TO DAVID "YOU WANT TO DO SOMETHING ABOUT IT, MOTHERFUCKER".

DAVID (THE SHOOTER) ALSO CLAIMS THAT HE SAID ABSOLUTELY NOTHING WHILE ALL THIS TOOK PLACE. VERY HIGHLY UNLIKELY. MORE LIKELY THAT DAVID ACTED AS THE AGGRESSOR, IN MUCH THE SAME WAY AS THE DAY OF THE SHOOTING.

IN HIS STATEMENT, DAVID (THE SHOOTER) CONTRADICTS OTHER STATEMENTS WHERE HE CLAIMS HIS WIFE WAS WITH HIM. NO MENTION, WHATSOEVER ABOUT HIS WIFE AMY BEING PRESENT DURING THIS ALLEGED ENCOUNTER. WAS SHE EVEN THERE? QUESTIONABLE AT BEST.

Det. King- Like, in your face? Like, he did that--

**David Gregory: He couldn't hit me. He stayed arm's length away.**

**David Gregory: But if he had another step, me or him, and he'd have torn my head off. And he was fucking—he threw, like, ten of them in a row, and he was just violent, was (sound effect).**

Det. King- Oh, he was swinging, but he was--

**David Gregory: Yeah. Oh, yeah, swinging.**

Det. King- away from you? Yeah.

**David Gregory: Coming from the chest. He wasn't—I mean, he—he's trained. He knows what the fuck he's doing.**

QUESTION: SO WE ARE TO BELIEVE THAT STEVEN PAUL WAS SWINGING AT THE AIR THE ENTIRE TIME BUT WASN'T CLOSE ENOUGH FOR CONTACT? THIS NARRATIVE MAKES NO SENSE AND IS MORE THAN LIKELY COMPLETE NONSENSE.

Det. King- Okay Were you—were you carrying a, uh, weapon at the time of those incidences?

**David Gregory: Yes. Every time that I—I—I've carried a gun for years.**

**David Gregory: Second amendment. Carried it for the coyotes. I never in my life thought I'd be in a situation, never. Who thinks of that shit? ...**

Det. King- So, you carried a—you carried a gun prior to having contact with him.

**David Gregory: Yeah.**

Det. King- And you said before it was because of the animals. But then

**David Gregory: Yeah**

Det. King- Then this—this started happening, and you're like, okay, I'm gonna continue based on these—

*MORE LEADING STATEMENTS ON THE PART OF DET. KING...*

**David Gregory: And—and—and I didn't carry it because of him, but I didn't put it down either.**

Det. King- Yeah.

**David Gregory: You know?**

Det. King- Exactly. Yeah.

**QUESTION: THESE STATEMENTS ARE COMPLETELY CONTRADICTORY TO THE STATEMENT MADE BY HIS WIFE AMY WHO STATED THAT DAVID (THE SHOOTER) STARTED CARRYING A GUN AFTER THE ALLEGED FIRST INCIDENT WITH STEVEN PAUL. THIS GOES TO MOTIVE AND INTENT.**

**David Gregory: Um, I wasn't looking for anybody, and he came after me. And I never confronted anybody---in my life.**

Det. King- Have you ever—Have you ever engaged him first when you—when you seen him?

**David Gregory: Fuck no.**

Det. King- What was your behavior on those other incidences that—that when he--

**David Gregory: I turned and left.**

Det. King- acted like—whether it was the spitting when he was talking, pacing--

**David Gregory: I turned and left.**

Det. King- You never said a word to him, never said like, "Get out of here, " or--

**David Gregory: No. No. I didn't say a word. I was silent, scared, petrified out of my fucking mind.**

Det. King- Yeah.

**QUESTION: SO WE ARE, ONCE AGAIN, SUPPOSED TO BELIEVE THE FALSE NARRATIVE THAT DAVID SAID AND DID ABSOLUTELY NOTHING? HIGHLY UNLIKELY AND MORE LIKELY THAN NOT THIS NARRATIVE IS COMPLETE FICTION.**

David Gregory: The only thing I said to—and, uh, the second time, I did go “Hey, man” trying to defuse the situation before he spit on me. That didn’t help at all ‘cause he was coming right at me, I mean at a full fucking pace with that hoodie on. And I mean, walking fast. Had a big ass coming at me, and he got right up to me. He said (sound effect) and then turned and went in his driveway. Then he turned around and started calling my wife?. I didn’t catch that. My Amy did.

Det. King- Uh. Huh.

QUESTION: SO THIS IS AN ALLEGED “SECOND TIME” INCIDENT? NO MENTION OF HIS WIFE BEING PRESENT FOR THE FIRST ALLEGED INCIDENT BUT NOW THERE IS THIS ALLEGED “SECOND” INCIDENT WHERE HIS WIFE AMY WAS PRESENT. THIS DOES NOT MATCH AMY’S STATEMENTS OR VERSION OF EVENTS. IS DAVID (THE SHOOTER) NOW MAKING UP A SUPPOSED “SECOND” INCIDENT WHERE STEVEN PAUL, COMPLETELY OUT OF NOWHERE AND FOR NO REASON WHATSOEVER WAS “COMING RIGHT AT ME, I MEAN AT A FULL FUCKING PACE WITH THAT HOODIE ON. AND I MEAN, WALKING FAST.” THIS NARRATIVE MAKES NO SENSE AND IS MORE THAN LIKELY COMPLETE FICTION.

David Gregory: And then we picked up and fucking ran home. I never (unintelligible) didn’t have to.

David Gregory: I’ve never been so scared in my life.

Det. Ojeda- Have you ever talked to anybody about his behavior?

David Gregory: What do you mean?

Det. Ojeda- When—when you were out with the neighbors.

David Gregory: All the neighbors talked about it.

David Gregory: And I even told the neighbors.

David Gregory: I told the neighbors, I said, “Look, you guys live here. You have an association. You have quorum here right now. Change your fucking bylaws and get him out of here. Do it legally. I mean, I was trying to help them.

HERE DAVID INDICATES THAT HE HAD SPOKEN TO THE NEIGHBORS. MOST LIKELY, GARY OSBORN, TOBY AND BETH AND OTHERS. THIS VERY STATEMENT SHOWS MOTIVE. MOTIVE. MOTIVE.

Det. King- Yeah.

David Gregory: Now I got this on my soul, man. It’s hard. Man, I help people, man. I help veterans. Hell, before that, I worked with the ?? And god damn, how does this shit happen? How do you get attacked walking a god damned dog? It’s not right. You know,

we were just waiting for my son to retire so we could quit—quit worrying every day that we're awake.

Det. King- Yeah, yeah.

David Gregory: Because that's—that's tough.

Det. King- Oh, yeah.

David Gregory: That's tough. Yeah, something different than you guys going out, man. It's just--

Det. King- It's the world we live in. You gotta—you gotta protect yourself.

David Gregory: Unfortunately, you do.

*COMPLETELY OUTRAGEOUS STATEMENTS ON THE PART OF DET. KING.*

*SEEMS QUITE APPARENT TO ANYONE WITH ANY COMMON SENSE THAT THESE TWO OFFICERS INTENDED TO TELEGRAPH THEIR INTENTIONS TO AGREE WITH DAVID'S FALSE CLAIM OF SELF DEFENSE AT THIS POINT.*

*THIS CONTINUED BEHAVIOR ON THE PART OF THESE TWO DETECTIVES BORDERS ON MALFEASANCE.*

Det. King- Is—Is there anything else that you—that you—since you had time over this last, you know, three weeks or so to really think about things and—and- anything else that comes up that you—that you wanted to say that you thought would be important to know?...

David Gregory: I just—I just don't know. I was just walking a fucking dog. Just walking a dog. You know, and it's bad enough we—we—this has nothing to do with this, but it does. I mean, when that guy came down here from North Carolina to do us in and stayed at Bentley's, we couldn't walk our dog in the street any more, he was too fucking scary, and still is to this day. We don't go by Bentley's. And my wife really is upset about it. So, we start half-blocking it, right?

*IT IS QUITE INTERESTING THAT DAVID (THE SHOOTER) CHOOSES TO BRING UP THIS INCIDENT AS IT RELATES TO AMY'S EX-HUSBAND OR EX-FIANCÉ. DAVID ONLY REFERS TO THIS PERSON AS "THAT GUY". WHY DOES DAVID BRING THIS UP? WHY DOES DAVID NOT MENTION THIS PERSON BY NAME OR MENTION THAT THIS WAS AMY'S EX-HUSBAND OR EX-FIANCÉ? VERY SUSPICIOUS THAT DAVID LEAVES SUCH IMPORTANT AND KEY FACTS OUT OF HIS STATEMENT. APPARENTLY, WHEN DAVID REFERS TO PEOPLE HE DOESN'T WANT TO CLAIM THAT HE KNOWS PERSONALLY. HE USES THE TERM "THAT GUY". SAME WAY HE REFERRED TO STEVEN PAUL. SAME WAY HE REFERRED TO GARY OSGOOD. SAME WAY HE REFERRED TO TOBY. SAME WAY HE REFERRED TO AMY'S EX-HUSBAND/EX-FIANCÉ.*

HERE DAVID (THE SHOOTER) FALSELY INDICATES THAT HE AND HIS WIFE AMY NO LONGER WALKED BY THE BENTLEY HOTEL WHICH WAS LOCATED AT THE NORTH END OF HIGHLAND ROAD. HERE DAVID (THE SHOOTER) STATES "WHEN THAT GUY CAME DOWN HERE FROM NORTH CAROLINA TO DO US IN AND STAYED AT THE BENTLEY'S...HE WAS TOO FUCKING SCARY, AND STILL IS TO THIS DAY. WE DON'T GO BY BENTLEY'S. AND MY WIFE REALLY IS UPSET ABOUT IT. SO, WE START HALF-BLOCKING IT, RIGHT?"

HERE DAVID IS REFERRING TO AMY GREGORY'S EX-HUSBAND OR EX-FIANCE WHO AS IT TURNS OUT WAS FROM NORTH CAROLINA AND APPARENTLY WAS FOUND DEAD IN THE PARK NEAR THE HOTEL OR AT THE HOTEL ITSELF. WHY WOULD THIS MAN COME TO FLORIDA FROM NORTH CAROLINA TO STAY AT THE BENTLEY HOTEL AND SUBSEQUENTLY WIND UP DEAD, IN SUCH CLOSE PROXIMITY TO WHERE DAVID AND AMY WERE LIVING? DETAILS OF THIS MAN'S DEATH ARE VERY SUSPICIOUS TO SAY THE LEAST AND THE FACT THAT WE HAVE ANOTHER DEATH POTENTIALLY LINKED TO THESE TWO SUSPECTS IS SOMETHING THAT SHOULD BE INVESTIGATED FURTHER.

IN ADDITION, HERE DAVID MAKES AN ADDITIONAL FALSE STATEMENT THAT THEY WOULD ONLY "HALF-BLOCK" IT WHEN WALKING ON HIGHLAND ROAD. DAVID AND AMY'S NEIGHBOR CAN ATTEST TO WITNESSING DAVID AND AMY ON MORE OCCASION WALKING IN THE VERY AREA NEAR THE BENTLEY HOTEL WHERE DAVID FALSELY CLAIMS THEY ARE TOO SCARED TO WALK ANY LONGER.

THIS FALSE NARRATIVE IS BEING PUT IN FRONT OF THE DETECTIVES, IN ORDER, TO FALSELY EXPLAIN WHY DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND AMY HIS WIFE DID NOT OPT TO WALK IN THE OPPOSITE DIRECTION AS STEVEN PAUL AND INSTEAD CHOSE TO FOLLOW BEHIND STEVEN PAUL JUST BEFORE THE SHOOTING. IT ALSO GIVES THE FALSE NARRATIVE FOR WHY THEY CONTINUED TO HANG OUT IN FRONT OF THE DRIVEWAY LEADING TO THE GRANDPARENTS OF STEVEN PAUL'S CONDO.

IF DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND AMY THE WIFE WERE SO FEARFUL OF STEVEN PAUL THEN WHY DID THEY CHOOSE THIS PATH AND WHY DID THEY REPEATEDLY HANG OUT NEAR THE DRIVEWAY ENTRANCE FOR STEVEN PAUL'S CONDO ASSOCIATION. THEIR FALSE NARRATIVE OF FEAR DIRECTLY CONTRADICTS THEIR REPEATED BEHAVIOR UP TO AND INCLUDING THE DAY OF THE SHOOTING.

Det. King- Yeah. How long were you at that address?

Det. Ojeda- How long have you been at your house now, total? You said eight years?

David Gregory: Yeah, that's that lease. Yeah.

David Gregory: We had a—we stayed on Highland in Osprey. It's a dead-end street there. We stayed there for eight years. Walked the dogs every day--

Det. King- Same thing?

David Gregory: Everywhere. Everybody's friendly. You know?

Det. King- Never had any issues over there with anybody?

David Gregory: Never had an issue in my life until

Det. King- Till this?

David Gregory: This is about it.

Det. King- Okay.

David Gregory: I've never been in jail. I never been in trouble. I—I—don't go out looking—I stay home and do what I'm supposed to do. I try to anyway

Det. Ojeda- Were you ever in the military?

David Gregory: Me? No. Everybody thinks that, uh, just 'cause of my haircut and the way I usually stand. But I can't do that anymore. Uh, well, I follow the rules, man. You know, I'm a ball buster. My son's a Navy SEAL. Dude, you get up and make your fucking bed in the morning. You don't make your bed, go live with you mom.

APPARENTLY DAVID TRIED TO GIVE THE FALSE IMPRESSION TO MANY THAT HE WAS A VETERAN. WHY THE FALSE PRETENSE?

David Gregory: ...I didn't understand my mother/daughter's mental illness. I don't understand ??, and neither did they. They just keep throwing different pills and sending them home, and no matter what you tell them—I mean, she fell and bust her head open, go to the hospital, got her stitches, take her to the doc, "Doc, she's drinking, falling down, watch her."

David Gregory: And now we don't—she needs help. She needs help. Mental help or, uh—and that's where we're at. You know? And—and if that was the case for him, I fucking feel for him because—our system is lacking in this.

Det. King- Yeah, yeah.

SEEMS QUITE APPARENT TO ANYONE WITH ANY COMMON SENSE THAT THESE TWO OFFICERS INTENDED TO TELEGRAPH THEIR INTENTIONS TO AGREE WITH DAVID'S FALSE CLAIM OF SELF DEFENSE AT THIS POINT.

David Gregory: This is a perfect example.

Det. King- What's that?

David Gregory: I file for disability so I can get fixed. I've gotta replace ??.

David Gregory: I filed for disability. They turned it down, 'cause they send it to a third party. ...

David Gregory: And they wouldn't let me get my money to get fixed. That's a true story. So you have to do it again. And if you ask them, they'll tell you the average is three time that you file the—then the third time, we approve it.

*HERE, DAVID (THE SHOOTER) MAKES A STATEMENT ABOUT REPEATEDLY TRYING TO FILE FOR DISABILITY, YET BEING DENIED. THAT IS BECAUSE HIS CLAIMS OF DISABILITY WERE FALSE.*

Det. King- But the physical stuff that you were concerned with with, um, him—you said if you—if he was to hit you--

David Gregory: Yeah. Oh, this is all rotten.

Det. King- Yeah.

David Gregory: All the neck—and this is something new, they're gonna take something the size of that phone and mold it--

Det. King- Okay. You got that. Then you said the...

David Gregory: Bad. Two through six is completely gone. That's why this arm, it used to be 16 inches, is that. I can't lift a gallon of milk.

Det. King- You can't lift—anything.

David Gregory: I can't no....

David Gregory: So, you lose everything. It goes in atrophy. ...I can't lift anything. I really can't. I mean, a gallon of milk. But, due, forks fall out of my hand when I eat.

*HERE, ONCE AGAIN, DAVID (THE SHOOTER) IS TRYING TO GAIN SYMPATHY BY FURTHER FALSELY PORTRAYING HIMSELF AS DISABLED. MORE FICTION.*

Det. Ojeda- I guess—well, my question, uh, how did that happen? Did it just—

David Gregory: Who knows? Um--

Det. Ojeda- Oh, no—there was no industrial accident?

David Gregory: Did—did—did I have a bad football game when I was a kid? I think it's genetic? To be honest with you.

*QUESTION: HERE DAVID (THE SHOOTER) STATES "I THINK IT'S GENETIC" WHEN ASKED TO EXPLAIN HIS DISABILITY. SO, IF HIS SUPPOSED DISABILITY IS GENETIC, THEN WHY*

*IS HE REPEATEDLY TRYING TO GET WORKER'S COMPENSATION? CONTINUED FICTION.*

David Gregory: Yeah, I—I was at work one day, and I noticed. I was looking at the computer screen. I was just out my mind in pain, and I got home. I couldn't lay on the couch. I was like, son of a bitch, what's going on? So, went to the doctor, and he's like, whoop, it's bad. I said, "What do you mean it's bad?" He says, "You're fucking bad, dude." And I was like "You gotta be kidding me." So, I go home after discusses everything with me and tells me about the—now I've gotta have Tommy John or rotator cuff surgery too. You ever hear that?

Det. King- Yeah. Pitchers get it.

Det. Ojeda- Oh yeah.

David Gregory: I gotta have that, too.

Det. King- Yeah.

David Gregory: That's what's really—there's—there's my range of motion. If I go past that, you'll be picking me up. I don't enjoy it. Uh—it's terrible.

Det. King- Yeah.

*MORE CONTINUED ATTEMPTS BY DAVID (THE SHOOTER) IS TRYING TO GAIN SYMPATHY BY FURTHER FALSELY PORTRAYING HIMSELF AS DISABLED. MORE FICTION.*

## **Other Suspicious Deaths Potentially Tied to Amy and David Gregory (The Shooter and His Wife)/Additional Important Information/Additional Areas Requiring Investigation:**

DAVID GREGORY'S INVOLVEMENT WITH THE BRIANBILL FOUNDATION FOR MILITARY MEMBERS AND THEIR FAMILIES DEALING WITH POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDERS AND MENTAL ILLNESS. HE IS A BOARD MEMBER. DAVID GREGORY'S PARTICIPATION IN A 31 MILE RUCK RACE TO RAISE MONEY FOR THE FOUNDATION. ALL INFORMATION ON THAT RACE INCLUDING VIDEO OF HIM RUNNING THAT 31 MILE RACE WITH TWICE THE AMOUNT OF HEAVILY WEIGHTED RUCK VESTING (BETWEEN 50 AND 75 LBS) WAS

SUBSEQUENTLY REMOVED FROM THE **BRIANBILLFOUNDATION.ORG WEBSITE** AND FACEBOOK AFTER THE SHOOTING. WHY WAS THIS POSTING REMOVED FROM THE BRIANBILLFOUNDATION.ORG WEBSITE AND FACEBOOK AFTER THE SHOOTING? MORE THAN LIKELY BECAUSE DAVID'S PARTICIPATION IN SUCH A GRUELING 31 MILE RUCK WOULD HAVE COMPLETELY CONTRADICTED HIS FALSE NARRATIVE OF BEING DISABLED.

DAVID AND AMY GREGORY'S CONNECTION TO HER NC EX-HUSBAND OR EX-FIANCÉ OR WHO WAS FOUND DEAD NEAR IN THE PARK NEAR THE BENTLEY HOTEL OR AT THE HOTEL FROM A SUPPOSED SUICIDE. AMY GREGORY STATED IN A TEXT TO HER NEIGHBORS, WHO WERE CONCERNED ABOUT HIS DEATH, THE FOLLOWING: "JUST TO PUT ALL MINDS AT EASE, THIS WAS MY EX-FIANCÉ FROM 26 YEARS AGO...HE CAME FROM NC LOOKING FOR ME...VERY LONG AND SAD STORY BUT THERE YOU GO...I MYSELF CAN'T WRAP MY HEAD AROUND IT AS WE HAVEN'T EVEN SPOKEN IN 26 YEARS, BUT HE FELT HE NEEDED TO DO IT PRACTICALLY IN MY "BACK YARD" AND HAD EVEN GOTTEN A ROOM AT BENTLEY'S WHICH IS RIGHT NEXT TO MY HOUSING DEVELOPMENT...INTERNET IS A SCARY THING CONSIDERING THAT'S HOW HE FOUND ME, PAY 15 BUCKS AND YOU CAN FIND ANYONE.....STILL SHAKING IN MY BOOTS.". THE QUESTION NEEDS TO BE ASKED, ARE DAVID AND AMY GREGORY CONNECTED TO THIS DEATH IN ANY WAY? THIS DEATH IS HIGHLY SUSPICIOUS AND NEEDS FURTHER INVESTIGATION.

DAVID (THE SHOOTER) CLAIMED DURING HIS INTERVIEW THAT HE LOST A FEMALE FAMILY MEMBER (DAUGHTER?) DUE TO MENTAL ILLNESS? IS THERE YET A THIRD DEATH THAT IS CONNECTED TO DAVID AND AMY GREGORY HERE? ARE THERE ANY MORE DEATHS THAT STILL HAVE YET TO BE DISCOVERED?

EVERY ONE OF THESE THREE SUSPICIOUS DEATHS (INCLUDING STEVEN PAUL) HAS A COMMON THREAD AND FALSE NARRATIVE OF MENTAL ILLNESS AS THE EXCUSE? WHY THE COMMON THREAD? IS IT TO MAKE THEIR DEATHS APPEAR TO BE CAUSED BY MENTAL ILLNESS TO SOMEHOW DIVERT ATTENTION AND THE INVESTIGATION AWAY FROM DAVID (THE SHOOTER)?

DAVID AND AMY'S CAUTION'S COOLERS DOG WEBSITE THAT THEY CLAIM DONATED PROCEEDS TO THE POLICE DEPARTMENT AND FIRST RESPONDERS.

DAVID GREGORY CLAIMS THAT THEY HAD ANOTHER DEATH OR LOSS OF A FEMALE FAMILY (MOTHER/DAUGHTER) MEMBER TO MENTAL ILLNESS.

DAVID GREGORY'S CLAIMS THAT HIS OWN MOTHER SUFFERED FROM MENTAL ILLNESS AND WOULD OFTEN SNAP AND THROW THINGS AT HIM. ESPECIALLY IF SHE WAS OFF HER MEDS. SAME MENTAL ILLNESS RHETORIC HE AND AMY USED IN ALL THE OTHER DEATHS AS WELL AS STEVEN PAUL. APPARENTLY MENTAL ILLNESS RUNS IN DAVID'S FAMILY. IT WOULD APPEAR THAT DAVID, HIMSELF, WAS MENTALLY UNSTABLE RATHER THAN STEVEN PAUL.

DAVID GREGORY MENTIONS THAT HE MAILED AWAY FOR HIS CONCEALED CARRY PERMIT BUT HAD NOT GOTTEN IT BACK IN THE MAIL. WHY WAS HE EVEN CARRYING A GUN ON HIM, KNOWING FULL WELL HE DID NOT RECEIVE AND DID HAVE THE LEGAL AUTHORITY TO CARRY A CONCEALED WEAPON? WAS DAVID GREGORY EVEN LEGALLY PERMITTED TO CARRY A CONCEALED WEAPON ON THE DAY OF THE SHOOTING? WHY WAS THIS NOT INVESTIGATED BY THE DETECTIVES IN THIS CASE?

THE FALSE NARRATIVE WAS THAT STEVEN PAUL HAD INJURED HIS GRANDFATHER AS WELL AS HIS GRANDMOTHER. THIS IS A COMPLETE FABRICATION. PICTURES ARE AVAILABLE OF STEVEN PAUL'S GRANDFATHER, OVER A YEAR AFTER STEVEN PAUL'S DEATH, SUFFERING FROM INJURIES TO HIS ARMS AND LEGS SUSTAINED DURING A FALL DUE TO HIS CONTINUED HEART CONDITION.

THE FALSE NARRATIVE WAS THAT STEVEN PAUL WAS A "JUNKIE" HOOKED ON ILLICIT DRUGS BOTH IN POWDER FORM AND USED SYRINGES FOR THIS ALLEGED PURPOSE AS WELL. THIS IS ALSO A COMPLETE FABRICATION. NUTRITIONAL SUPPLEMENTATION WAS PART OF STEVEN PAUL'S ATHLETIC ROUTINE. PICTURES ARE ALSO AVAILABLE TO SUPPORT THIS.

THE FALSE NARRATIVE WAS THAT DAVID (THE SHOOTER) WAS DISABLED. THERE IS PLENTY OF EVIDENCE AVAILABLE TO THE CONTRARY INCLUDING STATEMENTS FROM NEIGHBORS WHO WERE NOT INTERVIEWED. LINDA KREMBLASS LIVED DIRECTLY NEXT DOOR TO DAVID AND AMY GREGORY. HER WITNESS TESTIMONY NEEDS TO BE INCLUDED AS PART OF THIS INVESTIGATION AS HER TESTIMONY DIRECTLY CHALLENGES MANY OF THE FALSE NARRATIVES PUT FORTH BY BOTH DAVID (THE SHOOTER) AND AMY HIS WIFE. 1. SHE WITNESSED DAVID WEARING A WEIGHTED VEST ON NUMEROUS OCCASIONS AS HE WALKED THE NEIGHBORHOOD, EVEN THOUGH DAVID CLAIMED HE WAS DISABLED. 2. SHE HAS DIRECT KNOWLEDGE REGARDING THE TEXT MESSAGE WHERE AMY GREGORY REFERENCES HER EX-FIANCÉ'S FROM NORTH CAROLINA'S DEATH AT OR NEAR THE BENTLEY HOTEL SITUATED AT THE NORTH END OF HIGHLAND RD 3. SHE WITNESSED AMY AND DAVID CUTTING THROUGH THE NEIGHBOR'S YARD AS THEY WALKED BACK AND FORTH BETWEEN THEIR CONDO AND HIGHLAND RD. 4. SHE WITNESSED DAVID (THE SHOOTER) MOVING MULTIPLE HEAVY BOXES AND FURNITURE AS HE AND AMY MOVED FROM THE NEIGHBORHOOD AFTER THE SHOOTING. THIS, EVEN THOUGH DAVID FALSELY CLAIMED HE WAS IN SUCH TREMENDOUS PAIN AND WAS DISABLED. 5. SHE WITNESSED THE BOX FOR THE GUN USED IN THE SHOOTING LEFT ON THE CURB AFTER THEY HAD MOVED OUT. 6. SHE CLAIMED THAT DAVID WANTED TO GIVE OTHERS THE FALSE APPEARANCE THAT HE WAS A MILITARY VETERAN EVEN THOUGH HE NEVER SERVED IN THE MILITARY AT ALL.

## **2018 Florida “Stand Your Ground/Use of Force” Statute**

### **CHAPTER 776**

#### **JUSTIFIABLE USE OF FORCE**

776.012 Use or threatened use of force in defense of person.

776.013 Home protection; use or threatened use of deadly force; presumption of fear of death or great bodily harm.

776.031 Use or threatened use of force in defense of property.

776.032 Immunity from criminal prosecution and civil action for justifiable use or threatened use of force.

776.041 Use or threatened use of force by aggressor.

776.05 Law enforcement officers; use of force in making an arrest.

776.051 Use or threatened use of force in resisting arrest or making an arrest or in the execution of a legal duty; prohibition.

776.06 Deadly force by a law enforcement or correctional officer.

776.07 Use of force to prevent escape.

776.08 Forcible felony.

776.085 Defense to civil action for damages; party convicted of forcible or attempted forcible felony.

776.09 Retention of records pertaining to persons found to be acting in lawful self-defense; expunction of criminal history records.

**776.012 Use or threatened use of force in defense of person.—**

(1) A person is justified in using or threatening to use force, except deadly force, against another when and to the extent that the person reasonably believes that such conduct is necessary to defend himself or herself or

another against the other's imminent use of unlawful force. A person who uses or threatens to use force in accordance with this subsection does not have a duty to retreat before using or threatening to use such force.

(2) A person is justified in using or threatening to use deadly force if he or she reasonably believes that using or threatening to use such force is necessary **to prevent imminent death or great bodily harm to himself or herself or another or to prevent the imminent commission of a forcible felony.** A person who uses or threatens to use deadly force in accordance with this subsection does not have a duty to retreat and has the right to stand his or her ground **if the person using or threatening to use the deadly force is not engaged in a criminal activity** and is in a place where he or she has a right to be.

**History.**—s. 13, ch. 74-383; s. 1188, ch. 97-102; s. 2, ch. 2005-27; s. 3, ch. 2014-195.

**776.013 Home protection; use or threatened use of deadly force; presumption of fear of death or great bodily harm.—**

(1) A person who is in a dwelling or residence in which the person has a right to be has no duty to retreat and has the right to stand his or her ground and use or threaten to use:

(a) Nondeadly force against another when and to the extent that the person reasonably believes that such conduct is necessary to defend himself or herself or another against the other's imminent use of unlawful force; or

(b) Deadly force if he or she reasonably believes that using or threatening to use such force is necessary to prevent imminent death or great bodily harm to himself or herself or another or to prevent the imminent commission of a forcible felony.

(2) A person is presumed to have held a reasonable fear of imminent peril of death or great bodily harm to himself or herself or another when using or threatening to use defensive force that is intended or likely to cause death or great bodily harm to another if:

(a) The person against whom the defensive force was used or threatened was in the process of unlawfully and forcefully entering, or had unlawfully and forcibly entered, a dwelling, residence, or occupied vehicle, or if that person had removed or was attempting to remove another against that person's will from the dwelling, residence, or occupied vehicle; and

(b) The person who uses or threatens to use defensive force knew or had reason to believe that an unlawful and forcible entry or unlawful and forcible act was occurring or had occurred.

(3) The presumption set forth in subsection (2) does not apply if:

(a) The person against whom the defensive force is used or threatened has the right to be in or is a lawful resident of the dwelling, residence, or vehicle, such as an owner, lessee, or titleholder, and there is not an injunction for protection from domestic violence or a written pretrial supervision order of no contact against that person; or

(b) The person or persons sought to be removed is a child or grandchild, or is otherwise in the lawful custody or

under the lawful guardianship of, the person against whom the defensive force is used or threatened; or

(c) The person who uses or threatens to use defensive force is engaged in a criminal activity or is using the dwelling, residence, or occupied vehicle to further a criminal activity; or

(d) The person against whom the defensive force is used or threatened is a law enforcement officer, as defined in s. 943.10(14), who enters or attempts to enter a dwelling, residence, or vehicle in the performance of his or her official duties and the officer identified himself or herself in accordance with any applicable law or the person using or threatening to use force knew or reasonably should have known that the person entering or attempting to enter was a law enforcement officer.

(4) A person who unlawfully and by force enters or attempts to enter a person's dwelling, residence, or occupied vehicle is presumed to be doing so with the intent to commit an unlawful act involving force or violence.

(5) As used in this section, the term:

(a) "Dwelling" means a building or conveyance of any kind, including any attached porch, whether the building or conveyance is temporary or permanent, mobile or immobile, which has a roof over it, including a tent, and is designed to be occupied by people lodging therein at night.

(b) "Residence" means a dwelling in which a person resides either temporarily or permanently or is visiting as an invited guest.

(c) “Vehicle” means a conveyance of any kind, whether or not motorized, which is designed to transport people or property.

**History.**—s. 1, ch. 2005-27; s. 4, ch. 2014-195; s. 1, ch. 2017-77.

**776.031 Use or threatened use of force in defense of property.—**

(1) A person is justified in using or threatening to use force, except deadly force, against another when and to the extent that the person reasonably believes that such conduct is necessary to prevent or terminate the other's trespass on, or other tortious or criminal interference with, either real property other than a dwelling or personal property, lawfully in his or her possession or in the possession of another who is a member of his or her immediate family or household or of a person whose property he or she has a legal duty to protect. A person who uses or threatens to use force in accordance with this subsection does not have a duty to retreat before using or threatening to use such force.

(2) A person is justified in using or threatening to use deadly force only if he or she reasonably believes that such conduct is necessary to prevent the imminent commission of a forcible felony. A person who uses or threatens to use deadly force in accordance with this subsection does not have a duty to retreat and has the right to stand his or her ground if the person using or threatening to use the deadly force is not engaged in a criminal activity and is in a place where he or she has a right to be.

**History.**—s. 13, ch. 74-383; s. 1189, ch. 97-102; s. 3, ch. 2005-27; s. 5, ch. 2014-195.

**776.032 Immunity from criminal prosecution and civil action for justifiable use or threatened use of force.—**

(1) A person who uses or threatens to use force as permitted in s. 776.012, s. 776.013, or s. 776.031 is justified in such conduct and is immune from criminal prosecution and civil action for the use or threatened use of such force by the person, personal representative, or heirs of the person against whom the force was used or threatened, unless the person against whom force was used or threatened is a law enforcement officer, as defined in s. 943.10(14), who was acting in the performance of his or her official duties and the officer identified himself or herself in accordance with any applicable law or the person using or threatening to use force knew or reasonably should have known that the person was a law enforcement officer. As used in this subsection, the term “criminal prosecution” includes arresting, detaining in custody, and charging or prosecuting the defendant.

(2) A law enforcement agency may use standard procedures for investigating the use or threatened use of force as described in subsection (1), but the agency may not arrest the person for using or threatening to use force **unless it determines that there is probable cause that the force that was used or threatened was unlawful.**

THERE IS AMPLE PROBABLE CAUSE:

1. TO SHOW THE THAT DAVID GREGORY (THE SHOOTER) WAS NOT ACTING IN SELF DEFENSE AT ALL AND MORE THAN LIKELY ACTED IN A

PROVOKING MANNER OR AGGRESSIVE MANNER HIMSELF BOTH PRIOR TO AND AFTER THE SHOOTING.

2. TO SHOW BASED ON CREDIBLE THREATS COMMUNICATED TO MULTIPLE NEIGHBORHOOD WITNESSES, THAT DAVID GREGORY HAD SHOWN MOTIVE AND INTENT IN THE DAYS AND WEEKS LEADING UP TO THE DATE OF THE SHOOTING.
3. TO SHOW BASED ON CONFLICTING TESTIMONY, PREVIOUS REPEATED DENIALS OF FALSE DISABILITY CLAIMS ON THE PART OF THE SHOOTER, AND ACTIVE INVOLVEMENT IN NUMEROUS ACTIVITIES THAT DIRECTLY DISPUTE THE CLAIMS OF DISABILITY AND THAT DAVID GREGORY WAS LYING TO INVESTIGATORS ABOUT HIS FADED DISABILITIES.
4. TO SHOW THAT DAVID GREGORY HAD MADE NUMEROUS STATEMENTS TO VARIOUS HOA INDIVIDUALS ABOUT "GETTING RID OF THE PROBLEM" PRIOR TO THE DATE OF THE SHOOTING
5. TO SHOW THAT THE SHOOTER HAD MADE THREATS ABOUT SHOOTING STEVEN PAUL TO MULTIPLE INDIVIDUALS IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD PRIOR TO THE SHOOTING. INDICATING MOTIVE AND INTENT.
6. TO SHOW THAT ON THE DAY OF THE SHOOTING, THE SHOOTER WAS ACTIVELY ENGAGED IN CRIMINAL ACTIVITY WHEREIN AS IN THE ABUSE OF HIS OWN DOG AS WOULD POTENTIALLY BE VIEWED IN THE EYES OF ANY RATIONAL PERSON, INCLUDING STEVEN PAUL. IN CONTRADICTION OF HIS FALSE

SELF DEFENSE CLAIM AND REQUIREMENTS UNDER  
THE FLORIDA STAND YOUR GROUND STATUTE.

7. TO SHOW THAT THE SHOOTER HAD ACTED IN A  
VERY AGGRESSIVE MANNER AND HOSTILE  
POSTURE DURING A PREVIOUS ENCOUNTER WITH  
STEVEN PAUL ONE YEAR PRIOR.
8. TO SHOW THAT ON THE DAY OF THE SHOOTING,  
THE SHOOTER HAD ACTED IN A VERY AGGRESSIVE  
AND HOSTILE MANNER, INCLUDING YELLING  
NUMEROUS OBSCENITIES, TOWARDS STEVEN PAUL  
BOTH BEFORE AND AFTER THE SHOOTING.  
BEHAVIOR THAT IS COMPLETELY CONTRARY TO THE  
FALSE FEAR AND FALSE SELF-DEFENSE CLAIM.
9. TO SHOW THAT THE SHOOTER FIRED TWO  
SHOTS, NOT ONE ON THE DAY OF THE SHOOTING  
AND CONCEALED THIS DETAIL WITH INVESTIGATORS  
IN CONTRADICTION OF HIS FALSE SELF DEFENSE  
CLAIM.
10. TO SHOW THAT THE SHOOTER WAS INVOLVED IN  
ACTIVITIES THAT COULD NOT HAVE BEEN POSSIBLE  
TO PARTICIPATE IN BASED ON THE FALSE CLAIMS  
MADE TO INVESTIGATING DETECTIVES ABOUT BEING  
COMPLETELY AND SEVERELY DISABLED.
11. TO SHOW THAT AFTER THE SHOOTING, THE  
SHOOTER LIKELY TAMPERED WITH FORENSIC  
PHYSICAL EVIDENCE IN AN ATTEMPT TO FURTHER  
CONCEAL HIS CRIME.
12. TO SHOW FORENSIC EVIDENCE TO INDICATE  
THAT, IN FACT, THE SHOOTER HAD APPROACHED  
THE VICTIM, STEVEN PAUL, ON STEVEN'S SIDE OF  
THE ROAD AND NOT THE OTHER WAY AROUND

PRIOR TO THE SHOOTING IN COMPLETE CONTRADICTION OF HIS FALSE SELF-DEFENSE CLAIM.

13. TO SHOW THAT THE SHOOTER HAD BROKEN THE LAW BY CARRYING A CONCEALED WEAPON WITHOUT THE PROPER AUTHORIZATION OR PERMITTING FROM THE STATE OF FLORIDA AS WOULD HAVE BEEN REQUIRED UNDER FLORIDA LAW AT THE TIME OF THE SHOOTING.

14. TO SHOW THAT THE SHOOTER AND HIS WIFE ARE POTENTIALLY TIED TO ADDITIONAL/ANOTHER/OTHER SUSPICIOUS DEATH(S).

(3) The court shall award reasonable attorney's fees, court costs, compensation for loss of income, and all expenses incurred by the defendant in defense of any civil action brought by a plaintiff if the court finds that the defendant is immune from prosecution as provided in subsection (1).

(4) In a criminal prosecution, once a *prima facie* claim of self-defense immunity from criminal prosecution has been raised by the defendant at a pretrial immunity hearing, the burden of proof by clear and convincing evidence is on the party seeking to overcome the immunity from criminal prosecution provided in subsection (1).

**History.**—s. 4, ch. 2005-27; s. 6, ch. 2014-195; s. 1, ch. 2017-72.

**776.041 Use or threatened use of force by aggressor.**—The justification described in the preceding sections of this chapter is not available to a person who:

- (1) Is attempting to commit, committing, or escaping after the commission of, a forcible felony; or
- (2) Initially provokes the use or threatened use of force against himself or herself, unless:
  - (a) Such force or threat of force is so great that the person reasonably believes that he or she is in imminent danger of death or great bodily harm and that he or she has exhausted every reasonable means to escape such danger other than the use or threatened use of force which is likely to cause death or great bodily harm to the assailant; or
  - (b) In good faith, the person withdraws from physical contact with the assailant and indicates clearly to the assailant that he or she desires to withdraw and terminate the use or threatened use of force, but the assailant continues or resumes the use or threatened use of force.

**History.**—s. 13, ch. 74-383; s. 1190, ch. 97-102; s. 7, ch. 2014-195.

**776.05 Law enforcement officers; use of force in making an arrest.**—A law enforcement officer, or any person whom the officer has summoned or directed to assist him or her, need not retreat or desist from efforts to make a lawful arrest because of resistance or threatened resistance to the arrest. The officer is justified in the use of any force:

- (1) Which he or she reasonably believes to be necessary to defend himself or herself or another from bodily harm while making the arrest;
- (2) When necessarily committed in retaking felons who have escaped; or
- (3) When necessarily committed in arresting felons fleeing from justice. However, this subsection shall not constitute a defense in any civil action for damages brought for the wrongful use of deadly force unless the use of deadly force was necessary to prevent the arrest from being defeated by such flight and, when feasible, some warning had been given, and:
  - (a) The officer reasonably believes that the fleeing felon poses a threat of death or serious physical harm to the officer or others; or
  - (b) The officer reasonably believes that the fleeing felon has committed a crime involving the infliction or threatened infliction of serious physical harm to another person.

**History.**—s. 13, ch. 74-383; s. 1, ch. 75-64; s. 1, ch. 87-147; s. 54, ch. 88-381; s. 1191, ch. 97-102.

**776.051 Use or threatened use of force in resisting arrest or making an arrest or in the execution of a legal duty; prohibition.—**

- (1) A person is not justified in the use or threatened use of force to resist an arrest by a law enforcement officer, or to resist a law enforcement officer who is engaged in the execution of a legal duty, if the law enforcement officer was acting in good faith and he or she is known, or reasonably appears, to be a law enforcement officer.

(2) A law enforcement officer, or any person whom the officer has summoned or directed to assist him or her, is not justified in the use of force if the arrest or execution of a legal duty is unlawful and known by him or her to be unlawful.

**History.**—s. 13, ch. 74-383; s. 1192, ch. 97-102; s. 1, ch. 2008-67; s. 8, ch. 2014-195.

**776.06 Deadly force by a law enforcement or correctional officer.—**

(1) As applied to a law enforcement officer or correctional officer acting in the performance of his or her official duties, the term “deadly force” means force that is likely to cause death or great bodily harm and includes, but is not limited to:

(a) The firing of a firearm in the direction of the person to be arrested, even though no intent exists to kill or inflict great bodily harm; and

(b) The firing of a firearm at a vehicle in which the person to be arrested is riding.

(2)(a) The term “deadly force” does not include the discharge of a firearm by a law enforcement officer or correctional officer during and within the scope of his or her official duties which is loaded with a less-lethal munition. As used in this subsection, the term “less-lethal munition” means a projectile that is designed to stun, temporarily incapacitate, or cause temporary discomfort to a person without penetrating the person’s body.

(b) A law enforcement officer or a correctional officer is not liable in any civil or criminal action arising out of the

use of any less-lethal munition in good faith during and within the scope of his or her official duties.

**History.**—s. 13, ch. 74-383; s. 1, ch. 99-272; s. 9, ch. 2014-195.

**776.07 Use of force to prevent escape.—**

(1) A law enforcement officer or other person who has an arrested person in his or her custody is justified in the use of any force which he or she reasonably believes to be necessary to prevent the escape of the arrested person from custody.

(2) A correctional officer or other law enforcement officer is justified in the use of force, including deadly force, which he or she reasonably believes to be necessary to prevent the escape from a penal institution of a person whom the officer reasonably believes to be lawfully detained in such institution under sentence for an offense or awaiting trial or commitment for an offense.

**History.**—s. 13, ch. 74-383; s. 7, ch. 95-283; s. 1193, ch. 97-102.

**776.08 Forcible felony.**—“Forcible felony” means treason; murder; manslaughter; sexual battery; carjacking; home-invasion robbery; robbery; burglary; arson; kidnapping; aggravated assault; aggravated battery; aggravated stalking; aircraft piracy; unlawful throwing, placing, or discharging of a destructive device or bomb; and any other felony which involves the use or threat of physical force or violence against any individual.

**History.**—s. 13, ch. 74-383; s. 4, ch. 75-298; s. 289, ch. 79-400; s. 5, ch. 93-212; s. 10, ch. 95-195.

**776.085 Defense to civil action for damages; party convicted of forcible or attempted forcible felony.—**

(1) It shall be a defense to any action for damages for personal injury or wrongful death, or for injury to property, that such action arose from injury sustained by a participant during the commission or attempted commission of a forcible felony. The defense authorized by this section shall be established by evidence that the participant has been convicted of such forcible felony or attempted forcible felony, or by proof of the commission of such crime or attempted crime by a preponderance of the evidence.

(2) For the purposes of this section, the term "forcible felony" shall have the same meaning as in s. 776.08.

(3) Any civil action in which the defense recognized by this section is raised shall be stayed by the court on the motion of the civil defendant during the pendency of any criminal action which forms the basis for the defense, unless the court finds that a conviction in the criminal action would not form a valid defense under this section.

(4) In any civil action where a party prevails based on the defense created by this section:

(a) The losing party, if convicted of and incarcerated for the crime or attempted crime, shall, as determined by the court, lose any privileges provided by the correctional facility, including, but not limited to:

1. Canteen purchases;
2. Telephone access;
3. Outdoor exercise;

4. Use of the library; and

5. Visitation.

(b) The court shall award a reasonable attorney's fee to be paid to the prevailing party in equal amounts by the losing party and the losing party's attorney; however, the losing party's attorney is not personally responsible if he or she has acted in good faith, based on the representations of his or her client. If the losing party is incarcerated for the crime or attempted crime and has insufficient assets to cover payment of the costs of the action and the award of fees pursuant to this paragraph, the party shall, as determined by the court, be required to pay by deduction from any payments the prisoner receives while incarcerated.

(c) If the losing party is incarcerated for the crime or attempted crime, the court shall issue a written order containing its findings and ruling pursuant to paragraphs (a) and (b) and shall direct that a certified copy be forwarded to the appropriate correctional institution or facility.

**History.**—s. 1, ch. 87-187; s. 72, ch. 96-388.

**776.09 Retention of records pertaining to persons found to be acting in lawful self-defense; expunction of criminal history records.—**

(1) Whenever the state attorney or statewide prosecutor dismisses an information, indictment, or other charging document, or decides not to file an information, indictment, or other charging document because of a finding that the person accused acted in lawful self-defense pursuant to the provisions related to the justifiable use of force in this chapter, that finding shall be

documented in writing and retained in the files of the state attorney or statewide prosecutor.

(2) Whenever a court dismisses an information, indictment, or other charging document because of a finding that the person accused acted in lawful self-defense pursuant to the provisions related to the justifiable use of force in this chapter, that finding shall be recorded in an order or memorandum, which shall be retained in the court's records.

(3) Under either condition described in subsection (1) or subsection (2), the person accused may apply for a certificate of eligibility to expunge the associated criminal history record, pursuant to s. 943.0585(5), notwithstanding the eligibility requirements prescribed in s. 943.0585(1)(b) or (2).

**History.**—s. 10, ch. 2014-195.

## **What were Florida's gun laws on concealed carry in 2022 and prior to HB 543?**

Prior to HB 543 passing in 2023, Floridians needed to get a concealed weapon permit to carry a concealed weapon with limited exceptions.

Here are the previous minimum eligibility requirements for Floridians applying for a concealed carry permit, according to the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services:

1. You must be at least 21 years of age unless you are a servicemember, as defined in Section 250.01, Florida Statutes, or you are a veteran of the United States Armed Forces who was discharged under honorable conditions.
2. You must meet the citizenship and residency requirements set forth in the law.
3. **You must be able to provide a certificate of completion from a firearms training class or other acceptable training document that evidences your competency with a firearm.**
4. **You must not have a disqualifying criminal record or other condition that would make you ineligible for licensure.**
5. **You do not suffer from a physical infirmity which prevents the safe handling of a weapon or firearm.**
5. **Requires a mandatory background check.**

## **The 2022 Florida Concealed Carry Firearm Statutes**

### **790.01 Unlicensed carrying of concealed weapons or concealed firearms.—**

(1) Except as provided in subsection (3), a person who is not licensed under s. 790.06 and who carries a concealed weapon or electric weapon or device on or about his or her person commits a misdemeanor of the first degree, punishable as provided in s. 775.082 or s. 775.083.

(2) Except as provided in subsection (3), a person who is not licensed under s. 790.06 and who carries a concealed firearm on or about his or her person commits a felony of the third degree, punishable as provided in s. 775.082, s. 775.083, or s. 775.084.

(3) This section does not apply to:

(a) A person who carries a concealed weapon, or a person who may lawfully possess a firearm and who carries a concealed firearm, on or about his or her person while in the act of evacuating during a mandatory evacuation order issued during a state of emergency declared by the Governor pursuant to chapter 252 or declared by a local authority pursuant to chapter 870. As used in this subsection, the term "in the act of evacuating" means the immediate and urgent movement of a person away from the evacuation zone within 48 hours after a mandatory evacuation is ordered. The 48 hours may be extended by an order issued by the Governor.

(b) A person who carries for purposes of lawful self-defense, in a concealed manner:

1. A self-defense chemical spray.
2. A nonlethal stun gun or dart-firing stun gun or other nonlethal electric weapon or device that is designed solely for defensive purposes.

(4) This section does not preclude any prosecution for the use of an electric weapon or device, a dart-firing stun gun, or a self-defense chemical spray during the commission of any criminal offense under s. 790.07, s. 790.10, s. 790.23, or s. 790.235, or for any other criminal offense.

## **775.082 Penalties; applicability of sentencing structures; mandatory minimum sentences for certain reoffenders previously released from prison.—**

(1)(a) Except as provided in paragraph (b), a person who has been convicted of a capital felony shall be punished by death if the proceeding held to determine sentence according to the procedure set forth in s. 921.141 results in a determination that such person shall be punished by death, otherwise such person shall be punished by life imprisonment and shall be ineligible for parole.

(b)1. A person who actually killed, intended to kill, or attempted to kill the victim and who is convicted under s. 782.04 of a capital felony, or an offense that was reclassified as

a capital felony, which was committed before the person attained 18 years of age shall be punished by a term of imprisonment for life if, after a sentencing hearing conducted by the court in accordance with s. 921.1401, the court finds that life imprisonment is an appropriate sentence. If the court finds that life imprisonment is not an appropriate sentence, such person shall be punished by a term of imprisonment of at least 40 years. A person sentenced pursuant to this subparagraph is entitled to a review of his or her sentence in accordance with s. 921.1402(2)(a).