| 1 | IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS |
|-----|--|
| 2 | OF CHESTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA |
| 3 | |
| 4 | COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA : NO. 6132-02 |
| 5 | vs. : |
| 6 | MICHAEL MARCAVAGE : |
| 7 | , |
| 8 | Wednesday, March 12, 2003 |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | BEFORE: HONORABLE ROBERT J. SHENKIN |
| 12 | Chester County Courthouse Courtroom No. 2 |
| 13 | West Chester, Pennsylvania |
| 14 | _ |
| 15 | APPEARANCES: |
| 16 | ALEX SILOW, For Commonwealth |
| 17 | MICHAEL MARCAVAGE, |
| 18 | Pro se. |
| 19 | |
| 2 0 | |
| 2 1 | |
| 2 2 | |
| 1 2 | |



HELEN M. CONOVER Official Court Reporter

Reported By:

| 1 | <u>I N D E X</u> | | | | |
|----|---------------------------|-----------|------------|------|-------|
| 2 | | | | | |
| 3 | COMMONWEALTH'S TESTIMONY | | | | |
| 4 | WITNESS | <u>DR</u> | <u>CR</u> | RDR | RCR |
| 5 | Seargeant Thomas Sjostrom | 8 | 16 | | |
| 6 | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | |
| 10 | DEFENDANT'S TESTIMONY | | | | |
| 11 | WITNESS | <u>DR</u> | <u>C R</u> | RDR | RCR |
| 12 | Linda Beckman | 29 | | | |
| 13 | Michael Marcavage | 35 | 38 | | |
| 14 | | | | | |
| 15 | | | | | |
| 16 | · | | | | |
| 17 | | | | | |
| 18 | <u>E X H I B I T</u> | <u>s</u> | | | |
| 19 | | | | | |
| 20 | COMMONWEALTH'S EXHIBITS | | | | |
| 21 | NO. DESCRIPTION | | | MRKD | ADMTD |
| 22 | C-1 - Bull Horn | - | | 15 | 16 |
| 23 | | | | | |
| 24 | | | | | |

PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: Commonwealth versus

Michael Marcavage, on the charge of disorderly

conduct? Is that the charge?

MR. SILOW: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: You're Mr. Marcavage?

MR. MARCAVAGE: Yes, your Honor. I
was under the impression that this was an
arraignment. The case was heard in the district
court in my absence, because the hearing
information was sent to the wrong address.

I stand before you today and ask for a continuance based on these facts: I have not had the opportunity to file pretrial motions. In addition, I intend on subpoenaing Governor Rendell, since he is the one who authorized and asked me to speak at his rally. Because of his executive privileges, I will need some time to do this. Once again, your Honor, I ask that the Court grant me a continuance based on these reasons.

(Pause.)

THE COURT: All right. There was a

```
1
     hearing before the district justice, apparently in
     your absence; is that correct?
 2
                   MR. MARCAVAGE:
                                    That is correct, your
 3
 4
     Honor.
                   THE COURT:
                               And you say you didn't
 5
 6
     know anything about that until you were notified
     that you had been convicted?
 7
                   MR. MARCAVAGE:
                                    Exactly.
 8
                   THE COURT: And then you took an
 9
10
     appeal?
                   MR. MARCAVAGE:
11
                                    Yes.
12
                   THE COURT: And for some reason you
13
     thought this was an arraignment?
                   MR. MARCAVAGE:
14
                                    Yes.
                                The basis for your
15
                   THE COURT:
     request for a continuance is what?
16
                   MR. MARCAVAGE:
17
                                    On the understanding
     -- misunderstanding that this was an arraignment,
18
     and that this was not heard in the district court
19
20
     with my presence; therefore, I did not have an
21
     opportunity to plead guilty or not guilty or
22
     request a hearing.
23
                   THE COURT:
                                Well, you have an
24
     opportunity now. If you want to plead guilty, you
```

1 | can do it now.

MR. MARCAVAGE: Well, I'm pleading not guilty, your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, now you had the opportunity to plead not guilty, that takes care of that.

The fact that there was a hearing held in your absence is a non-event. Had you not been notified of it in time to file an appeal, that would have been a different story, but since you did find out about it in time, you filed the appeal, this is a hearing de novo, so the only issue is whether you are prepared to present your defense. If the only thing you're missing is the opportunity to subpoen Governor Rendell, you'll have to do something better, because we're not going to continue the matter for you to try to do something that isn't going to happen. What's next?

MR. MARCAVAGE: Well, understand I am not fully prepared.

THE COURT: Why is that?

MR. MARCAVAGE: Because I was under the understanding that this was an arraignment.

THE COURT: Well, fine, so if the matter is continued, what is it you're going to do to prepare yourself to defend?

MR. MARCAVAGE: I would like to file pretrial motions and also the opportunity to subpoena Governor Rendell. Those are the two requests.

THE COURT: Was Governor Rendell there? Is he a witness to this?

MR. MARCAVAGE: Yes. He's the one who had asked me to speak at his rally and is involved directly in this matter. Therefore, it's important that his presence or that he responds to the questions I present in order for me to defend myself in this matter. It is only right that the Court would allow me to take action on the subpoena.

THE COURT: Mr. Silow, what's the Commonwealth's position?

MR. SILOW: We are opposed to any continuance whatsoever in this matter, your Honor. The sergeant in this case has come out and made his appearance here today. We would ask --

THE COURT: What's the nature of your

evidence going to be? 1 2 Excuse me, your Honor? MR. SILOW: THE COURT: What is the nature of 3 your evidence going to be? 4 MR. SILOW: Testimony on behalf of my 5 witness. 6 THE COURT: Yes, but I have to have 7 some idea what it is to be able to judge --8 That he was creating a 9 MR. SILOW: disturbance during a public speaking engagement for 10 the now Governor Rendell, your Honor. 11 All right. Request 12 THE COURT: 13 denied. We'll proceed. Your Honor, I would 14 MR. MARCAVAGE: like the record to show that the defendant is not 15 fully prepared for trial today to represent 16 himself, to represent himself and to proceed would 17 be an issue raised by the defendant on appeal, if 18 19 necessary, to the Superior Court. THE COURT: Call your first witness, 20 21 please. Your Honor, I would first 22 MR. SILOW: 23 ask for sequestration.

THE COURT:

Excuse me?

| 1 | MR. SILOW: We would also ask for |
|------------|---|
| 2 | sequestration. |
| 3 | THE COURT: Of who? |
| 4 | MR. SILOW: If the defendant has any |
| 5 | witnesses, which I believe he does. |
| 6 | THE COURT: Do you have witnesses |
| 7 | here with you? |
| 8 | MR. MARCAVAGE: Yes, I do have |
| 9 | witnesses, your Honor. |
| . 0 | THE COURT: Request is denied. Let's |
| . 1 | go. |
| . 2 | MR. SILOW: We call Sergeant Sjostrom |
| . 3 | to the stand, your Honor. |
| 4 | COMMONWEALTH'S TESTIMONY |
| 5 | SERGEANT THOMAS SJOSTROM, |
| l 6 | S-J-O-S, as in Sam, T-R-O-M, having been duly |
| L 7 | sworn, was examined and testified as follows |
| l 8 | DIRECT EXAMINATION |
| L 9 | BY MR. SILOW: |
| 2 0 | Q. Sergeant, can you please state where |
| 2 1 | you're currently employed? |
| 2 2 | A. With the Phoenixville Borough Police |
| 2 3 | Department in Chester County, Pennsylvania. |
| 2 4 | Q. And how long have you been employed in |

1 | that capacity?

- A. About 13 and a half years.
- Q. And did you say that you were a sergeant?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Have you been an officer anywhere else before this?
 - A. No, I was not.
- Q. I would like to now direct your attention to May 19th of last year, 2002, around 3 p.m., and I believe it was a Sunday afternoon. What if anything significant happened that day that brought you into court here today?
- A. I'm a patrol sergeant. We were scheduled day shift that day. I was notified ahead of time of a democratic rally that was to take place at the Reeves Park, which is located at Third Avenue and Starr Street in Phoenixville.
- Q. If I may just interrupt you for a second. Is that in Chester County, Pennsylvania?
 - A. Yes, it is.
- Q. While you were at the park, did you come in contact with anybody in the courtroom that day that brought you into court here today?
- A. Yes, I did.

- Q. And can you please state what the person is wearing and where he is sitting for the record?
 - A. The defendant is wearing a black suit, light colored shirt.
 - Q. Where is he sitting?
 - A. At the defense table.

MR. SILOW: Let the record reflect that the witness did identify the defendant, your Honor.

THE COURT: Noted.

MR. SILOW: Thank you, your Honor.

BY MR. SILOW:

1

- Q. And what happened then?
- A. I had two bike officers assigned to the park for observation and any problems that may occur at this rally. They were under instructions that if anything was to happen they were to notify me immediately so I may respond to the scene.

I was notified, I did respond to the scene at that time.

- Q. What happened then?
- A. I did observe Mr. Marcavage to the rear of the benches where people were sitting. There were people on stage giving speeches. I did observe

- Mr. Marcavage standing on the rear of the bench, actually standing on the bench to the rear of the crowd, with a small microphone, and he was shouting through the microphone into the crowd.
- Q. Okay. And what did you do with the microphone -- excuse that. Strike that.

And what happened next?

- A. I also observed the crowd yelling back at him to stop his actions so they can proceed to hear the speech. There were other protestors also with signs, et cetera, to the back where Mr. Marcavage was standing. My concern, at that point, because the crowd was getting hostile towards

 Mr. Marcavage, and because of the fact that he was using a PA system or a small microphone to voice his opinion. I did approach Mr. Marcavage, I asked him to step down off the bench so I may proceed to talk to him.
 - Q. What happened then?
- A. I then asked him to stop using the microphone, if he wants to be heard -- to be here in a protest or a show of solidarity, solidarity with his other group, that's fine, but the PA system and the disruption has to stop.

- Q. And what did the defendant say, if anything, at this time?
 - A. He proceeded to give me an argument at that point in time. And basically I came down to the fact that if he continued to use the microphone and he continued to cause a disturbance, that he would be asked to leave the park.
 - Q. And did he stop at that time using the microphone?
 - A. Yes, he did.
 - Q. Did you later come in contact with the defendant that day?
 - A. Yes.

- O. And under what circumstances was that?
- A. After I observed for a while that things were calmed down, everything was okay, I did leave, and when Mr. Rendell arrived, I was called back to the scene.
 - Q. And why were you called back to the scene?
- A. I told my officers when Mr. Rendell got there to call me back, I wanted to be present.
- Q. Did you come in contact with the defendant at that time also?
- A. Yes, I did. Yes, I did.

Q. And what happened? Under what circumstances did you come in contact with the defendant?

- A. A few minutes into the -- to Mr. Rendell's speech, Mr. Marcavage was seen running up the center aisle of the benches, carrying a large sign, probably about three-foot-by-four-foot sign, and he was advancing in a quick motion towards Mr. Rendell while he spoke.
 - Q. What happened after that?
- A. The crowd became, again, angry with Mr. Marcavage's actions. One person in the crowd actually ran up and grabbed the sign and took off running. Mr. Marcavage continued towards Mr. Rendell, who was up on stage. And there's an area between the front of the benches and the stage, I'd say there's about a 20-foot area where nobody else was standing, and Mr. Marcavage advanced to that spot and in front of Mr. Rendell.
- Q. And was that marked off that you couldn't enter that area?
- A. No, it was not.
- Q. What happened next?
- A. At that time he proceeded, Mr. Marcavage

proceeded to yell and point at Mr. Rendell, insisting that he be heard, as Mr. Rendell was attempting to give a speech.

- Q. How did the crowd seem at this time?
- A. At that time the crowd continued to yell and get angry with Mr. Marcavage. Other protestors that were there weren't involved with Mr. Marcavage's actions.

At that point in time, I was about to approach and ask Mr. Marcavage to step away from the stage, when Mr. Rendell actually stopped, gave Mr. Marcavage an opportunity to speak. He actually leaned down and handed Mr. Marcavage the microphone. He said -- or whatever. He didn't actually address him as anything. He said, He has something to say, here, I'm going to give you a minute to talk, here's the microphone, it's yours.

Mr. Marcavage then proceeded to go on about an incident or incidents at the Phoenixville Hospital, and then after he got done saying what he had to say, he handed the microphone back to Mr. Rendell.

- Q. And what happened after that?
- A. Mr. Rendell said, Okay, are you done? And

then he proceeded to give his speech. He gave the man an opportunity to speak, he spoke, and then at that point Mr. Rendell was going to proceed with his speech. I actually thought that was going to be the end of it.

- Q. But was it the end of it?
- A. No, it was not.

- Q. What happened after that?
- A. When Mr. Marcavage felt that he was ignored, he then continued to yell into the crowd, yell at Mr. Rendell, and proceed to interrupt the speech.
 - Q. And was he using the bull horn at all?
- A. I don't recall if he was using the bull horn at that point in time. I know at one point one of my officers did confiscate the bull horn from him. We then approached Mr. Marcavage. We got close enough to talk to him to say, look, he needed to stop and leave the park at that point in time.

MR. SILOW: Can I have this marked as C-1, for identification purposes, your Honor.

(Whereupon, an item was marked, for identification, as Commonwealth's Exhibit C-1

Sjostrom - direct/cross

| 1 | at this time.) |
|-----|--|
| 2 | BY MR. SILOW: |
| 3 | Q. Sergeant, I'm now handing you what has |
| 4 | been marked as C-1, for identification purposes. |
| 5 | Do you recognize what I handed you? |
| 6 | A. Yes, I do. |
| 7 | Q. And what is that, if you know? |
| 8 | A. This is the loud speaker that he was using |
| 9 | that day. |
| 0 1 | MR. SILOW: I'll move for the |
| l 1 | admittance of C-1 into evidence at this time, |
| l 2 | your Honor. |
| l 3 | THE COURT: Any objection? |
| L 4 | MR. MARCAVAGE: No. |
| l 5 | THE COURT: It's admitted. |
| l 6 | MR. SILOW: No further questions at |
| l 7 | this time, your Honor. |
| 18 | THE COURT: Cross-examine. |
| 19 | CROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 2 0 | BY MR. MARCAVAGE: |
| 21 | Q. Officer Sergeant Sjostrom; is that |
| 2 2 | correct? |
| 2 3 | A. Yes. |
| 2.4 | THE COURT: Sir. do you want to |

| i I | |
|-----|--|
| 1 | remain at the table while you question, |
| 2 | please. |
| 3 | MR. MARCAVAGE: Yes, Sir. |
| 4 | THE COURT: Please sit down. |
| 5 | BY MR. MARCAVAGE: |
| 6 | Q. Did you receive any complaints from anyone |
| 7 | in the park? |
| 8 | A. Yes. |
| 9 | Q. Okay. Were these just general complaints |
| ١٥ | or were they specific people who complained to you |
| 11 | concerning my actions? |
| 12 | A. I had more than one person approach me and |
| 13 | complain about your actions. |
| 14 | Q. Did you record their names? |
| 15 | A. At that time, no, I did not. |
| 16 | Q. Why was it that you didn't think it was |
| 17 | necessary to record individuals who were |
| 18 | complaining about my speech? |
| 19 | A. Because at that point I was observing the |
| 20 | actions. |
| 21 | Q. How did you determine that the general |
| 2 2 | complaints were, the annoyance level exceeded the |
| 2 3 | law, the complaints that were made, how did you |

determine that the individuals were saying my

1 | speech was against the law?

- A. Could you rephrase the question, please?
- Q. Sure. What I'm trying to understand is, is there an annoyance level that needs to be met in order for you to make an arrest based on any law?
- A. We have disorderly conduct, which is unreasonable noise, and unreasonable noise can be anything that affects other people.
 - Q. Was I arrested under that particular law?
 - A. You were cited for disorderly conduct.
- Q. What do you understand disorderly conduct to be?
- A. Creating a hazardous condition. Causing annoyance to others.
- Q. Okay. Well, let me read Section 5503, disorderly conduct, Subsection (a): Offense defined: "A person is guilty of disorderly conduct if, with intent to cause public inconvenience, annoyance, or alarm or recklessly creating a risk thereof, he: No. 1, engages in fighting or threatening or in violent behavior.
 - No. 2: Makes unreasonable noise.
- No. 3: Uses obscene language or makes an obscene gesture.

Or, No. 4: Creates a hazardous or 1 physically offensive condition by any act which 2 serves no legitimate purpose of the actor." 3 According to the citation --4 MR. SILOW: I would like to object at 5 this time, your Honor. Is there a question 7 here, or --THE COURT: Well, he's finally 8 getting to it. If you had objected a little 9 bit ago, it might have helped, but I think he's 10 now getting to the question. 11 BY MR. MARCAVAGE: 12 13 The citation says --Q. THE COURT: Overruled. 14 15 BY MR. MARCAVAGE: -- I was charged with Section 5503 16 Subsection (a)(4), which would be: Creates a 17 hazardous or physically offensive condition by any 18 act which serves no legitimate purpose of the 19 actor." 20 So, Officer, I wanted to know why I 21 was not charged with Section 5503(a)(2), which is, 22 "Makes unreasonable noise."? 23

THE COURT: Do you want to object

| 1 | now? |
|----|---|
| 2 | MR. SILOW: Yes, objection. |
| 3 | THE COURT: Sustained. This isn't a |
| 4 | question of what you weren't charged with, it's |
| 5 | a question of what you were charged with, so it |
| 6 | doesn't matter why you weren't charged with |
| 7 | other offenses. Next question. |
| 8 | BY MR. MARCAVAGE: |
| 9 | Q. Sergeant, did I create a hazardous or |
| 10 | physically offensive condition by any act which |
| 11 | served no legitimate purpose of the actor? |
| 12 | A. Yes. |
| 13 | Q. And in what way did I do that? |
| 14 | A. Created a hazardous condition by creating |
| 15 | a hostile crowd towards your physical well-being. |
| 16 | Q. And did I create a physically offensive |
| 17 | condition? |
| 18 | A. I wouldn't say a physically offensive |
| 19 | condition, no. |
| 20 | Q. And would you say that my act had no |
| 21 | legitimate purpose? |
| 22 | A. Correct. |
| 23 | O Did you understand why I was there at the |

rally?

| 1 | A. Do I understand why you were there? |
|----|---|
| 2 | Q. Yes. |
| 3 | A. I had an idea. |
| 4 | Q. What was I speaking into the megaphone? |
| 5 | MR. SILOW: Objection, your Honor. |
| 6 | THE WITNESS: I don't recall |
| 7 | exactly. |
| 8 | MR. SILOW: That would be calling for |
| 9 | hearsay, your Honor. |
| 10 | THE COURT: Not at all. Why is it |
| 11 | hearsay? |
| 12 | MR. SILOW: Because it's made by |
| 13 | him. If he would like to testify to what he |
| 14 | said, your Honor, then he would have the |
| 15 | chance. |
| 16 | THE COURT: But he's being asked the |
| 17 | fact of what was said. |
| 18 | MR. SILOW: I thought he asked what I |
| 19 | said. |
| 20 | THE COURT: Yes. He was being asked, |
| 21 | what were the words that were being used. The |
| 22 | issue is, what were the words being used, not |
| 23 | whether they were true or not, not whether it's |
| | 11 |

a truthful statement, but the issue here would

be what words were used. That's not hearsay. 1 2 Overruled. Do you remember the question? Do you recall the words that the defendant used? 3 Not exactly, no. 4 THE WITNESS: BY MR. MARCAVAGE: 5 Is Reeves Park a public park? б 7 Α. Yes, it is. Officer, obviously, do you agree that we 8

have a constitutionally protected right of freedom

A. That's correct.

of speech?

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. Do you remember anything that I was shouting as you had stated in your previous testimony?
- A. I don't recall exactly what you were saying.
- Q. Did the speakers on the stage use a microphone to voice their opinion?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. And why was it that they were not arrested?
- A. They had previous permission from the Borough of Phoenixville to utilize the park for their purpose.

| 1 | Q. It is a public park? |
|----|---|
| 2 | A. That's correct. |
| 3 | Q. Did I ever let me just rephrase this |
| 4 | question here. |
| 5 | Was the person who grabbed the sign |
| 6 | from me arrested? |
| 7 | A. At that point we didn't identify that |
| 8 | person, no. |
| 9 | Q. Was he still at the rally? |
| 10 | A. I don't recall. |
| 11 | Q. Is there a reason the police didn't move |
| 12 | in to arrest the gentleman who took the sign from |
| 13 | me? |
| 14 | MR. SILOW: Objection, your Honor, I |
| 15 | don't see the relevance of this line of |
| 16 | questioning. |
| 17 | THE COURT: Sustained. |
| 18 | BY MR. MARCAVAGE: |
| 19 | Q. Does the law |
| 20 | THE COURT: Questions are for facts, |
| 21 | not to obtain this witness's opinions of the |
| 22 | law. |
| 23 | BY MR. MARCAVAGE: |
| 24 | Q. Sergeant, how did you determine that I |

intended to cause a public inconvenience, annoyance, or alarm? How was that determined on your behalf?

- A. When I first approached you, I warned you that if you continued to disrupt this gathering in the way that you're doing it, then you would be asked to leave the park. When I saw you approach the second time, then I knew you had intentions on disrupting that meeting.
- Q. Did you speak to me prior -- you said you spoke with me. And what did I say to you during that --
 - A. At which point?

- Q. After you had said that you had spoke with me and I stopped using the megaphone, I wanted to know what did I say to you in return? You said I created, you said, some kind of argument? I was arguing with you? What did I argue with you on?
- A. You refused to, at first, step down and stop talking on the loud speaker. It took me several times to get your attention for you to step down. When I asked you to stop using the loud speaker and stop disrupting the meeting, or the gathering, you continued to explain that you had

your specific rights of speech and that you were there for a specific purpose. And I advised you that was fine, that's not my intention. My intention was for you to do it peacefully and so it does not affect other people.

Q. So according to your own testimony you would say that I did inform you what my intent was.

THE COURT: He said what he said.

That's not a question. That's an argument. Do you have any more questions of this witness?

MR. MARCAVAGE: Yes, I do, Your

Honor.

THE COURT: How many?

MR. MARCAVAGE: Well, I do have several more here.

THE COURT: You have a few more minutes, at most, to cross-examine the witness.

BY MR. MARCAVAGE:

- Q. You said you heard Mr. Rendell offer me the microphone; is that correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Well, according to Section 5503, talking

| 1 | about creating a hazardous or physically offensive |
|-----|--|
| 2 | condition, do you think Mr. Rendell saw it that |
| 3 | way? If he would offer me a microphone |
| 4 | MR. SILOW: I would have to object. |
| 5 | THE COURT: Sustained. This witness |
| 6 | can't know what someone else is thinking. |
| 7 | Again, sir, if you want to question the |
| 8 | witness, the purpose of questioning is to |
| 9 | elicit facts. So you can ask him facts about |
| 10 | what happened, if you have any more questions |
| 11 | about that. |
| 12 | BY MR. MARCAVAGE: |
| 13 | Q. Did Mr. Rendell tell you or advise you |
| 14 | that he was annoyed or alarmed? |
| 15 | A. No. |
| 16 | Q. If Governor Rendell was annoyed or |
| 17 | alarmed, why would he ask |
| 18 | MR. SILOW: Once again, objection, |
| 19 | your Honor. |
| 20 | MR. MARCAVAGE: I didn't finish the |
| 2 1 | question, but we'll just skip that one. |
| 22 | BY MR. MARCAVAGE: |

Q. How did you determine that I was

physically offensive when the governor asked me to

23

speak for 60 seconds and handed me the microphone?

- A. Besides the fact that the crowd was becoming hostile towards you, Mr. Rendell's expressions at that point in time.
- Q. So you made the determination based on expressions?
- A. He interrupted -- you interrupted him, he stopped. He gave an expression of disgust. At that point we approached.
- Q. Did you consider that Mr. Rendell was physically offensive when he asked me to come and take the microphone and then I waited for his response? Why did you perceive Mr. Rendell's actions to be in a manner of physically offensive, he was physically offended by them?

MR. SILOW: I believe this has already been asked and answered, your Honor.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. MARCAVAGE:

Q. If the Governor Elect, now Governor, gives me permission to speak on his platform, how,
Officer, did you determine the governor's permission for me to speak serves no legitimate purpose?

| 1 | MR. SILOW: Objection, your Honor. |
|----|--|
| 2 | THE COURT: Sustained. |
| 3 | MR. SILOW: Thank you, your Honor. |
| 4 | BY MR. MARCAVAGE: |
| 5 | Q. Do you believe that my acts served no |
| 6 | legitimate purpose? |
| 7 | A. I don't understand your question. |
| 8 | Q. I'm just asking if you believe my acts |
| 9 | served no legitimate purpose? |
| 10 | A. The purpose that appeared to me was the |
| 11 | purpose of disrupting this meeting. So that was, |
| 12 | to me, your purpose. |
| 13 | MR. MARCAVAGE: I have no further |
| 14 | questions, your Honor. |
| 15 | THE COURT: Any redirect? |
| 16 | MR. SILOW: No further questions, |
| 17 | your Honor. The Commonwealth rests at this |
| 18 | time. |
| 19 | THE COURT: Thank you, you may step |
| 20 | down. Please watch your step. |
| 21 | (Witness excused.) |
| 22 | |
| 23 | THE COURT: All right. The defendant |
| 24 | has an opportunity to testify. If you have |

| 1 | witnesses you want to call on your own behalf, you |
|-----|---|
| 2 | may do that. |
| 3 | MR. MARCAVAGE: I would like to call |
| 4 | Linda Beckman to the stand, please. |
| 5 | MR. SILOW: The Commonwealth would |
| 6 | like to have an offer of proof of what Miss Beckman |
| 7 | is about to testify to, your Honor. |
| 8 | THE COURT: You'll just have to wait |
| 9 | and find out. |
| LO | DEFENDANT'S TESTIMONY |
| 11 | LINDA BECKMAN, B-E-C-K-M-A-N, |
| L 2 | having been duly sworn, was examined and |
| L 3 | testified as follows |
| L 4 | DIRECT EXAMINATION |
| ١5 | BY MR. MARCAVAGE: |
| ۱6 | Q. Good morning, Linda. |
| 17 | A. Good morning. |
| 18 | Q. I would like to ask you if you could tell |
| 19 | the Court briefly what happened on that day in |
| 2 0 | Reeves Park during the Rendell rally. What was the |
| 21 | purpose you were there and what happened? |
| 2 2 | MR. SILOW: Objection, your Honor. |
| 2 3 | THE COURT: Sustained. Sustained as |
| | |

to the purpose of why she was there. Who

cares? Well, it could go to bias, but I think, who cares. If your question is, what did she observe, she may answer that question.

BY MR. MARCAVAGE:

- Q. What did you observe in the park?
- A. Well, I observed not -- you know, there were other people there, Casey supporters in the back yelling also. They weren't talked to about disturbing the peace, or whatever, disorderly conduct. And I observed that Mr. Rendell did hand you the microphone, and you asked him a question, and then you stood back, you handed the mike back to him and stood back, and then waited for his response, which he didn't give you, and then the police just came on and dragged you away.
- Q. Did the police ever approach you and say you can't be here with your message? Did they ever tell you anything?

MR. SILOW: Objection, your Honor, I don't see what the grounds --

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. MARCAVAGE: Just one moment, your Honor.

(Pause.)

BY MR. MARCAVAGE:

- Q. Do you remember what Mr. Rendell said when he offered the microphone, anything of what he was saying?
- A. He said, to my knowledge, let's give him a chance. Give him --

MR. SILOW: Objection, your Honor, this is hearsay.

THE COURT: No, it isn't.

Overruled.

THE WITNESS: Give him a chance.

THE COURT: You'll have to brush up on hearsay. I'll give you a little course later, but we don't have time right now. When the issue is what words were spoken, whether they were true or not, when the issue is simply, as in a disorderly conduct case particularly, are the words offensive, it doesn't matter if they're true or not, it's just, what words are spoken.

If the fact at issue is what were the words that were used, then it as not hearsay because they're not being offered for the truth of the statement. So if the witness is being

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

asked to say what did somebody say not because what they said was true or not true, but because the issue in the case is what words were used or what words were used is relevant -- for instance, here the prosecution is contending that the words that were used had an incendiary effect. That's part of what you're trying to say here. Therefore, the words that are used is the relevant fact. And, as such, they're not being offered for the truth of what is being said. And, therefore, it's not even -- it's not hearsay. It's not a question of finding an exception, it's simply not hearsay because it's not being offered for the truth of the content of the words.

MR. SILOW: My belief was it was offered for the proof of what was said.

THE COURT: No, no. It is being offered for the proof of what was said, but not for the truth of the underlying statement. In other words, if the statement is, the sky is blue, and the issue is, what did the witness say, it doesn't matter if the sky is blue or isn't blue, it's what did the witness say.

| 1 | Good article in this month's ABA Journal. |
|-----|---|
| 2 | Commend it to your attention. I don't know |
| 3 | that this witness has much more of relevance to |
| 4 | add, however. |
| 5 | MR. MARCAVAGE: Can she answer that |
| 6 | question? |
| 7 | THE COURT: Who knows what the |
| 8 | question was? |
| 9 | MR. MARCAVAGE: I had asked what do |
| 10 | you remember Mr. Rendell speaking? |
| 11 | MR. SILOW: And may I object to the |
| 12 | relevance of that line of questioning. |
| 13 | THE COURT: What is the relevance of |
| 14 | what Mr. Rendell said? |
| 15 | MR. MARCAVAGE: Well, I think it's |
| 16 | important for the Court to understand this was |
| 17 | an invitation on behalf of Governor Elect |
| 18 | Rendell, and I am not able to produce |
| 19 | Mr. Rendell to testify for himself, therefore |
| 2 0 | the Court |
| 21 | THE COURT: What is the relevance of |
| 22 | what was said? |
| 23 | MR. MARCAVAGE: Well, it gives |
| 2 4 | evidence to the fact that I was offered to |

| 1 | speak. It wasn't I interrupted anything. |
|------------|---|
| 2 | THE COURT: That's not in dispute. |
| 3 | The officer already testified. Does this |
| 4 | witness have something different than what the |
| 5 | officer testified to about that part of the |
| 6 | incident? The testimony thus far is that the |
| 7 | then candidate handed you the microphone, said, |
| 8 | Here, say what you have to say, and you did, |
| 9 | and you gave the microphone back to |
| 0 | Mr. Rendell. Now, is this witness going to say |
| 1 | something different than that? |
| . 2 | MR. MARCAVAGE: Well, I don't know. |
| . 3 | THE COURT: Well, do you expect it? |
| 4 | MR. MARCAVAGE: I will just withdraw |
| 15 | the question, and we'll just proceed. |
| l 6 | THE COURT: Good. |
| L 7 | MR. MARCAVAGE: I have no further |
| L 8 | questions of this witness. |
| l 9 | THE COURT: Any questions of this |
| 20 | witness? |
| 2 1 | MR. SILOW: May I have one moment, |
| 2 2 | your Honor? |
| 2 3 | (Pause.) |
| 2.4 | MR. SILOW: No questions. |

M. Marcavage – direct

| 1 | your Honor. |
|------------|---|
| 2 | THE COURT: You may step down. |
| 3 | (Witness excused.) |
| 4 | |
| 5 | THE COURT: Any other witnesses? |
| 6 | MR. MARCAVAGE: I'm going to call |
| 7 | myself. |
| 8 | THE COURT: Yes, besides that, |
| 9 | anything else? |
| 10 | MR. MARCAVAGE: No. |
| 11 | THE COURT: Please take the stand. |
| 12 | MICHAEL MARCAVAGE, |
| 13 | M-A-R-C-A-V, as in Victor, A-G-E, having been |
| 14 | duly sworn, testified as follows |
| 15 | THE COURT: Go ahead. |
| 16 | DEFENDANT'S TESTIMONY |
| 17 | THE WITNESS: Your Honor, I'm here |
| 1.8 | today to defend myself in this matter, as you |
| 19 | know. I have some facts I need to provide |
| 20 | first, and that is the Pennsylvania Crimes |
| 2 1 | Code, Section 5503 |
| 2 2 | MR. SILOW: Objection, your Honor, he |
| 2 3 | is arguing the law here, I believe. It can go |
| 2 4 | toward argument, not during his testimony, your |

M. Marcavage - direct

1 Honor.

THE COURT: Well, it's a little hard to know what he's testifying to at this point.

Overruled. Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: I'll just briefly describe why I'm stating this. I was charged with Section 5503, Subsection (a)(4) of the Disorderly Conduct. I wasn't charged with any --

THE COURT: I understand what the charge is and I understand of what the offense occurred, of what the offense consists. Do you want to testify to facts.

THE WITNESS: In the public park, my purpose and intent was to preach the gospel of Jesus Christ. I am a street evangelist, and I have done this on many different occasions, and I was in a public park, in the back of the park, and was called to preach the gospel there on that day where the rally was.

There are, amongst myself, other people protesting various things, along with Casey supporters, in addition to that.

The police, I do not recall them

M. Marcavage - direct

б

approaching me, I'm not denying that they did to tell me that I needed to stop doing so, and they did say I did stop when they asked.

Sergeant Sjostrom did state that in his testimony.

I'm trying to describe to the Court today, my intent was to preach the word of God, to be obedient to God in accordance with my Christian faith, and to get a brief verbal message across to Governor Elect Rendell, now Governor. So the only intent I had there was not to cause public inconvenience. I wasn't trying to cause an annoyance or alarm, but these things did occur when the police engaged in violating my First Amendment rights to free speech.

In fact, even Mr. Rendell did offer me the opportunity, and since he's not here today, I cannot ask what he did say after I left the area, but I'm going to say what I remember him saying, and that is that the democratic party believes in free speech, and that is why we gave this young man an opportunity to speak here today. So

M. Marcavage - cross

Mr. Rendell, himself, even acknowledged this as a First Amendment activity.

I have to say that I was not in violation of Section 5503, Subsection (a)(4) because my act did serve a legitimate purpose, to preach the gospel of Jesus Christ. And that is all, your Honor.

THE COURT: Cross-examine.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. SILOW:

1.0

- Q. Mr. Marcavage, on that day in question you were using a bull horn to so-call preach your message; is that correct?
 - A. Yes, that is correct.
- Q. And you said you don't deny that the officers asked you to stop using the bull horn because you were causing a disturbance with the other listeners of the rally; is that correct?
- A. Yes. I was in the back, and they did approach me, I believe. I'm not denying that it did not happen.
- Q. And after you stopped for awhile, you continued to use the bull horn to preach your message of Jesus Christ; is that correct?

M. Marcavage - cross

A. No, I did not continue to use it.

- Q. Did you continue to voice your opinion in a very loud manner of your belief in Jesus Christ?
- A. During an opening, when Mr. Rendell was speaking, I did pose a question to him. That was part of my intent.
- Q. Did you happen to see the other people that were listening to now Governor Rendell's speech, did you happen to see what they were doing at this time?
- A. No, I did not. I did not see what they were doing.
- Q. You were asked to stop again, and you continued; is that correct?
 - A. No, I wasn't asked to stop again.
 - Q. When you were up at the stage?
- A. No, I wasn't asked to stop again. In fact, I just finished, and that's when the police came up and arrested me, after I gave the microphone back to Mr. Rendell, waited for his response, and as I waited for his response, the police came in and arrested me.
- Q. Isn't it true that after you gave

 Mr. Rendell back his bull horn or his microphone

M. Marcavage - cross

| 1 | that you continued to speak; is that correct, up |
|-----|--|
| 2 | front, without the microphone? |
| 3 | A. I asked him to answer my question, and |
| 4 | there was nothing else that was said, other than |
| 5 | waiting for his response. |
| 6 | MR. SILOW: No further questions at |
| 7 | this time, your Honor. |
| 8 | THE COURT: Anything further in |
| 9 | response to the questions that were just asked |
| 10 | of you? |
| 11 | THE WITNESS: No. |
| 12 | THE COURT: Thank you, you may step |
| 13 | down. |
| 14 | (Witness excused.) |
| 15 | - |
| 16 | THE COURT: Any other witnesses? |
| 17 | MR. MARCAVAGE: No, your Honor, there |
| 18 | are no other witnesses. |
| 19 | THE COURT: All right. You rest, |
| 20 | then? |
| 21 | MR. MARCAVAGE: Yes. |
| 22 | THE COURT: Any rebuttal testimony? |
| 23 | MR. SILOW: No, your Honor. |
| 2 4 | THE COURT: All right. |
| | |

MR. MARCAVAGE: I would like to make a closing statement, if that's permissible.

THE COURT: I had no doubt you would. You have three minutes. Go ahead.

1.3

MR. MARCAVAGE: Your Honor, my intent that day was to preach the word of God, to be obedient to God in accordance to my Christian faith, and to get a brief verbal message across to Governor Elect Rendell, now Governor. I believe that I have a constitutionally protected right to preach in the open air and to exercise my religious beliefs as a preacher of the gospel of Jesus Christ. I have a God-given responsibility that exceeds just mere public speech, because I am a minister of the gospel.

I'm going to read from Isaiah,
Chapter 58. "Cry aloud, spare not, lift up thy
voice like a trumpet, and show my people their
transgression and the house of Jacob their sins."

Preaching is not mere speaking or talking, it is a forceful verbal delivery of a specific religious truth. By public preaching I am called to cry out loud. It is like sounding an alarm and a warning that compels people to accept

or reject my message.

I'm going to now read from Romans,
Chapter 10. "How shall they hear? How then shall
they call on him in whom they have not believed?
and how shall they believe in him of whom they have
not heard? and how shall they hear without a
preacher? and how shall they preach, except they
be sent? as it is written. How beautiful are the
feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and
bring glad tidings of good things."

The Commonwealth must offer evidence to show that the defendant's actions showed no legitimate purpose, and has failed to do so today. My First Amendment right to exercise free speech was violated. Even Mr. Rendell saw my act as a matter of free speech, as he stated to the people there at the rally, and also quoted in the Phoenixville newspaper. I ask that I be acquitted based simply on a matter of law on these charges. I have nothing else, your Honor.

MR. SILOW: Your Honor, the Commonwealth would ask --

THE COURT: Mr. Silow, now that you're an expert on the law of hearsay, let's see

```
1
     how your First Amendment knowledge is.
 2
                   MR. SILOW:
                                Your Honor, we'll see how
 3
     that is, yes.
                   THE COURT:
 4
                                Excuse me?
 5
                   MR. SILOW:
                                I said, we will see how
     my First Amendment knowledge is.
 б
                                You know where we're
 7
                   THE COURT:
     going.
 8
                   MR. SILOW:
                                Your Honor, the
 9
10
     Commonwealth has shown, by testimony from Sergeant
     Sjostrom, that he's created a hazardous condition.
11
     He was annoying the listeners of Governor Rendell's
12
13
     speech.
              They were getting verbally --
                                That's what he was there
14
                   THE COURT:
15
             That's exactly what he wanted to do, isn't
     to do.
     it?
16
                   MR. SILOW:
17
                                Yes, your Honor; however,
18
     there is a section --
19
                    THE COURT: He would have been
     disappointed if they weren't annoyed.
20
21
                   MR. SILOW: He was asked numerous
22
     times to stop speaking because he was hindering
23
     people's listening of the speech.
24
     misdemeanor under 5508, disrupting a meeting or
```

session, that if he continued to do so he would be 1 found --2 THE COURT: Under (a)(4)? 3 Well, this is actually 4 MR. SILOW: 5508, actually. 5 6 THE COURT: But he's not charged with a violation of 5508. 7 MR. SILOW: Well, that's correct, 8 your Honor, but there is --9 10 THE COURT: He's charged with a violation of 5503(a)(4). Indeed that actually sort 11 of cuts against you, doesn't it, because if you 12 have a specific crime, you should be charged with 13 And the fact that a specific offense exists 14 implies that another charge is not intended to 15 cover that same specific offense. I wasn't aware 16 of 5508, but, what are you arguing, he violated 17 5508 so he should be found guilty of 5503? 18 MR. SILOW: Well, 5503, your Honor, 19 (a)(4), Creates a hazardous or physically offensive 20 21 condition, as also testified by Sergeant Sjostrom 22 that --THE COURT: Well, maybe you want to

quickly address the main defense, which is that the

23

1 defendant contends it served a legitimate purpose. 2 MR. SILOW: We believe that the only purpose that he was sent there -- there was no 3 4 legitimate purpose to his speaking out, your 5 Honor. THE COURT: Whoa, whoa, whoa, what 6 7 basis do you argue that, you personally don't find it to have been legitimate, or the sergeant, or 8 9 me? 10 MR. SILOW: No, the sergeant did not, and also based upon the fact that he was given his 11 opportunity to speak and also continued on 12 afterwards, as testified, and created a hindrance 13 14 to now Governor Rendell's ability to speak. 15 THE COURT: Don't you think that's enough punishment for the man, Rendell got 16 elected? 17 I don't believe so, your 18 MR. SILOW: 19 Honor. He's got to live with 20 THE COURT: that now for at least four years. Anything else? 21 22 MR. SILOW: No, your Honor. 23 THE COURT: Nice job, but it doesn't 24 fly. The offensiveness of the speech, if it were,

and I'm not called upon to rule upon whether it was or it wasn't, cannot be used to stifle a person from speaking. And this evidence doesn't overcome the latitude that has to be given of somebody exercising their First Amendment rights in a public And if other people are annoyed, that's, forum. basically, they're the ones who ought to be controlled. It's not that I'm not sympathetic to the horrendous problems this creates for police at a public gathering and the potential for terrible I understand that. But that can't be used as a mechanism, the criminal law, under these circumstances, can't be used as a mechanism for truncating First Amendment rights. The First Amendment just trumps the law here. And that's the reason why that phrase is put into the Disorderly Conduct Statute, to try to save it from unconstitutionality. And whether one agrees or doesn't agree with the message, doesn't and can't control whether it's a legitimate message. Legitimate has to be given a much broader reading than that. Is it a message that some rational person could believe to be a message that ought to be delivered? I know the defendant apparently

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

skipped over the part about love thigh neighbor.

It's in that book there somewhere, too, and some other parts, but it really doesn't matter. This is classic. It's a political rally, and if ever there's going to be a place where First Amendment rights have to be protected, this is it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I just know that too many cases would say that, under these circumstances, they are very unrealistic, I'm afraid, in many circumstances, concerning the limitations on the manpower of local police departments, but the law would say you just have to do what you have to do to protect the combatants from injuring each other. I have to say that in this case, too, remember that the officer's testimony was that he was using a bull horn. There's no testimony to indicate that subsequently he continued to use that. The officer didn't remember, the defendant says he did not. offense, if it occurred, was not at the time when he was using the artificial voice enhancer, because the officer said, he stepped down, he walked away, and he hoped it was over. So this was a continuation, something that happened a little bit There's no evidence that other than when he

was handed the microphone by the speaker at the rally that he enhanced his voice. I won't go on.

There also really isn't much evidence to sustain the fact that probably what the officers did prevented a situation from getting ugly, and maybe in that sense it's a good thing they did what they did, but it doesn't rise to the level of a criminal charge of disorderly conduct.

Accordingly, I find the defendant not quilty. And, once again, as with Mr. O'Leary, we have to recognize that the Court is not here to do what the Court's own personal feelings might or might not dictate. The Court is here to follow the law, and that's what we do. The defendant is found not quilty. If you will hand the yellow sheet to the District Attorney and the other two to the defendant.

(Hearing concluded at this time.)

21

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23