

The Steven Avery Proof of Guilt Challenge

The Proof of Guilt Challenge: We are so convinced that you will fail at answering the following 100 questions that we will offer an award of \$10,000 to anyone who fully answers all 100 questions based upon credible evidence that establishes Mr. Avery's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

Over the last 19 months, we have heard and read numerous claims that Steven Avery is guilty of the murder of Teresa Halbach. Without exception, the authors of these claims simply do not know the facts of the case nor do they address the most blatant discrepancies in the State's case against Mr. Avery. The Proof of Guilt Challenge is specifically designed to elicit from these commentators credible evidentiary support for their opinion that Mr. Avery is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

Rules: Anyone (including journalists, legal commentators, students, or the public) is eligible. All 100 questions must be fully answered referencing transcripts, evidence, and experiments which establish Mr. Avery's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. All submissions must identify the participant's name, address, and driver's license number. No submissions containing ad hominem attacks, vulgar language, or conclusions with no supporting evidence will be considered. We reserve the right to make the final determinations as to whether anyone has successfully answered all 100 questions and is entitled to the \$10,000 reward.

Answers should be submitted to the following email: attorneys@zellnerlawoffices.com.

1. Explain why, if Mr. Avery was "actively bleeding" from his finger, as Mr. Kratz told the jury, there are only 6 spots of his blood in the RAV-4.
2. Explain why Mr. Avery's blood is not on any of the objects in the car that he would have grasped with his hands which would have also resulted in him leaving his fingerprints.
3. Explain why Mr. Avery's blood was not present on the following items:
 - a. The key to the RAV-4;
 - b. The driver's door handle;
 - c. The rear passenger door handle;
 - d. The steering wheel;
 - e. The gear shift;
 - f. The hood prop;

- g. The brake release; and
 - h. The driver's seat release bar.
4. Explain why there are no fingerprints of Mr. Avery in or on the RAV-4 but, according to the prosecution, there is blood from his actively bleeding finger present in 6 spots, 5 of which are in the front of the vehicle and 1 on the rear passenger door jamb. *Note that Ms. Halbach's fingerprints are on the driver's door handle and 8 latent prints are identified on the vehicle, none of which matched Mr. Avery, thereby ruling out that the car was wiped clean of fingerprints.
 5. Why were the fingerprints of Lt. Lenk, Sgt. Colborn, and other potential suspects never compared to the 8 latent fingerprints in the following places: two on the rear passenger windows (TT:3/7/07:142-144), three on the pillar to the left side of the rear window above the taillight assembly (TT:3/7/07:143), one on the side of the wheel cover (TT:3/7/07:143), one next to where the key is inserted into the cargo gate (TT:3/7/07:143), one on the hood which would be left by someone trying to open the hood (TT:3/7/07:144). Note: Mr. Avery is ruled out from all the fingerprints in and on the vehicle.
 6. Explain why repeatedly putting the key (10 times) in the ignition with a bloody middle finger on the right hand failed to produce any blood smear similar to the one noted by the ignition, but applying blood with an applicator produced exactly the same bloodstain pattern as that noted by the ignition. (Trial Exhibit 291). Note that the blood smear was 2.25 inches to the right of the ignition, making it impossible to deposit blood on the dash where the blood smear was deposited. (Crime Scene Photo with Ruler).
 7. If Mr. Avery was planning to kill Ms. Halbach, why would he schedule an appointment with AutoTrader that could be traced to him (and was traced to him (SAO2486)) because the Janda and Avery AutoTrader accounts were linked by phone number and address.
 8. If Mr. Avery was planning to kill Ms. Halbach, why wouldn't Mr. Avery have called Ms. Halbach's cell phone, which she had given him, and arranged a meeting with her at a different location that couldn't be traced to him. *Note that at that time, Ms. Halbach's cell phone records did not

show the phone numbers for incoming calls so Mr. Avery's incoming call would not have been identified in Ms. Halbach's cell phone records.

9. Why would Ms. Halbach have given Mr. Avery her cell phone number and called him on October 10 (as her cell phone records indicate) if she was afraid of him?
10. Why would Ms. Halbach have returned to the Avery property on October 31 if she was afraid of Mr. Avery as the prosecution claimed?
11. Why is there no forensic evidence (*e.g.*, blood, hair, skin cells, fingerprints) of Ms. Halbach in Mr. Avery's trailer if she was raped and stabbed there?
12. Explain why not even a fragment of Ms. Halbach's hair was found in Mr. Avery's trailer or garage, when Brendan Dassey described cutting her hair.
13. If you believe that Ms. Halbach was killed in the trailer and that Mr. Avery and Brendan Dassey cleaned up the trailer so thoroughly as to remove any forensic trace of Ms. Halbach, identify the specific cleaning products and chemicals that could have been used to remove all traces of forensic evidence (blood, hair, skin cells, etc.).
14. What proof is there that Mr. Avery owned or purchased any of the specific cleaning products that you identified in question 13 at any time before the murder? (Receipts, bottles, etc.).
15. What specific evidence was there of a clean up in the trailer or the garage (*e.g.*, chemical residue, wipe marks, diluted stains)?
16. If Ms. Halbach was handcuffed to the bed with Mr. Avery's handcuffs, why is her DNA not present on the handcuffs but other individuals' DNA was on the handcuffs?
17. Describe any forensic process (known anywhere in the world) which would remove one person's DNA from an object (such as the handcuffs) but leave someone else's DNA on the object.
18. Why, if Ms. Halbach was handcuffed to the bed and brutally raped, were there no striations on the post mounted 2.5 feet above the mattress on the headboard?
19. What would be the point of Mr. Avery using *67 to allegedly conceal his identity if his *67 calls are documented in his phone records along with Ms. Halbach's phone number? (STATE1582).

20. Explain how Ms. Halbach, on 10/31, was unwittingly “lured” to the Avery salvage yard when she was given the “**Avery Road**” address for the appointment and she had been to Avery Road no fewer than 5 times previously.
21. Explain how Ms. Halbach, on 10/31, was unwittingly “lured” to the Avery salvage yard when Ms. Halbach told Dawn Pliszka of AutoTrader in a 2:27 p.m. call that she was on her way to the Avery Property.
22. Explain how Ms. Halbach, on 10/31, was unwittingly “lured” to the Avery salvage yard when there is a large sign that reads “Avery’s Auto Salvage” at the entrance to the property on Highway 147. Did Ms. Halbach have her eyes closed as she drove down Avery Road?
23. If Ms. Halbach were afraid of Mr. Avery, why did she allegedly confirm with Dawn Pliszka at 2:27 p.m. on 10/31 that she was driving to the Avery salvage yard for her appointment?
24. Explain why Ms. Halbach’s sub-key was not discovered in Mr. Avery’s bookcase by Sgt. Colborn on November 5 when he searched the bookcase for 1.5 hours.
25. Provide any re-enactment videos or photographs, conducted with a similar bookcase, which demonstrate that Ms. Halbach’s sub-key could have been dislodged by the “none too gentle” twisting and turning of the bookcase, fallen through the gap between the back panel and the frame of the bookcase, and landed by Mr. Avery’s slippers located on the northwest **side** of the bookcase. (Trial Exhibit 210).
26. Explain why, if Sgt. Colborn twisted and turned the bookcase, all of the loose change and other items on top of the bookcase remained in place and did not fall to the floor. (Trial Exhibit 208, 209).
27. Explain why Ms. Halbach was using a sub-key (RAV-4 Manual) and not the master key which she is holding in a photograph of her with the RAV-4. (Trial Exhibit 5).
28. Explain why Ms. Halbach’s DNA was not on her sub-key, which prosecutors claim she used every day, but Mr. Avery’s DNA was on the sub-key.
29. Describe and identify any experiments that you have conducted with a similar sub-key in which you have been able to remove the primary

owner's DNA and substitute another individual's full DNA profile by simply having that individual hold the key in their hand.

30. Or, in the alternative, describe any experiments with an exemplar sub-key and blood in which the blood of one individual concealed the DNA of another individual on the exemplar sub-key.
31. If you successfully perform this experiment, explain why the blood that was used to conceal the other individual's DNA would not be detectable, as none of Mr. Avery's blood was detected on the sub-key by the Wisconsin State Crime Lab.
32. Provide an explanation of how Mr. Avery was able to leave his full DNA profile on the key from his skin cells only and to mask any DNA of Ms. Halbach left on her sub-key.
33. Provide an explanation of why a microscopic examination of Ms. Halbach's sub-key revealed an abundance of debris which ruled out that the sub-key had been used frequently.
34. Why would Mr. Avery leave his full DNA profile on Ms. Halbach's sub-key when he had allegedly successfully removed all forensic traces of Ms. Halbach from his bedroom?
35. Why would Mr. Avery keep Ms. Halbach's sub-key when he could move Ms. Halbach's vehicle to the crusher by using a frontloader, making it unnecessary to start the vehicle's engine with a key?
36. Explain why Mr. Avery would not have crushed Ms. Halbach in her vehicle rather than burning her body in an open fire pit 30 yards from his trailer at 7:30-11:00 p.m. when family members were coming and going and approaching the fire.
37. Why doesn't any Avery family member describe the distinct smell of a burning body on October 31?
38. Why do Mr. Avery and Brendan Dassey allegedly leave Ms. Halbach's body burning in the burn pit, in plain sight, while they drive Ms. Halbach's vehicle to the southeast corner of the Avery salvage yard?
39. Why would Mr. Avery so thoroughly clean up every speck of forensic evidence in his trailer and the garage but leave 6 easily-detectable blood spots of his in the RAV-4?

40. Explain why the prosecution claims that, after Mr. Avery shot Ms. Halbach on his garage floor, he put her body into, and then removed it from, the RAV-4.
41. Why did the prosecution have 2 inconsistent theories in the Avery and Dassey trials about the cause of death? (Avery = gunshot to the head; Dassey = stabbing and throat cut).
42. Explain how the prosecution acted in good faith when it changed its theory of the murder by moving all of the events of the crime to the garage, after the Wisconsin Crime Lab could not detect any forensic evidence in the trailer. (*Dassey v. Dittmann*, 860 F.3d 933 (7th Cir. 2016), footnote 13).
43. Explain why Brendan's confession is so similar to the fictional story in James Patterson's book/movie "Kiss The Girls," which Brendan admitted to reading and/or watching. Is this just an amazing coincidence?
44. Explain how Mr. Kratz recently denied that the two bullets found on the garage floor went through Ms. Halbach's head when he told the jury that Ms. Halbach was killed on the garage floor when she was shot twice in the head. Note: Kratz's proof that Ms. Halbach was shot twice in the head, according to him at Mr. Avery's trial, was that "**two bullets were found**," referring to the bullet fragments found on Mr. Avery's garage floor.
45. Explain why the bullet fragment (Item FL) has wood, but no bone, embedded in it if it entered and exited Ms. Halbach's skull and landed on the garage floor.
46. Explain why the bullet fragment (Item FL), which Mr. Kratz claimed had Ms. Halbach's DNA on it, did not have detectable blood on it if it entered and exited Ms. Halbach's skull.
47. Identify in the trial transcripts where Mr. Kratz tells the Avery jury that the bullet fragment Item FL, which had Ms. Halbach's DNA on it, entered any part of her body other than her skull.
48. Explain how the bullet fragment (Item FL) got red paint on it by being shot through Ms. Halbach's skull and landing on the garage floor without any evidence of having ricocheted off any items that were painted red.
49. Identify any evidence that would establish that the bullet fragment (Item FL) exited the skull of Ms. Halbach (in light of Mr. Kratz's recent

statements that it is very unlikely that a .22 would have sufficient power to exit the skull).

50. Explain how the bullet fragment, if it did not enter and exit the skull, entered and exited a vital organ of the body but left no evidence of organ cells on the bullet fragment.
51. Explain how the bullet fragment (Item FL) has wood embedded in it if there were no bullet holes in the garage wall in the area where it was found.
52. Explain the trajectory of the bullet that resulted in wood and paint being embedded in fragment FL but not bone.
53. Explain why Mr. Kratz never told the jury about the bullet trajectory that accounted for the wood and paint on Item FL.
54. Explain how the size of the entrance skull defect is consistent with a .22 caliber bullet and not any other caliber bullet.
55. Explain how Steven and Brendan removed all traces of forensic evidence from the garage. Describe the cleaning solutions and chemicals used to accomplish this feat.
56. Explain why the bullet fragments were not discovered in the earlier searches of the garage.
57. Why, if Mr. Avery removed the forensic evidence of Ms. Halbach from his garage, did he leave his own DNA in the garage?
58. If Mr. Avery removed the forensic evidence of Ms. Halbach from his garage, how did he distinguish between his DNA and Ms. Halbach's DNA?
59. Explain why the creeper, which the State claimed Mr. Avery used to transport Ms. Halbach's bloody body, had no forensic evidence of Ms. Halbach on it.
60. Why would Steven and Brendan carry Ms. Halbach's body from the trailer to the garage but then decide to place her on the creeper to roll her to the burn pit 15 yards away?
61. Why wouldn't Mr. Avery dispose of Ms. Halbach's body somewhere other than his burn pit which was 30 yards from his back door between 7:30 and 11:00 p.m.?
62. If Mr. Avery cleaned his garage so thoroughly, why did he leave the bullet fragments on the floor?

63. Explain how the prosecution's blood spatter expert was correct in describing the blood on the inside rear cargo door was impact blood rather than cast-off blood.
64. Explain why there is not more of Ms. Halbach's blood on the carpet of the RAV-4 cargo area when the prosecution never claimed that Ms. Halbach was placed on a tarp.
65. Explain why the prosecution failed to tell the jury that Ms. Halbach's bloodstain pattern in the rear cargo area demonstrated that the RAV-4 was moving while Ms. Halbach's body was in the rear cargo compartment.
66. Explain why the bullet fragment (Item FL) had no garage dust on it even though the concrete in the garage was jackhammered and all other items in the garage were covered in dust as the crime scene photographs illustrate.
67. Explain why the prosecution contended that the RAV-4 could not have been driven onto the Avery property from the Radandt pit despite at least 4 entry points from the Radandt pit onto the Avery Salvage Yard.
68. Explain why a civilian, Ryan Hillegas, was allowed to lead the search party on November 5, 2005?
69. Explain why only Pamela Sturm was given a camera and allowed onto the Avery salvage yard on November 5 when the other searchers were sent to other locations not on the Avery property.
70. Provide an explanation (other than by divine intervention) of how Ms. Sturm and her daughter could have located Ms. Halbach's vehicle within 20 minutes among the 4,000 vehicles on 26.9 acres of the Avery salvage yard if they had not been told where the car was located prior to their search.
71. Explain why Pamela Sturm was the only searcher provided with a camera by Mr. Hillegas.
72. Explain why Ryan Hillegas was never questioned about the 21 unknown phone calls he received on November 4 between 3:45 p.m. and 7:25 p.m.
73. Explain how Steven and Brendan could be the killers when unidentified blood deposits on the rear cargo door excluded both of them.
74. Explain why Ryan Hillegas accessed Teresa Halbach's Cingular account at 5:48 p.m., before the investigators arrived at Ms. Halbach's residence.

75. Why was the Cingular account accessed a second time at 7:18 p.m. when Mr. Hillegas was not present?
76. Why didn't the investigators investigate that Ms. Halbach had appointments in Sheboygan on the morning of 10/31?
77. Why did Ryan Hillegas and Scott Bloedorn tell the investigators that Mr. Bloedorn did not have a romantic relationship with Ms. Halbach?
78. Why did Ryan Hillegas claim that Scott Bloedorn called him about Ms. Halbach being missing when the phone records show that Mr. Hillegas called Scott Bloedorn first at 2:19 p.m.?
79. Why did Ryan Hillegas claim to be with Kelly Pitzen at Ms. Halbach's house on November 3 all afternoon until midnight or 1 a.m. when Pitzen called him at 5:16 p.m. and Ryan called Pitzen at 7:18 p.m.?
80. Why did Ryan Hillegas testify inconsistently that he went to Ms. Halbach's house once a week and that he went to Ms. Halbach's house three nights in a row?
81. If the original burn site for Ms. Halbach's body was the Avery burn pit, why are 60% of the bones and all of the teeth but one missing? Why are bone fragments found in the grass several feet from the burn pit? Why is the suspected human pelvic bone from the Radandt pit never microscopically examined? Why are the bones not melded into the wire in the burn pit? Why is the skeleton not in the normal anatomical position described at other open pit cremations?
82. Why did the missing person poster describing Ms. Halbach's vehicle not describe the front-end damage to the parking light if the damage existed prior to her disappearance?
83. Explain why Scott Bloedorn, who claimed Ms. Halbach was never gone overnight, never reported her missing?
84. Why do the investigators not discover who had possession of Ms. Halbach day planner?
85. Why does Mr. Kratz tell the jury that the RAV-4 is not visible on the flyover video on November 4 because it is covered in branches when the edited flyover video given to the defense does not show the area where the RAV-4 was located?
86. Why does the microscopic examination of the hood latch swab fail to reveal any evidence that the swab ever touched a hood latch?

87. Explain the exact evidence that excluded Ryan Hillegas as a potential suspect.
88. Explain the exact evidence that excluded Scott Bloedorn as a potential suspect.
89. Explain the exact evidence that excluded Bobby Dassey as a potential suspect.
90. Explain the exact evidence that excluded Scott Tadych as a potential suspect.
91. Explain the relevance of the other acts evidence repeatedly mentioned by Mr. Kratz in post-conviction interviews, since the evidence was excluded from the trial by Judge Willis as having zero probative value.
92. Explain why 60% of Ms. Halbach's remains were missing from the burn pit including all but one of her teeth, if the pit was the primary burn site.
93. Explain why the CD recording of Ms. Halbach's call to the Zipperers' answering machine at 2:13 p.m. was never turned over to the defense and is now missing from the prosecution's case file.
94. Explain why Mr. Hillegas was not asked by the investigators to provide an alibi.
95. Explain why Mr. Bloedorn was not asked by the investigators to provide his DNA.
96. Explain why Scott Tadych was not asked to provide his DNA or fingerprints to the police.
97. Explain why Mr. Hillegas was not asked by the investigators to provide his DNA.
98. Explain why Mr. Hillegas was not asked by the investigators to provide his fingerprints.
99. Explain why Mr. Hillegas told the investigators a false story that the Halbach family told Mr. Hillegas that Ms. Halbach had damaged the driver's side parking light of her vehicle, made an insurance claim, received compensation, but had not used the proceeds to repair the parking light.
100. Explain why the following statements by Mr. Kratz are true, in light of the evidence refuting these statements:

Kratz Quote	Refutation
<p>“Beginning six years after the trial, in January 2013, Steven Avery and I exchanged a series of letters. He knew that I was no longer a DA and no longer represented the state, and he invited me to visit him at the prison in Boscobel, Wisconsin.” <u>Avery</u> at 164-165.</p>	<p>Although Mr. Kratz does not specify who initiated their correspondence, the record is clear that Mr. Kratz wrote to Mr. Avery first with a letter dated January 14, 2013. In this letter, Mr. Kratz asked Steven to meet with him “for [Mr. Kratz’s] own personal use.” In fact, Mr. Kratz has not produced any correspondence from Steven Avery wherein Steven invited Mr. Kratz to visit him. Rather, Mr. Kratz invited himself with the intention, later revealed in his letter dated September 6, 2015, of writing a book about Steven.</p>
<p>“Steven [Avery] calls to tell <i>Auto Trader</i> employees that Teresa never showed up on October 31st, but that she called to tell him she couldn’t make it. He asked that they reschedule the appointment.” <u>Avery</u> at 163.</p>	<p>Investigators concluded that Steven Avery did not call AutoTrader between 4:30 and 5:00 p.m. on November 3. (STATE5509-5514).</p>
<p>“Steven [Avery] tells Scott Bloedorn, Teresa’s roommate, that Teresa ‘never showed up’ for her appointment on October 31st, and is upset that he was even contacted in connection with the disappearance.” <u>Avery</u> at 163.</p>	<p>Scott Bloedorn called Steven Speckman, not Steven Avery, on 11/3 at 4:10 p.m. (STATE5509-5514).</p>

<p>“Without Brendan’s statement as to where the murder occurred, the investigators would never have gotten a search warrant and found that bullet.” <u>Avery</u> at 108.</p>	<p>The magic bullets were magically found during a search on March 1, 2006, after Brendan’s confession. However, law enforcement had previously searched the garage 5 times between November 5 and 12, 2005. Mr. Kratz is correct in saying that law enforcement would not have found the damaged bullet if not for the March 1, 2006 coerced statements of Mr. Dassey. Most importantly, Brendan’s statements about where the murder occurred are entirely inconsistent. Brendan first described shooting Ms. Halbach outside the garage, then inside the vehicle in the garage, and, finally, on the garage floor (only after being told about the shell casings in the garage). The Seventh Circuit Opinion stated that there were clear efforts by the interrogators “to have Dassey move all of the events to the garage, as no forensic evidence was found in Avery’s trailer.” (<i>Dassey v. Dittmann</i> at 68).</p>
<p>“[Brendan] describes the horrible smell of a burning body — a smell that those unfortunate enough to experience can tell you they will never forget.” <u>Avery</u> at 106.</p>	<p>In his May 13, 2006, interrogation, Brendan said only that the fire smelled “real bad.” Before, when asked if he could smell burning body parts, Brendan told Fassbender and Wiegert that he could not. Brendan</p>

	<p>does not describe “the horrible smell of a burning body.”</p>
<p>“The rape was initially reported to authorities by the girl’s mother; the girl herself only agreed to cooperate with prosecutors after Avery was safely locked up for the Halbach murder the following fall.” <u>Avery</u> at 35.</p>	<p>These allegations were investigated by the Calumet County Sheriff’s Department in 2004 after they were reported by the girl’s mother. The complaint was unfounded because the alleged victim denied any sexual contact with Steven. The only credible investigation declared that these allegations were unfounded. According to Mr. Kratz, the alleged victim agree to cooperate with prosecutors after Mr. Avery’s detention. This is a misstatement. The alleged victim did cooperate, <i>i.e.</i>, agree to be interviewed, with investigators when the allegations were investigated in 2004. While cooperating with the investigation at that time, the alleged victim denied any sexual contact with Mr. Avery and the investigators concluded that the allegations were unfounded.</p>
<p>“. . . officers jackhammered chunks of concrete out of [Steven Avery’s garage] floor, looking for blood that might have soaked through the cracks Analysts did follow-up tests to more precisely identify the substance as human blood, but in this case those tests came back</p>	<p>Here, Kratz conflates three sets of evidence collected from Steven Avery’s garage: ten swabs from stains on the garage floor taken on November 6, 2005, and sixteen chunks of concrete from the garage floor jackhammered on March 1, 2006, and numerous swabs from the concrete</p>

inconclusive. No expert would be willing to testify that blood was present in Avery's garage in great quantities." Avery at 88.

floor of the garage collected on October 4, 2006. **There is no evidence that suggests, as does Mr. Kratz, that swabs from the jackhammered chunks were analyzed for the presence of blood.** Mr. Avery's DNA was identified on one of those swabs and **Ms. Halbach's DNA was not identified on any of the swabs.** The ten swabs taken on November 6 were sent to the crime lab, where nine of them tested positive for the presence of blood. **Further, six of those swabs yielded Steven Avery's DNA profile.** Mr. Kratz's assertion that the stains on the garage floor tested inconclusive for the presence of blood is false. Mr. Avery's blood was present in the garage in sufficient quantity to yield his DNA profile. **None of Ms. Halbach's blood was detected in the garage.** If Ms. Halbach was shot in the head in the garage, her blood would be detectable in the garage. If Mr. Avery had sufficiently cleaned the garage so as to destroy every trace of Ms. Halbach's DNA, he would have cleaned up his own blood. STATE 5244-46; 5648. In fact, the State's DNA analyst, Sherry Culhane, testified consistently with this analysis. TT:2/26:112-115.

<p>“In fact, Avery not only doesn’t mention the fire, he denies even having a ‘burn pit,’ and then eventually allows that he has one, but that nothing had been burned in it for two weeks.” <u>Avery</u> at 38.</p>	<p>Steven Avery, when asked if any of the garbage in the salvage yard pit was burned “in burn barrels or open pits,” replied: “Not in the pit, no.” Steven Avery readily admitted that there were burning barrels in the residential areas on the Avery property and that the last time he used his burning barrel was about two weeks earlier when he burned regular garbage. Clearly, Mr. Kratz is mischaracterizing Mr. Avery’s statement. The Averys did not burn garbage in the business or salvage yard areas of the property; they did, however, burn garbage near their homes. Marinette County Interview 11/6/05.</p>
<p>“When [Scott] Bloedorn called Steven Avery on Thursday, November 3rd to ask about <i>his</i> appointment with Teresa, Avery said she’s never shown up.” <u>Avery</u> at 10.</p>	<p>Steven Avery never spoke with Teresa’s roommate, Scott Bloedorn on November 3, 2005, or any other day. Law enforcement investigated these allegations and determined they were false.</p>
<p>“[On October 31st], Avery took steps to conceal himself. Unwilling to give his name or phone number to Auto Trader when booking the shoot, he provided “B. Janda” as a contact name and a telephone number belonging to his sister, Barb</p>	<p>Dawn Pliszka, the AutoTrader employee who took Steven Avery’s call on October 31, 2005, informed law enforcement that she guessed at the contact name for the appointment when she typed “B. Janda” because the caller was difficult to understand, not that he told her the appointment was</p>

<p>Janda.” <u>Avery</u> at 22.</p>	<p>for “B. Janda.” There is no evidence that Steven Avery told Pliszka that the contact name for the appointment was “B. Janda.” TT:2/13:60-63.</p>
<p>“... after phoning Teresa directly to set up the appointment on a forty-six degree October 10th, Steven Avery answered his door clad in only a small white towel. Creepy, thought Teresa. She told friends and coworkers she didn’t want to return.” <u>Avery</u> at 23.</p>	<p>Mr. Kratz’s assertions are false. There is no evidence that 1) this incident occurred on October 10, 2005; 2) Ms. Halbach thought it was “creepy”; and 3) she told coworkers that she did not want to return. No one reported that Ms. Halbach did not want to go back to the Avery property. TT:2/13/60-63. Another AutoTrader employee, Rachel Higgs, told investigators that Ms. Halbach was not uncomfortable going to the Avery property to take photos and that Mr. Avery was harmless.</p>
<p>“Steven doused the cat in gas and oil before the stricken animal was thrown onto the fire. It jumped off and ran around the yard, still ablaze, until Avery caught the cat, applied additional fuel, and threw it back on.” <u>Avery</u> at 29.</p>	<p>Kratz’s assertion that Steven Avery threw the cat into the fire is false. In fact, there is only evidence that someone else threw the cat into the fire. Further, the trial judge ruled this evidence inadmissible because it has “zero probative value.” Motion to Allow the Introduction of Other Acts Evidence pg. 3-4</p>