D A D A	DOESN'T	KNOW	THINCS	LTVE	TUAT	NOW
BAB	( DOESN L	KNUW	THINGS	LIKE	IHAI	NOW.

NOW DEFENSE COUNSEL HAS THROWN A PART OF THAT

KITCHEN SINK THAT'S BROKEN ON THE GROUND IN FRONT OF

YOU RIGHT NOW IS THIS IS CONCEPT OR THIS THEORY THAT

PORNOGRAPHY AND CHILDREN HAVE ACCESS TO A LOT OF

INFORMATION NOW, SO MAYBE JUST MAYBE, THIS

NINE-YEAR-OLD-BOY AT THE TIME OF HIS FIRST OUTCRY WAS

WATCHING HARDCORE PORN AND HE LEARNED HOW IT FELT TO

HAVE A LONG, HAIRY PENIS IN HIS MOUTH. THAT DOESN'T

MAKE SENSE. BUT THAT'S WHAT THEY WANT YOU TO BELIEVE.

THAT CHILD TESTIFIED CREDIBLY. HE WAS HONEST WITH YOU. HE EVEN WENT SO FAR AS TO SAY -- AND I SPECIFICALLY ASKED HIM FOR A REASON BECAUSE I WANT HIM TO BE HONEST WITH YOU -- I ASKED HIM DID HE TOUCH YOU ANYTIME OTHER THAN THAT? HE MENTIONED ABOUT THE BATHTUB AND HE DID NOT MENTION ABOUT THE ANUS. HE DIDN'T MENTION IT.

AND LET'S BE UP FRONT ABOUT IT. HE MENTIONED THAT IN HIS INTERVIEW BEFOREHAND BUT TODAY OR THE OTHER DAY WHEN HE TESTIFIED BEFORE YOU, HE SAID, NO, THAT DIDN'T HAPPEN. THAT'S VERY IMPORTANT. ALL OF THE INCIDENTS INVOLVING CLARENCE WERE DEALING WITH ANAL SODOMY. THE INCIDENT THAT INVOLVED ORAL SODOMY WAS ONLY RELATED TO HIM.

SO I WILL AGREE WITH DEFENSE COUNSEL TO A CERTAIN

MELISSA BROCK, RPR

352

1	EXTENT THAT MAYBE HE WAS A LITTLE CONFUSED WHEN IT
2	COMES TO HIM BEING ANALLY SODOMIZED. AND THAT CHILD
3	WAS HONEST ABOUT THAT. BUT THERE HAS NOT BEEN ONE
4	INCONSISTENCY AT ITS CORE WHEN IT COMES TO BEING ORALLY
5	SODOMIZED BY THE DEFENDANT. NOT ONF.

THE REASON WHY WE ADDED THAT CHARGE OF ANAL SODOMY IS BECAUSE LITTLE NINE-YEAR-OLD-CURTIS STATED THAT IN HIS STATEMENT. BUT WHAT I'M ASKING YOU, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, IS TO DETERMINE THESE FACTS BASED UPON WHAT YOU HEARD HERE IN THIS COURTROOM. YOU DON'T HAVE TO FIND HIM GUILTY OF COUNT 2 IN THE INDICTMENT DEALING WITH ANAL SODOMY. BUT YOU ARE COMPELLED TO FIND HIM GUILTY OF COUNT 1 DEALING WITH ORAL SODOMY. COMPELLED.

TALKING ABOUT THE INDICTMENT. YOU ARE GOING TO RECEIVE A DOCUMENT WHICH WILL LIST OUT THE CHARGES.

AND IN THIS INDICTMENT, YOU WILL HAVE THE DATE AND I WILL READ IT FOR YOU: IN THE NAME AND BEHALF OF THE CITIZENS OF GEORGIA DO CHARGE AND ACCUSE JON M. THIEME WITH THE OFFENSES OF AGGRAVATED CHILD MOLESTATION, FOR THAT SAID ACCUSED IN THE COUNTY OF FULTON AND STATE OF GEORGIA BETWEEN THE 1ST DAY OF DECEMBER 2006 AND THE 29TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2007, THE EXACT DATE UNKNOWN TO THE GRAND JURORS, DID UNLAWFULLY COMMIT AN IMMORAL AND INDECENT ACT, CURTIS BELL, A CHILD UNDER THE AGE OF 16 YEARS, BY PLACING ACCUSED'S MALE SEX ORGAN INTO THE

MOUTH OF SAID CHILD WITH THE INTENT TO AROUSE AND

SATISFY THE ACCUSED SEXUAL DESIRES, SAID ACT INVOLVING

AN ACT OF SODOMY.

THAT'S WHAT WE HAVE CHARGED HIM WITH. THE DATES ARE CLEAR. EVEN THOUGH DEFENSE COUNSEL WANTS TO KIND OF MUDDY THE WATERS A LITTLE BIT ABOUT THIS WHOLE SECOND GRADE VERSUS THE AGE AT THE TIME OF SIX YEARS OLD, BUT THE FACT OF THE MATTER IS TAKING INTO CONSIDERATION THE MOTHER'S TESTIMONY, IN TERMS OF THE TIMEFRAME OF WHEN THIS WOULD HAVE OCCURRED AND TAKING INTO CONSIDERATION THE GRANDMOTHER'S TESTIMONY IN TERM OF WHAT SHE HEARD FROM HER GRANDSON AND THE TIMEFRAME THAT SHE HEARD THAT, WE KNOW THAT THIS ACT OCCURRED BETWEEN THOSE DATES.

BUT YOU WILL LATER SEE A JURY CHARGE WHICH STATES
THAT THE DATES ARE NOT MATERIAL. AS LONG AS THIS
HAPPENED WITHIN THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS FOR THIS
CRIME, YOU ARE AUTHORIZED TO CONVICT HIM FOR THAT. SO
HE DOESN'T GET OFF BY COMING BEFORE YOU AND SAYING, OH,
THERE'S CONFUSION ABOUT THE DATE WHEN YOU ARE DEALING
WITH A CHILD VICTIM WHO AS WE HAVE HEARD FROM THE
EXPERT, MAY HAVE VERY WELL BEEN A LITTLE CONFUSED ABOUT
DATES. THAT'S TYPICAL. HE WAS NINE YEARS OLD AT THE
TIME.

THIS IS COUNT 2. THIS IS THE COUNT DEALING THE

MELISSA BROCK, RPR 354

1	ANUS. AND I WILL JUST CUT TO THE MATERIAL PORTIONS OF
2	IT. CURTIS THE DEFENDANT DID UNLAWFULLY COMMIT AN
3	IMMORAL AND INDECENT ACT TO CURTIS BELL, A CHILD UNDER
4	THE AGE OF 16 YEARS, BY PLACING THE ACCUSED'S MALE SEX
5	ORGAN UPON AND INTO THE ANUS OF SAID CHILD.
6	AS I STATED, WE WILL CONCEDE THAT. LIVE TESTIMONY
7	THE CHILD SAID, NO, NOW THAT DIDN'T HAPPEN. THIS IS
8	WHAT HAPPENED.
9	LET'S TALK ABOUT THE LAW. A JUROR'S DUTY IS TO
10	SEEK THE TRUTH. THAT IS WHAT YOU'RE TASKED WITH IN
11	THIS ENDEAVOR THAT YOU WILL EMBARK UPON ONCE YOU GO
12	BACK INTO THE DELIBERATION ROOM. YOU ARE TO SEEK THE
13	TRUTH. NOT TO SEEK DOUBT. SEEKING THE TRUTH IS WHAT
14	YOU ARE TO DO.
15	REASONABLE DOUBT. THE STATE IS NOT REQUIRED TO
16	PROVE THE GUILT OF THE ACCUSED BEYOND ALL DOUBT OR EVEN
17	TO A MATHEMATICAL CERTAINTY.
18	A REASONABLE DOUBT MEANS JUST WHAT IT SAYS. IT IS
19	A REASONABLE DOUBT A DOUBT THAT IS FAIR-MINDED OF
20	A FAIR MINDED, IMPARTIAL JUROR HONESTLY SEEKING THE
21	TRUTH.
22	WHAT DOES THAT MEAN? LET'S SAY FOR EXAMPLE WE
23	HAVE A SITUATION WHERE SOMEONE COMES INSIDE AND THEY
24	SAY IT'S RAINING. THEY COME TO THE COURTHOUSE, THEY

SAY IT'S RAINING OUTSIDE AND THEY SAY THAT THEY KNOW

25