J. HAROL D : 6 IN THE MATTER OF THE 8 ILLEGAL ABDUCTION OF ASHTON R. O'DWYER, JR., FROM THE PREMISES LOCATED AT 1.0 6034 ST. CHARLES AVENUE, NEW ORLEANS, 11 LOUISIANA 70118, AT 1205 HOURS ON TUESDAY 12 SEPTEMBER 20, 2005 13 14 15 Sworn Statement of HAROLD J GAGNET, 1569 Calhoun Street, New 16 Orleans, Louisiana 70118, taken in the above-entitled matter, held at 6034 St. 17 Charles Avenue, New Orleans, Louisiana 70118, commencing at 12:35 p.m., on 18 Friday, the 4th day of November, 2005. 19 APPEARANCES: 20 21 LAW OFFICES OF ASHTON R. O'DWYER, JR., L.L.C. 22 Ashton R. O'Dwyer, (By: Esquire) 23 One Canal Place Suite 2670 24 New Orleans, Louisiana 25

> Curren-Landrieu, L.L.C. Certified Court Reporters (504) 833-3330



```
2
      REPORTED BY:
 1
                                         CCR,
               KATHY ELLSWORTH SHAW,
               Certified Court Reporter
                     049519)
               Curren-Landrieu, L.L.C.
               749 Aurora Avenue
               Suite 4
 5
                                       70005
               Metairie, Louisiana
               (504) 833-3330 (800) 487-3376
 6
 7
 8
 9
11
12
13
14
15
1.6
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

HAROLD J. GAGNET,

after having been first duly sworn by the above-mentioned Certified Court Reporter, was examined and testified as follows:

EXAMINATION BY MR. O'DWYER:

-13

Q. Sir, my name is Ashton O'Dwyer and I'm here to review with you certain details of what transpired here at my home at 6034 St. Charles Avenue on the evening of Monday, September 19, 2005, and then continuing into the next day.

Would you state your full name and your present address for the record, please?

- A. Harold J. Gagnet, 1569 Calhoun Street, New Orleans, Louisiana, 70118.
- Q. Mr. Gagnet, you and I have gotten to know each other quite well, post-Katrina, have we not?
 - A. Yes, that's correct.
- Q. And we spent a lot of time in each other's company virtually every day since the storm; correct?
 - A. That is correct.

me to assume that in your capacity as a chief engineer having supervision over men under your charge, that you have an eye for determining whether a man is under the influence of alcohol; that is, whether a man is intoxicated or not?

- A. I've had to make that decision on many occasions.
- Q. When you left my company sometime in the neighborhood of 2300 hours on Monday, September 19, 2005, in your judgment, sir, was I intoxicated?
- A. In my judgment, you were not intoxicated; and also in my own judgment, I was not intoxicated at the same time, and you had not consumed any more than I had consumed in the same evening. So to speak for myself, I had no reason to believe that what you had consumed would have gotten you into a state of intoxication. Because I crossed the street dodging four lanes of traffic at the time and had to make my way back to where I was going to spend the night, and so in my own judgment, I

was capable of navigating that distance without any trouble whatsoever or being hit by any automobile or anything else.

THE WITNESS:

So I would say that judging from my own experience, he was not intoxicated and neither was I. So I can base it on that.

7

EXAMINATION BY MR. O'DWYER:

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. You're looking at the court reporter and speaking about me in the third person. You mean in your judgment I was not intoxicated?
 - A. You were not intoxicated.
 - Q. All right. Thank you, sir.

Now, Mr. Guice, in your judgment was he intoxicated?

- A. No, he was not.
- Q. All right. Now, sir, when did you next attempt to make contact with me, and in your own words, tell us what transpired?
- A. When I woke up the next morning and crossed the street and met the gentleman who was in residence at

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

the Dabezies home as a security guard, he beckoned to me as I crossed the street, because he was sitting on the And he called me and said, "I porch. have something I want to show you." So I went over and he showed me the note that Mr. Guice had clipped to the door with a bag clip, a little type of kitchen object. And I read the note, which had already been read by the security guard. He had read the note and tried to come to some conclusion. And then he told me that Mr. Guice had left by seven o'clock, seven a.m. of that morning. And I got there about one hour later. And I read the note. And then after reading the note and discussing what was the best thing to do, I decided to go and find Kilbride who had experience in matters like this.

- Q. All right. Mr. Kilbride is Michael Kilbride --
 - A. Michael Kilbride, chief --
 - Q. -- who is chief of security

for Freeport McMoRan --

ž

. 9

A. :-- for Freeport McMoRan who was in residence directly across the street from 6034.

So after discussion with him, he volunteered to take one of his guards with him as a witness because he didn't know what was going to happen when he got down there either. So --

Q. Let me stop you for one second.

Would you tell us what knowledge the note imparted to you about my whereabouts?

A. I did not actually have the exact whereabouts at the time. It was apparent by the note. It was apparent that you had been abducted from the premises, but where you had been taken was only a presumption on my part until we verified that only after Mr. McBride --

Q. Kilbride.

A. -- Mr. Kilbride went down to the train station and determined that

that is where you ended up. Until then we didn't know where you were, but we knew you were somewhere in custody, but under whose jurisdiction, we did not know at the time.

Q. Why was I in custody?

્3

- A. We didn't know why you were in custody. We had no idea why you were in custody. We knew that you had been taken from the premises. We judged that from the note. So he took the note with him.
 - Q. By someone purporting to be law enforcement officers?
 - had removed you from the premises and deposited you at some other location that we were not aware of at the time and only became completely aware of after Mr. Kilbride verified this. And after a lengthy attempt by Mr. Kilbride to gain your release, he finally had to leave with the knowledge that you would not be released before 5:00 p.m. and that the reason was that they were not

processing people between 12:00 and 5:00, which was about the time that he finalized the fact that he couldn't get you out at that time and that no one would be there to conduct any process until 5:00 p.m.

- Q. And Mr. Kilbride imparted this knowledge to you upon his return to this neighborhood?
 - A. To his premises, yes.
 - Q. Okay. Did Mr. Kilbride report to you any reason why I was being detained or why I had been abducted in the first place?
 - particular reason other than that they took you and that's where it commenced. So we were not able to determine anything as to the specific charges, if any, had been brought against you, but they had you in their possession. You were incarcerated by them, and that was all that we knew was that they had taken you.
 - Q. All right. Now, when you left

my company and this address at or about 2300 hours on Monday evening September 19, 2005, was there any illegal activity going on on the premises by me or anyone else?

- A. Absolutely not. The only thing -- The only thing at all that could have been construed at the farthest end of speculation was that you were still awake after curfew, that you were somewhere on your premises and you were awake and curfew had already fallen.
- Q. And by my premises, you mean my bought and paid for property?
 - A. Absolutely.

. 9

- Q. Not public property?
- A. No. Not public property, no.
- Q. Thank you.

Now, sir, when did you and I next see each other?

A. It was several minutes after five o'clock on the same day as the arrest or whatever it was called, the abduction -- five p.m. -- after five

p.m., shortly after five p.m. when I saw you coming across the lobby of the train station out to the waiting room. And of course, we recognized each other right there.

THE WITNESS:

2 0

And then that's when he was released. He had this piece of paper that he was -- he had been released.

EXAMINATION BY MR. O'DWYER:

- Q. How long had you been at the train station before you and I saw each other?
 - A. Close to an hour.
- Q. Did anyone during that hour period say to you or make known to you in any way, shape, or form what alleged justification they had for detaining me?
- A. No one gave me any explanation except that the only direct conversation I had was with a state trooper who told me that "He is being processed now. He's now being processed." Other than that, the only thing I saw were other

- Q. Do you know if they took my shoelaces?
- A. I don't know that you had shoelaces. I think you had shoes without laces. You had slip-on shoes.
- Q. You mentioned the word "arrest" a few moments ago.
 - A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

· 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Do you have any knowledge that I actually had been placed, quote, = "under arrest," close quote, at any time?
- A. No, I did not. Nobody used that word precisely in that context.
- Q. All right. Is there anything else you'd like to say, Mr. Gagnet?

. 4

mention that I did not at the time -not knowing what the whole thing was all
about, I certainly did not confirm or
imply to anyone else what had happened
before I found out what had happened. I
didn't go tell all the neighbors what
had happened, so if that's pertinent I'm
not sure. But I didn't think that there
was anything to it. I was sure that it
was something that was a total error on
the part of the people who removed you
from the premises.

Q. But you did subsequently learn that while I was in custody I was mistreated and brutalized, did you not, sir?

A. I did, absolutely, upon observation of the condition you were in. It was plain to anyone, not necessarily a medical expert, that you had been totally mistreated and physically brutalized while in their control -- while under their control.

MR. O'DWYER:

Curren-Landrieu, L.L.C. Certified Court Reporters (504) 833-3330

```
16
                          you, very much,
                    Thank
 1
                 Gagnet.
                            That's
 2
            Mr.
                 WITNESS:
            THE
 3
                    Okay.
 4
                                              statement
                    (Whereupon the sworn
 5
                 concluded
                              аt
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

2 I, Kathy Ellsworth Shaw, CCR, RPR, _3 Certified Court Reporter, in and for the 4 State of Louisiana, as the officer 5 before whom this testimony was taken, 6 hereby certify that HAROLD J. GAGNET, 7 after having been duly sworn by me upon 8 authority of R.S. 37:2554, did testify 9 as hereinabove set forth in the 10 foregoing 16 pages; that this testimony 11 was reported by me in stenotype 12 reporting method, was prepared and 13 transcribed by me or under my personal 14 direction and supervision, and is a true 15 and correct transcript to the best of my 16 ability and understanding; that I am not 17 related to counsel or to the parties 18 <u>t</u>erested herein, nor am I otherwiss 19 of this mat the outcome 20 Certified Court Reporter 2 1

> ELASWORTH SHAW., Court Reporter Certified 049519) Curren-Landrieu, L.L.C. 749 Aurora Avenue

Suite 4

Metairie, Louisiana 70005

25

22

23

24

1