

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF WAUPACA COUNTY

STATE OF WISCONSIN

STATE OF WISCONSIN,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Case No. 22CF142
Motion

ROBERT I. KNOX,

Defendant.

The Honorable Raymond Huber Presiding

Wednesday, June 8, 2022

Reported by Rose M. Coulthart, RPR, CRR, CCP

A P P E A R A N C E S:

Mr. Nicholas W. Bolz, Assistant District Attorney, 811
Harding Street, Waupaca WI 54981, appearing on behalf of the
State of Wisconsin.

Mr. Alex Gelhar, Assistant Public Defender, 1265 Main
Street, Ste. 201, Stevens Point, WI 54481, appearing on
behalf of the Defendant who is present in person.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

E X A M I N A T I O N

CHIEF DEPUTY CARL ARTZ

| | |
|----------------------------|----|
| BY MR. BOLZ..... | 4 |
| CROSS BY MR. GELHAR..... | 8 |
| REDIRECT BY MR. BOLZ..... | 19 |
| RECROSS BY MR. GELHAR..... | 19 |

E X H I B I T S

| | |
|----------------------|----|
| 1 Amended Complaint | 5 |
| 2 Original Complaint | 16 |

(All exhibits are received and retained in the file.)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDING

THE COURT: I will call the matter of State of Wisconsin versus Robert I. Knox, Case No. 22-CF-142. He is here in the custody of the Sheriff's Department represented by Attorney Gelhar.

Assistant District Attorney Bolz is here on behalf of the State. There has been amended criminal complaint filed in this matter. Have you received a copy of that, Mr. Gelhar?

MR. GELHAR: I have, your Honor. And I went through it with my client prior to this hearing.

THE COURT: You wish to have it read?

MR. GELHAR: We would waive formal reading, your Honor.

THE COURT: There was previously a motion to dismiss filed on the original complaint. Is that motion still relevant in light of the amended complaint?

MR. GELHAR: While I would acknowledge that the amended complaint does undercut or address some of the concerns outlined in the motion that would have supported our belief for the motion to dismiss, I do think the filing of this amended complaint and the language that was changed in the probable cause statement does still support our motion to dismiss.

1 And we would ask for the motion to be heard
2 at this time, your Honor.

3 THE COURT: You can proceed then.

4 MR. BOLZ: Your Honor, the State's going to
5 call Chief Deputy Artz to the stand.

6 THE CLERK: Would you raise your right hand
7 and state your name for the record?

8 THE WITNESS: Carl Artz.

9 THE CLERK: Do you solemnly swear the
10 testimony you will provide will be the truth, whole
11 truth and nothing but the truth so help you God?

12 THE WITNESS: I do.

13 THE CLERK: You may have a seat.

14 CHIEF DEPUTY CARL ARTZ, called as a witness
15 herein, having been first duly sworn on oath, was
16 examined and testified as follows:

17 E X A M I N A T I O N

18 BY MR. BOLZ:

19 Q Chief Deputy, how are you employed?

20 A With the Waupaca County Sheriff's Office.

21 Q And as part of your job responsibilities, at least in
22 the recent past, were you assigned the duty of signing
23 criminal complaints for the Sheriff's Department?

24 A Yes.

25 Q And the process for the signing of the complaint is

1 that the District Attorney's Office sends a-- E-files
2 the complaint to an E-mail associated with the
3 Sheriff's Department?

4 A Yes.

5 Q And at some point yourself or other members of the
6 Sheriff's Department open the complaints and then call
7 the DA's office?

8 A Yes.

9 Q And at that point then the DA's office -- one of the
10 attorneys in the DA's office swears you to the
11 complaint; is that correct?

12 A That is correct.

13 Q At that point then the State or the DA's Office
14 provides you with a pin?

15 A Yes.

16 Q And once the pin is provided, you put the pin in and
17 your signature; is that correct?

18 A That's correct.

19 MR. BOLZ: And may I approach, your Honor?

20 THE COURT: You may.

21 MR. BOLZ: I'll show you the amended --

22 (Exhibit No. 1 marked for identification.)

23 BY MR. BOLZ:

24 Q Chief Deputy, I'm going to show you what's -- let me
25 get to a microphone so Rose can hear me.

1 Chief Deputy, I'm going to show you what's
2 been marked Exhibit No. 1. Is that a copy of a
3 criminal complaint that you signed?

4 A Yes, it is.

5 Q And that complaint is Mr. Knox's complaint; is that
6 correct?

7 A Yes.

8 Q And when you signed that complaint did you review the
9 complaint prior to signing that complaint?

10 A Yes. There's a period of time where we get to observe
11 the charges and review as far as reading it.

12 Q And you would have reviewed and read that complaint; is
13 that correct?

14 A Yes.

15 Q And a portion of the -- I believe it's the first
16 paragraph of the complaint indicates that the reports
17 were compiled by the Waupaca County Sheriff's
18 Department?

19 A Yes.

20 Q And on that -- in that certain complaint it indicates
21 that -- who the reviewing officer of the reports were?

22 A Yes.

23 Q And who would have been that officer?

24 A By Sergeant Lewinski.

25 Q Okay. And in the complaint it also indicates that the

1 signing individual from the Sheriff's Department would
2 have verified with Sergeant Lewinski or another member
3 of the Sheriff's Department that the complaint, or
4 excuse me, the reports that were provided to the DA's
5 Office had not been changed; is that correct?

6 A That's correct.

7 Q So it's your testimony here today that the reports that
8 were sent over to the District Attorney's Office were
9 not changed at any point?

10 A That's correct.

11 Q And at some point prior to I think it was May 2nd
12 when you signed that complaint, the Sheriff's
13 Department was -- was refusing to sign complaints from
14 the DA's Office; is that correct?

15 A Under our consultation of our legal direction, we were
16 not.

17 Q Okay. But at some point then obviously --

18 A Yes.

19 Q -- it was determined that you were once again going to
20 sign complaints?

21 A Yes.

22 Q And -- and it's my -- my understanding that there's
23 also a policy -- a report policy that the Sheriff's
24 Department is to follow?

25 A Yes.

1 Q And in Mr. Knox's case, that report policy was
2 followed?

3 A Yes.

4 Q And at this point the Sheriff's Department is
5 continuing to sign the complaints, correct?

6 A That's correct.

7 Q It's my understanding that the complaints were being
8 signed under protest; is that still occurring?

9 A No.

10 Q Okay.

11 MR. BOLZ: I have nothing further then, your
12 Honor.

13 THE COURT: Cross?

14 MR. GELHAR: Thank you, your Honor. Just
15 give me one moment.

16 C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N

17 BY MR. GELHAR:

18 Q Chief Deputy Artz, how long have you been employed with
19 the Waupaca County Sheriff's Office?

20 A Little over 38 years.

21 Q Okay. So you worked with the Sheriff's Office under
22 Sheriff Hardel as well?

23 A Yes.

24 Q And you currently work under Sheriff Wilz?

25 A That is correct.

1 Q Attorney Bolz asked you about a report policy on direct
2 examination. Would that be Policy No. 322?

3 A I believe that's the number.

4 Q Okay. And that's for report preparation?

5 A Correct.

6 Q Okay. And in your 38 years with the Sheriff's
7 Department you've been familiar with this policy?

8 A Yes.

9 Q Okay. You've relied on this policy when preparing and
10 signing reports?

11 A Yes.

12 Q And this policy was updated or changed in February of
13 this year; is that correct?

14 A Not that I'm aware of.

15 Q Okay. Are you aware of the ongoing litigation
16 involving Peter Klotzbuecher?

17 A I'm aware of it.

18 Q Okay. And that that litigation is taking place in
19 February of this year?

20 A Yes.

21 Q And this report preparation policy was at issue in that
22 case?

23 A It was part of testimony, correct.

24 Q Was -- it was part of the testimony. And there was an
25 updated version of this policy that was issued on

1 February 22nd of 2022?

2 A Not that I'm aware of.

3 Q Okay. So your testimony today is you're not aware of a
4 change in the report preparation policy on or around
5 the Peter Klotzbuecher litigation?

6 A No.

7 Q Okay. The offense date in Mr. Knox's case was
8 April 29th of 2022; is that correct?

9 A Yes.

10 Q Okay. So pursuant to that policy, it's the obligation
11 of yourself and other deputies to document pertinent
12 details to arrest; is that correct?

13 A That's correct.

14 Q Okay. And the reporting officer did this in his
15 initial report?

16 A Correct.

17 Q Okay. He documented his firsthand observation and
18 those of witnesses at the scene?

19 A Correct.

20 Q And then that reporting officer submitted his prepared
21 report and statement for review?

22 A Yes.

23 Q Okay. And to the best of your knowledge, does that
24 officer draft his report or is it dictated?

25 A The original officer?

1 Q The original officer.

2 A I have no clue.

3 Q Okay. Before that report gets to the reviewing officer
4 does it go to a records custodian?

5 A When a completed -- officer completes the report, it
6 goes to records.

7 Q Okay. And then that version of the report goes to the
8 District Attorney's Office?

9 A Then it's reviewed.

10 Q Reviewed. Okay. And that reviewed report goes to the
11 District Attorney's Office?

12 A That reviewed report then is sent to the District
13 Attorney's Office as a referral for --

14 Q Okay. Then it comes back to you in the process
15 Attorney Bolz outlined with the pin and signatures; is
16 that correct?

17 A Yeah.

18 Q Okay. And so the complaint that Attorney Bolz provided
19 to you, was that dated May 24th, 2022?

20 A Where I signed and swore was the 23rd.

21 Q May 23rd. I apologize.

22 A Yes.

23 Q The E-filing date was May 24?

24 A Yes.

25 Q Okay. Did your office receive an earlier version of

1 this criminal complaint?

2 A That I'm not aware of.

3 Q That you're not aware if the earlier version of this
4 complaint was sent to your office on May 2nd, for
5 instance?

6 A Am -- I haven't -- I don't have a document to that.

7 Q Attorney Bolz asked you on direct examination about a
8 prior practice of the Sheriff's Office refusing to sign
9 complaints; is that correct?

10 A Yes.

11 Q And that was due to wording that was in those
12 complaints?

13 A There was some wording, yes.

14 Q Okay. And now it is the practice of the Sheriff's
15 Department to sign complaints?

16 A Yes.

17 Q And your testimony was that it is no longer under
18 protest?

19 A No longer under protest.

20 Q Okay. And it is that you are in agreement with the
21 words that are now in the complaints?

22 A I cannot speak in regards to a legal standpoint on
23 that, but that is what I'm instructed to do at this
24 point.

25 Q Okay. So when the -- sorry. I'm going to back up a

1 little bit. In the review process, when that reviewing
2 officer looks over the report, is it sent back to the
3 original authoring officer?

4 A It could be.

5 Q Is it the standard policy of the Sheriff's Department
6 to send the reviewed report back to the original
7 author?

8 A It is the practice if it does not meet the criteria for
9 a referral for charges.

10 Q Okay. And could you elaborate? What would not meet
11 the criteria of a referral for charges?

12 A I can only speak for myself, but every case I had in 20
13 years being a detective I looked at the jury
14 instructions. If the elements of the crime were not
15 fulfilled as far as charges or in recommendations by
16 calling the DA's Office that more work needs to be
17 done, at that point we consider it completed and then
18 it can move on with them clarifications.

19 Q And is this transmission back to the authoring officer
20 documented?

21 A Yes. It would be a supplement.

22 Q Okay. A supplemental report?

23 A It would be, you know, I'm requesting you look into
24 this, yeah.

25 Q Okay. And then so between the original author of the

1 report and the DA's office, would you agree that there
2 is an intermediary, somebody else that would be --

3 A It is the reviewer, yes.

4 Q The reviewer. Okay. And those intermediaries don't
5 always return reports to the original author?

6 A If the elements of the crime fit and grammatically and
7 everything is correct, it can be signed off and set as
8 a referral; that is correct.

9 Q So in this case you said Sergeant Lewinski was the
10 reviewing officer; is that correct?

11 A That's what it reads. That's correct.

12 Q Okay. And you independently confirmed with Sergeant
13 Lewinski that the reports were not changed in this
14 case?

15 A It is my belief when it's received as a criminal
16 complaint for my signature, that it is correct.

17 Q Okay. So the complaint that you were handed as an
18 exhibit says that your complainant has verified that
19 the reviewing officer did not change the reporting
20 deputy's report before submission. Did I read that
21 correctly?

22 A Yes.

23 Q So how did you verify that Sergeant Lewinski did not
24 change the reports?

25 A When I'm addressed by the District Attorney's Office

1 that it's true and correct, that is my belief.

2 Q And so you didn't independently speak with Sergeant
3 Lewinski about the reports?

4 A No.

5 Q You did not review any documentation of whether or not
6 there were changes in the reports?

7 A No. I did not.

8 Q Okay. And so I think you probably understand why I'm
9 asking these questions due to the fact that in that
10 previously-referenced Klotzbuecher case there was an
11 allegation that reports were changed where exculpatory
12 information was removed. You're aware of that
13 situation, correct?

14 A I'm aware of that.

15 Q Okay. And are you aware that it was the Captain Julie
16 Thobaben that was the one that is alleged to have
17 removed that exculpatory information?

18 A Alleged. That's right.

19 Q Okay. And are you aware that her position within the
20 Department is still being supported by Sheriff Wilz and
21 others?

22 MR. BOLZ: I would object. It's not
23 relevant.

24 THE COURT: Sustained.

25

1 BY MR. GELHAR:

2 Q So the complaint you've been provided as an exhibit is
3 an amended complaint; is that correct?

4 A Yes.

5 Q Okay. And the reason it's amended is because the
6 Sheriff's Office did not sign the original complaint?

7 A I'm not aware --

8 MR. BOLZ: I'm going to object. It calls for
9 speculation. He doesn't know why we filed the amended
10 complaint.

11 THE COURT: He can answer if he knows.
12 There's certain language in the original complaint that
13 was crossed out, and there's different language now in
14 this complaint. If he knows, he can answer.

15 THE WITNESS: I'm not aware.

16 MR. GELHAR: Your Honor, may I approach?

17 THE COURT: You may.

18 MR. GELHAR: Can I have this marked as an
19 exhibit, please?

20 (Exhibit No. 2 marked for identification.)

21 MR. GELHAR: Providing the witness what has
22 been marked as Exhibit No. 2.

23 BY MR. GELHAR:

24 Q All right. Chief Deputy Artz, do you recognize the
25 document I just handed to you?

1 A It's a criminal complaint.

2 Q Okay. And does it look similar in terms of the
3 probable cause statement and the charge to the first
4 complaint you were handed, Exhibit 1?

5 A Yes.

6 Q Okay. I would point out that there is one significant
7 difference, is there not, in that under the section
8 where it says probable cause in Exhibit 2 which I just
9 handed to you that first paragraph is struck through;
10 is it not?

11 A Yes.

12 Q And following that language that is struck through,
13 there's a sentence that reads, "Per WPSO staff, Sheriff
14 Wilz will not allow his staff to sign the complaint
15 with this wording"; is that correct?

16 A Yeah. That's what I seen.

17 Q Okay. So back to my previous question, the reason the
18 first exhibit you were handed as an mended complaint is
19 because your office did not sign the original
20 complaint; is that correct?

21 A That's the way it looks. Yes.

22 Q Okay. And your office had a policy of not signing
23 complaints with this wording for a few months; would
24 that be correct?

25 A We did not have a policy. We had a recommendation by

1 our legal team.

2 Q Okay. And as that complaint indicates, the
3 recommendation was from Sheriff Wilz himself?

4 A At the direction of the legal team, correct.

5 Q Okay. And so the -- at the direction of your legal
6 team then, that's essentially, by not signing the
7 complaint, that's what brought you to testify here
8 today?

9 I guess my further point, had you signed that
10 original complaint, there would have been no need for
11 you to come testify here today?

12 A I'm not aware of it. When I received the subpoena
13 yesterday it is to -- to reflect that I signed Exhibit
14 1.

15 Q Okay. And your testimony here today -- your testimony
16 here today, excuse me, has been to support that your
17 signing Exhibit 1 was meaning that it was true and
18 accurate?

19 A That's correct.

20 Q And there was no such signing for Exhibit 2?

21 A No such signing.

22 Q Even though, as you testified, the vast majority of
23 those documents are entirely similar?

24 A Yes.

25 Q Okay.

1 MR. GELHAR: I have no further questions,
2 your Honor.

3 THE COURT: Redirect?

4 R E D I R E C T E X A M I N A T I O N

5 BY MR. BOLZ:

6 Q Just to reiterate the -- to the best of your knowledge,
7 the document that you've signed is true and accurate,
8 correct?

9 A Correct.

10 Q To the best of your knowledge, the reports had not been
11 changed?

12 A That's correct.

13 MR. BOLZ: Nothing further.

14 THE COURT: Anything further, Mr. Gelhar?

15 R E C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N

16 BY MR. GELHAR:

17 Q Just to reiterate as well, you personally did not
18 verify with Sergeant Lewinski that reports weren't
19 changed?

20 A That's correct.

21 MR. GELHAR: Nothing further, your Honor.

22 THE COURT: You may step down then. Any
23 other witnesses from the State?

24 MR. BOLZ: No, your Honor.

25 THE COURT: Mr. Gelhar, do you have any

1 testimony or witnesses you wish to introduce?

2 MR. GELHAR: No testimony or witnesses at
3 this time, your Honor.

4 THE COURT: Do you wish to be heard on the
5 motion?

6 MR. GELHAR: Do you have anything --

7 MR. BOLZ: It's your motion.

8 MR. GELHAR: All right. I would wish to be
9 heard on the motion, your Honor.

10 I -- as I acknowledged at the beginning of
11 the hearing, the language that was signed in the
12 amended complaint does undercut a little bit of the
13 argument made in the motion. But I think Chief Deputy
14 Artz's testimony and the existence of both complaints
15 with largely similar language that was now just signed,
16 a lack of testimony on the record of any verification
17 process that the reports weren't altered does call into
18 question the sincerity, the lack of authenticity and
19 the reliability of the statements that are outlined in
20 the criminal complaint here to support probable cause.

21 And as the case law outlined in the motion
22 suggests, if that reliability is called into question,
23 then the only recourse is for the Court to dismiss the
24 complaint. So I think without any further
25 acknowledgment, without any further reliable testimony

1 to support that these reports in this case were not
2 altered, especially given the lack of any other
3 substantive changes in the amended complaint versus the
4 original, I would ask the Court to grant the motion to
5 dismiss. Thank you.

6 THE COURT: This is a motion to dismiss, in
7 effect, the amended complaint. A complaint has to,
8 within its four corners, provide probable cause for
9 each element of the charged offense.

10 Contained within the amended complaint
11 there's clearly a description of who was charged, why
12 he is charged, what the basis of the charge is, and the
13 four questions typically asked are clearly answered.

14 The defendant wants the Court to look outside
15 of the four corners of the complaint to find that there
16 is a lack of probable cause because the initial
17 complaint was not sworn to by a sheriff's deputy. That
18 has been corrected now in the amended complaint.

19 There is nothing that would suggest that the
20 complaint as sworn to by Chief Deputy Artz is not
21 factually accurate. So, therefore, I will deny the
22 defendant's motion.

23 So do we need this set for a preliminary
24 hearing?

25 MR. GELHAR: No, your Honor. At this time I

1 have discussed with my client his right to a
2 preliminary hearing, what the State would have to prove
3 at a preliminary hearing, the purposes and scope of
4 that hearing.

5 And at this time he would wish to waive his
6 right to a preliminary hearing and proceed to an
7 arraignment.

8 THE COURT: Is that correct, Mr. Knox?

9 THE WITNESS: Yes, it is.

10 THE COURT: How old are you, sir?

11 THE WITNESS: 57.

12 THE COURT: How far did you get in school?

13 THE WITNESS: HSED.

14 THE COURT: Can you read and write the
15 English language?

16 THE WITNESS: Yes.

17 THE COURT: Did you read the amended criminal
18 complaint in this matter?

19 THE WITNESS: Yes.

20 THE COURT: Was there anything about the
21 complaint which you did not understand?

22 THE WITNESS: No.

23 THE COURT: Have you ever received treatment
24 for mental or emotional problems?

25 THE WITNESS: No.

1 THE COURT: Have you taken any medication,
2 alcohol, drug or other intoxicant in the last 24 hours?

3 THE WITNESS: No.

4 THE COURT: Did anyone make any promises or
5 threats of any kind to get you to waive your right to a
6 preliminary hearing?

7 THE WITNESS: No.

8 THE COURT: Do you understand that a
9 preliminary hearing is a statutory right you would have
10 to have the State present sufficient evidence to
11 convince me there's probably been a felony committed
12 and that you are probably the person who committed it?

13 THE WITNESS: Yeah.

14 THE COURT: Do you understand that if the
15 State could not meet that burden, the matter could be
16 dismissed or reduced to a less serious charge such as a
17 misdemeanor?

18 THE WITNESS: Yes.

19 THE COURT: Do you understand in the process,
20 the State would have to put witnesses on the witness
21 stand. And Attorney Gelhar would have a right to
22 question or cross-examine those witnesses against you?

23 THE WITNESS: Yes.

24 THE COURT: Do you understand you would have
25 a right to present evidence on your own behalf at the

1 proceeding?

2 THE WITNESS: Yes.

3 THE COURT: Have you had enough time to talk
4 with Mr. Gelhar about what a preliminary hearing is?

5 THE WITNESS: Yes.

6 THE COURT: Do you have any question at all
7 as to the nature of the proceeding?

8 THE WITNESS: No.

9 THE COURT: And it's your wish to give your
10 right up to the hearing at this time?

11 THE WITNESS: Yes.

12 THE COURT: Mr. Gelhar, have you had enough
13 time to speak with your client?

14 MR. GELHAR: I have, your Honor.

15 THE COURT: Are you satisfied he does in fact
16 understand the nature of the proceeding and its
17 intended benefits?

18 MR. GELHAR: I do.

19 THE COURT: Are you satisfied then the waiver
20 today is knowing, voluntary and intelligent?

21 MR. GELHAR: I am.

22 THE COURT: I will then find that Mr. Knox is
23 knowingly, voluntarily and intelligently waiving his
24 right to a preliminary examination. Upon such a
25 waiver, I will find probable cause to believe a felony

1 has been committed and that he is the probable culpable
2 party. And I will bind the matter over to this branch
3 for an arraignment.

4 I take it the results of the blood draw are
5 not in yet?

6 MR. BOLZ: That's correct. Well, I guess I
7 didn't look that close, your Honor. I did file an
8 information consistent with the criminal complaint.

9 If the blood draw is in or upon receipt, the
10 State will likely file an additional charge of
11 operating motor vehicle with prohibited alcohol
12 concentration.

13 THE COURT: So the information has not hit my
14 computer yet, but have you received it yet, Mr. Gelhar?
15 Do you wish to proceed to arraignment at this time or
16 do you want --

17 MR. GELHAR: Assuming that the information
18 will mirror the amended complaint, your Honor, we would
19 acknowledge receipt and waive reading. And the
20 defendant would stand mute to the sole count therein.

21 THE COURT: I will enter a not guilty plea on
22 behalf of Mr. Knox. Why don't we set the matter for a
23 status. I don't know if the test results will be in,
24 but how about 10 o'clock on June 28 since he is in
25 custody?

1 MR. BOLZ: That works for the State, your
2 Honor.

3 MR. GELHAR: That works for us as well, your
4 Honor. Thank you.

5 THE COURT: Bond will be continued in the
6 interim. Exhibits are received for the record, yes.

7 * * *

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF WISCONSIN)
 2 WAUPACA COUNTY) SS:
 3)

4 I, Rose M. Coulthart, Registered Professional
 5 Reporter, Certified Realtime Reporter, Certified CART
 6 Provider, Notary Public in and for the State of
 7 Wisconsin, and Official Court Reporter for Branch 3, do
 8 hereby certify that the preceding court proceeding was
 9 recorded by me and reduced to writing under my personal
 10 direction.

11 I further certify that said proceeding was
 12 taken at The Waupaca County Courthouse, on the 8th day
 13 of June, 2022.

14 I further certify that I am not a relative or
 15 employee or attorney or counsel of any of the parties,
 16 or a relative or employee of such attorney or counsel,
 17 or financially interested directly or indirectly in
 18 this action.

19 In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my
 20 hand and affixed my seal of office on this 10th day of
 21 June, 2022.

22
 23 E-signed: Rose Coulthart
 24 Rose M. Coulthart, RPR, CRR, CCP
 25 Notary Public
 My commission expires
 June 9, 2026