

FALSE CONCESSIONS OF GUILT

MADE BY THE DEFENSE ATTORNEY AGAINST HIS OWN CLIENT

1  
2 Defeating all chances of acquittal, the defense attorney conceded falsely,  
3 the guilt of the accused, PF Lazor, many times to the jury. Subtly, and directly.  
4 Quotes below are verbatim from the official court record. The attorney, Wesley  
5 Schroeder, also badgered his own client to admit guilt of murder while on the  
6 witness stand. Where Mr. Lazor resisted, Mr. Schroeder's inferences and arguments  
7 of guilt to the jury served the same purpose in encouraging a "guilty" verdict.

8 ["RT" means "Recorder's Transcripts" page of the official court record]:

9 (Defense attorney to jury, RT 1670):

10 "MR. HAMES [the prosecutor] HAS MADE A BIG POINT OUT OF THE  
11 FACT THAT IT HAD TO BE SHOT THROUGH MR. ALLRED'S BACK AND  
MR. ALLRED'S BACK HAD TO BE TO MR. LAZOR. HE'S ABSOLUTELY  
CORRECT AND WE DON'T DISAGREE WITH IT..."

12 (NOTE: Lazor and the evidence disagreed; both were kept hidden).

13 (Defense attorney to jury, RT 1670-71):

14 "...I THINK THAT IS A LEGITIMATE ARGUMENT... THAT MR.  
15 ALLRED SOMEHOW HAD TO BE DOWN ON HIS KNEES; SOMEHOW HE  
16 WAS IN A DISABLED POSITION WHEN MR. LAZOR ACTUALLY  
FIRED AT HIM THROUGH HIS BACK..."

17 (NOTE: The evidence they kept hidden, proved this was not even possible).

18 (Defense attorney to jury, RT 1676-77):

19 "...THAT MAN, AS HE SITS OVER THERE, IS INNOCENT UNTIL YOU  
20 DECIDE OTHERWISE. THAT'S NOT TO SAY THAT EVERYTHING HE DID  
21 IS RIGHT. ... I AM NOT SAYING THAT THERE ISN'T SOME  
22 REASON TO BELIEVE THAT HE DID SOMETHING ILLEGAL THAT DAY."

23 (NOTE: Isn't doing "SOMETHING ILLEGAL" conceding guilt to a crime?)


24 (Defense attorney to jury, RT 1623):

25 "NOW MY PRUPOSE HERE IS TO ARGUE THAT I DON'T BELIEVE THAT  
26 [the burden of proof] HAS BEEN SATISFIED IN THIS CASE. I AM  
27 NOT GOING TO STAND UP HERE AND ARGUE TO YOU THAT THERE IS  
28 NOT A SHRED OF EVIDENCE THAT MR. LAZOR DID ANYTHING WRONG  
BECAUSE THAT WOULD BE PATENTLY ABSURD AND IT WOULD BE AN  
INSULT TO YOU AND IT WOULD BE A SILLY THING FOR ME TO DO."

(NOTE: All evidence of guilt, Mr. Schroeder helped state agents fabricate and cover up that fact. There was no other evidence of guilt. Yet had there been, shouldn't a defense attorney leave such comments to the prosecutor?)

(Defense attorney to jury, RT 1649):

"I WANT TO EMPHASIZE...I AM NOT GOING TO STAND UP HERE  
AND TELL YOU THAT HIS REACTION WAS ADVISABLE AND WORTHY  
OF SOME KIND OF COMMENDATION MEDAL BECAUSE IT WASN'T.  
[Continued]



1 I'M NOT SAYING THAT IT WAS A SMART THING TO DO."

2 (NOTE: This concerned an uncharged accusation that weeks before killing the  
3 attacker, Lazor pulled a gun on him. It was false which Lazor told the jury.  
4 Being denied, these comments by Schroeder told the jury that Mr. Lazor:  
(1) Committed a crime; (2) Provoked the attack which, by law, removes the  
right to self-defense acquittal; and (3) Lied to the jury by denying it).

5 (Defense attorney to jury re: "Lying in wait" to murder. RT 1629):

6 "...THIS IDEA THAT MR. LAZOR WAS BASICALLY SITTING THERE  
7 JUST WAITING FOR MR. ALLRED TO SHOW UP...IS CERTAINLY  
8 [an argument] THAT ONE CAN LEGITIMATELY MAKE..."

9 (Defense attorney to jury, emphatically, RT 1676):

10 "MR. HAMES [the prosecutor] HAS DONE AN EXCELLENT JOB  
11 IN ARGUING...HIS CASE TO YOU. I HAVE DONE MY BEST..."

12 (NOTE: Including fabricating evidence, testimony and the whole murder case?)

13 (Defense attorney badgering Lazor on the witness stand, RT 1333):

14 "DIDN'T YOU REALLY WANT TO GET [your gun] BACK BECAUSE  
15 YOU WERE REALLY ANGRY AT JOHN ALLRED AND YOU WANTED TO  
16 HAVE A GUN AT BOTH RESIDENCES?\* ¶ "DIDN'T YOU WANT TO  
17 GET IT BACK TO HAVE A WEAPON AT BOTH RESIDENCES...?"

18 (NOTE: Lazor's first answer\* was "NO" but he kept at this badgering-type  
19 of "leading" until the judge and prosecutor stopped and reprimanded him).

20 (Defense attorney further badgering his client on witness stand, RT 1341):

21 "IF YOU WANTED TO USE [the .45 gun] WHICH WE OBVIOUSLY  
22 KNOW YOU DID, WHAT WOULD NEED TO BE DONE..."

23 (NOTE: Isn't "wanting to use" a gun on a human being, automatically murder?)

24 (Defense attorney further badgering Lazor while testifying, RT 1286, 1287):

25 "DO YOU RECALL WHETHER OR NOT AT THE TIME YOU TOOK THE  
26 BB PISTOL AWAY FROM MR. ELLIS — " ¶ "WHAT DID YOU DO  
27 WITH THE BB PISTOL AFTER MR. ELLIS HAD IT?"

28 (NOTE: Mr. Lazor had truthfully denied taking the gun from Ellis; yet the  
defense attorney kept coercing and badgering him to falsely admit guilt  
that would incriminate him in murder, and admitted it "for him." The judge  
and prosecutor again had to interrupt and restrain him both times).

(Defense attorney, this time to judge in proceedings Lazor didn't know of):  
(RT 1498 and 1502):

"...CLEARLY THEY ARE...LEGITIMATE EVIDENCE THAT [the  
prosecutor] HAS A RIGHT TO ARGUE..." ¶¶ "THERE IS SOME  
ARGUMENT THAT THERE IS A FIRST DEGREE [murder] HERE..."

(NOTE: Mr. Schroeder knew this evidence was illegally seized and falsified  
and could not be used without his duplicitous, misconductful consent. The sole  
purpose of this proceeding is to argue there's no basis for "first degree").

At "sentencing" where Mr. Schroeder is supposed to assert innocence, he told the  
public and court that Mr. Lazor's "crime" was "a very, very serious one."

(These were secret proceedings that Lazor never knew took place. He couldn't object because he wasn't present)

Schroeder to judge in chambers with prosecutor present:

100  
SEEN  
HERE  
ANY  
RLY

1 W  
2 I  
3 S  
4 V

**ADDED COMMENTARY**

**SCHROEDER TOTALLY BETRAYS LAZOR'S INTERESTS IN SECRET, WHILE PRETENDING TO DEFEND. THE FACT THAT THE ATTACKER WAS NEVER SHOT IN THE BACK WAS THE CENTRAL ISSUE OF THE CASE**

6 UNPLEASANT THINGS

7 . IF THERE WAS SOME ARGUMENT THAT WE WERE

8 MAKING ABOUT THE WAY THE BULLET ENTERED OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT

9 IN TERMS OF THE WAY IT WENT THROUGH THE BODY, I THINK I

10 WOULDN'T HAVE A LEG TO STAND ON, BUT I THINK THAT WE HAVE A

11 SITUATION WHERE WE ARE NOT DENYING THE MAN WAS SHOT, WE ARE

12 NOT DENYING MY MAN SHOT HIM.

13 E MAY HAVE BEEN IN AT THE

14 TIME THAT THE SHOTS WERE FIRED AT

15 WHAT POSITION HIS BODY WOULD BE

16 WHATSOEVER UPON HOW THE BULLET WOULD

17 THEY CAME ABOUT FROM A .45 THAT WAS

18 SO THE OTHER ISSUE IS WHAT WAS

**ADDED COMMENTARY**

**THIS MADE THE ENTIRE TRIAL A COMPLETE PRE-TENSE. A SHAM.**

19 NOT HOW DOES HIS BODY LOOK AFTER HE'S BEEN

20 SHOT. WE ARE NOT ARGUING THAT THE BULLET WENT THROUGH AT X, Y

21 AND Z ANGLE. THAT IS NOT AN ISSUE IN THE CASE.

22 WE

23 ARE NOT DISPUTING THOSE THINGS IN THE CASE.

25 RECESS.

26 MR. HAMES: COULD I HAVE JUST A MOMENT?

27 THE COURT: SURE.

28 (WHEREUPON, A SHORT RECESS WAS TAKEN, AFTER WHICH