In The Matter Of:

Caniglia vs Strom, et al

Major Robert Quirk July 13, 2018



Min-U-Script® with Word Index

			22
1		2015?	
2		A. No. I believe that's the first time I've	
3		actually seen the name.	
4	Q.	They had some prior contact on some unrelated	
5		matters before that with the Cranston Police	
6		Department. Do you recall if you had any	
7		involvement in those other matters?	
8		A. Not that I'm aware of.	
9	Q.	My understanding is back up. This case	
10		involves the seizure of Mr. Caniglia's firearms by	
11		the Cranston Police Department, him being sent for	
12		a psychiatric evaluation at Kent Hospital and then	
13		a subsequent issue over the return of his firearms	
14		by the Cranston Police Department. My	
15		understanding is you were not involved in the	
16		seizure of the firearms or sending him for a	
17		psychiatric evaluation?	
18		A. That's correct.	
19	Q.	Okay. So your involvement, my understanding has	
20		to do with the return of the firearms to	
21		Mr. Caniglia?	
22		A. That's correct.	
23	Q.	We're going to talk about that first, and then we	
24		may go back and talk about general policies or	
25		procedures with respect to seizures and so forth	

			23
1		because you have discussed some of that in your	
2		Answers to Interrogatories.	
3		A. Okay.	
4	Q.	With respect to the return of Mr. Caniglia's	
5		firearms, why don't you give me an overview of	
6		what your involvement was?	
7		A. Colonel Winquist had received a notification	
8		from a person, I'm not sure on the exact name who	
9		stated he was Mr is it C-a-n-e-e-l-i-a	
10		(phonetic) or Caniglia?	
11		MR. LYONS: He says Caniglia. He	
12		hasn't anglicized it. I say Caniglia, too.	
13		A. Okay, we'll go with Caniglia. An attorney	
14		had left a message with the Colonel requesting to	
15		have Mr. Caniglia's firearms returned to him. I'm	Ĺ
16		not sure on the exact date. It was after August	
17		of 2015.	
18	Q.	Okay. I'll represent to you that prior to that	
19		letter going out the Caniglias had made some	
20		efforts themselves to get their firearms back	
21		from Mr. Caniglia's firearms back from the	
22		Cranston Police Department. Were you involved or	
23		aware of those efforts?	
24		A. No. The first I learned of it was with the	
25		request from Mr. Caniglia's attorney.	

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

2	1
1.	4

Q. All right. Let me show you what has been previously marked in Colonel Winquist's deposition as Exhibit 28 and ask you if that is the letter you were referring to. Before I ask you that question I should ask you one first, which is, did you ever see the letter from the attorney? MS. MURPHY: Objection as to time. You may answer. I don't recall if I saw the letter or not. Α. Ι know that, like I said, a request was put in to the Colonel, and I took it upon myself after speaking to the Colonel to reach out to Mr. Caniglia's attorney and speak to him. far as actually observing the letter, I can't be certain. Q. So, what you're not certain is whether or not you actually saw this letter that's been marked as Exhibit 28? That's correct. Α.

Q. That's fine, then we don't need to look at it any more. What did you do after you took it upon yourself to respond to the letter?

A. I spoke to the Colonel, and I had a discussion about the case at the time, read the report, and we were both in agreement that I was

			25
1		to call the attorney and advise him as to our	
2		decision.	
3	Q.	And do you recall your discussion with the Colonel	
4		about the case?	
5		A. Like I mentioned, we discussed the case	
6		itself after reading the report and decided that	
7		the attorney representing Mr. Caniglia would be	
8		called and be informed of the process that he	
9		needed to take.	
10	Q.	And what was that process?	
11		A. The process was that he needed to go ahead	
12		and petition the court, that the guns were	
13		firearms were taken for safekeeping, and that the	
14		custom and/or practice of the Cranston Police	
15		Department was to have the attorney petition the	
16		court, and if the courts felt as though the person	
17		in possession of the firearms was no longer a	
18		safety risk, they could come back to us at that	
19		point, and we'd return the firearms.	
20	Q.	Okay. When you discussed that with the Colonel,	
21		did either of you consult with any of the	
22		departments written policies or procedures?	
23		A. I don't know whether or not he did.	
24	Q.	Did you?	
25		A. I don't believe so.	

			27
1		general order dealing with mental health	
2		evaluations?	
3		A. Same thing, I'm not certain.	
4	Q.	You referred to the custom and practice of the	
5		Cranston Police Department	
6		A. Yes.	
7	Q.	about requiring somebody to go for a court	
8		hearing?	
9		A. Yes.	
10	Q.	Is that reflected in any written document?	
11		A. I don't know whether or not it's reflected in	
12		any document. I know that's been a long-standing	
13		practice within the Cranston Police Department	
14		pertaining to the return of firearms.	
15	Q.	When you say long-standing, how long are we	
16		talking about?	
17		A. As far back as I can remember.	
18	Q.	And do you know what the legal basis is for that	
19		custom and practice of requiring somebody to go	
20		have a court hearing?	
21		THE WITNESS: As far as pertaining	
22		to a court hearing?	
23		MR. LYONS: Right.	
24	Q.	My understanding is that your understanding is	
25		that the custom and practice of the Cranston	

		28
1		Police Department is that in a situation like this
2		where a firearm has been seized for safekeeping
3		because of a perceived mental issue of the
4		firearms owner, that the Cranston Police
5		Department requires the person to go to court and
6		get a court order before he or she can get the
7		firearm back?
8		A. Yes.
9		MS. MURPHY: Objection as to form.
10		You may answer.
11		A. Yes.
12	Q.	Okay. Are you aware of any legal authority that
13		supports that custom and practice?
14		THE WITNESS: As far as within the
15		police department?
16	Q.	Well, are you aware, for example, of whether any
17		attorney has given the Cranston Police Department
18		an opinion that that is a legally appropriate
19		procedure?
20		A. No, I'm not aware of that.
21	Q.	Are you aware of any decision by any court of law
22		that says that's a legally appropriate procedure
23		requirement?
24		A. No, I'm not aware of that.
25	Q.	Are you aware of any statute or regulation that

		29
1		says that's a legally appropriate procedure?
2		A. No, I'm not.
3	Q.	Do you know whether before 2015 anyone had ever
4		challenged whether or not that was a legally
5		appropriate procedure?
6		A. I'm not sure if they did.
7	Q.	Okay. Are you aware, for example, whether my
8		office in 2012 sued the Cranston Police Department
9		challenging that policy and procedure?
10		A. No, I wasn't aware of that.
11	Q.	When you contacted Mr. Caniglia's attorney, was
12		that, by the way, Attorney Nick Lambros; does that
13		name ring a bell?
14		A. I'm not certain of the name of the attorney.
15	Q.	Was it the same attorney who had sent a letter to
16		Colonel Winquist?
17		A. I'm not certain.
18	Q.	Was it a phone conversation that you had with the
19		attorney?
20		A. It was.
21	Q.	Okay. Apart from telling him that he needed to go
22		to court and get a court order, do you recall
23		anything else about that phone conversation?
24		A. From what I can recall, I explained to him as
25		to why he needed to go ahead and petition the

		30
1		court, and the attorney seemed to be, quite
2		frankly, he seemed to be fine with it, and he
3		says he left it as, okay, I'll take care of it.
4		He didn't seem to have any concerns, at least
5		nothing that was relayed to me on the phone.
6	Q.	Did you have any further communications with that
7		attorney?
8		A. I don't believe so. I know originally I
9		think we were going back and forth playing phone
10		tag for a bit. But beyond the conversation when I
11		advised him what he needed to do, I don't believe
12		we spoke after that.
13	Q.	How soon after Colonel Winquist received the
14		letter did you and the Colonel discuss what to do
15		about it?
16		A. I don't know exactly when he received the
17		letter, datewise.
18	Q.	Assuming for the sake of discussion that the
19		letter is dated October 1st, 2015, and that the
20		Colonel received it soon thereafterward. Do you
21		know whether it was in, for example, the first
22		half of October that you and the Colonel had your
23		discussion?
24		A. I don't know.
25	Q.	Okay. Do you know how soon after you had your

		31
1		discussion with the Colonel did you call
2		Mr. Caniglia's attorney?
3		A. Like I said, I may have left a message. We
4		went back and forth, the messages with his
5		receptionist, by the time we actually spoke on the
6		phone.
7	Q.	Do you recall how much time passed?
8		A. I don't.
9	Q.	All right. Did you report back to the Colonel
10		after you spoke to Mr. Caniglia's attorney?
11		A. Yes, I did.
12	Q.	What did you say?
13		A. Exactly what I relayed to you, that I
14		explained to the attorney what process he needed
15		to take, and that he seemed to be okay with it.
16	Q.	Okay. Did you have any subsequent conversations
17		with Colonel Winquist about Mr. Caniglia's
18		firearms?
19		A. I don't believe so.
20	Q.	Okay. Do you ever recall having a conversation
21		with Colonel Winquist in which he instructed you
22		that Mr. Caniglia's firearms were to be returned
23		to him without a court order?
24		A. I believe once that may have taken place
25		once I believe there might have been something

	 I	32
_		
1		that came in from, I don't know if it was the
2		court or the solicitor, I'm not certain on that.
3		But something prompted the Colonel to mention that
4		the guns would be released.
5	Q.	Okay. Do you know when Mr. Caniglia sued Cranston
6		over the seizure of his firearms?
7		A. I do not.
8	Q.	If it was in December, if I represented to you it
9		was in December of 2015, would that refresh your
10		recollection?
11		A. No.
12	Q.	All right. Do you know whether or not the guns
13		were returned before or after he filed suit?
14		A. That I don't know.
15	Q.	Did you have any discussions, I'm just asking this
16		as a yes or no question, did you have any
17		discussions with Cranston's solicitor or any other
18		lawyer representing the city about the return of
19		the firearms?
20		A. I don't believe so.
21	Q.	When you were instructed to return the firearms to
22		Mr. Caniglia, what did you do?
23		A. I believe that was that may have been
24		through the BCI division that they actually had
25		the physical return of the firearms.

			34
1		who is no longer on the job.	
2	Q.	How about Karen Guilbeault?	
3		A. If it was, then she took over right after	
4		Captain Carmody.	
5	Q.	Let me show you what was marked as Exhibit 25	
6		during Officer Henry's deposition, and ask you if	
7		you've seen this document before?	
8		(PAUSE)	
9	Q.	Have you seen that before?	
10		A. No.	
11	Q.	That's fine. There appear to be two different	
12		signatures	
13		A. Right.	
14	Q.	one of which I'll direct your attention to the	
15		bottom line first, it says captain's signature	
16		denying the return of weapons, and a signature in	
17		what appears to be a date that looks to me like	
18		9-1-15?	
19		A. Right.	
20	Q.	Do you know whose signature that is?	
21		A. No idea.	
22		(OFF THE RECORD)	
23	Q.	And then above that it says captain's signature	
24		authorizing release of firearms, and then there's	
25		a signature there next to a date that appears to	

		43
1	Q.	Were you aware of this general order at the time
2		that you were involved in returning Mr. Caniglia's
3		firearms to him?
4		A. I may have read it prior to a conversation
5		with Mr. Caniglia's attorney, but I can't be
6		certain.
7	Q.	Okay. Had you ever read it before then?
8		THE WITNESS: Prior to speaking to
9		Mr. Caniglia's attorney?
10		MR. LYONS: Yes.
11		A. Possibly.
12	Q.	Okay. But you don't have a recollection of it?
13		A. I don't, no.
14	Q.	Do you recall having had any discussion with any
15		other Cranston police officer about this general
16		order?
17		A. No, I don't recall.
18	Q.	Did you speak with any of the Cranston police
19		officers who had firsthand contact with Mr.
20		Caniglia before making a decision about returning
21		his firearms to him?
22		A. No, I did not.
23	Q.	Do you know if any of them came to the conclusion
24		whether Mr. Caniglia was mentally incompetent?
25		A. I'm not sure if they did.