Exhibit "K"

Deposition Transcript of

Kim Caniglia

June 27, 2018

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND

EDWARD A. CANIGLIA

VS

C.A. NO. 15-525-M-LDA

ROBERT F. STROM, as the Finance Director of the CITY OF CRANSTON, et al

D-E-P-O-S-I-T-I-O-N

DEPOSITION of Kim Caniglia, taken in the above-entitled cause on behalf of the Defendants, pursuant to notice, before Brenda A. Scharver, Notary Public in and for the State of Rhode Island, at the offices of DeSisto Law, 60 Ship Street, Providence, Rhode Island on June 27, 2018 scheduled for 10:00 a.m.

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE DEFENDANT:

DeSISTO LAW

BY: PATRICK K. CUNNINGHAM, ESQ.

FOR THE PLAINTIFF:

THOMAS W. LYONS, III, ESQ.

- 1 MR. LYONS: Objection.
- 2 A I put the gun back where it normally is. I hid the
- 3 magazine because I was worried about Ed.
- 4 Q When you say that, what were you worried about?
- 5 A His-- I was worried about his state of mind. I was
- 6 worried about what he had just said.
- 7 Q When you say you were worried about his state of mind,
- 8 with respect to what particularly?
- 9 MR. LYONS: Objection
- 10 A That he wasn't happy, that I didn't know how to make him
- 11 happy, the argument that we just had.
- 12 Q But why would you hide the magazine?
- 13 A It seemed a reasonable thing to do.
- 14 Q Why would it be reasonable?
- 15 A Because Ed was depressed.
- 16 Q Were you afraid he was going to do something with the gun
- 17 and the magazine?
- 18 A Yes.
- 19 Q It's okay. Again, I'm sorry that this leads to emotion.
- 20 I thought that was why, but again, we don't want to put
- 21 words in your mouth.
- 22 I believe you said during the incident you were going
- 23 to call 911?
- 24 A Yes.

- 1 A I probably told her that I was worried about going home,
- 2 that I was worried about what I was going to find.
- 3 Q When you say you were worried about going home and
- 4 worried about what you were going to find, what were you
- 5 worried you were going to find?
- 6 A I was afraid that I was going to find Ed hanging from the
- 7 rafters, that's what I was worried about.
- 8 Q You were afraid you were going to find him, when you say
- 9 "hanging from the rafters"?
- 10 A Hanging.
- 11 Q Were you afraid that he was going to use the gun?
- 12 A No.
- 13 Q Why weren't you afraid that he was going to use the gun?
- 14 A I don't know.
- 15 Q You were afraid he was going to commit suicide?
- 16 A I was incredibly worried.
- 17 Q You were incredibly worried that he was going to commit
- 18 suicide or harm himself in some way; is that correct?
- 19 A Yes.
- 20 Q So after you have the discussion with Barbara, you call
- the Cranston Police Department; is that correct?
- 22 A Yes.
- 23 Q Do you remember what you informed the Cranston Police
- 24 Department on that telephone call?

Page 31 A Not verbatim. 1 Q What do you remember concerning what you said on that telephone call? 3 A That I would like to have an officer come with me to my house to check on my husband, I was worried about him. 5 may have said that we had an argument the night before 6 and that he has been depressed. I don't remember word for word. Q So you requested some sort of escort from where you were 10 to your house? 11 A Yes. Q You also informed officers that your husband may have 12 13 been depressed? A Yes, only I think they asked me why. 14 Q Did you inform the officer of the gun incident? 15 16 A On the phone? 17 Q Yes. A I don't know. I don't remember. 18 19 Q So you don't remember if you told the officer about the 20 gun incident or the words your husband used? 21 A No, I don't remember. I don't remember. MR. LYONS: So far we're just talking about 22 23 the phone call? 24 MR. CUNNINGHAM: Phone call, yes, just the

- 1 phone call.
- 2 Q On the phone call did you inform the Cranston police
- 3 officer that you were afraid of your husband?
- 4 A No.
- 5 Q You don't remember saying that?
- 6 A I don't remember saying that. I was afraid for my
- 7 husband.
- 8 Q But you don't remember saying you were afraid of your
- 9 husband?
- 10 A No.
- 11 Q So as we sit here today, again I don't want to put words
- 12 in your mouth, but from what I'm understanding there are
- two things that you remember about the phone call, that
- 14 you requested an escort to the house and that you
- 15 informed the police department that your husband was
- depressed?
- 17 A I don't remember the exact words, but I believe they
- asked me why, and I had told them that he was depressed,
- 19 I was worried for him, I was worried about what I would
- 20 find.
- 21 Q When you say worried about what you would find, did you
- 22 express that to the police officer?
- 23 A Yes, I was worried about Ed.
- 24 Q And again, when you say you were worried about what you

- nine lines down and go to the middle of the paragraph
- where it states, "wife shared that her hope was that her
- 3 husband could get some help here in the ER"; do you see
- 4 that?
- 5 A Yes.
- 6 Q Do you remember sharing that concern or hope?
- 7 A It was taken out of context.
- 8 Q What was taken out of context?
- 9 A This statement.
- 10 Q Let me start with this: Did you make the statement that
- 11 you hoped that your husband could get some help in the ER
- or something similar to that statement?
- 13 A Yes.
- 14 Q You just expressed to me that it was taken out of
- 15 context. Could you explain to me how it was taken out of
- 16 context, how you believe it was taken out of context?
- 17 A Because prior to that I had told her that he was not
- 18 happy, he was in a depression and I didn't know why and I
- didn't know how to help him and I hoped that he could get
- 20 help in the ER.
- 21 Q So you were concerned about his depression?
- 22 A Yes. There was something wrong with my husband.
- 23 Q And you hoped that he could get some type of help for
- that while he was in the hospital?

Exhibit "L"

Deposition Transcript of Officer John Mastrati May 31, 2018 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND

EDWARD A. CANIGLIA Plaintiff

VS.

C.A. NO. 15-525

1

ROBERT F. STROM, as the Finance Director of THE CITY OF CRANSTON, et al.

Defendants

DEPOSITION OF OFFICER JOHN MASTRATI, a
Defendant in the above-entitled case, taken on
behalf of the Plaintiff, before Linda L.
Guglielmo, RPR-RMR, a Notary Public in and for the
State of Rhode Island, at the offices of Strauss,
Factor, Laing & Lyons, One Davol Square,
Providence, Rhode Island, on May 31, 2018 at 10:00
A.M.

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF.....STRAUSS, FACTOR, LAING & LYONS BY: THOMAS W. LYONS, ESQ. RHIANNON S. HUFFMAN, ESQ.

FOR THE DEFENDANTS....DeSISTO LAW

BY: PATRICK K. CUNNINGHAM, ESQ.

Allied Court Reporters, Inc. (401)946-5500 115 Phenix Avenue, Cranston, RI 02920 www.alliedcourtreporters.com

		27
1		to seize firearms for safekeeping if you thought a
2		person was suicidal?
3		A. Yes.
4		MR. CUNNINGHAM: Objection.
5	Q.	Who told you that?
6		A. It would be during our trainings, things to
7		consider, somebody that's suicidal and has
8		weapons, to notify a supervisor, let them know of
9		the situation, and they make the call from there.
10	Q.	The supervisor makes the call?
11		A. Something like that, yes. I have the
12		supervisor notified and have them come to the
13		scene.
14	Q.	Okay. That's your understanding of what the
15		Cranston police procedure is in those
16		circumstances?
17		A. Yes.
18	Q.	Okay. Do you recall who told you that?
19		A. No.
20	Q.	All right. But your recollection was it was part
21		of an in-service training?
22		A. Part of the in-service, yes, to consider
23		weapons that are around that individual.
24	Q.	Right. Right. But was it also part of the
25		in-service training that the procedure in those

			36
1		understood correctly, his behavior changed when	
2		you pulled on to the street?	
3		A. Yes, he had unusual behavior, yes.	
4	Q.	Just what was the unusual behavior?	
5		A. To be exact, I would rather have my report.	
6	Q.	And when you say a Terry pat, you're referring to	
7		a Supreme Court case?	
8		A. Yes.	
9	Q.	Okay. What's your understanding of what that case	!
10		says?	
11		A. Terry pat is a pat on the outside of the	
12		clothing for any weapons.	
13	Q.	What is your understanding of what the decision in	ļ.
14		the Terry case permits you to do as a police	
15		officer?	
16		A. We're allowed for articulable perform a	
17		pat-down of the outer clothing without any	
18		manipulation of anything on the person.	
19	Q.	And under what circumstances can you do that?	
20		A. For officer safety and anything that you feel	
21		as though there might be weapons present.	
22	Q.	With respect to seizing firearms when someone may	
23		be suicidal, what's your basis what's your	
24		understanding of your legal authority to do that?	
25		A. For someone that's suicidal, I would notify a	

		- ,	
			37
1		supervisor of the situation and that there's	
2		firearms present, and to seize them would be for	
3		the well-being of that person and the safety of	
4		others.	
5	Q.	Okay. You just referred, for example, to a Terry	
6		pat, which you can do of a person?	
7		A. Yes.	
8	Q.	And you can seize their firearms if you detect	
9		them during the Terry pat, right?	
10		A. Yes.	
11	Q.	Okay. Is it your understanding that the Terry	
12		case gives you the authority to seize the firearms	
13		of a person who may be suicidal, or does your	
14		legal authority come from a different source than	
15		the Terry decision?	
16		A. For me, the Terry decision would be I use	
17		it for any illegal firearms. I never seized on a	
18		suicidal subject. I never obtained a firearm from	
19		a Terry pat on a suicidal subject.	
20	Q.	My question is with respect to the Terry pat, you	
21		cited a legal authority for that	
22		A. Yes.	
23	Q.	the Terry decision?	
24		A. Yes.	
25	Q.	What is your legal authority to seize the firearms	

			38
1		of a person who may be suicidal?	
2		A. It would be pretty much for safety, his	
3		safety and other people's safety. So I figure it	
4		would be a duty to seize that firearm to prevent	
5		him from hurting himself or hurting others.	
6	Q.	Okay. I'll be more specific. Are you aware of,	
7		for example, a different U.S. Supreme Court case	
8		that gives you the authority to do that?	
9		A. No.	
10	Q.	Are you aware of a constitutional provision that	
11		gives you the authority to do that?	
12		A. No.	
13	Q.	Are you aware of the decision of any other court	
14		that gives you the authority to do that?	
15		A. No.	
16	Q.	Are you aware of any Rhode Island statute that	
17		gives you the authority to do that?	
18		A. No.	
19	Q.	Does the Cranston Police Department have a written	L
20		policy or procedure or general order that gives	
21		you the authority to do that?	
22		A. No.	
23	Q.	Your understanding of your authority to do that	
24		comes from the in-service training you have	
25		received or let me withdraw the question. Does	

		100
1	Q.	If you go to Page 8 of this, there's a paragraph
2		which is it appears to be English letter I, I
3		say that to distinguish it from Roman Numeral I,
4		which is right underneath it, but it's called
5		Disposal of Evidence; do you see that?
6		A. Yes.
7	Q.	Do you ever get involved in disposal of evidence?
8		A. No.
9	Q.	Do you ever get involved in returning evidence to
10		its rightful owners?
11		A. No.
12	Q.	Are you aware of any laws respecting the return of
13		firearms to people after they're seized by the
14		police?
15		A. No.
16		EXHIBIT 6 (PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT 6
17		MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION)
18	Q.	Officer Mastrati, let me show you what's been
19		marked as Exhibit 6 which is Cranston Police
20		Department General Order 320.70, which is entitled
21		Public Mental Health. Are you familiar with this
22		order?
23		A. Yes.
24	Q.	If you go down to Roman Numeral IV on the first
25		page, it says Procedures; do you see that?

		107
1		causing personal harm to himself?
2		A. Yes.
3	Q.	What do you base that on?
4		A. I base that off his statements and presenting
5		a firearm.
6	Q.	Are you aware of whether any Rhode Island statute
7		in effect at the time addressed the situations
8		under which a person can be compelled to go to a
9		hospital or mental health facility?
10		A. No.
11	Q.	Are you aware of whether or not, for example, a
12		court order may be required?
13		A. No.
14	Q.	Has that been any part of your training at either
15		the Cranston Police Department or at the training
16		academy?
17		A. I don't think so.
18	Q.	Okay. If you go down to the last section on that
19		page which has the letter V, and it says training?
20		A. Yes.
21	Q.	It says, "Cranston Police Department will provide
22		entry-level personnel with training on this
23		subject and will provide refresher training at
24		least every three years." Do you see that?
25		A. Yes.

Exhibit "M"

Deposition Transcript of
Officer Austin Smith
June 1, 2018

In The Matter Of:

Caniglia vs Strom, et al

Officer Austin Smith June 1, 2018



Min-U-Script® with Word Index

Officer Austin Smith - June 1, 2018

			34
1		A. I've probably been on scene at about ten	
2		calls where that's happened, approximately.	
3	Q.	What were the circumstances under which firearms	
4		were seized for safekeeping?	
5		MR. CUNNINGHAM: Objection.	
6	Q.	I understand it may be different, there may be	
7		different circumstances. I'm asking you for a	
8		general description of what kind of circumstances	
9		have resulted in the seizure of firearms for	
10		safekeeping?	
11		A. Essentially, if there are firearms there we	
12		feel we make a determination, we talk to a	
13		supervisor, that someone having these firearms in	
14		their possession may be unsafe to them or to the	
15		general public and to us.	
16	Q.	Just so we're clear, we're talking about	
17		circumstances in which there's not a criminal	
18		investigation going on?	
19		A. Yes. That's what I thought we're talking	
20		about.	
21	Q.	Right. I just wanted to make sure we were on the	
22		same page. So, what were the circumstances that	
23		led the police department to conclude that a	
24		person was unsafe it was unsafe for a person to	
25		have firearms? Again, I realize it may differ	

Officer Austin Smith - June 1, 2018

		57
1		you see that?
2		A. Yes.
3	Q.	"To define the limits of law enforcement authority
4		during the execution of a criminal process."
5		A. Yes.
6	Q.	What do you understand criminal process to mean?
7		A. If a crime has been committed.
8	Q.	Are you aware of any Cranston Police Department
9		general order that sets forth its limits of
10		authority when there is not a criminal process?
11		A. No. Probably something in here about it,
12		though. I'm just not very familiar with it.
13	Q.	Okay. Do you recall whether there's anything in
14		this general order that sets forth the Cranston
15		Police Department's limit of authority when there
16		is not a criminal process?
17		A. I don't recall.
18	Q.	Have you ever been involved in returning firearms
19		to anyone?
20		A. No.
21	Q.	I'm going to show you what was marked as Exhibit 5
22		during Officer Mastrati's deposition, which, for
23		the record, is a copy of Cranston Police
24		Department General Order 350.20 entitled Bureau of
25		Criminal Identification. Was this one of the

Exhibit "N"

Deposition Transcript of Sergeant Brandon Barth July 19, 2018

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND

EDWARD A. CANIGLIA,

vs.

C.A. No. 15-525

1

ROBERT F. STROM as the Finance Director of THE CITY OF CRANSTON, et al.,

DEPOSITION OF SERGEANT BRANDON BARTH, a witness in the above-entitled cause, taken on behalf of the Plaintiff, before Devin J. Baccari, CSR, at the Law Office of Strauss, Factor, Laing & Lyons, One Davol Square, Suite 305, Providence, Rhode Island, on July 19, 2018, scheduled at 10:00 a.m.

PRESENT:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF:

STRAUSS, FACTOR, LAING & LYONS BY: THOMAS W. LYONS, ESQUIRE RHIANNON S. HUFFMAN, ESQUIRE

FOR THE DEFENDANTS:

DESISTO LAW LLC

BY: PATRICK K. CUNNINGHAM, ESQUIRE

			9
1		A. Not that I remember, no.	
2	Q.	When you met with Ms. Murphy in June, did you	
3		look at any documents?	
4		A. Not that I remember, no, besides the incident	
5		report and the interrogatories.	
6	Q.	Okay.	
7		MR. CUNNINGHAM: Tom, just to clarify	
8		the record, we also met for about ten minutes	
9		before we came over here this morning.	
10	Q.	(By Mr. Lyons) Okay. Did you look at any	
11		documents when you met with Mr. Cunningham before	
12		you came over here?	
13		A. The interrogatories.	
14	Q.	The interrogatories. Okay. Have you looked at	
15		any other documents to prepare for this	
16		deposition whether it was with one of the	
17		attorneys or otherwise?	
18		A. I reviewed the Community Care Doctrine. I	•
19		don't, again, know the correct terminology on it,	
20		but in the meetings with Caroline she had	
21		mentioned that, so I took it upon myself to kind	
22		of look at it.	
23	Q.	Okay. So you looked at an actual document that	
24		discussed the Community Care Doctrine?	
25		A. No. It was more of, maybe, a Wikepedia entry	

the computer recently?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Objection.

Q. (By Mr. Lyons) Okay. When you read about the Community Care Doctrine on the computer sometime between June and today, what did it say?

A. It was basically the rights of police officers or the rights of police officers when it comes to public safety. And when I saw the term "public safety," it more jogged my memory that I've -- I know this, this is things that I practice every day.

So if the terminology of Community Care, if that was ever said in the training or it was on a particular document or a policy, I'm not sure. But when I saw about public safety and certain instances where police officers maybe not in a criminal act where they're more using public safety as the matter, not a criminal matter, it's a public safety matter, that that's kind of what jogged my memory that that's what we were dealing with here.

Q. All right. So do you recall having any prior education or training on the issue of dealing with public safety outside the criminal context?

A. Specifically, no, but standard procedures in

Allied Court Reporters, Inc. (401)946-5500 115 Phenix Avenue, Cranston, RI 02920 www.alliedcourtreporters.com

		15
1	Q.	Okay. What are the exceptions of which you're
2		aware?
3		A. Exceptions would be if plain view exigent
4		circumstances. Open field type of open
5		field type open field, I don't know the direct
6		terminology there. Any searches due to an
7		arrest. There's six total, and I apologize, I
8		don't remember the
9	Q.	Okay. Well, if any more come back to you while
10		we're talking, let me know.
11		A. Okay.
12	Q.	And we're not going to go through this right now,
13		but we're going to talk about this some more
14		later on in the deposition.
15		A. Okay.
16	Q.	Although, I'm going to ask one more. When you
17		talk about maintaining the public safety, is
18		that, in your mind, an exception to the usual
19		Fourth Amendment rules?
20		A. I'd say yes.
21	Q.	Okay. We'll come back to that then.
22		Are you aware that other Cranston police
23		officers have had their deposition taken?
24		A. Aware just through the attorney's office, but
25		I'm assuming it was the people that responded to

		41
1		taking the totality of the situation, you know,
2		again, here's a wife that decided to stay at a
3		hotel because she was concerned of what her
4		husband may do. So wasn't hysterics, but, you
5		know, there was definitely concern for the fact
6	: :	that she called the police and wouldn't go back
7		to her house without us.
8	Q.	Okay. Did she indicate to you whether she wanted
9		all four police officers to go to the house?
10		A. I don't think she indicated that. That was
11		what the response was going to be regardless just
12		based on what she had told us about the incident
13		prior.
14	Q.	So even if Mrs. Caniglia had indicated, for
15		example, that she only wanted one police officer
16		to go with her to the house, would you still have
17		responded the same way?
18		A. Yes.
19	Q.	Okay. How was Mr. Caniglia's emotional state
20		when you spoke with him?
21		A. I'd say aggravated. He wasn't happy that we
22		were there based on the incident prior to that,
23		so but, otherwise, he wasn't, you know, overly
24		angry or hysterical or anything like that. There
25		was definitely annoyance, some trepidation about

		56
1		A. I'm sure he did when I spoke with him either
2		in person or on the phone, but the exact
3		questions that he asked me I'm not sure of.
4	Q.	Does the Cranston Police Department use written
5		forms to obtain consent to do searches?
6		A. Sometimes, yes.
7	Q.	Okay. Did you use a written form in this case?
8	 	A. No.
9	Q.	Why not?
10		A. Because of the totality of the circumstances,
11		that Mr. Caniglia had corroborated what Mrs.
12		Caniglia had said. Even with his misgivings
13		about going to the hospital, we felt that Mr.
14		Caniglia was a harm to himself in the least and
15		possibly a harm to his wife until he sought
16		medical help.
17		And not being a medical professional, I
18		don't know how long that takes, so we didn't seek
19		that. We just took possession of the firearms at
20		that point.
21	Q.	Okay. Do you recall where the firearms were
22		located?
23		A. I believe there were two firearms that were
24		taken from the home. The first one, I don't
25		recall where that one was located. The second

			58
1		transported them back to our headquarters.	
2	Q.	Okay. I understand from your Answers to	
3		Interrogatories you were not involved in whether	
4		or not to return Mr. Caniglia's firearms to him.	
5		A. No, that has nothing to do with me.	
6	Q.	Okay. Have you ever been involved in that kind	
7		of decision with respect to anyone else?	
8		A. No.	
9	Q.	Did you have any discussion with Mrs. Caniglia	
10		about obtaining a return of the firearms?	
11		A. No, not that I recall.	
12	Q.	Did you have any discussion with Mr. Caniglia	
13		about obtaining a return of the firearms?	
14		A. No.	
15	Q.	Do you know if any Cranston police officer told	
16	:	either Mr. or Mrs. Caniglia that they would get	
17	: :	the firearms back after Mr. Caniglia was checked	
18		out by the hospital and discharged?	
19		A. I don't know if anyone had that conversation	
20		with them.	
21	Q.	What would the usual procedure be for the	
22		Cranston Police Department in these	
23		circumstances?	
24		A. Once the person is transported to the hospital	•
25		and any firearms are taken possession of, I don't	•

		79
1		in an instance where the public safety would be
2		an exception, because if you find somebody
3		that's mentions doing harm to themself, is not
4		in their right frame of mind, is not acting like
5		a reasonable person would, is an instance where
6		exceptions to the search and seizure rules.
7	Q.	Okay. Is it your understanding that this
8		exception is expressly set forth, for example, in
9		the constitution or a statute?
10		A. Not to my knowledge that I can recall that it
11		is. I'd have to research it.
12	Q.	Okay. So what's the basis? Where does this
13		exception come from legally?
14		A. Again, I go back to the Community Care
15		Doctrine. I've always, in my head, refer not
16		referred to it, but acted as a public safety in
17		these types of incidents where it's not criminal
18		but there's still, maybe, some harm to the
19		public.
20	Q.	Okay. Are you aware of any decision by a court
21		which sets forth this exception for maintaining
22		public safety?
23		A. I don't recall, no.
24	Q.	Have you received any instruction from any lawyer
25		or law any lawyer, I'll put it that way, as to

82 which where did I learn this and where did I 1 learn that, I can't recall specifically to this 3 particular question, but I'm sure I've had -- I 4 know I've had training on dealing with people with mental health issues and kind of the 5 response thereto, but specifically what was 6 7 discussed at that training I don't recall. 8 If you go to the next page, it refers to Okay. 9 seizing and retaining a person's weapons without 10 a warrant for safekeeping or otherwise as based 11 on the totality of the circumstances. Do you see 12 that? 13 A. Yes. What is the totality of the circumstances? 14 15 A. Sometimes it could be a person's demeanor, statements made by individuals involved, any 16 17 physical evidence that you may see on scene, 18 anything that corroborates it, but a lot of times 19 you may only get a verbal statement from one 20 party and a verbal statement from another party, 21 so you may look at a person's demeanor and try to 22 make a judgment on this statement based on 23 demeanor. 24 As in the Caniglia's case with Mrs. 25 Caniglia, the totality would be she was so

		8	3
4			
1		concerned that she stayed at a hotel that night.	
2		That kind of added to the totality of that	
3		particular call.	
4	Q.	Okay. But your recollection was when you saw her	
5		at Scramblers her demeanor was that she was calm?	
6		A. Yes.	
7	Q.	Okay. And when you spoke to Mr. Caniglia, he was	
8		agitated about the fact that the police had come	
9		to his house, but, otherwise, he was calm?	
10		A. Agitated. He wasn't like I said, wasn't	
11		happy with us being there but wasn't hysterical.	
12	Q.	Okay. Apart from the fact that he wasn't happy	
13		with you being there, how was his demeanor?	
14		A. Again, angry but not overtly angry. He was	
15		there was a lot of discussion back and forth	
16		between the officers and him about going to the	
17		hospital. He did not want to go, from what I	
18		remember, to the hospital under those	
19		circumstances. Ultimately, he did consent to	
20		going after talking to him some time, you know,	
21		in regards to the situation. But, otherwise, it	
22		was more just anger, but not hysterical anger.	
23	Q.	Do you know if he consented to go to the hospital	
24		after he was told that if he did not consent his	
25		firearms would be seized?	

86 1 say that that was from my experience as a police Again, I'm not a medical professional, 2 so I don't know whether a statement like that 3 rises to that level. But in my experience when someone makes any type of statement to harm 5 themselves, whether it's through anger or 6 7 anything else, they're not in their right frame 8 of mind and they need to at least speak to a medical professional in regards to that. 9 10 Can you read your Interrogatory Number 7 and your 11 response. 12 (Witness complied.) 13 A. Okay. 14 (By Mr. Lyons) All right. And there are eight 15 factors that you list in this response that I understand constitute the totality of the 16 17 circumstances here; is that fair to say? 18 A. Yes. 19 Okay. Number 1 is plaintiff and his wife were involved in divorce proceedings. Do you see 20 21 that? 22 A. Yes. Did you hear Mrs. Caniglia say that? 23 24 A. I don't recall specifically if it was her or 25 another officer telling me at the time, but --

			87
1	Q.	Do you know if, in fact, they were in divorce	
2	_	proceedings?	
3		A. That I don't know.	
4	Q.	Okay. You said plaintiff was sick of the	
5		arguments between him and his wife and he wanted	
6		to work things out is Number 2. Do you see that?	
7		A. Yes.	
8	Q.	Did you hear Mr. Caniglia say that?	
9		A. I don't recall specifically like that, but I	
10		think when we were speaking to him on the porch	:
11		was one of the things that he wanted to work it	
12		out with his wife, that the argument just kind of	
13		escalated and I believe he was referring to the	
14		possible divorce or the marital status.	
15	Q.	Well, did Mr. Caniglia say that they were in	
16		divorce proceedings?	
17		A. I don't recall if he said it or not or if it	
18		was one of the officers that relayed that	
19		information.	
20	Q.	If Mr. Caniglia said he wanted to work things out	
21		with his wife, wouldn't that indicate that he was	
22		not suicidal?	
23		A. Again, I'm not a medical professional so I	
24		don't know if that statement would negate the	
25		statement from the night before, so it wouldn't	

		88
1		have changed any outcome at that time.
2	Q.	Okay. If you go down to Number 4, it says,
3		"During the argument plaintiff grabbed a firearm
4		with one hand and a magazine with the other." Do
5		you see that?
6		A. Yes.
7	Q.	Okay. Do you recall someone telling you that, in
8		fact, Mr. Caniglia had a firearm in one hand and
9		a magazine in the other?
10		A. Specific, I don't know if it was him or an
11		officer that had relayed it on scene or if it was
12		Mrs. Caniglia, but going off of the dispatch,
13		Exhibit 22 there, she had mentioned something
14		different, so specifically I don't know who said
15		that.
16	Q.	Okay. Would it have made a difference to you
17		here if, in fact, he had not had a magazine in
18		his hand?
19		A. Wouldn't have made a difference. The fact
20		that the it's a firearm. It is a true firearm
21		that whether or not it was loaded or not, whether
22		or not he made reference to load it, it doesn't
23		really change much, in my opinion.
24	Q.	Number 5 says "plaintiff was upset."
25		A. Yes.

			89
1	Q.	Have you described for me the way in which	
2		plaintiff was upset?	
3		A. Just the the anger and trepidation when we	
4		were on scene speaking to him on the porch.	
5	Q.	And that had to do with the fact that the police	
6		had gotten involved?	
7		A. Yes.	
8	Q.	Okay. If you go to Number 8 it says, "Upon	
9		returning to the residence, plaintiff's wife	
10		parked her car about 100 feet away from the	
11		residence and remained in her car until plaintiff	
12		left the property by rescue." Do you see that?	
13		A. Yes.	
14	Q.	My understanding, as you testified earlier, that	
15		she did that because she was told to by the	
16		Cranston Police.	
17		A. Yes.	
18	Q.	Okay.	
19		A. May I go back to that?	
20	Q.	Oh, yes. Yes.	
21		A. I just she was told to, meaning advised,	
22		that we as the police department wanted to make	
23		contact. She was concerned about what could have	
24		possibly happened. We didn't want Mrs. Caniglia	
25		to possibly walk into something tragic. So,	

102 1 higher level of law enforcement intervention will 2 be required when officers encounter the following 3 scenarios," and Number 1 says, "the person is 4 imminently dangerous to himself or others." Do 5 you see that? A. Yes. 6 7 Is that what you thought applied here? Did you 8 believe Mr. Caniglia was imminently dangerous to 9 himself or others? 10 A. Yes, based on the totality of the 11 circumstances, the -- you know, what had happened the previous night, I know imminently applies 12 13 there was the night before and now we're dealing 14 with it a day later (sic). 15 My concern at that point was the statements were made that the Police Department 16 17 was made aware of those statements and that he --18 when we go back to the involuntary part of it, regardless of what Mr. Caniglia had said, after 19 we had learned -- corroborated the statement from 20 the night before, he was going to the hospital 21 22 for a medical evaluation. 23 When I go back and state that we would 24 rather -- the Police Department would rather not 25 put our hands on somebody and take physical

		124
1		but depending on what he asks you, I may have
2		some follow-ups.
3		MR. CUNNINGHAM: I promise to be short
4		and speak slowly because I have a tendency to
5		ramble.
6		EXAMINATION BY MR. CUNNINGHAM
7	Q.	Could you look at Exhibit 9 again. Mr. Lyons
8		asked you to look at page Bates stamped number
9		000243.
10		A. Okay.
11	Q.	And I believe your testimony, Sergeant, was that
12		you considered Bullet Point 1 and Bullet Point 2
13		as a warning sign of suicide in this particular
14		case; is that correct?
15		A. Correct.
16	Q.	Okay. If you look at the bottom of the page, it
17		also lists agitation. Did you consider the fact
18		that Mr. Caniglia was agitated as a result of the
19		argument he had with his wife?
20		MR. LYONS: Objection.
21		A. His demeanor at the time did show agitation
22		and it was kind of added to the totality of the
23		circumstances.
24	Q.	(By Mr. Cunningham) Thank you. If you could
25		take a look at Exhibit 6, which is, sorry,

Exhibit "O"

Deposition Transcript of Captain Russell C. Henry, JR.
June 13, 2018

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND

EDWARD A. CANIGLIA Plaintiff

VS.

C.A. NO. 15-525

1

ROBERT F. STROM, as the Finance Director of THE CITY OF CRANSTON, et al.

Defendants

DEPOSITION OF CPT. RUSSELL C. HENRY, JR., a Defendant in the above-entitled case, taken on behalf of the Plaintiff, before Linda L. Guglielmo, RPR-RMR, a Notary Public in and for the State of Rhode Island, at the offices of Strauss, Factor, Laing & Lyons, One Davol Square, Providence, Rhode Island, on June 13, 2018 at 10:00 A.M.

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF.....STRAUSS, FACTOR, LAING & LYONS BY: THOMAS W. LYONS, ESQ.

FOR THE DEFENDANTS....DeSISTO LAW

BY: PATRICK K. CUNNINGHAM, ESQ.

		24
1		A. Yes, sir.
2	Q.	Don't get impatient with me.
3		A. I have all day.
4	Q.	I mentioned the community caretaking function,
5		have you heard of that phrase before?
6		A. Yes.
7	Q.	What is your understanding of it?
8		A. My understanding is that the courts recognize
9		that law enforcement needs to take certain actions
10		relative to the Fourth Amendment without a warrant
11		that pertain to public safety functions or
12		emergencies.
13	Q.	Are public safety functions and emergencies
14		different categories or
15		A. Or emergencies.
16	Q.	So when you say a public safety function, what
17		public safety what kind of public safety
18		functions are you referring to?
19		A. Say, an intoxicated person stumbling down
20		Reservoir Avenue into traffic, I think the courts
21		recognize that it's reasonable for the police to
22		take custody of the person for their own
23		well-being, protect them from getting hurt, make
24		sure they receive whatever care that they need.
25		Hypothetically, a person jumping off the Pell

Bridge, I think the courts recognize that the police have to, you know, take reasonable action to prevent the person from killing themselves.

A person has a firearm that's thinking of harming themselves or others, I think the courts recognize police have to take whatever action is necessary to prevent that. Those type of scenarios.

- Q. Okay. Are those either a public safety function or an emergency, or are there other examples that you would put in the category of an emergency?
 A. I think the circumstances around those type of issues where they're unfolding as the police are there. So I think the courts recognize sometimes, whether it's a seizure of a person or some type of property to maintain public safety, I think as long as it's reasonable, the courts recognize that it's okay to do it without a warrant.
- Q. My question was, as you had sort of made two broad categories, public safety functions or emergencies, I was asking, maybe unclearly, the examples you gave were, those just public safety, or were they emergencies, or were they a combination of both?

			26
1		A. I think it's fair to say that they could be	
2		one or the other or both.	
	•		
3	Q.	Okay. When did you first hear of the community	
4		caretaking function?	
5		A. I hear about it periodically. It's	
6		something to me it's synonymous with public	
7		safety. I think the Community Caretaking Doctrine	
8		that's referred to if you depending on what you	
9		read.	
10	Q.	Okay. Did you learn about it in any formal	
11		education that you have had?	
12		A. I may have. I don't recall where I learned	
13		it specifically.	
14	Q.	All right. Did you read about it in any materials	
15		you received?	
16		A. May have. I try I take pride in	
17		self-education, you know, sometimes with different	
18		court decisions, whatnot, you know, I try to read	
19		those, keep up on current events. Sometimes the	:
20		lack of formal training or in-service training on	
21		those type of things, so I do a lot of reading.	
22	Q.	Has the Cranston Police Department had any	
23		in-service let me back up. You referred to	
24		in-service training, what do you mean by	
25		in-service training?	

		31
1	Q.	Would the community caretaking function ever come
2		up during a roll call training?
3		A. It may have, I don't recall specifically. We
4		do it on a regular basis, we do high-speed pursuit
5		training at roll call, we do review of the cell
6		block policy at roll call. We're mandated by
7		CALEA to do that, the accreditation. There are
8		certain policies within the Cranston police
9		general orders that mandate roll call training,
10		continuous training. That particular phrase,
11		community caretaking, may not be, but it may be
12		part of a different topic.
13	Q.	Okay. So, in other words, the theory of the
14		community caretaking function may have been
15		discussed even if that particular phrase was not
16		used?
17		A. It may have been discussed under mental
18		health in roll call training.
19	Q.	Do you believe, or is it your understanding that
20		the Cranston Police Department has the authority,
21		separate from a criminal investigation, of
22		requiring a person to submit to a psychiatric
23		evaluation?
24		THE WITNESS: Can you repeat that?
25		(QUESTION READ)

35 1 topic? MR. LYONS: Yes. 2 3 I'm not aware of any. Α. 4 Other than what we've talked about so far, have Q. had any other training or education addressing the 5 6 community caretaking function, whether or not it 7 was called that? I think it's fair to say that mental health, 8 the mental health training we received encompassed 9 the concept of the Community Caretaking Act or 10 11 Doctrine, whatever you want to call it. Most recent mental health training really 12 that I can remember when it became more present is 13 14 veterans coming back overseas from Operation 15 Desert Storm and all those Middle East operations where we were getting people in the community that 16 17 had post-traumatic stress disorder. It was very So different law enforcement agencies 18 prevalent. 19 started training officers on that. We'll actually talk a little more specifically 20 Q. 21 about that in a little bit. We have been provided 22 with some records of what I think are in-service Let me see if I can locate them. 23 training. 24 First, let me ask you a question, your son Russell 25 Henry, is he designated a different way in the

		58
1		surrendered firearms, how they're handled, how
2		they will be put into evidence, documented, how
3		they're secured, paperwork to be filed, to be
4		tested, test-fired, how they will be dispossessed
5		of and released.
6		It talks about, Page 11, firearms seized for
7		safekeeping, firearms seized as found property,
8		firearms surrendered to the police department,
9		forfeited and abandoned firearms. It talks about
10		several things that deal with firearms and seizure
11		of.
12	Q.	Maybe I misunderstood, but it was my impression,
13		correct me if I'm wrong, that this general order
14		deals with what the police department does after
15		it comes into possession of the firearm, for
16		whatever reason, and how it handles the firearms
17		thereafter. Does this general order address the
18		circumstances under which the police department
19		may seize a firearm?
20		A. No, I don't believe so. That's not the
21		purpose of the policy.
22	Q.	All right. Have you ever been involved in
23		returning firearms to a person?
24		THE WITNESS: How? Specifically,
25		what do you mean?

		cpt. Russell C. Henry, Dr Dune 13, 2016	
			59
1	Q.	Have you been involved in returning firearms to a	
2		person from whom they were seized?	
3		A. Involved? Not as a member of the Bureau of	
4		Criminal Identification, no.	
5	Q.	Okay. Have you ever been involved in it in any	
6		capacity whatsoever?	
7		A. I served in the detective division for seven	
8		years, from 2004 to 2010. In the narcotics unit	
9		we made numerous seizure of firearms. So in that	
10		aspect, whether they were going to be returned by	
11		us or not, sometimes I was involved.	
12	Q.	All right. I'm going to then ask you some	
13		questions about the general order. If you go to	
14		Page 8, there's a topic called Disposal of	
15		Evidence; do you see that?	
16		A. Yes.	
17	Q.	It says, "When no longer needed for evidentiary	
18		purposes, all evidence with the exception of	
19		firearms and contraband, shall be returned to its	
20		lawful owner." Do you see that?	
21		A. Yes.	
22	Q.	And then Number 2 or ii, it says, "Firearms and	
23		non-drug contraband shall be destroyed unless a	
24		court order authorizes use of this item by this	:

agency or the firearm is required by state law,

25

		63
1	Q.	Was that a temporary state of mind?
2		A. I can't say. I don't know.
3	Q.	Okay. Did anyone make a determination that it was
4		not a temporary state of mind?
5		A. I don't know.
6	Q.	Okay. Do you know on what basis Mr. Caniglia's
7		firearms were not returned to him after the date
8		of the incident?
9		A. I have no knowledge of anything to do with
10		the return of the firearms.
11	Q.	Okay. Who would have been involved in determining
12		whether to return Mr. Caniglia's firearms to him?
13		A. Depends so if there was a request,
14		assuming there was a request made, I imagine that
15		the chief would have been notified at one point,
16		the majors, usually based on my experience,
17		when there are requests made, whoever they make it
18		to goes up to the chain of command, and then
19		there's a approval.
20	Q.	All right. Well, who is it that usually has the
21		final approval on determining whether to return
22		firearms to someone?
23		A. I don't want to say it's the same person in
24		every instance. I guess it would depend on it
25		could be different in each instance.

		ope. Rubbell 6. Menly, 61. Same 15, 1616
		94
1	Q.	Right. When we looked at the prior record of an
2		in-service training, and I'm not sure where it
3		went, it listed several specific topics.
4		A. Right. Domestic violence, mental health,
5		intro to safety net, 2011.
6	Q.	Correct. Just so we're clear, that's Exhibit 14
7		you're looking at right now?
8		A. Yes.
9	Q.	So what I'm getting at is whenever there is record
10		of in-service training similar to Exhibit 14,
11		would it list the topics that were presented?
12	-	A. I would assume that the training lieutenant
13		keeps the curriculum of what's presented when, to
14		who.
15	Q.	Okay. In other words, I should ask the training
16		lieutenant for whatever records there are of any
17		presentations of in-service training dealing with
18		search and seizure law?
19		A. Yes.
20	Q.	Okay. If you look at, going back to Exhibit 8, if
21		you go to Page 10, please. There's a slide
22		entitled Exceptions to the Search Warrant
23		Requirement; do you see that?
24		A. Yes.
	I	

There are ten items listed; do you see those?

25

Q.

			95
1		A. Yes.	
2	Q.	Number 10 says Community Care; do you see that?	
3		A. Yes.	
4	Q.	Is that the community caretaking function we've	
5		been discussing?	
6		A. Yes.	
7	Q.	So that would be an exception to the search	
8		warrant requirement?	
9		A. Yes.	
10	Q.	Then if you will go to Page 32, there's one slide	
11		which is entitled Community Caretaking Function;	
12		do you see that?	:
13		A. Yes.	
14	Q.	Okay. Do you recall seeing this slide in any	
15		presentation at the Cranston Police Department?	
16		A. I don't recall it specifically, no.	
17	Q.	Okay. It refers to one case, if you see, State	
18		versus Roussell; do you see that?	
19		A. Yes.	
20	Q.	It says, Trooper investigates erratic operation of	
21		motor vehicle by opening passenger side door of	
22		motor vehicle. Makes impaired operator	
23		observations. Not a search because officer	
24		engaged in community caretaking; do you see that?	
25		A. Yes.	

Exhibit "P"

Deposition Transcript of Edward A. Caniglia June 29, 2018

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND

EDWARD A. CANIGLIA,
Plaintiff

 \mathbf{v} .

C.A. NO. 15-525-M-LDA

1

ROBERT F. STROM, as the Finance Director of the CITY OF CRANSTON, et al.

Defendants

DEPOSITION OF EDWARD A. CANIGLIA, taken on behalf of the Defendants, Friday, June 29, 2018 at 10:00 a.m., pursuant to Rule 30 and Rule 45 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure at the offices of DeSisto Law LLC, 60 Ship Street, Providence, Rhode Island, before Linda F. Oakley, RPR, Notary Public.

APPEARANCES:

STRAUSS, FACTOR, LAING & LYONS BY: THOMAS W. LYONS, III, ESQ. Counsel for the Plaintiff

DESISTO LAW LLC BY: CAROLINE MURPHY, ESQ. Counsel for the Defendants

> Allied Court Reporters, Inc. (401)946-5500 115 Phenix Avenue, Cranston, RI 02920 www.alliedcourtreporters.com

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

Edward A. Caniglia - June 29, 2018

44 PT -- patient -- at a qun and told his wife to shoot him, police recovered gun, PT -- meaning patient -stated he was not looking to hurt himself. happened last night. Wife called today. Wife leaving him, stated for her to shoot him again. PT -- indicating patient -- calm, did not deny altercation, psych I'm going to focus on the last sentence that eval. I've read. It says: Patient calm, did not deny altercation, psych eval. Today as I read this out loud, does it refresh your recollection as to the statement that I just read, did not deny altercation? Do you recall having any kind of conversation with the rescue? I had no conversation with the fire rescue people, other than he spoke to one of the officers. He got into the back of the wagon. I was sitting on the rescue cart. He said, "How are you feeling?" I said, "Fine." He said, "Okay. We're going to go to Kent County Hospital." I said, "Fine." And that was it. Q. Okay. He said -- he may have said, "Do you have any obvious health problems?" And I said, "Just high blood pressure," or something like that.

Exhibit "Q"

Officer Wayne Russell's Response to Plaintiff's Interrogatory No. 7

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND

EDWARD A. CANIGLIA, *Plaintiff*

v.

C.A. No. 15-525-M-LDA

ROBERT F. STROM, as the Finance Director of the CITY OF CRANSTON, the CITY OF CRANSTON, and COL. MICHAEL J. WINQUIST, in his official capacity as Chief of the CRANSTON POLICE DEPARTMENT

Defendants

<u>DEFENDANT, WAYNE RUSSELL'S</u> <u>RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S INTERROGATORIES</u>

1. Set forth your complete legal name and address at which you may be served with a subpoena to testify at trial, if necessary.

<u>RESPONSE</u>: Wayne Russell, Patrolman, Cranston Police Department, 5 Garfield Ave., Cranston, R.I. 02920.

2. Set forth your educational background, including the names and addresses of all postsecondary schools you have attended and all degrees or educational honors you have received.

<u>RESPONSE:</u> Community College of Rhode Island, 400 East Ave. Warwick, R.I. 02886-1807, Associates in Criminal Justice.

3. Set forth all positions you have held in law enforcement, including the name and address of your employers, the inclusive dates during which you were employed and the name and last known address of your immediate supervisor.

<u>RESPONSE:</u> 1. Patrolman, Cranston Police Department, Immediate Supervisor: Lieutenant Justin Dutra.

4. Describe all formal training you have received in law enforcement with respect to the seizure of firearms.

RESPONSE: I received various trainings with respect to the seizure of firearms at the

7. State whether your actions in seizing Edward Caniglia's firearms and refusing to return them without a court order were pursuant to a custom, policy or practice in effect at the Cranston Police Department in 2015.

RESPONSE: Objection. Defendant objects to the extent that this request seeks some responsive information that was not compiled and/or kept in the ordinary course of business. I have no direct knowledge of the alleged refusal to return Edward Caniglia's firearms without a court order because I was not involved in the retaining, evidence storage, or return of firearms, including the firearms of Edward Caniglia. Notwithstanding and without waiving the objection, to the extent that I was involved in the seizure of Edward Caniglia's firearms, the actions in seizing Mr. Caniglia's firearms as a result of several factors in which plaintiff made suicidal statements and took action in furtherance of those statements, were pursuant to Cranston Police Departments custom and practice in effect in 2015. The several factors include, but are not limited to the following:

- 1. Plaintiff and his wife were involved in divorce proceedings;
- 2. Plaintiff was "sick" of the arguments between him and his wife and he wanted to "work things out";
- 3. Plaintiff and his wife were involved in an argument about a mug which precipitated the contact with Cranston Police;
- 4. During the argument Plaintiff grabbed a firearm with one hand and a magazine with the other and directed his wife to end his life because he could not "take it anymore";
- 5. Plaintiff was upset; and
- 6. Before Cranston Police spoke to Plaintiff, Plaintiff's wife expressed her concern to Cranston Police that Plaintiff may have committed suicide.

Please refer to Exhibit A, Cranston Police Department's Incident Report #15-43394-OF and Exhibit B, Seizure Report for Incident # 15-43395-OF.

8. Set forth the Cranston Police Department's current policy with respect to seizing and retaining a person's weapons without a warrant, for safekeeping or otherwise, including all facts, data, studies or reports, that support this policy.

<u>RESPONSE</u>: Please see City of Cranston's Response to Request for Production, Response No. 2, herein incorporated, which provides Cranston Police Department's practice procedure and/or guidelines and provides the CD containing Cranston Police Department's policies.