

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

This "online comments" section is in operation, despite some technical difficulties over the past several months. The two postings of January 9 by Mark C and Bob Arnold were "waiting for approval" but I didn't realize they were there. I had seen the January 3 posting by Bob Arnold and initially withheld approval, but approved it today, unedited.

There are no other submitted comments awaiting approval.

In response to Bob Arnold's question of Jan 9, Chad has never visited Cassidy's gravesite. He had intended to go to her funeral service, but he was arrested two days beforehand. During his time on bail, his probation status prohibited him from going out of state, and Amanda's mother still lived in Buckfield which might have made the visit awkward. Since his re-incarceration in August, 2001, he has been in prison.

*28 May 2013 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Mark C**

Sorry, but Chad's response is lame. Even if 150 people saw Cassidy the night before her death, that doesn't mean it would have been obvious that the poor little girl was struggling internally. He left her in the car because of the state she was in...period. Didn't want others seeing her, especially drooling or being out of it. Also, to argue that no one saw him beating Cassidy on the way to the daycare is ridiculous. As with the other times he beat the snot out of the poor toddler, he was calculated and careful not to have witnesses.

By the way, time is all he has these days...thankfully to other potential stepkids.

*9 January 2013*

**Bob A**

How are we to believe in Chad Evan's claims of love and kindness towards Cassidy Bortner, when his actions tell another story? He claims he had a "loving, nurturing" relationship with her, but left her all alone in the car. Only one word can describe it....unconscionable. He claims he was in the building for 2-3 minutes. I've never had a parent pickup that was "2-3 minutes." They are always 5-10 minutes.

Two more questions:

Did he, or would he have ever left Kyle alone in the care like that?

Did he ever visit Cassidy's grave?

Bob

*9 January 2013 - NH*

**Chad Evans (via letter to Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Morrison, in your letter #775 you asked about the pick up of Kyle at Crossroads Kindergarten on 11/8/2000. As I've indicated in the past I was running late to pick up Kyle that evening and knew I was going to be cutting it close to the closing deadline. I pulled right up to the main entrance of the Kindergarten. It's hard to describe without a photograph, but there was some construction around that time as they were adding another classroom, but the front was all open and the building had a front door. As I recall, the parking lot at the school had several parking spaces off to either side off the building and typically you park at them and walk in to pick up your child. Typically that is where I parked and on a few occasions when Cassidy was with me I parked there and walked in with her to pick up Kyle. On these nights I liked to linger for a minute because Kyle could show us what he was doing in school that day, if it was nice out the children were all out back playing in the school playground and I could watch him interact with other kids, etc. Also, It gave me a minute to see Cassidy take in unfamiliar surroundings.

On this particular night, I knew I was going to be in there only a minute or two and was likely the last

parent or next-to-last parent to pick up their child. As I recall there was no other cars in the lot that evening. I had arrived that late one other time and Kyle's teacher had him sitting right next to the front door so I half expected that when I opened the door. Anyway, I did not unbuckle Cassidy and bring her in to the daycare with me. Even though there was large windows there and my car was right at the front door and visible through the windows the entire time, in hindsight it was stupid for many reasons. First, even though it is a remote area and, as Ms. Entrekin points out I was only in there for 2-3 minutes, there was the slight possibility that someone could have smashed my window and grabbed Cassidy or something.

(continued below)

8 January 2013 - New Hampshire State Prison

**Chad Evans (by letter to Morrison Bonpasse) | **

(continued from above)

Sometimes as a parent when you have a child that is snuggled in a warm care and is in and out of dozing and you know you are only going to be gone a second, they are so peaceful you just don't want to disturb them. Second, I had no way of knowing that Cassidy would die the following day but for my own selfish reasons of all the days to make that split second decision to let her sit there for a minute or bring her in, this is a day that I've wished a million times that I had brought her in. I wish a hundred and fifty people had seen her with me that evening. It would then have been awful hard to blame me for something I didn't do. I know this question was asked by Mr. Arnold and yes, the simple answer is yes, I screwed up. I left Cassidy in the car unattended for a few seconds, but I pulled right up to the door and I never thought for a second that anything would happen to her. Instead of always trying to find fault maybe the question one might ask is if I was this monster that supposedly just got done beating Cassidy so violently on the highway (that miraculously no one observed) how was I so calm to ask my son's teacher about a movie that I could buy for the kids minutes later? It is all so ridiculous. But I'm beginning to see people are going to find the answers they want to find. I'd like to get more in depth, but I'm out of time.

Thanks.

8 January 2013 - New Hampshire State Prison

**Bob A**

Morrison:

2: I don't agree. Chad was frustrated with Cassidy, angry with her, hated her. But go ahead and ask him for his explanation.

4: I look forward to Chad's response but you can't assume it was safe to leave a child in the car because these two did it, two individuals who were convicted of abusing an 18 month old. I've made over 1000 pickup/drop-offs at our daycare providers over the years and never, not once did I ever observe another parent leave a young child in the car.

Early statements and writings by Chad and Amanda are very revealing. It's interesting how Chad has embellished his story since his conviction. How is it that Chad Evans knowingly lied to the police, avoided the police, hid out in the woods, etc etc, if he was an innocent man? Please ask him to explain that one.

Regards,

Bob

3 January 2013 - Rochester NH

**Morrison Bonpasse | **

Bob,

1. Thanks for the reference to that fall on evening of the 8th. I'll ask Chad about it. In the section you were apparently referencing, he wrote, "I decided I was going to give her a bath. She hardly touched her supper and I figured I would just put her to bed early. I set her down again standing up in the hallway to start her bath water. I heard this thud apparently she took a step and fell back hitting her head on the wall. I ran out to see what happened and her eyes did it again." I didn't take sufficient note of it when reading that 2009 letter to Chad's attorneys, and it hasn't come up in other discussions or correspondence. It was likely another event that may have been important in retrospect, but which was missed at the time.

2. The reason Chad said to Amanda on the evening of the 8th that he perhaps shouldn't take care of Cassidy was that he was feeling stupid about the Tee-ball accident and feeling jinxed. It was not because he didn't want to care for her.

3. Yes. It was not a good decision to tell the trampoline story to his attorneys at the very beginning of their representation of him. Chad didn't tell them the truth about the trampoline story until later. Unfortunately, at Chad's trial, his attorneys did not make it clear to the jury that Chad was admitting that he shared the creation and telling of that story with Amanda, and that it was false. Because that issue wasn't clarified, the jury (like you?) likely questioned the truthfulness of everything that Chad said.

(continued below)

2 January 2013 - Newcastle, Maine

### Morrison Bonpasse |

(continued from above)

4. You already asked about the pickup of his son at Cross Road. I don't have Chad's response yet, but the summary of the Erin Entrekin interview gives her opinion that Chad was there 2-3 minutes. Also, that same summary states that she saw Amanda bring Chad's son to Cross Road around noon on the 8th, and that she could see "a small female child" in the car behind the driver's seat, and noted that she was wearing a pink coat. Thus, parents delivering and picking up their child could safely leave children in their cars while visiting the school. A day care center would not be a good place for a parent to show carelessness about leaving children unattended in his/her parked car. That's surely one reason why the parking lot is close to the building.

5. Agreed. Chad's seeing Cassidy awake when he and Amanda checked on her around midnight is another example of information which should have been presented to the jury. The examination and cross-examination of Amanda was insufficiently detailed, and Chad's decision not to testify, on advice of counsel, was a terrible mistake.

6. Chad's call to Jeff Marshall at 9:47 a.m. on the 9th took 13 minutes, but there was very little said about that call in Chad's and Jeff's interviews or in Jeff's testimony. Again, Chad should have testified and the full contents of the call should have been discussed. Even without Chad's testimony, the cross-examination of Jeff about the call should have incorporated Chad's written recollection of the call. As Jeff never mentioned that Chad referred to Cassidy as the "little princess," you will likely never believe that such a reference was used. It's a phrase that Chad used to describe Cassidy from time to time.

P.S. When submitting comments, which are split into two or more comments, please submit the last one first.

2 January 2013 - Newcastle, Maine

### Bob A

Morrison,  
I have a few more questions for Chad.

See Chad's letter to his attorney written shortly after he was arrested.

1: Chad mentions Cassidy falling down in the hallway and hitting her head on the wall while he was preparing her bath. I consider this significant, however Chad never mentioned it during his police interview.

2: How is it that during Chad's phone conversation with Amanda on the evening of the 8th, he

claims to have told Amanda that he didn't want Jeff to watch Cassidy anymore, out of concern for her safety, and within seconds he tells her he didn't want to watch her either.

This simply does not make sense.

We know for a fact that he did tell Amanda that he didn't want to watch her anymore, see police interview with Amanda. She confirms that Chad told her he didn't want to watch Cassidy anymore, however there is no mention of Chad being concerned about how Jeff cared for Cassidy.

(continued, below)

*2 January 2013 - Rochester, NH*

## **Bob A**

Continued from above:

3: Chad's trampoline story appears in this letter, which is indicative of deceit to his attorney.

4: Upon arrival at Crossroads, Chad writes that he "ran in real quick" to get Kyle. Based on his description of the pickup, It appears he was in the building for at least 10 minutes, and he left Cassidy alone in the car, in the parking lot. Why didn't he bring Cassidy into the building? As a parent, this is a huge red flag and is indicative of either A: Chad was hiding Cassidy from other adults or B: Chad didn't care about her and treated her like a dog or c: Both A and B above.

5: Chad claims that around midnight of the 8th, Cassidy was awake when he checked on her. There was never any mention of this during the police interviews or cross-examination of Amanda during the trial.

6: Chad claims that when he called Jeff on the morning of the 9th, he asked Jeff "how's the little princess".

I find this unbelievable, based on two things: First, police interviews of both Chad and Jeff. Second, the true nature of the call was the result of a DCYF call placed to Chad's house that morning.

(continued below)

*2 January 2013 - Rochester, NH*

## **Bob A**

Continued from above:

In closing, I'd like to comment of something Chad wrote in his 11/6/12 letter, "people choosing to believe whatever they wanted despite what the facts say, and terrible, judgmental comments." Everything I've relied on is fact, and can be found in the police reports as well as trial testimony. These facts, combined with intuition and gut instinct, lead me to believe in Chad's guilt. As far as terrible comments, yes I've made quite a few and most were not appropriate, but were in response to comments made by Chad supporters who turn this forum into a dog and pony show, making attacks on me, comments about my family and parading around with quotes. I'm open to civil, intellectual debate, but if people want to turn this into something else I'm always up for that too.

Regards,

Bob

*2 January 2013 - Rochester, NH*

## **Morrison Bonpasse |**

Bob,  
Happy Holidays to you as well.  
I'll ask Chad for more details.  
Morrison

*29 December 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

## Bob A

Morrison,

I hope you had a nice Christmas holiday. I have a question I'd like you to ask Chad: Please ask him for more detailed information concerning the pickup of Kyle at Crossroads on the 8th, more accurately between 5:50pm and 6:10pm. Based on his police interrogation, "Case Chronology" as well as his letter to his attorney written after his arrest, and his letter to Jeff Strelzin dated Sep 21, 2012, it appears that Cassidy was left in his vehicle, in the parking lot of the daycare center. It also appears that Chad entered the building, based on his description of the movie being played for the children and his conversation with one of the providers.

Thanks,

Bob

*29 December 2012 - Rochester NH*

## Morrison Bonpasse |

(From letter sent by Chad to his family and friends)

Happy Holidays!

It is hard to believe that another year has passed. Hopefully 2013 will be filled with wonderful things for all of us. I for one would love the year to start with another Super Bowl trophy for the Patriots. Morrison and I, along with the committees, have been working hard on the criminal case for the past twelve months. I'm happy to share that we've made significant progress and we expect to file a comprehensive motion for habeas corpus during the first quarter of 2013.

On the recreational side, in between working out and playing basketball, I've continued to explore my interest of the Golden Age of Hollywood. This past year I read biographies or autobiographies about Louis B. Mayer, Greta Garbo, Jean Harlow, Ava Gardner, Louise Brooks, Dorothy Dandridge, Gloria Swanson, Marilyn Monroe, and Lauren Bacall. I'm not sure what fascinates me so much about this period. I suspect it is the fact that the special effects were minimal and the acting was so raw. I also enjoy history so I'm sure that adds to it. So far, I've enjoyed the books more than the movies I've seen. I am determined to see a silent film from the 1920's someday before I leave this planet. I can't imagine how they told a cogent story without using any spoken words.

Kyle also taught me how to play cribbage recently. Now if I could just figure out which cards to hold onto so I can beat him ...

I continue my journey of self exploration. Often it is not easy to look at yourself and admit you were a first class jerk to someone you care about most in the world. In this respect I've had to learn that I'm not unique; most of us make these mistakes from time to time. As many of you know, I feel that I've made more than my share of mistakes in life. Some I can atone for; others I cannot. I mourn the relationships that have been permanently damaged. It appears the only thing that I can do is apologize for my mistakes and strive everyday to be a better person that I was the day before.(continued below)

*29 December 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

## Morrison Bonpasse |

(continued from above)

During a recent seminar that I attended, one of the presenters shared a definition of forgiveness. (See below.) It seemed so powerful. This got me to thinking ... Perhaps you can avoid the hustle, bustle, and stress of shopping for that one "perfect" gift for someone on your list this holiday season because you already possess it. Extending forgiveness to someone you have been withholding it from is a gift to them as well as yourself. I assure you, this gift will have far more meaning than anything you could ever purchase in a store. I certainly don't mean to sound preachy. I've long identified with the plight of Sisyphus. To hear I've been forgiven by several that I've hurt during my lifetime would bring immeasurable happiness to me. Just as I'm sure the person (s) you are knowingly or unknowingly holding hostage to unforgiveness would feel similar relief, especially if it is not too late to rebuild what was once a great relationship. It is easy to forget that there cannot be hurt unless there was once love.

So ... for that definition of forgiveness by Fred Luskin-

"Forgiveness is the feeling of peace that emerges as you take your hurt less personally, take responsibility for how you feel, and become a hero instead of a victim in the story you tell. Forgiveness is the experience of peacefulness in the present moment. Forgiveness does not change the past, but it changes the present. Forgiveness means that even though you are wounded you choose to hurt and suffer less. Forgiveness means you become a part of the solution. Forgiveness is the understanding that hurt is a normal part of life. Forgiveness means you don't make others suffer along with you. Forgiveness is for you and no one else. You can forgive and rejoin a relationship or forgive and never speak to the person again."

I hope you have an incredible holiday season and you have a chance to create some everlasting memories with those that you love most.

-Chad

29 December 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

Morrison Bonpasse | 

(In his Nov. 16, 2012 letter, Chad wrote...)

You forwarded a question from Bob Arnold about how many formal warnings I had received from my bosses either written or verbal prior to Cassidy's death. In the interest of full disclosure, I will not limit my response in any way and you can share it fully.

In my recollection I can recall two instances where I was given reprimands.

The first came when I was a 16 year old shift manager in the Keene McDonald's working for Dan Frazier. At the time one of my best friends was one of the Asst. managers, Chris Goss. A bunch of us including Chris decided that after close Saturday night that we wanted to drive to Hampton Beach and watch the sun come up and spend the day at the beach. The only trouble was that I was scheduled to open on Sunday. Chris said, "No problem, Chad, J will cover your shift." Chris found another manager to cover the open and all was good. (I thought.) Chris, a carload of other shift managers, crew, and I went to the beach. When we got back Sunday night I got a call to see Dan Frazier on Monday. Apparently, Chris hadn't covered the shift or at least effectively.... It was upsetting because I let Dan down. Up to that point I was the "Golden Child," so to speak, and I knew he was disappointed that I had acted like an irresponsible kid. It was a good character builder for me though. Up to that point I hadn't faced any adversity. I could do no wrong. I was employee of the month, manger of the month several times, etc. A week or so after reviewing my written warning with me, Dan came to me and rescinded it.

This taught me a valuable lesson that I would use throughout the rest of my career; it's never too late to show your managers you are human.... Dan indicated something to the effect of, "often as the boss you have to take the blame for others mistakes and share the credit even when some people haven't done anything to deserve it. If you've got that figured out at 16 you will have a bright future with the company if you want it."

(continued below)

23 December 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

Morrison Bonpasse | 

(continued from above)

The second reprimand came about a decade later when I was an area supervisor at a restaurant managers convention. It is a tradition for the operations managers to take the restaurant managers out for drinks during one of the off-nights at the convention to "let their hair down" a bit. Typically all the supervisors will go out and we might expense a few hundred in drinks and the ops manager another \$500.

Well, that night there was 40-50 of the managers in the company and only Sal Napoli and I in the bar. Our tab was close to \$900.00 each. Oh shit! I said to Sal, "What the hell, I had no idea it was going to be that much. I'm only submitting like a few hundred of this thing. Pete is going to flip." Sal said, "Wow, I know, I was a little shocked too. No. Submit the whole thing. Everyone had fun. I'll talk to my dad." I did not submit the bill.

A month later we are in a supervisor's meeting. At the end Peter called Sal and I into his office. Peter said something like, "Can you two show me your driver's licenses." I have no idea where he was going with this because I had never submitted my expense report or anything, so I was thinking

he needed copies of our licenses for our company cars or something. We whipped out our licenses. He said in his half Italian accent, "Can you tell me on there where it says your name is 'Peter Fucking Napoli?' " I'm looked at Sal, puzzled, and then it dawned on me what Peter was getting at. Obviously Sal talked to him about our bar bill. Peter continued, "You two All-stars might be the future of this company but you can get your ass chewed in the present. I don't want to see another bar bill like that again. Is that understood?" We both shook our heads like two teenage boys and then Peter lowered his voice, "Good. Did everyone at least have a good time?" On the way out of Peter's office he told me to be sure to submit my receipt to get reimbursed, and to do so in this case directly to him.

23 December 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

### Morrison Bonpasse |

Effective Sunday morning, Nov. 25, at 10:00 a.m., there will be a one-month moratorium on comments posted here. Between now and then, if anyone wants to post a comment, please limit yourself to one comment.

On December 23, I'll resume the review and posting of comments and writing my own, if there is continued interest.

Let's see if a one-month break can help improve the civility and utility (i.e. cost/benefit) of this section.

23 November 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

### Morrison Bonpasse |

Bob,

1. I searched the trial transcripts for the word "beat" and didn't find a statement by Jeff Marshall that Chad had accused him of beating Cassidy. Please let us know what statement you are referencing.
2. On the afternoon and early evening of Nov. 8, 2000, Chad Evans was annoyed, and not angry. He was no more angry than you seem to be when you write your comments on this website.
3. Yes, Jeff Marshall was not enthusiastic about babysitting for Cassidy, and neither was Jennifer Conley, but as far as I know, Marshall had initially agreed to an overnight stay for Cassidy. That plan was changed at Chad's initiative, as far as I know. If you have evidence otherwise, please let us know.
4. About Chad's reach from the driver's seat, he is 5' 8," and his car was a mid-sized Ford Taurus.
5. The police interviewed the day care teacher, Erin Entrekin, on November 17, 2000. The officers' report states, "Chad walked into the K3 room where the children were watching a movie, VEGGIE TALES. They always watch a movie from 5 - 5:30 pm and Erin remembered Chad showing up near the end of the movie. He questioned Erin as to where he could get the movie for Kyle. Chad then got Kyle's lunch box from his cubby and left. Erin estimated that he was present for approximately 2-3 minutes. Erin did not observe any unusual behavior. She stated that Chad was wearing a suit and tie."

23 November 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

### Bob A

Morrison,

...

Chad did call JM and ask if he's beaten Cassidy....go read the transcripts and find it for yourself. Chad was enraged that he had to pick up Cassidy, he was angry that he had to drive all the way to Jeff's to get her (see interrogation). He didn't voluntarily go pick her up, he had to pick her up because Jeff didn't want to watch her all night and Amanda had to work past 10pm(this is a bonafide fact so don't try to distort it again). Chad was angry about the car seat. He was angry about running late, although it was his own fault for going to Peter's Palace (an adult movie/toy store)....

How do you come up with an estimation about the distance to the rear seat? Did you measure it yourself or are you just trying to make it sound good?...

Where did you come up with a calm conversation with Kyle's teacher, did you interview her or something?...

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Mark C,

1. We agree. Cassidy, being the child of a single mother, was likely jealous of Chad. Amanda knew that. Chad knew that. That happens in blended families.

2. When you or Bob A put something in quotes, readers assume that you are accurately quoting something, but too often that isn't the case. Chad never asked Jeff Marshall if he "beat Cassidy or something." Did you make that up? In fact, Marshall testified that when Chad called about 5:45 p.m. on the 8th, he wasn't blaming Marshall. Marshall testified, "He never accused me of anything." (p. 266, Dec. 6, 2001) Chad called Marshall to report that Cassidy was acting oddly, and ask what Marshall had seen in Cassidy's behavior while he was at Jeff's. Sounds reasonable to me.

3. Your challenge about showing that Chad didn't beat Cassidy on the way home is accepted, even though it's harder to prove a negative than a positive:

a. Chad voluntarily picked up Cassidy at Marshall's. It was Chad's idea, as Amanda's original plan was to have Marshall babysit Cassidy overnight and through the next day.

b. Chad was annoyed about the absence of a car seat because he was concerned about her safety. He took off his own jacket and placed it between the seat belt and Cassidy to lessen the impact of a possible collision. (Yes, I know. Chad told me that, and it's not in any police report or testimony.)

c. At 5 foot 8 inches, for Chad to reach from the driver's seat over to strike a small child in the right rear seat was close to impossible.

d. Chad was close to being late to picking up his son at day care, so stopping the car to get out and open the right rear door and hit her, in view of all the rush hour traffic, seems unlikely.

e. At the day care center, Chad parked in the normal waiting area where the child-sensitive child care workers could see Cassidy.

f. Inside the day care center, Chad talked calmly with his son's teacher about his son and about getting a child-appropriate movie.

g. After an extensive police search, there was zero physical evidence found in Chad's car of any kind of an assault.

Ok. How do you and Bob find an assault beyond a reasonable doubt during that 30 minute car trip?

*21 November 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Mark C**

My point all along is that hothead abusers who have anger issues, like Chad, often take action behind closed doors with no witnesses.

Kassidy's actions toward him were indicative of a child afraid of what he would do to her and/or her mother if something was done to set him off. The spin here is that Cassidy was "jealous" of Chad spending time with Amanda. Right...that's it. Most toddlers are extremely territorial like that.

I also find it absurd that he called Jeff and asked him if he "beat Cassidy or something" when she was acting lethargic and drooling in the car on that ride home. Wouldn't a normal person first assume that the child was sick...not exhibiting signs from a beating? That is beyond bizarre to me.

Instead of asking those who believe Chad is guilty of murdering this child to provide evidence that he did it (which the State has proved), how about you and the committee provide concrete evidence that he did NOT do it?

*21 November 2012*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Mark C,

The Hansen case is a good example of how innocent people have been convicted of crimes which didn't happen. In that case, there was an accident six days before the daughter's death. In Cassidy's case, there was a serious fall from a truck 12-13 days before her death, and several accidents occurred later. This theory of accidental causation of death, or contribution to death, is not

a certainty, of course, but it doesn't deserve your label of "ludicrous" either. Respectfully, the theory that Chad Evans hit Cassidy while he was driving with her to pick up his son at daycare seems less likely than the theory of causation by accident. Nonetheless, as both you and Bob A. seem convinced that there was a beating in the car, what evidence can either of you cite in support of that theory? Please exclude evidence which points equally to an injury or injuries which may have occurred at the babysitter's during the previous two hours.

21 November 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

### Mark C

Morrison...nice attempt.

However, this isn't a game of horseshoes or a grenade where close enough is good.

"Likely caused"... "SIX days before"

How about something a little closer to the situation being discussed?

No one on the committee wants to admit that Chad beat the snot out of Cassidy on that ride home.

21 November 2012

### Morrison Bonpasse |

Mark C,

In 2006, Michael Hansen was convicted in Minnesota of murdering his four-month old daughter on May 1-2, 2004. He was in prison for six years before the Innocence Project and others were able to secure his release and preparation for a re-trial. What the medical examiner believed was a skull fracture caused by Hansen was likely caused by a fall from a shopping cart at Wal-Mart when the daughter was with her mother SIX days before the daughter died. Fortunately, the fall was captured on a Wal-Mart security camera. See the documents collected on this website at

<http://www.chadevanswronglyconvicted.org/documents/CombinedMichaelHansen2008appealand2011articles.pdf>. Also, Google "Michael Hansen" with "Minnesota." The first article is the NPR story about the dropping of charges against him in September, 2011.

21 November 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

### Bob A

Morrison,

1: It's a fact that Chad began the interview by emulating he didn't discipline Cassidy, he also painted a distorted picture of his relationship with both Amanda and Cassidy by downplaying, etc....it wasn't until the police pressed that he began to reveal the true nature of things. I stress, the police had to press. This is called an uncooperative subject, someone who doesn't share all the facts and has to be pressed by police investigators to get the truth out of them.

2: Chad was not distraught about Cassidy's death. Evidence can be found by viewing the video tapped interrogation. He was laid back, smiling, joking, shooting-the-shit with McCleish, etc etc etc....he certainly didn't appear "distraught" in the video. The camera doesn't lie.

3: His rights were taken away by due process of law. He received fair treatment by the police and the prosecution. They even let him out on bail, but he intentionally broke his bail conditions by knowingly maintaining contact with a homicide witness. Evidence against Chad was weighed by a grand jury, which found enough reason to send him to trial. He and his attorneys received every lawful consideration by the court. He was found guilty by an unbiased jury of twelve people. He lost his rights due to a murder conviction, not because as you claim he was vilified by the media and the police. Your claims of an unjust conviction lack merit.

20 November 2012

### Mark C

Becky...trying to insinuate that the fall from Jeff's truck caused Cassidy's death almost 2 weeks later is ludicrous. Cite examples of such delayed deaths before trying to throw out that net in a desperate attempt to catch something.

What isn't ludicrous is believing that Chad beat Cassidy during that fateful drive home from Jeff's house.

Seems she took a dramatic turn for the worse from that point forward. Quick call to Jeff to deflect guilt and suspicion.

Face it...the guy killed a toddler. Not sure how one could come to any other conclusion based on the facts as we know them, Peter Hyatt's statement analysis, Chad's actions during and subsequent to LE interviews, etc.

20 November 2012

**Becky B** | 

LOL! Are you serious?

Chad works & makes money...

Unfortunately, it's just chump change, compared to what he used to make before he was wrongly convicted!

20 November 2012 - Rochester

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

1. Not telling Amanda how to "run her kid" is not the same as "taking an active role in disciplining" Cassidy. In your quote, Chad was saying that he learned from his failed marriage not to try to manage his companion. He was trying not to be the controlling partner. On the other hand, at page 29, Detective Lance McCleish asked Chad, "If, if say KASSIDY or, or one of your boys is over the house and someone does something you know that's bad or whatever, who's usually the person to, to kind of discipline them or you know tell them that..."

Chad responded, "We, we both do."

2. During the interview, Chad asked several times about how Amanda was doing. He was distraught about the death of Cassidy and was very concerned for Amanda. Afterwards, he wanted to be with her and comfort her and share their grief, and try to understand what had happened to Cassidy. Once again, you seem to see a "dark side" to whatever you can.

3. Regarding your name, Chad can use your name whenever he wishes, as long as it is not defamatory. If you stop posting comments here, Chad will stop using your name. The rights that he has lost were taken because of his wrongful conviction and they must be restored, along with his right to raise his son and earn a living.

20 November 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob A**

Morrison:

1: Please review the interrogation transcript: "I don't tell her how to run her kid."

2: Key witness-Amanda Bortner. Again, see interrogation transcript, he tells the police, in so many words, that she's just some girl that he is having fun with, that she means nothing to him, that he has no desire to get serious with her, that he refuses to tell her he loves her because in fact he doesn't. Within one hour of the conclusion of his police interview, he has a sudden change-of-heart towards Amanda and shares his new-found affection with her over the phone. This is called manipulation of a key witness. Why can't you see this?

Morrison, I have a lot of respect for you, you're a very educated, intelligent man, much more so than myself...I find it unbelievable that you can't see what I'm seeing.

Do me a favor, ask Chad, why it is that he's represented to the police that Amanda is just some girl he's having fun with and doesn't consider it a serious relationship. Within hours of his come-to-Jesus meeting with the cops, he's suddenly in love with her?

Ask him. I can't wait to hear what he comes up with this time. And one other thing, tell him to stop using my name in his "letters," I'd prefer he refer to me as he has in the past, as Mr. X. He has no right using my name. As a matter of fact, he has no rights at all. He can't vote, make money, own guns, drive, fly on an airplane, open a checking account, walk freely among the rest of us in society who obey the laws and the police.

19 November 2012

**Becky B** | 

Bob,  
"alleged fall"???  
That's a solid fact she fell from the truck.  
C'mon now...

19 November 2012 - Rochester

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,  
The fall from Jeff's truck occurred during the three day/two night babysitting of October 26-28, 2000. That was 12 days before Cassidy died. In hindsight, it appears that her behavior declined after that weekend. She became lethargic. Following the truck fall, Cassidy hit her head on the living room coffee table the next weekend, and she fell on Chad's driveway and was hit by the Tee-ball on the evening of the 8th. It could have been that these four accidents compounded the injury of the truck fall and caused or contributed to her death. Yes, it's a circumstantial case, but so is the entire case against Chad. There "was no evidence, plain and simple," to use your phrase, that Chad hit Cassidy on November 8th or 9th, either.

Regarding your umpteenth statement that Chad "will distort the truth if it suits him....he lies," we all lie when it suits us. As Detective Angela Blodgett said to Amanda, "I think everybody lies." The key is that it suits you, me, Chad and most others very seldom. In earlier postings we have disagreed about how often Chad lied to the police. I say once, and you say more often.

Puhlease, the headbutting was an accident when both Amanda and Chad were bending down at the same time to pick up laundry in the basement.

Two questions:

1. What did Chad say to the police to support your claim that he denied having "an active role in disciplining" Cassidy?
2. What is your evidence that "Chad also willfully and intentionally manipulated key witnesses in this case?"

Chad is no more a manipulator that you are, or I am. Just because you don't believe some of what he writes doesn't make him a manipulator. You just seem to have a hard time believing anything that Chad writes that conflicts with your theory.

19 November 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob A**

Becky,  
I've thought a lot about the alleged fall from JM's truck as a reason for Cassidy's death, there's a huge problem with that theory: There is no evidence that it killed her, plain and simple. As far as the state's theory, it's rock solid. There's overwhelming evidence that Chad had an explosive temper, he liked to choke, hit, push, head butt people (women) he was unhappy with. There's also plenty of evidence that Chad will distort the truth if it suits him....he lies. There's also overwhelming evidence that he didn't like Cassidy, he would become agitated by her, at times so agitated that he'd assault her in ways that exceed parental discipline. Chad had an active role in disciplining Cassidy, contrary to what he told the police (another lie). Chad also willfully and intentionally manipulated key witnesses in this case, to affect an outcome favorable to himself.

Bottom line, Chad is a manipulator, further evidence is obvious in his recent letter published below.....

19 November 2012

**Becky B** | 

Mark C, Chad DOES think about Cassidy, everyday, and the things he DIDN'T do for her, NOT the things he "did to her". You & I have discussed in the past about Cassidy's wart & the virus that causes it, and the dangers of carrying the virus.

So please tell me...

Why is it impossible that the fall wasn't the injury that caused her death??

*19 November 2012 - Rochester*

**Mark C**

Chad was so concerned about a WART that Cassidy had yet the BRUISES all over her body were not worthy of medical attention...? That seems plausible.

Abused kids are often referred to as clumsy...they fall down alot for no reason.

He SHOULD think about Cassidy every single day and regret the fact that what HE did to her lead to her death.

RIP, Cassidy.

*19 November 2012*

**Becky B** | 

Why is it so impossible that the fall from the truck was not the injury that caused her death?

*19 November 2012 - Rochester*

**Bob A**

As I read "letters" from Chad, I'm convinced that he knowingly and willfully caused harm to Cassidy, harm that resulted in a slow, painful death for her.

*19 November 2012*

**Morrison Bonpasse (1st paragraphs of Nov. 9 letter fm Chad)** | 

"...As you know, exactly twelve years ago today Cassidy died. It is hard to believe.... With each anniversary of Cassidy's death I find myself sitting here thinking about her. I think of Cassidy often and am constantly wondering what she would be doing right now, what she would look like, what kind of student she would be, etc. if she were still alive. I guess what sets this day apart for me is it highlights my failures. When I picked Cassidy up at Jeff's Nov. 8th 2000 and noticed almost immediately something didn't seem right, why didn't I take action? Why was I so quick to rationalize behaviors that seemed odd to me? Was it simply because she exhibited them one minute and seemed like normal Cassidy the next or... Or could a guy like Bob Arnold be right and I wasn't paying as much attention to Cassidy as I would have Kyle because she wasn't my biological child? I don't believe this is the case. I know how much I loved and cared about Cassidy and all kids in general but how can I say I am on a search for truth if I'm not objective?

These are all questions that likely have no answer. I don't know if they serve any purpose other than self torture.

I try to use them as reflection and for awareness of the person that I want to be.... I did not kill Cassidy. I know that there are a number of people that I will never be able to convince of this fact and I accept it. Everything that could have possibly gone wrong in that moment, it seems, did. As you have indicated many times, if either Amanda or I had even an inkling that Cassidy ...needed serious medical attention, we would have been the first people to bring her. For Christ sake, I brought it to Amanda's attention a bunch of times to get a wart removed and get Cassidy's gait checked because she was pigeon toed and seemed to fall often for no reason. What the hell sense does it make that I would do that and then knowingly withhold medical care for her when she needed it? Bottom line, my awareness should have been better and needs to be better. I didn't kill Cassidy but how can I feel anything but that I failed her."

*17 November 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

Moving back to the substance of the Chad Evans case, Bob A asked on November 4, "Why would an innocent man consider suicide?"

I responded that inmate informant Cory Merrill was the apparent source of that allegation and that "I've never asked Chad about that claim, so I just wrote him a letter with that question, and I'll be visiting him this Thursday and will try to remember to ask then, too."

Chad responded in a letter to me on November 9, as follows:

You asked about a comment that Bob Arnold made where he quoted Cory Merrill's claims that I supposedly told him I wanted to commit suicide. So this is what we've come to? We want to believe so desperately now that Chad Evans is a monster that we are going to hang our hat on the word of a convicted child molester who tried making a deal with the prosecutors to get into the sex offender treatment program faster? Just as a reminder Cory Merrill lied under oath within in minutes of being asked 3 or 4 questions by my attorney and was potentially facing more charges so an attorney had to be appointed to him. Also when the police first approached Merrill, he had nothing to say to them. It wasn't until after Foster's Daily Democrat had run several stories about my case and Merrill was now faced with being sentenced for prison time did he "grow" a conscience and seek the police out to talk. The last point I will make from memory on Cory Merrill is that he is the only person in this entire case that made the outlandish claim that I hit Cassidy with a leather belt.

I certainly do not recall ever speaking to Cory Merrill about suicide. I cannot swear to the fact that a conversation never came up or that I could pass a polygraph on the subject.

(continued below)

*15 November 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

(continued from above)

What I can say is this: When you are first charged with a crime, especially one of this magnitude, your mind goes through a lot. I recall thinking many different thoughts and no thoughts at all. I cannot even begin to effectively describe it on paper. My thoughts were all over the road. I was worried about my family, my sons, Amanda, my mom and dad. Cassidy was dead at this point and I was worried about her being alone on a cold steel table or alone in a dark room. I was worried about people harassing Tristan. I was worried about what life would be like for my sons if the truth didn't come out, I was worried about my friends, hell, some minutes believe it or not, I was even worried about my restaurants etc. etc. I had people screaming at me from other cells to kill myself. I had people throwing things at me from the tier, etc. There is a chance that I thought out loud, "Maybe my family is better off if I'm not around." I don't think I did say this but there is a chance. I think it can be safely assumed that in this high stress situation almost anyone is going to feel this at least for a brief moment. It is just as likely that Merrill assumed it as heard it or perhaps even advised me, "Hey, don't listen to those people out there telling you to kill yourself," You have to remember, Merrill was doing everything he could to become my "best friend."

Let me assure you of one thing that I KNOW. If I had ANY form of a conversation about suicide with Merrill, it was fleeting and had nothing to do with guilt or innocence. It had to do with not wanting to put my family including my children and former wife through all of this. They are all good people and deserved none of this. At the time I had a pretty good life insurance policy that would have helped Tristan raise our boys. I had the truth on my side and I was determined to see this through so I could get back to the people that I loved.

*15 November 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

Please note the new requirement that comments be posted using a real name. If comments are submitted without a name (whether full, first or last) or initial or initials, they will not be posted.

*15 November 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

## Just Saying

To: "Bob A" or whom ever you are...

I direct your attention to the statement describing this forum: I t does not say: Despicable behavior,Insults,Foul language, Outrageous verbal assaults, Are gladly accepted. Nobody cares that your opinion differs, However everyone does care about your behavior! Perhaps you should look up the word "respect". Look around, People are no longer posting because they do not want to be part of any of your bad behavior. You are not the "victim", You are the aggressor. I stand by my comment, If banning stops this, then yes Banning is the answer. Good debate, is Welcome and the poor behavior is not, IMHO. As Mister Bonpasse states, "360 pages of comments to date." Speak for themselves and back up what I have stated. Quite frankly, I am disgusted that it was ALLOWED.

14 November 2012

## Bob A

To: "just saying" or whoever you are...

Please direct your attention to the statement describing this forum:

"This section is meant to provide a forum for all those with opinions and facts about the case."

So what's wrong with what I've written? I've stated my opinions as well as facts and facts that I know of, and someone screams to have me banned, is that correct? It's a fact that I've been a loyal follower of this forum for a long time, and I've stated my opinions and made every effort to back them up with known facts, but instead of receiving arguments about my facts, I get threats, public confrontations, someone honking in front of my house, threats of releasing my home address to those who may want to do harm to me, demands that I be banned, etc.... Now you know why I use the word "sham." Look it up.

At least Terri sees the value in having someone here who has a different opinion that everyone else. Thanks Terri.

14 November 2012

## Morrison Bonpasse |

This section of Chad's website has been dedicated from the beginning to "opinions and facts" and questions about the case. Unfortunately, while most of the "online comments" posted here have been civil and helpful for a better understanding of the case, some comments have been less than civil and less than useful. The 360 pages of comments to date have hopefully helped all of us to learn more about the case, including the arguments against Chad's innocence.

Effective today, I'll be acting as "moderator" and will need to APPROVE postings. (We're still testing this utility, which is different from the earlier plan, announced yesterday.) Please know that comments in support of the Attorney General's view of the case against Chad will be posted, as long as they are civil and helpful to a better understanding of the case.

If parts of a message are inappropriate, I'll post the message without the unwanted sections or not post any of it. Let's see how this works.

14 November 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

## Just Saying

What is posted below Weakens the goal. if you think otherwise, you are sadly misguided.

13 November 2012

## Terri

In harmony we thrive as we welcome all for their differences because we are all one. To contribute to a cause is a beautiful thing as long as it strengthens the goal.

13 November 2012

## Just Saying

Banning despicable behavior IS the answer. Banning the use of more than one name is the answer. Banning insults IS the answer. Banning the foul language IS the answer. So if banning stops this, then yes Banning is the answer. NO person has the right to behave in that manner here.

13 November 2012

## Terri

Everyone has a right to contribute. Please remember that you may or may not agree with views, statements, or beliefs of others yet it is so critical that every point be heard, questioned, and researched. If you disagree then you have that right. We all have something in our lives to believe in and fight for. Banning people is not the answer.

13 November 2012

## Bob A

I, too, am disgusted. I'm disgusted with the CEWCC, whose purpose is to free a violent, abusive child-murderer. I find it disgusting that people support him and his agenda. I'm amazed how blind you all are to the facts of this case, and I'm disgusted that you'd point your finger at Jeff Marshall.

What a sham. You hide behind your keyboards, posting anonymous, harrassing messages directed at me. This is all just one big sham.

12 November 2012

## We arent Stupid

I second that motion. Him and his 7 alter Egos.

12 November 2012

## BAN BOB ARNOLD!!! |

As a "veteran" you disgust me!  
How dare you say the things you say here!  
I think you're a spineless & pathetic human being!  
Your mouth needs soap!  
Absolutely disgusting!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

11 November 2012

## Bob A

My questions were not ridiculous, as far as Kato, look at the police video, Chad so emotional about that stupid dog that it's freaky, but never once during that entire police interview did he become emotional about Cassidy, not once. As a matter of fact, he distanced himself from her, so much so that it feels awkward to watch. He laughed, joked, lied, fabricated, down-played, but when it came to Kato he whined like a little baby.

This is the same guy who now claims that he loved her and misses her, that he sets a bite of desert aside for her in prison.....it's disingenuous that he would do that now, but bagged up dry cereal for her while he ate a hot breakfast. What a sham. I doubt he ever sets a thing aside for any child, let alone one he beat the crap out of. I don't doubt he had a hand in sexually assaulting Cassidy either, judging by the way he treated her penniless mom.

Chad had a thing about choking, going for the throat. He choked Tristen, Barbara, Amanda, Cassidy, who else? I hope someone chokes him in prison, so he knows how it feels.

11 November 2012

## Bob A

Morrison

Chad wasn't the loving nurturing father figure he claims to be, why is it everyone in the house woken up late on the morning of the 9th? If he was such a great, successful guy, why didn't he ever make sure the kids and he were up in time to get ready and be fed a good breakfast before starting the day? Why is it that this was the norm for he and Amanda, being late all the time, never arriving on time to pick up or drop off? Why was it that Chad had a nice hot breakfast on the morning of the 9th, but poor little Kassidy got none? Oh wait, he dumped some dry cereal in a ziplock.....great. Kassidy left that house dirty, unbrushed teeth, with no hot meal in her tummy but plenty of bruises. It's a fact. She was so battered and bruised, it's doubtful she'd be able to eat a thing. Oh, Kyle got his breakfast (cold cereal) but at least he got milk with his.

11 November 2012

## Bob A

Continued...

What a sham. Chad Evans, "successful father" who tries to sleep with all Amanda's friends, demands anal sex, threesomes, rough sex, etc. Demands discipline from a child he later claims to the police he doesn't "tell her (Amanda) how to run her kid."

It was no secret among the managers at Colly McCoy that Chad was a wildman, a crazy SOB, someone who beat his wife very badly, someone who was always in fights, someone with a bitter temperament. Everyone walked on eggshells around Chad. It was a relief that he left. Where are all his managers now? Why is it that all these guys have cut ties with him? Explain that to me? If he was such a great guy and Colly McCoy loved him so much, why was he denied employment when he begged for his job back? I know why.....

Why do you guys talk smack about JM? He didn't do anything to deserve this. And Chad, what a wack job, trying to point the finger at Jeff. He wasn't even man enough to come up to the hotel room to get Amanda, chicken shit hid in the parking lot. He spent the entire night, all night, on the phone with Amanda, claiming to be in love with her blah blah blah....he didn't love her. That's about the only thing he was honest about with the police, that he didn't love her and she was, in so many words a rebound relationship, too young to get serious with.....

11 November 2012

## Morrison Bonpasse |

Bob,

Here is a clarification on my posting below, regarding your question 6a.

The only information I recall about the Newington McDonald's reaction to Chad's case was in Jeff Marshall's November 16 interview, where he referred to the manager of that restaurant and to a "Jerry." Below is his exchange with Maine State Police Detective Jeff Linscott, at page 1640:

JM But, I uh, talked to the store manager and stuff and just kind of, cause we're good friends.

JL Which one, the Dover one, or ... ?

JM No, no, uh, Newington, and I talked to, Jerry, you know, and they had both told me, because I brought it up at a football party, and they said, "That's not what we heard, there's no way that could have happened, police just released his house." And I said, "really," you know what I mean, I'm like

...

JL Hm.

JM "Well, I heard that he had a football party," you know what I mean, and, uh, and then they told me that he had took, taken time off from work, you know, cause they didn't know the whole story, and he's probably not coming back to MacDonalds, and, uh, but they got told to get different snow plowing guy, cause obviously they didn't know what was happening with me.

Was this Q and A your source?

11 November 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

## Morrison Bonpasse |

Bob,  
Your questions, sometimes abbreviated, are answered below:

1. What was the purpose of the meeting Chad was in on the 9th? It was a meeting in Hudson with his boss, Bob McDougall.
2. How many formal warnings, both verbal and written, did Chad receive from his boss prior the Cassidy's death? None. He was promoted several times. Unfortunately, his personnel records were not requested by the police or his lawyers, and they have been destroyed.
3. Why was Chad so violent with Cassidy on the evening of the 8th? He wasn't. He gave her a bath, read to her, gave her dinner and a Pop-Ice, and put Johnson's Baby Lotion on her before bed.
4. Why didn't Chad just go up to the hotel room on the morning of the 10th to get Amanda, why did he send his sister up there, while he hid in the parking lot? One obvious answer is that he wanted to avoid a confrontation with Jeff Marshall.
5. Why did Chad tell so many lies to the police on the evening of the 9th? He told them the trampoline story, and hid his knowledge that his holding Cassidy's face when obtaining eye contact had caused bruises.
6. Why did Chad take "leave of absence" from Colley McCoy? If he was innocent, why leave? He didn't want the stigma of his arrest, even if innocent, to cast a blemish on McDonalds.  
6a. Also, why did the employees at the Newington store believe he wasn't coming back? I don't know anything about those employees. Please say more.
7. Why did Chad hide from the police? They gave him their contact info, but he never called to followup. This is ridiculous. He didn't hide from the police. What is the reason for this question?
8. Why was Chad more concerned about Kato than the death investigation of Cassidy? Also ridiculous. What is your reason for this question?
9. Why did Chad flip out when he got the call from child services? Calling Jeff and raising hell, saying Amanda and the "little bitch" can get out of his house? He didn't "flip out," but he was concerned that his pending (he thought) divorce/custody agreement would be affected.
10. Why did Chad hate Cassidy so much? He loved her.  
10a. Why did he repeatedly abuse her? He didn't.

11 November 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

#### Bob A

Sandy,  
I didn't use the word "lie" you did.

Becky,  
Where've you been?

Morrison,  
There are many unanswered questions in this case. Here are but a few:

What was the purpose of the meeting Chad was in on the 9th?

How many formal warnings, both verbal and written, did Chad receive from his boss prior the Cassidy's death?

Why was Chad so violent with Cassidy on the evening of the 8th?

Why didn't Chad just go up to the hotel room on the morning of the 10th to get Amanda, why did he

send his sister up there, while he hid in the parking lot?

Why did Chad tell so many lies to the police on the evening of the 9th? Why didn't he just come clean with them. It's obvious they tried to throw him a life line, but he refused to take it.

Why did Chad take "leave of absence" from Colly McCoy? If he was innocent, why leave? Also, why did the employees at the Newington store believe he wasn't coming back? Why did those employees make statements to the effect that it didn't surprise them, based on Chad's temper?

Why did Chad hide from the police? They gave him their contact info, but he never called to followup.

Why was Chad more concerned about Kato than the death investigation of Cassidy?

Why did Chad flip out when he got the call from child services? Calling Jeff and raising hell, saying Amanda and the "little bitch" can get out of his house?

Why did Chad hate Cassidy so much? Why did he repeatedly abuse her, squeezing her face, throwing and jerking her around, making her stand in the corner when she was bad? A 20 month old? Give me a break.

Thank god the police quickly solved the brutal murder of this poor little angel.

*10 November 2012*

#### **Sandy**

Bob

Why get nasty? Because I don't agree with you! I know Chad better than you do. He is innocent. And he is nothing like you say he is. I did know him before he was convicted. How dare you call ME a liar. Get your facts straight.

*10 November 2012 - nh*

#### **Becky** |

Bob, are you saying that you personally know Tristan?

*10 November 2012 - Rochester*

#### **Morrison Bonpasse** |

Bob,

Once again, your understanding of the facts is incorrect. Chad is imprisoned with the general population, as he has been from the beginning.

Regarding Tristan, she came to a Chad Evans Wrongly Convicted Committee meeting last year, together with Dorothy Urrutia, a friend of of Chad and Tristan. Sandy was at that meeting and all of us talked with Tristan and Dot. Tristan was certainly assertive at the meeting, and she did not give the impression of being someone who would tolerate controlling behavior by a spouse or significant other.

*10 November 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

#### **Bob A**

Sandy,

I don't care to write Chad, or meet with him as others have suggested I do. You say you knew him before he killed Cassidy. You didn't really know him. You say he's a swell guy, well there are a lot of swell guys in prison, convicted of the most horrible crimes. Chad is just another ex-school board member convicted of a felony against a child. Everyone thought Timothy Logsdon was a great guy too, he was elected to the Somersworth School Board, several posts with the NH GOP, etc.....yea he was a great guy, until he was convicted of repeatedly raping his 3 year old daughter. The only difference between Tim and Chad is Tim was man enough to admit he was guilty, Chad was never

man enough to take responsibility for his violent actions. Look at the police reports, look at the way he treated people, look at the way he beat women, controlled them, manipulated them, had his way with them. Chad has a dark demon within him. The should put him in general population so that an inmate meaner than him can rip that demon out of his empty soul.

As far as Tristen, you don't know her, nor have you conversed with her so don't come on here and try to deceive us with your bs about knowing people. Your attempt at convincing us that you know her to make your position stronger actually undermines your efforts.

10 November 2012

### Mark C

Sandy...you lost me at "pretty face"...if you are insinuating that Chad fits that description...and, most definitely, when you referenced Hillary Clinton. Strong woman? Not sure how many strong women easily forgive their husbands for banging interns and making a public spectacle of themselves. Hillary is a power hungry phony riding on Billy Boy's coat tails. But I digress.

Back to your support of baby killer Chad. I'd love to hear some other great stories about how swell he really is.

10 November 2012

### Sandy

I did in fact know Chad before he was convicted. I knew him even before Tristan knew him. I am not some teeny bopper fooled by a pretty face. I know abusers, I've lived with them my whole life. I am not easily fooled, and definitely not easily manipulated, and I will never be controlled again. I find Chad to be sincere. Nobody can fake being what they're not for long. True colors always shine through. And I find Chad to be the same person in person as he is in his letters. And he's the same person I knew years ago. I do not know Tristan or Amanda well at all. But I also don't know Hillary Clinton, but I do know she's a strong independent woman. I know people, not because I have a degree, but because I have life experience. I'm not 17, I'm 44. I do not have a love interest in Chad. I truly believe he's innocent, not because he says so, but because I've spent hours researching this case. I do not, however understand your agenda. I think you should get to know Chad before you go bashing him. Write to him. What have you got to lose? You might even find you (gasp) like him. Maybe not, but it can't hurt...can it?

9 November 2012 - NH

### Bob A

I never thought very much of JM, however I didn't feel that he had a hand in Cassidy's death. I'm extremely interested in seeing what they say about his statement.

It broke my heart to read the analysis of Tristen's police report, it sheds light on how she was abused by Chad.

Sandy,

I'm sure you're a nice person, but I think your judgement is blinded by Chad's nice-guy appearance. Did you know Chad before he was convicted? I wonder. As far as Tristen, you say you met her. Do you know her? I'm going to venture to say you don't really know her, you probably met her once but you don't know her on a personal level.

Morrison, I do wonder about some of the statements Hyatt has targeted, however he does bring up a lot of good points, namely Chad's lack of the use of Cassidy's name, using "just" to describe how he put Cassidy in the car, etc....

Chad Bad,  
Seriously, I was joking.

9 November 2012

## Mark C

I found the entire (first) blog very persuasive, Morrison.

The details provided using Chad's own damning words...which confirm my thoughts about his actions and statements during the interview. I wonder what they would come up with if they broke down the video as well?

9 November 2012

## Chad Bad

Hey big bad Bob, when's the first FCC meeting?

9 November 2012

## Morrison Bonpasse |

Bob,

I like the word "maybe." Maybe, too, I see more light than is appropriate (as compared to your "dark"). We'll see. Let's pursue the truth together.

I liked Sandy's response about your allegation of Chad being controlling. In addition:

1. When Chad fell in love with Tristan, he was a supervisor at McDonald's and she was an employee. Together they decided, as I understand it, that it would be best for Tristan and for their family-to-be for Tristan to find another career and not be a stay-at-home Mom. Chad paid for radiology school for Tristan.
2. One of Chad's regrets about his marriage was that he was too tight with money and reluctant to spend a little to have fun. So maybe where that's where some of your sense of "controlling" comes in. When he met Amanda, he loosened up and traveled more and bought some recreational items including three 3-wheelers and a boat.
3. After Amanda moved to Chad's home with Cassidy, she was not working for an income, so she could have been called a stay-at-home mom. Trying to assist in the general homemaking, she liked keeping Chad's home clean. One of her friends interpreted Amanda's interest as showing Chad's controlling behavior, but it was Amanda's initiative.
4. As far as I know Chad's and Amanda's sex life was fun and mutually voluntary. The threesome that you seem to like to bring up again and again, was Amanda's idea, because she thought Chad would like it. I recall that a woman supporter of Chad wrote eloquently about this issue months ago.
5. Because Amanda did not have a bank account, she was not able to cash the big check, so Chad deposited it into his account so she could get the use of the money. It was NOT a control issue. This is a classic instance of your "dark" interpretation of otherwise neutral events.
6. Chad supported Amanda's getting work, beginning with at-home data entry work from his friend, Bruce Aube. Then Amanda obtained a job at Old Navy.
7. Witness tampering? Please say more, because my understanding is that he asked Amanda and his friends to tell the police and the jury the truth.
8. About Cassidy's last days on earth, let's look at Sunday, Nov. 5 when Chad took Cassidy to his sister's for the day. Several people saw them there.

9 November 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

## Sandy

Bob,

I have met Tristan myself, and I can tell you with certainty, she is not one to be controlled by anyone. She's a strong independent woman. I've also met Amanda, and found her to be strong and independent. And I also know Chad. I have never found him to be controlling. I find him very articulate, smart, sincere...not manipulative as you say. And believe me I know manipulative when I see it. Please, write to Chad, get to know him for yourself.

9 November 2012 - NH

## Morrison Bonpasse |

Mark C.,

Well, it appears that in the documents which are analyzed, deception is the usual determination. I have not done a search, but I did not see a statement analysis by Peter Hyatt/Seamus O'Riley which found truth telling. Also, I note that he seems to have found deception by Amanda Knox, who was finally released from her wrongful conviction. Your use of the word "followers" seems appropriate. Most or all of the comments I saw supported Hyatt's analyses. Did I miss seeing any which questioned Hyatt's work and conclusions? I look forward, nonetheless, to more analysis. I believe that Hyatt wrote that he would be analyzing the babysitter's statement to the police on November 9, 2000.

Chad cause futile? Not at all. He was wrongly convicted. Can you please post here what portion of Hyatt's analysis you found MOST persuasive?

*9 November 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob A**

Morrison,

You suggest that I may be too rash with my assessment of Chad? Maybe, but one thing is certain, the words I've used to describe Chad and his character are, I believe, accurate. Let's tackle "controlling" real quick and see what we come up with:

Chad's control over Amanda, as well as Tristen (while they were married) is obvious. As far as Amanda, he had complete control over her, their sex life, he controlled where she went, who she was with, when she'd be home, her thoughts, her finances. He would demand, and get deviant sexual acts, against Amanda's will, like anal sex, rough sex, sex with others including her closest friends, etc...Several of Amanda's friends say they were approached for threesomes. Amanda's friends stated to the police that Amanda was afraid to make Chad mad, she would cut off an engagement to rush home before he got home from work. Amanda's thoughts: Look at interview 4 with Blodgett: "He keeps bringing up Jeff," this is an example of witness tampering. He's in the early stages of changing her testimony for his own good, taking complete control of what she believed and what she knew in her heart to be true. Finances: Interview 4, Chad would take all her money and deposit in his account to have complete control over it. The Rochester PD had to contact him to give her back that last \$1000. For a guy who preached financial independence, he made no effort to help Amanda open her own accounts. Why? Because he wanted control. He was a control freak.

Now let's look for a moment at Cassidy. Cassidy was only 20 months old, she didn't understand the concept of control. As hard as Chad tried, he failed to control her. The first few months he tried to be nice about it, but as time went on, his frustration grew, frustration then turned to anger. We all know what happens when Chad becomes angry, don't we? He gets physical, violent, abusive (see Hammel interview, see Tristen police report, see proof of pushing, shoving, head-butting, choking in all police interview with other women).

Dark indeed. Cassidy's last days on this earth were a living hell. He hated her because he couldn't control her.

I've decided to start my own committee. I'll name it "The F\*\*K Chad Committee." Membership is free.

*9 November 2012*

**Mark C**

Morrison,

Are you suggesting that Peter Hyatt and his followers who are analyzing details of this case are just "finding" things to support the position of guilt?

Surely, after reading the breakdown of Chad's comments by them, you have to wonder if this cause is futile. No?

*9 November 2012*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Ok. The two quotes from the Foster's article that you apparently relied upon were the reporter's sentence, "Evans said the injuries Cassidy sustained were accidental." and the quoted statement from Chad, "All I know is I didn't kill Cassidy. I know that I didn't intentionally, maliciously hurt her." And from those statements you drew "dark" conclusions? It appears that you look for the dark side of almost everything that you see in this case that might point to Chad's guilt.

Regarding your theory of Cassidy's tantrums and fits when Chad approached Amanda, some level of jealousy or fear of loss of her mother to another person seems to have been at work. That often happens with melded families as the children of one spouse lean to share their parent with a new adult. Your theory that Cassidy was fearful for her mother's safety is another example of your looking for a dark side wherever you can find it or invent it. As Peter Hyatt has shown, you can find darkness almost everywhere if you wish.

*9 November 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob A**

Morrison,

Fosters interview:

[http://www.fosters.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20110208/GJNEWS\\_01/702089934](http://www.fosters.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20110208/GJNEWS_01/702089934)

"Accident" wasn't an actual quote from Chad but a quote from the reporter interviewing Chad.

I've been thinking about Amanda's police interviews and her recollections of Cassidy's "fits." The more I think about it, the more I believe that Cassidy was fearful of Chad hurting her mother. Why would she feel this way? Because of the physical abuse he would inflict on her. She was so scared of him, and whenever he would get near mommy, she would freak out. I doubt if jealousy had anything to do with it. It was actually a terrifying fear that he would do to mommy what he'd already done to her. Poor little thing.

*8 November 2012*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Mark C

Generally, I prefer not to leave stones unturned. Earlier in this investigation, I was asked if a psychic could be asked to look at the case. It didn't happen, but I didn't oppose the idea.

Bob,

You haven't responded to my request below for the source of the alleged statement by Chad, which led you to ask readers to "Notice he says he didn't 'intentionally' hurt her. It was an accident." You then drew "dark" conclusions from your understanding of what Chad allegedly said. However, as far as I can determine, he NEVER said that. Are you going to provide the source for your statement? Please do so, or withdraw your comment.

Regarding Hyatt's analysis of a TV interview, I haven't read it. Which one? Where is it?

*8 November 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob A**

Morrison please review the tv interview he did, I believe in mid 2011. They reviewed that as well.

*8 November 2012*

**Mark C**

Morrison...I applaud the fact that you engaged the Statement Analysis folks to look at this case. However, it appears that no one over there has the same view on Chad's innocence as you or the committee. In fact, it looks like some posters would like a few minutes alone with Chad to see if Mr.

Toughguy could inflict as much damage on someone who actually IS potty-trained.

I think you are a good man, Morrison. However, this may very well have blown up in your face much like that bomb planted by Trenkler.

8 November 2012

### Morrison Bonpasse |

Bob,

In your comment below you wrote, "Notice he says he didn't 'intentionally' hurt her. It was an accident." Can you tell me where Chad said that? The word "intentional" or "intentionally" is used six times in Chad's interview, and EVERY time it was spoken by Detective Lance McCleish, not Chad Evans. McCleish was trying very hard to get Chad to admit that he had caused injuries which he had not caused.

Again, what was the source for your quote?

7 November 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

### Bob A

I believe the Statement Analysis paints a dark picture of Chad, his own words have left a blueprint for experts to study, and study they have. It appears that Chad did indeed inflict fatal injuries to poor Cassidy. Notice he says he didn't "intentionally" hurt her. It was an accident. Now this is the part that gets dark, because instead of fessing up to the police, and admitting what really happened, he stubbornly denies, avoids, lies, fabricates, blames, manipulates and hides. This is indicative of Chad's personality, a natural born violent, abusive, hostile individual with no regard for others.

Let's think about this for a moment, if Chad had fessed up and told the truth, he most likely would be out of prison by now, instead of a second degree murder conviction, he would have had a manslaughter conviction. Chad did not do the honorable thing in this case because Chad is not an honorable person. He's a sick, twisted deviant monster who hated Cassidy and looked at her poor penniless mom as a sex toy. What a story. A horror story. In Amanda's words, "all I ever wanted was for Cassidy to have her own room and have nice things."

In Chad's mind, Cassidy was out to get him, she wanted to undermine him, this 20 month old child was determined to torture poor Chad, and she got what was coming to her. Even to this day, Chad hates Cassidy. Despises her. He's happy she's dead. He enjoys thinking back to the last night of her little life, to stuffing that bannana down her throat, to smacking her around and torturing her. What a sick, twisted guy Chad is.

It's another wonderful day in the state of New Hampshire, where a bonafide child murderer gets what was coming to him. May you rot in jail Chad Evans.

7 November 2012

### Mark C

Amazing...the breakdown provided by those guys is in line with my initial feelings of Chad distancing himself from Cassidy/Amanda, being deceitful, body language, etc. during the interview.

It took someone else (not from this site) writing down his/her observations of the exchange to validate the things I was thinking as well...avoiding questions, acting differently when talking about his son, lifting weights, etc.

I find the analysis extremely intriguing and agree that the manner in which people answer questions is incredibly telling especially in a situation where the person has something to hide.

I think the Committee can effectively disband at this point. Nothing more to see here...

7 November 2012

**Bob A**

My intuition told me all along that Chad was deceitful in his interrogation. They also confirmed my belief that Chad hated Cassidy, couldn't stand her, wanted her dead, gone, out of the way. What a monster, to go around now and claim that he loved her, what a sick sob. I seriously doubt if he ever read to her or taught her ABC's. Sick twisted baby killer.

*7 November 2012*

**Mark C**

Wow...great find with the Statement Analysis.

After just a few minutes of reading the information, it confirms my thoughts about the manner in which Chad referenced Cassidy.

I can't wait to read more of this analysis. Thanks

*7 November 2012*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Thanks for asking.

I prefer to hold my comments or evaluation until Peter Hyatt has completed the initial phases of what he wants to do with the Chad Evans case.

My general approach in the search for truth in this case, and others, is that seeking and receiving more input and perspectives is valuable.

*6 November 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob A**

Morrison, what's your impression of his take on this?

*6 November 2012*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

As I had seen that Peter Hyatt, a.k.a. Seamus O'Riley, had written about crime and justice on the Web, I asked him to look at this case in the interest of getting other perspectives. Let's see what else he has to say in future postings.

*6 November 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob A**

Hey Mark, did you read the Statement Analysis by Peter Hyatt? If not, go check it out on the home page. Keep going down and you'll get a Statement Analysis community blog devoted to this case. These people are on our side, the side of justice.

They're getting ready to start looking at Amanda's and Jeff's statements soon, but they're not done tearing up Chad Evans and the deceptive lies he told to the police, and the lies he continues to tell.

What a sham. From the night of the final, fatal blows inflicted by Chad, to the lies he told the police, the manipulation of witnesses, the lies he tells to CEWCC members, to the "book" written by Morrison, the sham "VSA" and sham polygraph administered by a "friend of Chad" to the outrageous explanations made by Morrison. There is no better entertainment value than this website.

The greatest democracy in the world held elections today, and in the great state of New Hampshire justice continues to prevail with the lawful incarceration of a violent, abusive child murderer.

*6 November 2012*

**Mark C**

Amanda really showed her assertiveness like putting her foot down when King Chad demanded a threesome...oh wait. No, she didn't.

Yeah, I'm sure if it were not for this silly prison stint, Chad and Amanda would be married and have their own reality TV show. Its a shame because they could have called it something catchy like Kassy Boo Boo.

Disband the Committee and give up this cause. The justice system worked in this case.

One less baby killer roaming the beautiful streets and towns of NH and Maine.

*6 November 2012*

#### **Bob A**

And another thing, allowing Chad to create his own polygraph questions is unbelievable. The question regarding "hitting, punching, kicking" completely avoids the actual violence that occurred on Nov 8th. So you see, not only has Chad managed to lie his way to this point, he's been permitted to completely avoid any polygraph questions that would indicate guilt. Namely, the violent assault on Kassidy while he was placing her in the back seat of his car, as well as the assault later that evening when she refused to eat. As indicated by the statement analysis by Peter Hyatt, a second devastating assault occurred in the Chad's kitchen. Both of these assaults did in fact happen, it's a fact. It's also a fact that Chad lied to the police. Lie after lie, so many lies and half-truths that McCleish and LeClair couldn't keep up with them.

Your "book" is a sham, shame on you for writing such a notorious work of fiction and tall tales. Your claims that Chad was a loving, nurturing person are utterly absurd. Kassidy was choked, pushed, jerked around, squeezed, yelled at, thrown around by this violent person who you try to portray as a great guy.

What a sham.

*6 November 2012*

#### **Bob A**

I just finished reading the Statement Analysis by specialist, Peter Hyatt. He is able to better articulate what I've felt and said all along about Chad's police interrogation. I also find it ironic that he pointed out the same things that I've pointed out, particularly the statements made by Chad then, and statements now.

The statement analysis confirms what I believe, it also answered the biggest question I've had all along: When, exactly did the final assault occur? It happened while Chad was putting Kassidy in his car. There was a second violent assault made on Kassidy during dinner time that night.

Chad Evans is a hateful, violent, deviate monster who belongs in prison with all the other child abusers/rapists.

It's another wonderful day in the New Hampshire, where our criminal justice system worked flawlessly in convicting a child murderer. May you rot in prison, Chad Evans.

*6 November 2012*

#### **Morrison Bonpasse** |

Mark C,  
Amanda and Chad loved each other, and that love survived the tragic loss of Kassidy. The death of a child sometimes takes a terrible toll on the relationships of those close to that child. Amanda's and Chad's love even survived their wrongful convictions, and they came close to marrying. However, the reality of Chad's continued long term wrongful imprisonment has forced the transition of their relationship to a supportive friendship. From time to time, they communicate by phone. Better than

anyone else in this case, Amanda knows that Chad loved Cassidy, and he did not assault or murder her. If Amanda thought otherwise, she would have ended her relationship with Chad long ago. She is, and was, a lot smarter and tougher and more assertive than you seem to believe.

6 November 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

### Mark C

Morrison...there is no need to talk to my family using terms such as "screw toy" because I don't have a deviant family. I challenge you to prove that Amanda was nothing more than that to big boy Chad. Oh wait...you can't. I'm sure you'll come up with some lame excuse about how Chad distanced himself from Amanda when questioned by police because big boy Chad was scared.

Or, maybe Chad brought Amanda candy and donuts too. We all know that is the foundation for showing love to another person.

Why don't you also try to spin the whole Pete's Palace trips, threesomes with Amanda's friend (against Amanda's desires) and all the other twisted stuff this jack ass did...? Much like your "book" I'm sure you'll dissect each and every element and concoct your own story about super hero Chad. Not only did he bring candy and donuts to Cassidy...he also brought an end to her life. Kind of a terrible trade off in my opinion.

6 November 2012

### Morrison Bonpasse |

In any case, the two reasons for Chad's picking up Cassidy on Wednesday afternoon, the 8th, are consistent and mutually supportive:

1. Chad thought that she would be better cared for at home, and
2. Jeff Marshall was not enthusiastic about another overnight babysitting stint.

5 November 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

### Bob A

No Morrison, it wasn't something you wrote, it was something that Chad has written and is now claiming.

5 November 2012

### Morrison Bonpasse |

Bob,

Thanks for reminding me of what Chad said about picking up Cassidy. It was at page 12 of his interrogation: "Ah so she went to JEFF'S house and I - AMANDA was supposed to work till 8 and then, actually she was working 5 to 11. Her schedule got kind of screwed up I don't know. But I told her, you know JEFF didn't want to watch KASSIDY the whole time I guess, and I told her it wouldn't be a big deal I'd pick her up, when I, because I had to pick up KYLE, my son."

This statement is true and was a second reason for picking her up on the 8th and is not inconsistent with what I wrote in an earlier posting about Chad's reason. It's just another reason. If I had remembered it in my earlier posting, I would have mentioned it, together with the first reason.

Chad's was reluctant, at this stage of the interrogation, to state his dissatisfaction with the babysitter's care of Cassidy. As he said on the next page, "I don't want to get anyone in trouble."

5 November 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

### Bob A

So much to straighten out, so little time. Must you keep making excuses for Chad and his violent, abusive behavior towards Cassidy? The testimony you refer to was given at trial, over a year after the initial police interviews, and there were many. Chad had the means, motivation and time to affect testimony from both those witnesses, as was proven by the prosecution. Speaking of Chad, it's interesting that he now claims that he picked Cassidy up from JM's on the 8th out of concern for

her well being, contrary to what he told the police on the 9th. He stated that he was told, by JM prior to the 8th, that JM didn't want to watch her all night. So don't bambozle us on any more facts. If what you say is true, then Chad told yet another lie to the police, didn't he?

Chad was and still is a troubled, violent, deviant, abusive liar who will stop at nothing to get his way.  
4 November 2012

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

The book, "EYE CONTACT" is not fiction. You may not believe some of the sources, but everything in that book is true, as far as I know. I've been asking readers for over a year to tell me where there are mistakes in the book, and there have been few responses. None of those responses detracts from the book's conclusions. As far as I recall, you have not made any substantiated claims of errors in the book. (Speaking of errors, my posting below misspelled Strafford County.)

Regarding Chad's teaching Kassidy her numbers and ABC's, I refer you to Amanda's testimony on December 6, 2001, at page 11, "He -- actually he taught a lot. He taught her to count. He said ABCs with her more than I did. He read books to her at night before she went to bed, and I would read books to Kyle. So we kind of had our own little bonding time with each kid." Travis Hunt testified on December 11, 2001, that he saw Chad teaching Kassidy about the names of parts of the body. He told the jury of seeing Chad with Kassidy and her Pop-Ice, "He was just -- he'd say something, she'd say it after, pointing out parts of her face." (Page 131)

Kassidy's deterioration was not synchronous with her moving to Chad's home in July. She saw her pediatrician on August 10, and an orthopedic surgeon on September 11. Together with Chad and Amanda, she visited her grandmother and Chad's parents twice each in July and August, and stayed with her grandmother for several days in September. On October 1, she visited her grandmother, who took the famous photograph (Exhibit 19) which was shown at trial. This was approximately 80 days after moving to Chad's. Her serious deterioration began around mid-October, after coming home from two overnight babysittings in Kittery.

In his Nov. 20, 2000, interview with Nancy Harris of the State's Victim Witness program, Chad's son said of Kassidy, "She's a bitchy," and "she's bitchy." It's not unusual, of course, for children to try out swear words that they hear from adults, even if they don't understand them. Kyle likely heard that word from several sources. As for the fighting between Kyle and Kassidy, have you never seen siblings or step-siblings argue or fight?

4 November 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob A**

He brought candy and donutes home to her and taught her ABC's, all while terrorising her on a daily basis. Looking at police interviews regarding Kassidy's gradual deterioration after Chad came into the picture, it's hard for me to believe he taught her ABC's or even read to her at bed time. You make these claims with nothing to back up what you say, yet another example of how you've mischaracterised Chad in your book. Further evidence can be found within the very first few pages of your "book." Your skillful use of pure fiction is offensive.

Chad terrorised that little girl, he filled her heart with terror and fear, he assaulted her on a daily basis, yelled at her, called her names like "retard" and "little bitch." It was so common that even his son started calling her a bitch and hitting her, just like daddy.

What a sham.

4 November 2012

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

As far as I know, Chad has never considered suicide. I assume that your source for that assertion was Cory Merrill, the inmate informant whose testimony at Chad's trial was stopped when he seemed to have admitted perjury in his previous criminal proceedings. The summary of his February, 2001 interview with NH State Trooper Jill Rockey included Merrill's claim that Chad

considered suicide while they shared a cell at the Stratham County Jail. Merrill repeated that claim at Chad's trial. (Dec. 11, 2001, p. 170). The claim of suicide seems like a typical inmate informant embellishment of his story.

I've never asked Chad about that claim, so I just wrote him a letter with that question, and I'll be visiting him this Thursday and will try to remember to ask then, too.

Chad was not a stranger to suicide, as one of his school friends, or relatives, killed himself, I believe, with a gun. Also, as I wrote in EYE CONTACT he convinced a friend not to jump off a bridge in Keene, and another friend credited Chad with talking her out of killing herself.

Regarding the rest of what you wrote, we've exchanged our evidence and views before.

*4 November 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

### Bob A

Becky,

my beliefs about Chad are based on facts that were presented at his trial as well as police reports, interviews and most of all his video taped interview. I find that his behavior after Cassidy's death clearly points to guilt. Furthermore, if her were in fact innocent, then why tell all the lies to the police? And what about his other actions, like hiding from the police, playing games, etc. Why would an innocent man consider suicide? How does one explain all this?

*4 November 2012*

### Bob A

Screw toy. That sums it all up in a nutshell. That's all she was to him until the police were on to him.

*4 November 2012*

### Morrison Bonpasse |

Mark C,

It's postings like your most recent that are frustrating to me. They contain some worthy observations, but are poisoned by such vile expressions as "screw toy." Do you talk like that with your friends and your relatives? Do you talk like that with your daughters, sisters and mother? I doubt it. My guess is that you wouldn't post such expressions here if you used your real name. Such postings are another reason why requiring real names seems like a better idea.

Nonetheless, on to the merits. Chad loved Cassidy. He brought candies and donuts home to her and helped teach her numbers and ABC's. He and Amanda took her boating and to York's Wild Animal Kingdom, and and twice to his parents'. On Sunday, Nov. 5, he took her to a family gathering at his sister's. Please know that on Wednesday, November 8, Amanda's original plan was for Cassidy to stay overnight at the babysitter's. Chad thought Cassidy should come home and he volunteered to pick up Cassidy that afternoon, on his way to pick up his son at day care. It's likely that the reason why Amanda forgot to leave the car seat at the babysitter's was because part of her brain was pursuing the original plan, which was for her to pick up Cassidy on Thursday after work. Chad's intent when holding Cassidy's cheeks was to gain her attention through eye contact, and not to hurt her. Amanda was with Chad many times when Chad sought such eye contact with Cassidy. Amanda testified, "...it didn't look like it hurt. I never thought it hurt her until I saw bruises... I remember two times I could see bruises." (Dec. 5, 2001, page 85)

Regarding anger management therapy, it's ordered by the courts because it WORKS, at least, sometimes. Further, Chad continued to see a therapist on his own because he didn't think the court-ordered sessions were enough. His days with Amanda and Cassidy were among the happiest in his life. Early in their relationship, Amanda took the "anger management hint" list off the wall, while telling Chad he didn't need such a list any more.

Finally, during the argument/fight with his wife in March, 1999, a cap on one of her teeth was broken off.

*3 November 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

### Mark C

Morrison...Here's my take on Chad's behavior as it relates to his own boys. He cared for them more than Cassidy who was more of a nuisance getting in the way of his screw toy, Amanda.

You claim he doesn't believe in corporal punishment yet grabbing a baby's face so hard it leaves bruising isn't a form of that? Forcing someone to do something they don't want to (i.e., grab face and stare your abuser in the face) seems pretty damn close to abuse in my opinion. Or, when he "mistakenly" hit her head on the wall going downstairs, with the tee ball, etc.? The fact that he may not have rolled up his fist and punched her teeth out, like he did to his former lover, doesn't mean he didn't exhibit aggressive behavior against a defenseless child who pissed him off when she got in the way of his schedule or plans. People with anger management issues don't simply get better after a few sessions with a shrink...they often find ways to minimize the appearance of their bad behavior. I don't believe for one second that he never hit Cassidy. I believe he did, several times, however most of those times were behind closed doors with no witnesses. Just like a lot of his other deviant activities.

3 November 2012

Becky | 

No, Bob, I don't agree with abuse in any way, shape or form.  
But let's be real, people who love each other often fight & disagree, and sadly it can get out of hand & way out of control (especially if alcohol is involved).  
Not all humans are lucky enough to be raised with anger control, coping skills, knowing when to say when or even how to communicate well, for whatever reason.  
Chad grew up in a very loving & supporting family.  
He didn't hurt or kill Cassidy.  
Yes, Chad has made mistakes.  
I have made mistakes in my life.  
You have made mistakes too.  
Who hasn't?  
Point: Your beliefs about Chad are based on false information.  
He was convicted on bogus evidence. Not physical evidence.  
Why can't you see that?

3 November 2012 - Rochester, NH

Becky | 

\*continued from above\*

I know Chad, sometimes better than I know myself.  
I knew Chad years before he met Tristan.  
I spent everyday with Travis for many years too.  
You don't think I get grief for my beliefs on Chad's innocence?  
Do you truly think if I had any doubt at all, being a Mom of 4, I would continue to support him?  
I've been saying all these years this case never made sense, I repeat:  
it never made sense!  
This website put the entire story into order. It holds the missing pieces to the story, a story the public, or the jury never heard/saw.  
Why is so impossible that Cassidy couldn't have died from complications from the fall from the truck? How tall is a Dodge Ram truck anyway??  
Why is it JM's criminal record of assaults & restraining orders, against his former girlfriends, are so easily pushed to the side, to be forgotten about and never to be mentioned? (which, by the way, is probably longer than your resume)  
It's not a good day in NH, it hasn't been since Chad was wrongly convicted in 2001.  
I hope you stick around and see what will come of this.  
Chad will be free!  
You call your time here "spirited debates", I consider it cyber bullying, aka abuse.  
Don't worry though, I'll continue to respect you here & will always be pleasant on the street.  
Will you ever take responsibility for mistreating us?  
Will you ever be man enough to take the time to get to know Chad or will you continue to believe the bogus evidence that robbed him from his family?

What will you say when he passes the next polygraph test?

3 November 2012 - Rochester, NH

**Bob A**

Becky, I'm intrigued by your position of Chad's conviction. I'm shocked that a single mom would side with this guy, considering all of the available information about him, for instance-his history of beating women. Namely his ex-wife and ex-girlfriends including Amanda. Are we to believe that you're OK with that? Do you like men who smack you around and abuse your kids? Surely you're not attracted to woman beaters, or maybe you are? I'm baffled.

2 November 2012

**Becky** | 

Of course I'm going to bring up coworkers!  
Chad was/is one of the best people to work with!  
I'm sorry that you can't handle the truth, but fact is I been blessed with amazing coworkers!  
Babies are better than Big Macs though & the pay is greater too.

2 November 2012 - Rochester

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

To "Yes you are" (whomever you are)  
Let's focus on ONE of the labels you applied to Chad: "child beater."  
Can you tell us of any instances where he beat, hit, slapped or spanked either his stepson or his son? (On page 73 of Amanda's third interview, on Nov. 12, 2000, she told the police that of an incident where she was watching Chad's son, who used Magic Marker on a wall. She said that Chad "just smacked him [his son] in the butt and made him go upstairs I think. I think he did that. His mom got even more mad about it." Chad agrees that he probably sent his son upstairs, but disputes Amanda's recollection of spanking. Amanda's double use of the phrase, "I think," does not indicate a vivid recollection.)  
Apart from holding Cassidy's face to obtain EYE CONTACT, can you tell us of any other instances where he beat, hit, slapped or spanked Cassidy?  
Chad has told me that he doesn't believe in corporal punishment for children. Do you have any evidence to the contrary?

2 November 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Yes you are**

To "we aren't stupid." Yes you are. You're very stupid. You think baby killer Evans is such a sweet guy well he's not a nice guy. Hes a wife beater, child beater, heavy drinker, coke user, womanizer, and a cold blooded killer. He belongs in prison with all those other freaks.

2 November 2012

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob and Mark,

1. Because Sgt. Stewart and Det. Avery did not file reports of their conversations with Chad before his 7:10 p.m. interrogation, we don't know what Chad asked them about Cassidy's death. Yes, of course, Mark C., "one of the first things that I would ask, especially to a LE officer, is how and when." As far as I know, he did. However, because neither of you believe what Chad says, you are left with your assumptions.

2. About the DCYF call to Chad's home on the morning of Nov. 9th, Chad DID talk with Kristine Keeler of DCYF around 4:30 p.m. on November 9, at about the same time Sgt. Stewart told him that Cassidy was dead. The "Chronology" entry for that call says, "4:30 p.m. Kristine Keeler of the New Hampshire Div. of Children Youth, Children and Families called the Kittery Police Station and talked with Detective Avery and then with Chad Evans about Cassidy, Kyle and Chad's stepson and the care arrangements for each

of them.”

The entry for 5:40 p.m. says, “5:40 p.m.~Kristine Keeler of DCYF called the Kittery Police Dept. again (See above, at approx. 4:30 p.m.) and talked with Chad, after he had talked with Tristan. She wrote, “It was evident that he was upset about the death of Cassidy.” [Kristine Keeler report. Discovery page 163]” That report is at

<http://www.chadevanswronglyconvicted.org/documents/001109KristineKeelerWtwopagereportfor9Nov.pdf>. Please bear in mind that DCYF was in a bind because it received the call from Tristan Evans about Cassidy on October 31, and didn’t successfully reach Chad until Nov. 9. In view of the DCYF requirement that contact be made to followup on such calls within 48 hours, this DCYF delay was inexcusable. As far as I know, no DCYF employee was ever disciplined for his/her work in this case.

For Bob A to say that Chad’s failure to mention a phone message left on his phone that morning as “yet another example of Chad’s guilty behavior” shows how detached from facts and evidence Bob’s thinking about this case has become. Why isn’t the failure of the police to ask Chad about that call an example of their negligence? They knew about it before Chad’s interrogation.

*1 November 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

### **We aren’t stupid**

Again One person, So many Names.

*1 November 2012*

### **Bob A**

I agree with Mark. Chad's general demeanor during his interrogation is unconscionable. I think it speaks volumes about where his mind was at. In addition, the more I think about that call from DCYF, the more I'm convinced that if Chad was, indeed innocent of causing her death and believed Jeff did it, he most certainly would have mentioned that call to the police. However, he didn't. This is yet another example of Chad's guilty behavior. Deny, avoid, blame, omit, hide. He did all these things, from Nov 9th until his trial, and even now he's doing these things.

Becky, there you go again. I don't care to hear who you know or who you claim to know, and if you're bringing up my family again you need to explain yourself because I've asked you repeatedly to avoid that topic. Instead of debating the guilt of Chad, you're bringing up coworkers, WTF????

*1 November 2012*

### **Mark C**

If someone I knew, and loved, died, the first things that I would ask, especially to a LE officer, is how and when.

The fact that this was not included in the report suggests that Chad never asked the questions.

But, then again, why ask questions when you already know the answers...?

*1 November 2012*

### **Morrison Bonpasse |**

It's interesting to see how passionate we can be about families. Chad, too, feels passionately about his family and the damage that this case has caused. The damage to the Bortner/Conley family has been immense as well. The death of a child causes pain and damage in every affected family, but a wrongful prosecution and wrongful conviction here has compounded all of it.

Regarding the considered change in the log-ins for “Online Comments,” Mark’s and Bob’s comments are well-taken. A change doesn’t seem worth the effort right now.

Nonetheless, as Bob suggested, “So let’s get on with the debate:”

He asked two questions:

1. “Why didn't Chad mention the call from child services to the police at his interrogation?”
2. “Why didn't he express an interest in what caused Cassidy's death?”

There were a lot of aspects of this case that were not mentioned or covered in detail in Chad's interrogation.

1. DCYF call. Patricia Hocter called at 9:06 a.m. on the 9th and Chad returned that call at 9:35 a.m. with a message. It was one of the lost opportunities for Cassidy that DCYF did not call sooner in the week, or that Hocter and Chad didn't talk that morning. In any case, the police knew about that call when they interrogated Chad, but the subject didn't come up. In an interrogation, the police ask the questions.

2. About the causes of Cassidy's death. Incredibly, Chad didn't learn that Cassidy had died until about 4:30 p.m. when Sgt. Matthew Stewart told him. There is no report from Stewart about that conversation during which Chad asked how it happened. At about 5:15 p.m. Chad was taken to Det. Ronald Avery's office and remained there with Avery until his 7:10 p.m. interrogation. Avery filed no report about those two hours with Chad, including Chad's questions about how Cassidy died. In any case, at pages 90-91, Chad's interrogators told him how she died. "She died from major trauma. She didn't die from, from a baseball to the face or falling down out of the car or whatever. She died of a major trauma.... And that trauma can't come from accidents or falling down or anything like that." At page 96, McCleish asked, "How do you explain these injuries?" and Chad responded, "I don't know what the injuries are. How do I explain that?" Again, the police were asking most of the questions.

*1 November 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Becky** | 

And again I would NEVER hurt, threaten or harass my co-worker of many years!

OR anyone for that matter!

I'm not a bully or irresponsible like that.

BUT, IF my family was threatened for my beliefs (and yes, it has happened) I would take the legal & correct measures to stop the issue.

*31 October 2012 - Rochester*

**Bob A**

What traffic? It seems there are less than four people who post here regularly. As far as using real names, I'm the only one besides Morrison who has used my full name and as Mark pointed out, it resulted in threats, someone honking outside my home, comments from Becky about my wife, and someone confronting me in public, so by all means go ahead. It won't change things for me anyway because you guys already have my address, email, Facebook, telephone number, etc...

In closing, I'd like to explain why I responded the way I did to Becky several weeks ago. Though I doubt she would do any physical harm, if you guys bring up my family, my wife, my address, etc...I consider that an act of war, something that I was very good at and have many fond memories of. I'm here for open, spirited debate. So let's get on with the debate.

Back to Chad, Why didn't Chad mention the call from child services to the police at his interrogation? Why didn't he express an interest in what caused Cassidy's death?

*31 October 2012*

**Mark C**

He's my 2 cents on banning anonymous postings...if you do, the traffic on here will be reduced. Do you want more activity or less?

As insightful, or ridiculous, certain comments are...they are comments nonetheless. I guess there may be some posting anonymously who don't want to use their real names in fear of harassment along the lines of what Bob has experienced in his real (not cyber) life.

*31 October 2012*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Last evening, we had a meeting of the Rochester chapter of the Chad Evans Wrongly Convicted

Committee. One agenda item was whether to explore a requirement that people who post here use their Facebook names, which are usually real names. The Portland Press Herald just made a switch to that policy. I've been a supporter of anonymous postings in the past as it was thought to encourage discussion, but postings like the one below, and several of Bob Arnold's vitriolic postings make me wonder.

There are many good people, including Bob Arnold and Jeffery Strelzin, who believe that Chad Evans actually murdered Cassidy Bortner. However, the strength of their position is weakened by the garbage that is posted here in support of that view. Part of me welcomes such postings because it makes that view look so weak. On the other hand, these postings poison the generally positive discussions.

Way back in August 2010, Cassidy's grandmother, Jacqueline Conley, introduced the term, "Chad Bad," with a claim that Cassidy used that term. Since then, "Chad Bad" has posted a few comments, but it's hard to believe that Jacqueline Conley could write such comments as the one below. Whoever is now using that moniker is making it look like Jacqueline is posting these comments which is probably unfair to her. Perhaps she could now post a comment under her real name, with real email address and clarify that question.

Should we change this section to require that comments be posted by people who use their real, or Facebook, names?

*25 October 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

#### chad bad

Please please tell chad to say hi to Tim. It wasn't his fault that he rape his daughter, it wad her fault for wearing that sexy snow white outfit. I think chad and Tim have a lot of good jail sex

*25 October 2012*

#### Morrison Bonpasse |

Bob,

Ok. Thanks. I'll address what you have described as Chad's lies during his police interview.

1. Regarding his travel time to the Kittery police station, Chad said, "Drove two and a half hours to get here." (p. 2) My estimate (See "Chronology of Case") is that it took him an hour and a half. Chad's time estimate was incorrect, but not a lie. A few seconds earlier, Chad said, "I've been sitting for two straight hours." Actually, it was three hours, so that estimate by Chad was also off by an hour and was also not a lie.

2. Regarding the discussion between Jeff Marshall and Chad about meeting somewhere, to reduce Chad's travel time on the 8th, it's not clear how the idea of meeting at Moonlite Reader arose. Therefore, it's not clear that Chad's response, "I just said, 'do you want to meet somewhere?'" to the question of "where did you suggest that you could meet?" was a lie. Then Chad told the police of how they had met in Newington in an earlier transfer of Cassidy. (pages 77-78).

3. Regarding his initial description of his relationship with Amanda, I agree that he minimized it. The first question about Amanda was on page 18, "How long have you guys been together?" Chad answered, "Not very long. I mean I just met her I think it was July we went on a date to a concert." Actually, the concert was June 2, so he was off by a month, when describing a six month relationship. This case saw many incorrect estimates of time, including Amanda's statements at Chad's trial that Cassidy's doctor appt. to check her feet was "in July." Actually, it was Sept. 11, which was a critically important two month difference.

4. Regarding why Cassidy wasn't in daycare, Chad said, "but we haven't been able to get into day care." Amanda made 14 calls to daycare centers on Friday, Nov. 3, and Wed., Nov. 8, without success. Chad talked with his son's daycare center/school about placing Cassidy there.

5. Trampoline story. Agreed.

6. Your sarcastic question about Timothy Logsdon is totally irrelevant to Chad's case.

7. Finally, I don't see how you can draw an incriminating conclusion from a person's unwillingness to look at a photo of a body of a child you loved and last saw alive 12 hours previous.

*25 October 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

## Bob A

Your last explanation of Chads lies to the police are so far off track and don't make sense. Chad told many lies on the evening of the 9th, one only needs to watch the video and read the closing arguments by the State to see them. However, I will at this time dispute a particular charge you've made in regards to facial bruising to Cassidy. First off, Cassidy's face was covered with severe bruises at the time Cassidy was dropped off in Kittery. These were confirmed by Jeff, Jen and Amanda. Second, Chad refused to even look at pictures of Cassidy's face, claiming "I don't want to see a dead kid." What a sham. This violent, abusive liar who inflicted injuries on "that girl" and who distanced himself from her and her mom during police questioning later claims that he was a loving father figure to her, that he "loved and nurtured her." How is it, if he was such a good, loving, nurturing parent, refuse to see the injuries for himself? What a liar. What a manipulator. He's manipulated every member of the CEWCC, he dupped all of you.

Let's talk about more lies. His claim that he drove over two hours to the to the station, insinuating that he drove straight to Kittery. LIE. His explanation for calling Tristen. LIE. Refusing to identify his suggested meeting place to pick up Cassidy on the 8th. LIE. His initial characterization of his relationship with Amanda. LIE. His story about why Cassidy wasn't in daycare. LIE. His trampoline story. LIE.

What a sham this whole effort is. I ask you again, is he friends with the baby rapist Timothy Logsdon? There's another scumbag.

*25 October 2012*

## Morrison Bonpasse |

Bob,

As has been agreed from the beginning of this campaign for Chad Evans, Chad did lie about the source of the bruises on Cassidy's cheeks. At first, he told the police that he didn't know the source of those bruises. (p. 1532) However, he later did tell the police the correct reason for those bruises which were the source of the "trampoline story" in the first place, which was that he held Cassidy's face in order to obtain eye contact. (p. 1545) Unfortunately, he also told the police the "trampoline story" which was a lie. (p. 1548)

It was a significant mistake for Chad, and later, his attorneys, not to tell the police that the "trampoline story" was a lie. In fact, Amanda had already told the police. Later, it was an error not to be clear at Chad's trial that he agreed with Amanda about how the "trampoline story" was created, just as she told the jury. It was initially, simply a "white lie," like so many other "white lies" that people tell others to avoid embarrassment.

Chad told no other lies to the police. He did minimize, at times, his relationship with Amanda, to protect what he thought was her Maine citizenship or residency for the ASPIRE program. However, those statements were not lies, in my humble opinion.

You are right that I am curious about what other lies you referenced when you wrote, "told so many lies, one lie after another," and "all the lies." Please, give me, and other readers here, just one for the sake of discussion.

P.S. the website problem, which deleted last night the previous three messages, was fixed and the messages were restored at about 11:45 this morning.

*24 October 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

## Bob A

Whatever. The more I read about Chad, the more I'm convinced that he's responsible for Cassidy's death. He's a sick bastard who did infact lie outright to the police, he told so many lies, one lie after another. Those cops knew he was lying to them too.

Yes you've been dupped by a manipulative liar. After reading "Physical Contacts between Chad

Evans and Amanda Bortner" I'm convinced that he's a nut case. What a sham. This guy has managed to explain away some very abusive, violent incidents he's had with Amanda. Unbelievable.

I want to know why he lied to the police. Don't come back with a request that I summarize all his lies, they're there in plain sight. If you can't see them for yourself, well I got to wonder about you,  
*23 October 2012*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Ok. Thanks for the support for a new polygraph exam, which we seek to be provided with the highest possible standards of precision and accuracy. However, no thanks for the sarcasm which detracts from your sincere concerns in this case. If you didn't care about justice, you wouldn't be spending the time you spend on this case. Let's keep our comments respectful and worthy of our shared interest in justice. At SOME point, one of us is going to say, "You know, you were right," and extend a hand of friendship, or at the very least, of respect. Let's not poison the communications so as to preclude that moment. I expect that at that same time, similar communications or gestures will be exchanged with the Attorney General's office and the State Police. Justice is our mutual goal.

*23 October 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob A**

Sure, now please find out if Chad and Timothy Logsdon are friends. I bet they're really good buddies. Two former school board members serving time together in the same prison, probably share the same bed, who abused children, one of the children was raped and the other one died.  
*23 October 2012*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,  
My question is quite straightforward. Do you support giving Chad a second polygraph, a valid, bona fide polygraph exam? In the past, you have supported such a exam. Our first effort wasn't successful for several reasons which have been presented here and elsewhere in this website. Nonetheless, we believe that a well-administered polygraph can assist in the determination of the truth. Again, do you support giving Chad another polygraph exam? More generally, are you interested in trying to determine more about the truth in this case, or is your mind made up, and closed?

*23 October 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob A**

I don't agree to whatever it is you're trying to get me to say yes to and I certainly don't agree to another sham polygraph administered by friends of Chad Evans. Speaking of friends, does Chad know Timothy Logsdon? I bet he does, because they're both serving time together in the same prison, and they've both done harm to children. Chad's a child murderer, Tim's a child rapist. I bet they're in the same segregated unit, because neither of them would survive in general population. They have a lot in common, they were both former school board members. How ironic.  
*23 October 2012*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,  
1. Sure. It's POSSIBLE that I've been "duped," to use your term, but after almost three years of work on this case, it seems to me that the facts of this case point powerfully toward the wrongful conviction of an innocent man.  
2. Do you agree that it's POSSIBLE that you have been supporting the conviction of an innocent man?

3. I repeat the question at the end of my last posting: Do you support another polygraph examination for Chad? Mark C. can answer for himself.

23 October 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

### Bob A

Talk about twisting everything around....reminds me of Amanda's assertion after Chad's come-to-Jesus meeting with the police. You sure do have a way of spinning things. Speaking of come-to-Jesus.....it reminds me of how Chad's heart (if he ever had one) did a complete 180 and suddenly he's professing his love to Amanda....the same girl he refused for so long to tell "I love you" to. The same girl he saw as a convenient piece of ass, someone he could enjoy his post-marriage playboy time with. Someone who would arrange threesomes with her girlfriends for him, not because she liked to do that sort of thing, but because she loved him, and she would do anything to get him to love her. It's a very sad.

Chad's meeting with the police resulted in a change-in-heart for the way he treated Amanda. He never needed her for anything but sex, until now. Now he needed to unleash the evil, influential side of himself and tell her that he loved her (though he didn't). Tell her he wanted to spend the rest of his life with her...tell her everything she so wanted to hear, and hear she did. She heard so much that she changed her testimony.

I can't believe you can't see this Morrison. A man with your education and knowledge, you've been dupped just like Amanda was dupped.

As far as comparing murder to rape of a child, they're both one in the same. Chad never intended to murder Cassidy. However, he did abuse her to the point that she died of injuries he inflicted. I reiterate, abuse. Same thing that Timothy Logsdon, another former school board member did to a child. So save your "former school board member" comments, because they don't help your cause. Besides, people voted for Chad because they thought they were voting for his dad, so there.

In closing, it was another great day in the state of New Hampshire, where a convicted child murderer remains behind bars where he belongs.

22 October 2012

### Morrison Bonpasse |

Bob,

I've asked the State Police to identify exactly which questions were accompanied by those "notable movements," but the State Police have declined that request. I don't understand the nomenclature of "C6" or "S1," etc. In the report, the State Police said that these movements "could be indicative" of countermeasures and then said that such a possibility was "elevated" by Chad's "claim" of a broken ankle. Well, Chad fractured his ankle on February 27 and he wore a cast thereafter. So much for the disparaging term, "claim."

Even without the exact identification of the "notable movement" questions, using nomenclature that I and others can understand, the State Police report said there were 8 such movements among the control questions. Now, the seven control questions were asked four times, for a total of 28, and during those 28 there were 8 suspicious movements? Please bear in mind my transcript recorded that Chad coughed 18 times during the 3 1/2 hour exam and 3 times during the actual 20 minutes of questions.

Please note that even with the State Police scoring of the exam, Chad did not fail it. That is, there was no conclusion of deception. The two State Police reviewers graded it as "inconclusive." Doesn't that tell you something? Chad was asked three questions about Cassidy's death four times and answered "NO" every time and there was no reported indication of deception. Please remember that the polygraph machine was sensitive enough to help the examiner to determine that Chad was lying when he denied that the card he chose was a "7."

You and Mark C have repeatedly called for a polygraph test for Chad. He voluntarily took such a polygraph in good faith and didn't fail it, even by the State Police scorings. Again, doesn't that tell you something? Do you and Mark C support his taking another polygraph?

22 October 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

## Bob A

Can we please set the record straight? ".....notable movements all seem timely and consistent to only control questions which could be indicative of the examinee employing countermeasures."

I would not characterise it as "flaws in the administration of the exam." It would appear that the exam was so bad that Dave Crawford pulled Healy's certification, and went as far as write a letter to Jeff Strelzin about how bad the exam was. Add to this the biased statement Healy made in his opinion, this adds up to a failed attempt to clear Evans of a crime he did commit.

21 October 2012

## Morrison Bonpase |

The video of Chad's April 30, 2012 polygraph exam is now linked at the 14 October 2012 entry in the "Latest News" section of this website at [http://www.chadevanswronglyconvicted.org/latest\\_news.html](http://www.chadevanswronglyconvicted.org/latest_news.html). The video is three and a half hours long, with the actual four sets of the same ten questions beginning at the 3 hour 6 minute mark. Even if the polygraph exam has been deemed invalid because of flaws in the administration of the exam, and unexplained movements by Chad during a few "safety valve questions," it is still worth viewing.

20 October 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

## Morrison Bonpasse |

To Bob,  
While sexual abuse of children is a terrible crime, I assume that you agree that it is not the same as murdering a child. Again, I believe that it's extremely unlikely that a Board of Education member, or former member, would murder a child. It's also unlikely that a teacher would murder a child. Therefore, I think that Chad's service as a Board of Education member makes it less likely that he murdered Cassidy Bortner. Not impossible, but less likely. If you can find a such a case, please let me know.

Yesterday, I briefly described Chad's case to someone, and when I said that Chad was a former member of the Keene Board of Education, the person responded, "Huh?"

To Bob Bad,  
The issue of wrongful conviction cuts across party lines. My sense is that conservatives are more affronted, or should be, than liberals. Conservatives have always been concerned about individual liberty. Doesn't the wrongful conviction and imprisonment of an innocent man violate individual liberty? That philosophy is contained in the New Hampshire state motto: "Live Free or Die." Also, conservatives are especially loathe to waste tax dollars, so why would they support spending about \$35,000 a year to incarcerate an innocent man? Also, the government loses the taxes the innocent man would have paid if still free and working.

18 October 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

## Bob Bad

Mark, unless of course he gets a presidential pardon from O.MG WTF between Nov 6 and Jan, in light of the fact that O is on his way out of office.

I'm sure this post will upset all the tree-hugging left wing CEWCC members.

18 October 2012

## Mark C

Bob...Radio Shack has some reasonably priced wireless day/night security cameras that are simple to install and easy to hide. That'll put an end to any ridiculous tough-guy wannabe harassers.

As far as this case...if you fast forward 10 years, Evans will still be in jail and there will be no new evidence or support for a re-investigation (let alone re-trial) of this case.

Its over and done. Cassidy never got a fair shot in life...maybe karma is at play here.

18 October 2012

### Bob A

From Fosters: "Former Somersworth School Board member Timothy Logsdon was sentenced to 10 to 30 years in state prison Tuesday after pleading guilty to sexually abusing his daughter when she was as young as three."

Your use of Chad's past position of as a school board member lacks merit.

As far as the blood under Cassidy's fingernails, what does this prove? Nothing. It would not change the outcome of this case. Furthermore, Chad and his attorneys were well aware of this report that was provided to them. The question is, why didn't they want to use it at trial? Maybe because it was inconclusive?

18 October 2012

### Morrison Bonpasse |

Bob,

1. I did run, unsuccessfully, for State Rep. in 2000 and 2002. Chad was the more successful candidate, as he was elected to the Keene Board of Education in 1991.

2. Yes, Jeff Strelzin did spend many hours reviewing Chad's case, but he concluded his August 21 letter to Chad with this sentence, "Therefore, after consultation with the Attorney General, we will not be reopening your case or reinvestigating the death of Cassidy Bortner." He didn't tell Chad in his letter whom he had contacted so I don't know that he contacted "key players and witnesses" as you allege.

3. When I began working on this case, Chad's mother, and others, said to me that "Cassidy's fingernails should have been tested." So I thought they had not been tested. It is true that in Oct., 2010 when I found the March 12 and March 22, 2001 Maine State Police Crime Lab. reports of the DNA tests on the blood underneath all ten of Cassidy's fingernails, I thought they were "new evidence." I had not previously seen them amidst the 3,274 pages of Discovery materials. However, when Mr. Strelzin wrote to Chad in Sept., 2011 that these two reports had been furnished to Chad's attorneys before his trial as part of the discovery process, and they actually were within the Discovery materials, I immediately apologized to Mr. Strelzin for my claim that the tests had not previously been made known to Chad's attorneys. Nonetheless, the stark fact remains that these important reports were not presented to the jury. When testifying that Cassidy's blood on a Wendy's wrapper was "what we call purge, and it's really just bloody fluid that may come out of the nose or the mouth," (p. 157), Dr. Greenwald said that Cassidy had no open wounds which could have been the source of that blood. So how did her blood get underneath all ten of her fingernails? The DNA tests confirmed that the blood was Cassidy's, and it was likely placed on her fingernails after her November 8 evening bath, as the bath would have washed away any blood accumulating before that bath. If Chad's attorneys had asked Dr. Greenwald about the blood underneath Cassidy's fingernails, the jury's understanding of her death would likely have been different. This is one of the many reasons that in the subtitle of EYE CONTACT, Cassidy's death is called "mysterious."

17 October 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

### Bob A

Morrison:

1: Nice try. Have you thought about running for office? You talk like a politician.

2: Wrong. Jeff Strelzin spent countless hours reviewing this case, many more hours than those claimed by members of the CEWCC...ie Christine, who claims to have spent over 2000 hours on this case (slow clap)....He went as far as to contact key players and witnesses...oh, I bet you didn't know that, did you? You assume that he just reviewed the available information, however you

assumed wrong..... There will be no reinvestigation of this case because the CEWCC has failed to provide viable evidence that he didn't receive a fair trial....furthermore, the CEWCC has not presented once ounce of credible evidence that Chad is innocent. See #3: This committee sits around making unsubstantiated theories about Cassidy'd death, like lead paint, etc.....(very slow clap).

3: You claimed to have "new DNA evidence" that would prove Chad's innocence. You made that claim repeatedly, on TV, in the paper, on this website. There's only one problem, this "new DNA evidence" was not new, it was made available to Chad's defense during trial. How do you back track on that? Also, you've got Christine claiming Chad passed a polygraph on youtube.com, both of these claims are incorrect.

Would you agree that incorrect public statements can be called distortions (lies)? If you agree, would you agree that the CEWCC uses distortions to get more people to support your efforts? If so, would you agree that the CEWCC uses distortions and deceit to gain members?

It's sad that the CEWCC has to use incorrect information to promote their agenda. Freeing a bonafide child murderer is risky business, especially in New Hampshire where people generally don't allow themselves to be bull shitted into something that their gut tells them is wrong.

I would like to thank the Kittery PD, Maine State Police as well as the Rochester PD and New Hampshire State Police for all their professionalism and hard work in solving the untimely death of this poor little girl. I'd also like to commend the New Hampshire AG's office and the prosecution for making sure that the baby killer Chad Evans received a fair trial. May he rot in prison for the rest of his child-killing life.

16 October 2012

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Ok, you have answered the question. It doesn't seem to trouble you that you may be supporting the continued incarceration of an innocent man.

Also, you don't seem interested or concerned about the problem of wrongful conviction in this country.

Finally, three points:

1. The Attorney General's office did NOT re-investigate Chad's case and has explicitly stated that it will not do so.
2. Nothing I have written about this case is fictitious. You may not like what I have written, but you have offered no evidence to support your preferred belief that anything I've written is fiction.
3. To my knowledge, none of my assertions or claims about new evidence are false. Please share here whatever evidence you have for that assertion.

16 October 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob A**

Morrison,

I have never "wondered" if Evans is innocent. I have, however, wondered why you've made fictitious stories about his character, why you've gone to great lengths to present him as a loving, nurturing father. Why you've made false claims about "new evidence."

I've also wondered why Chad played games during the police investigation, why he played hide-and-seek while out on bail, playing catch-me-if-you-can with the state police, then he turns around and cries foul when they do indeed attempt to locate him. I wonder why he beat Cassidy so bad that she died the next day. Why did he summon all his friends to the police station? Why did he lie about his phone conversation with Tristen? Why did he take so long to get to the police station? And why did he lie about it? He lied, plain and simple, claiming he drove two straight hours to get there, but left out all the stops along the way, he left out all the phone calls he made, he left out the part where he waited for Tristen to meet him at the Portsmouth traffic circle, etc....Why did he lie about the trampoline, about the reason Cassidy wasn't in day care, etc etc...Why did he play dumb in the police interview? You know, if he was so convinced that Jeff did it, why didn't he confront Jeff before his interview? Why didn't he discuss this with the police? The reason is because he was guilty, he

knew he was guilty. He only confronted Jeff after finding out that Jeff was honest and truthful to the police.

Your request for a reinvestigation was granted by the AG's office. The results found that Chad's claims had no merit. Now you want a retrial? Why? Why retry Baby Killer? You've not presented one good reason why there should be a retrial. Not one.

Cover-up, lie, persuade, hide, lie some more, these are the games Chad played.

It's another wonderful day here in New Hampshire, where a violent, abusive child killer remains behind bars.

16 October 2012

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Have you ever wondered whether you are wrong about Chad Evans?

If Chad, and members of the Chad Evans Wrongly Convicted Committee are correct, then Cassidy's death should be re-investigated and Chad's conviction should be vacated. If the Attorney General continues to believe in Chad's guilt, then he should seek to retry Chad. We have not been saying, "Let him out." We have been saying, "Re-investigate, and, if necessary, re-try."

If we are wrong, then a re-investigation would likely present further evidence of guilt and that would be the end of our effort.

If a re-investigation led to a re-trial, and if we are still wrong, a re-trial would lead to a re-conviction and our efforts would have cost the State of New Hampshire time and money; but no one's freedom. Remember that this is the state with the motto, "Live Free or Die."

If you, and others who agree with you are correct, then Chad did assault and murder Cassidy and he deserves to serve all of his sentence.

If you are wrong, then you have been arguing for the continued incarceration of an innocent man.

Again, if we are wrong, the State of New Hampshire will go through the expense of a re-investigation and maybe a re-trial with the same result of conviction.

If you and other believers in Chad's guilt are wrong, and there is no re-investigation and no re-trial, then an innocent person will stay in prison for at least another 31 years.

Again do you and others who agree with you think about the possibility that you are wrong?

As an aside can you tell us your views of the 300 DNA exonerees since 1989, and the possible feelings of all those supporters of their original guilty verdicts? All beyond a reasonable doubt?

15 October 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold**

Morrison,

I see you've made a good effort, but it's not good enough. I can find over 20 examples of violent behavior, given by bonafide witnesses to the police, including beating up complete strangers, punching holes in walls, punching automobiles, grabbing women by the throat and threatening to kill them, threatening strangers with physical assault, horribly assaulting his ex wife which resulted in an assault conviction, and assaults on Amanda as well as Cassidy. These are all documented as violent, horrifying acts of rage. All of these eye witness accounts can be found in the police interviews. You can also find plenty of evidence of lies that Evans told, many lies.

In summary, Chad is an abusive, violent and controlling person. He's so persuasive that he's a danger to society. Chad loves Chad. Chad also loves to persuade, get people to do things for him. He sees it as a game, and he plays the game well. However, Jeff Strelzin, as well as law enforcement are on to him and the games he plays.

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

When scanning the trial transcripts, I see that Jennifer Bortner did use the word "pain" to describe Kassidy on the 9th. She said at page 111 of her testimony of Kassidy, "She was quiet, real quiet. She acted like she was sick, in pain," and at page 113, "It was totally different. Like she -- she was a lot quieter. I thought she was tired. You know, she seemed like she was in pain." However, there was no indication of crying and no indication that there was pain in any particular part of her body. Usually, when we think a child might be hurting we ask the question, "Where does it hurt?" That didn't happen here. If Jennifer thought Kassidy was really in pain at the time, wouldn't she have asked Kassidy some kind of question? Wouldn't she have said something to Jeff about the perception of pain? She didn't.

You asked for evidence in police reports or trial testimony that Chad was not an abusive violent person. Well, one problem with that request is that the trial excluded character evidence. Also, the police rarely asked people to tell them why they think that their suspect is a good person. The police focused on the negative. After the trial, 52 letters were written to the judge in support of Chad. You asked for ONE document, so I suggest the Police interview with Jeremy Hinton on November 9. He said of Chad's parenting of his son and stepson, "But I've never seen him so much as spank either one of them." (p. 9) Jeremy was asked at page 12, "Have you ever seen him be violent before?" and he said "Never," and then added, "...the only time I've ever seen him hit another person, ah, was one night at a party when Tristan his ex-wife hit him and he just kinda grabbed her, he didn't really slap her, he just kinda grabbed her and held her up against the wall, and said don't hit me." At page 34, Jeremy was asked, "Was he affectionate with his own children?" and he responded, "Yeah, Chad was very affectionate with them."

At page 34, Jeremy said of Chad, "He's a very friendly guy."

15 October 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob A**

Morrison you are incorrect. Kassidy was in a lot of pain on the morning of the 9th, so much pain that she was a quiet battered shell. See police interviews as well as trial transcripts. She was still in a shitty diaper that neither of these two dirtbags would take care of the night before. Some loving, caring father.....Kassidy was normally the first one up in the house, not on this morning, she lay in bed moaning. She didn't eat. A baggy of cereal, that was her only breakfast, was later found uneaten at Jeff's house. When Amanda dropped her off, her face was battered and severely bruised, "the worst ever," see Amanda's comments "look at her face, it looks like shit!"

This was a child who slept through the night of the 8th suffering from trauma and blunt force impacts to her head, stomach, back, sleeping in a shit filled diaper. There is only one person who had access to Kassidy, one person who had means and motive, that person is Chad Evans. The same person hated Kassidy, the same person who violently choked her mommy on the same evening, shortly after violently beating Kassidy. The same individual who told lies "too numerous to mention" -see closing arguments by the prosecution.

Chad is not the loving, nurturing family man you describe him as. Show me where it says that, in all the police interviews and investigative reports, that Chad was not an abusive, violent person? Show me one interview, one documented police interview that sheds light on your fictitious claims about him. Show me proof that Corey Merrill later recanted his testimony, documented proof and not a statement from Chad.

15 October 2012

**Bob A**

Hey Morrison, I've never heard of a polygraph going on this long. The reason it went on so long is because John Healy and Chad Evans are buddies, and nearly all the conversation supports this fact. He was just showing off, a lot of unnecessary commentary to shed light on his vast experience,

however no reasonable instructions given to Chad Bad, as pointed out by the NH State Trooper who examined Healy's bs report. Why did Healy allow Chad to formulate the questions? Why did the state police characterize this exam as a sham? Why did the polygraph school pull Healy's polygraph certificate and basically call this exam "unprofessional?" Why did Healy bs with Evans so much?

By the way, I don't doubt someone in the CEWCC honks their horn in front of my home. Just look at all the other harrassment I've received, threats made about my address and phone number, discussion about my family, I've even been confronted in public. This is what happens when people feel they are loosing, and they lack the skills and evidence to effectively debate. They resort to threats, etc.....

I would like to say it's another wonderful day in New Hampshire, where a convicted child killer remains in prison. I'd also like to thank the professionals in our AG office, as well as all the law enforcement personnel who did their jobs to get a rock solid conviction.

15 October 2012

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

It's surely hard to celebrate a birthday while wrongly imprisoned, but I join Wendy in her Happy Birthday wishes to Chad. I'll be visiting him Thursday to convey those wishes personally. His best birthday present will be freedom before his 42nd birthday in 2013.

For "Again," we all understand that Cassidy's death was a tragedy. However, imprisoning an innocent man for her death compounds that tragedy. Neither Amanda nor Chad saw that Cassidy showed any signs of being in pain during her last two days of life, except for when she was hit by the Tee-ball on the night of the 8th. Chad took her downstairs to wrap ice in a cloth to apply to the bruise on her head, but she didn't want it. That pain apparently subsided quickly as Travis saw no evidence of pain when he saw Cassidy a few minutes later in the bathtub, and when he saw her sitting in Chad's lap eating a Pop-Ice and learning the words for body parts in his downstairs office. The next morning, when Amanda and Chad prepared Cassidy for her day of babysitting at Jeff Marshall's and Jennifer Bortner's, there was no indication of pain. None of the four adults who saw Cassidy during her last day alive reported any indication that Cassidy showed pain. Yes, Cassidy indicated that she was uncomfortable and didn't want to stand or move at Jeff's, but there was no reported crying that indicated that she was in pain.

Perhaps "Again" can explain what s/he knows about what Cassidy "felt like before she died."

15 October 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Again**

Happy Birthday! Are you kidding me? What a shame.

15 October 2012

**Again**

There is an angel in heaven that is trying to rest peacefully! Focus on her not on this BS! Chad give up! You are not getting out! Let the angel rest and stop the BS. You are where you belong, you are NEVER getting out! NEVER EVER EVER! You did the crime now stop trying to figure a way out it! MAN UP AND DO THE TIME WITHOUT CRYING! YOU IGNORED HER PAIN SO YOU BET YOUR ASS WE WILL IGNORE YOURS! Your supporters have no idea what she felt like before she died!

15 October 2012

**wendy**

Happy birthday Chad hope its an ok day.

15 October 2012 - nashua

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Sure, the three and a half hour examination began slowly, with an introductory discussion. My understanding is that many or most polygraph exams begin this way.

The core of the examination began at page 100, when Chad picked a card with a number, and at page 101 when the polygraphist concluded correctly that the number was 7. As Chad said, "Hot damn. How did you know?... this tells you, huh?" The polygraph obviously had some credibility. At page 103 began the real questions in the first of the four charts. While reading the entire 111 pages is a large task, please consider reading the last 12 pages which have the ACTUAL questions, including the three questions about the Cassidy Bortner case. The answer to those three questions was always "No."

*14 October 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob A**

After reading the first 15 pages, I've concluded that this was not a bonafide polygraph examination.

This was a long bs session between John Healy and Chad Evans. That's all it was. It was not an objective, unbiased examination. The whole thing was a joke, nothing more that two buddies shooting the bull for a very long period of time.

*14 October 2012*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

I have just posted the transcript of Chad's April 30 polygraph exam. I've redacted a few sentences, mostly by the polygraphist, that had nothing to do with the death of Cassidy Bortner. The video file will be posted soon. It's very large (The MP4 file is 898 MB), so I have to take it to my Internet Service Provider physically for uploading.

At page 89, after being reassured that the exam would be composed only of questions that had previously been discussed, Chad told the polygraphist that other questions could be asked, when he said, "You can." It was a short statement, but still noteworthy.

The accuracy of the polygraph impressed me when the polygraphist told Chad (at page 101) that the number he had picked from collection was #7. Previously, Chad had lied, as instructed, about which card he had picked, and the polygraph recognized that lie.

It's very rare to see a transcript of an actual polygraph exam. If any reader here knows the internet address of an online transcript of another polygraph exam, please let me know.

The actual video will be linked to that posting as soon as possible.

*14 October 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob A**

Whatever. Don't mention my wife again.

*13 October 2012*

**Becky** | 

Ahem, \*FAR FROM THE TRUTH\*

*12 October 2012 - Rochester*

**Becky** | 

Fact: I wouldn't hurt, disrespect or harass my co-worker of many years!!

Fact: your comments are hurtful, far from the true & completely uncalled for!

Fact: Chad did NOT kill Cassidy!

Fact: Give respect, get respect!

*12 October 2012 - Rochester*

Bob,

I don't see how Becky's statement that your comments were an insult to your wife's co-workers was an attack on your family. It seemed to be an attempt to defend those co-workers, whomever they are.

Nonetheless, I agree that all postings here ought to avoid references to the family members of other commenters.

Also, please be assured that I have never heard from any member of the Chad Evans Wrongly Convicted Committee member that s/he has honked a horn when driving by your home. It's not a good idea and no member should do it. Your frequent exaggerations don't help the situation, however. In a recent posting you wrote that Amanda was lucky that Chad didn't kill her. (I'm still waiting for some evidence which purportedly supports that bizarre idea.) In the posting below you implied that a member of the Chad Evans Wrongly Convicted Committee would even think of breaking into your home, and then you threaten violence against such a person. Where do such ideas come from?

*12 October 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob A**

Becky,

Your last post is indicative of your desperation. When you lack supportive evidence and documentation to back your argument, you attack my family. This is the second time you've brought up my wife. What's wrong with you? Just a little friendly advice to you and your friends, if you decide to attempt physical harm on my family, prepare yourself for the worst. Furthermore, if honking your horn when you drive by my home becomes boring, and you decide to break in, you should bring some friends and make sure everyone has a gun.

Mark,

It's sad that Peter's Palace lost a huge market share when Chad went to the slammer. Maybe the website can devote a page to Peter's Palace, how to order things for your favorite child murderer, etc...

As far as your friend, that sounds interesting. I also have some information from an old friend of Chad's would further reinforce what you and I have been saying all along.

Regards,

Bob

*12 October 2012*

Morrison Bonpasse | 

Welcome back Mark C,

I remember that you supported the plan to have a polygraph for Chad. We're now trying to arrange another one. We've asked that the State Police conduct an exam, but there has been no interest in that option.

Has your friend seen any of the documents and information which have been developed about the case since 2001? Does your friend know that there were photographs of a healthy Cassidy available which were not shown to the jury? The most recent photo was taken on October 20. Does your friend know that the prosecution's primary medical witness had records of Cassidy's medical appointments in August and September, 2000, which was during the period of the charges against Chad, but which the jury did not know? The jury was told that Cassidy's most recent medical appointment was in July.

Does your friend know that Chad took Cassidy to a family event on November 5, 2000, four days before she died, where an elementary school nurse observed her, albeit socially? This, too, the jury did not know.

Might your friend be interested in re-examining the case in light of the above, and other information

not available to the jury in 2001?

11 October 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

### Mark C

Bob...I've caught up on some past posts. I come to this section periodically. However, nothing new has been presented to change my mind of Chad's guilt so its more for the entertainment value reading the posts by committee members.

I will say this...I know someone who was intimately involved with this case. I went to college with this person, lived in the same house for a few years and discovered that this person was involved with the prosecution after I read through all of the facts and documents.

I came to my own conclusion about this case but had it validated by my friend. That's good enough for me.

By the way, I'd be up for a reunion of sorts at Peter's Palace. That place had to have lost a ton of revenue since Chad has been in the joint.

11 October 2012

### Morrison Bonpasse |

Bob,

I realize that every case is different, but among the exonerations in this country since 1989, there are several elements which keep recurring, such as police failure to pursue leads, once they had minimal evidence to support their incorrect theories of a case. Ineffective assistance of counsel also frequently occurs.

The "900 exonerations" I was referencing are listed in the new "National Registry of Exonerations" at <http://www.law.umich.edu/special/exoneration/Pages/about.aspx>. I just checked that site, and see that the number has increased to 980.

However, the innocence of some of those exonerees is not as clear as in the DNA cases, so let's focus on the 300 DNA-based exonerations listed by the Innocence Project at <http://www.innocenceproject.org/>

Are you willing to acknowledge that the justice system failed these 300 people AND the victims in all of the related crimes? Are you willing to acknowledge that the justice system found every one of these 300 guilty beyond a reasonable doubt?

Are you willing to pick ONE of those cases and explore it in detail and tell us what you think about that case? Are you willing to empathize with at least one of the 300?

Regarding your two previous posts, your "facts" 1-5 are mostly your opinions, and we have seen them all before. Let's try to avoid rehashing what has been discussed here before.

One new item is your incredible theory that "Amanda is lucky to be alive," and that Chad actually "gave himself a choice, either kill her for personal gain, or convince her that he loved her and influence her for his personal gain." Such speculation is bizarre, but in the interest of fairness, I'll ask you to provide evidence to support that theory.

11 October 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

### Becky B |

I admire the way you insult your wife's co~worker's, Bob.  
Professional.

10 October 2012 - Rochester, NH

### Bob Arnold

One other question, where is everybody? Why are you the only person addressing me? I can only assume this is a strategic move, and another bad decision on your part. I miss all the uneducated, weak responses from the other members of the committee. Other bad decisions include the way you portrayed Evans in your EC "book" if you want to call it a book. More like a touchy-feely fictional

account of Evans. Unbelievable. That's how I characterize your book and your efforts to make Chad the squeaky clean, loving, fatherly figure that he's not, nor has he ever been. The police interviews speak volumes about Chad, they paint a picture of a hostile, arrogant, abusive asshole who never loved Amanda. The only person Chad ever loved was Chad.

Amanda is lucky to be alive. I believe that he gave himself a choice, either kill her for personal gain, or convince her that he loved her and influence her for his personal gain. He chose the later. Lucky for her.

You guys cry about the way the police spent all that time trying to determine if he was in contact with her, give me a break. Chad knew what he was doing, and he knew better, but he did it anyway because it was either kill her or persuade her.

10 October 2012

### Bob Arnold

Morrison,  
We're not discussing "900" other cases, we're discussing this case, so let's stop the bs and stick to the facts....

Fact 1: Chad had motive, he looked at Amanda as a sex toy. One problem, her little girl got in the way. He hated Cassidy, he bruised her, he yelled at her, he abused her as he saw fit. He became angry whenever she would throw tantrums, he would call her bitch, retard, etc.

Fact 2: He had the means. He beat Cassidy on the evening of Nov 8th. Repeatedly. He tried to cover it up by calling Jeff. He made up the baseball/wiffle ball/starter ball story.

Fact 3. His rage that evening was apparent by the way he choked the shit out of Amanda when she came home. Another example of his abusive, violent behavior towards others, namely females.

Fact 4: He lied to the police, he lied about his phone call with Tristen, he lied about running late to the police station, he lied about the trampoline, the baseball/wiffle ball, he lied about his relationship with Amanda, he lied about how he felt about Amanda, he lied about Cassidy "mowing cereal" on the morning of the ninth. Etc, etc, Chad is a liar.

Fact 5: Chad has a documented history of using violence against others, see his interview, see police report concerning brutal assault on Tristen, see interview with Barbara Hamel, see other interviews with people who worked with him. Violent, unpredictable, abusive, these are but three words to describe the child murderer Chad Evans. Yes, he murdered Cassidy Bortner, and he was given a fair trial which resulted in his just conviction. Now that sorry SOB wants to play games during a polygraph, use documented countermeasures.

Let me ask you a question, why are you still defending him? Surely a man of your character and education should come to a different conclusion.

Regards,

Bob

10 October 2012

### Morrison Bonpasse |

Bob,  
Ok. You don't agree. Big surprise.  
Let me ask you. Is there a single exoneration of a wrongly convicted person in this country, out of approximately 900 since 1989, that has interested you? Is there a case which has offended your sense of justice? Is there a case where you felt that a person had genuinely been wrongly convicted and deserved an apology from the government and compensation?  
Out of 900, is there at least ONE that comes to mind?

10 October 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

---

**Bob Arnold**

Morrison,

I don't agree. Mr. Healy did more harm than good by offering his opinions about wrongly convicted people. Courageous? More like unprofessional and rash if you ask me. Another example of preaching to people who don't agree with your point of view. Here's a guy who performed a polygraph examination, and he's offering his findings to the AG's office, but that's not enough. He has to spice it up with some touchy-feely tree-hugging, heart-warming bs that's emotionally charged, vs offering a professional, unbiased and objective summary of his findings. Kinda like your book. It starts there and trickles down. Speaking of trickle down, I'm reminded of the vomit from my mouth after reading the first few pages of EC. Ya gotta rewrite it and this time do it right.

Best Regards,

Bob

*10 October 2012*

---

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Yes, of course, a new polygrapher would be responsible for his/her own questions. It's interesting that you do not seem to support my stated intention to ASK that polygrapher to use a question suggested by the New Hampshire State Police.

As for John Healy's letter which forwarded (voluntarily, it should be noted) the polygraph video and charts to Jeff Strelzin, I think it was honorable and courageous to speak in support of the claims of innocence by wrongly convicted people. Not enough people in New Hampshire are speaking in support of investigating the claims wrongful conviction.

*10 October 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

---

**Bob Arnold**

Morrison,

It doesnt look good at all. Irregular movements coincidentally occurring during control questions.... Maybe you should let the next guy create their own questions. Also, mount as many cameras around Chad as possible, ie above, behind, in front, under the table, etc, etc. That way, he can't pull the same thing he pulled with Healy. Speaking of Healy, I find it incredible that he would parade an arrogant remark about wrongly convicteds in his opinion to the AG. What kind of dog and pony show is this?

Here we go again, Christine should think about taking down that youtube video that claims he passed a polygraph.

Regards,

Bob

*10 October 2012*

---

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

To "Polygraph (whomever):"

At the bottom of page 7 of the Trooper Ardini's report, he stated, "These notable movements all seem timely and consistent to only control questions which could be indicative of the examinee employing countermeasures." It's true that I misquoted the report in my earlier comment below by recalling that it said "could have." Do you see a meaningful difference between "could have" and "could be"? I don't.

I am today finishing transcribing the 3 1/2 polygraph exam and interview. It sure didn't look like fun to me. I fail to see any reason why Chad would volunteer to take such an exam and then somehow

use “countermeasures” during control questions which would rendered the test invalid and the scoring inconclusive.

On re-reading Trooper Ardini’s report, I see that he criticized the time period description as “between” the 8th and 9th in the questions. Ardini guessed that Chad could have somehow tricked the polygraph if he had inflicted the fatal blows on Nov. 7th. This is a startling idea, as the charge, for which Chad was convicted stated that “on or about November 8-9,2000, ..., with force and arms, did commit the crime of Second Degree Murder.” Further, there was no evidence at Chad’s trial that I can recall of what Cassidy, Amanda, Jeff, Jennifer or Chad did on Tuesday, Nov. 7. I’ve seen Amanda’s and Jennifer’s work schedules for that day, which were not introduced into evidence as the trial, and understand that Cassidy was at Jeff’s and Jennifer’s apartment on that day, for Amanda’s 11 1/2 hour shift. Thus, Trooper Ardini’s speculation about November 7th seems to be a long reach, even for someone who is presumed to be skeptical about Chad’s innocence. If the indictment said “on or about November 8-9” what is so wrong with a polygraph question saying “between November 8th and November 9th”? The common understanding for the time period “between November 8th and 9th” is that it includes all the hours of those two days, at least until Cassidy’s death at 12:30 p.m. on the 9th.

Nonetheless, I will recommend to a future polygraph examiner that s/he use Trooper Ardini’s recommended question, “Did you cause those fatal injuries to that girl?”

Finally, it is only Trooper Ardini’s SUSPICION about countermeasures that is documented, as he wrote about them, but proof of countermeasures is negligible.

10 October 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

### We aren’t stupid

One person, So many names.

10 October 2012

### polygraph

Where does it say that? Nowhere. They suspected him of employing countermeasures, read the report again. Even with his good buddy Healy administering the test, he still had to use documented countermeasures. Documented, 100% without a doubt

10 October 2012

### mike

A baby gone to soon, is what this is about.....End of story

10 October 2012

### Morrison Bonpasse |

To “polygraph:”

Chad didn’t use countermeasures. The State Police report said that the charts indicated that he “could have” used countermeasures, but that’s not the same as “did use.” The State Police reference to Chad’s broken ankle as a “claim” indicates some lack of objectivity in the report. If there was any doubt about Chad’s ankle, a simple phone call from the State Police to the prison would have resolved the question. Last spring, I saw the cast myself. He hurt his ankle playing basketball.

9 October 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

### polygraph

Why did Chad use countermeasures during his polygraph

9 October 2012

### Morrison Bonpasse |

Bob,

Apparently you misunderstood the extended quote at the end of my last comment. It was Tristan’s own statement about the fight in March, 1999. The word “escorted” that you termed “BS” was part of

Tristan's statement. Are you now challenging her recollection of that fight and night? Ok, let's set aside your renewed allegation that Chad told more lies than just the "trampoline story during his police interrogation. I say that he didn't tell any additional meaningful lie and you say he did. You're not persuaded of my view, and I'm not of yours, but, as John Adams said, "facts are stubborn things." More recently, Senator Patrick Moynihan said famously to someone, "You're entitled to your own opinion, but you are not entitled to your own facts." Chad denies that he used deceptive countermeasures during his polygraph exam. You don't believe him. I do. No, John Healy is not a member of the Chad Evans Wrongly Convicted Committee. He does, however, believe in Chad's innocence in this case. It's interesting to me that you dispute Chad's "broken ankle." During one of my visits last Spring he had a cast on one of his legs. Do you still want more proof? If you do seek more proof, which would be an interesting indication of your faith in my credibility, I could ask Chad to produce a document as you request. However, before I ask him, can you give me ANY indication that your estimation of Chad's integrity would increase by any measurable amount if such a document were produced? You seem to dispute, without any evidence to the contrary, most if not all, of what Chad says that conflicts with your opinion of him and the case.

*7 October 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

### **Bob Arnold**

I'm still laughing about your description of the night Chad beat Tristen up. So let me see if I understand this, you're saying that Chad grabbed her hair and escorted her downstairs. Do you realise how ridiculous that sounds? What did he do, gently hold her hair and say "common honey, common, let's go down the stairs sweetie pie", on the contrary he nearly ripped her hair out while dragging her downstairs, yelling and screaming along the way. What happened next Morrison, did he gently loosen her tooth after giving her a big loving kiss? Nooo, he violently smacked her face repeatedly, hard enough to knock out a crown. Oh, I suppose you'll say it happens all the time, right?

By the way, how does Chad know so much about polygraph reactions and countermeasures?

*7 October 2012*

### **Bob Arnold**

Wow, you're at it again. Chad "escorted" her downstairs? BS. He dragged her downstairs by her hair.

Lies, where do I start? They're all recorded in the video taped interrogation. You're trying to bait me into another argument, it's not going to work anymore.

I'd like to know why Chad used deceptive countermeasures during his afternoon bs session with Healy. That's what it appears to have been, a bs session with someone who conducted a highly questionable polygraph, not to mention that he's alluded to being a wrongful conviction crusader. Is Healy a member of the CEWCC?

I would like evidence of Chad's alleged "broken ankle" in the form of a prison medical report. Chad can get it for you. Then you can post it so we can see if in fact he actually had a broken ankle.

*7 October 2012*

### **Morrison Bonpasse** |

Bob,

With respect to Chad's struggle to prove his innocence, the only important message from Dave Crawford's letter was his opinion that Chad's polygraph exam should be considered invalid. You're right. The rest of the letter is between Crawford and John Healy. The State Police reviewed the exam and reached the same conclusion. Rather than wait for the transcript of the exam to be completed, I've posted the State Police review today.

Once again, I ask you to specify the "lies" you claim Chad told the police in addition to the

acknowledged “trampoline story.” Similarly, what was “grossly distorted” in Chad’s description of his treatment of Cassidy?

Regarding the fight between Tristan and Chad in March, 1999, you have previously cited Jeff Marshall as your source for calling it the “worst beating in New Hampshire.” In a recent posting you implied that Tristan was included when you wrote that Chad had “beaten the holy dogshit out of three women,” Once again, you claimed that I have minimized it. Below is part of Tristan’s statement (as posted in the Chronology section of this website) of what happened.

“As I walked in, I noticed that Chad was awake on the bed., so I went to lie down next to him. As I lied down next to him he proceeded to start cursing at me for being late and not letting him know by calling. He then got up off the bed and started accusing me of having an affair, which I then proceeded to slap him in the face for saying this. As I kept slapping him, he then shoved me backward off the bed by pushing me on the neck. He then grabbed me by the back of the hair/neck and escorted me downstairs to the couch where he proceeded to yell and curse more at me, While I did the same back. I then proceeded to slap and kick him for yelling at me and accusing me of having an affair and for calling me obscene names. The last time that I hit him he slapped me in the back fthe head and held my legs down so that I couldn't kick him. After about an hour and a half of yelling and arguing, not getting anywhere, Chad then got up and went upstairs to bed and fell asleep.”

*7 October 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

### **Bob Arnold**

Defamatory? Well if that's the case, then John Healy can take that up with Dave Crawford because it's now a matter of public record, surely a Freedom of Info Act request will make it available. You can't spin that letter the way you did, in summary, Dave Crawford basically told the AG that John Healy conducted a polygraph test which was completely against everything he was trained to do. John Healy resigned from his internship, and will not recieve his certification and will no longer conduct polygraph tests. How can you downplay this? It reminds of how Tristen's beating was downplayed, and all the lies Chad told to the police on 11/9 were spun, how his treatment of Cassidy was grossly distorted, etc etc....

*7 October 2012*

### **Morrison Bonpasse** |

Bob,

Yes, I removed the letter from Dave Crawford because it bordered on being defamatory. I hadn't intended to post it, and was surprised that I had mistakenly done that. Basically, he said that the polygrah should be considered as an invalid test. Mr. Crawford has not responded to my two email requests for more info about his evaluation of Chad's polygraph. Also, he did not respond to my asking him if he was willing to give Chad a polygraph. We have asked the State Police to conduct such a polygraph, but there has been no response to that request either. So we are looking to schedule a polygraph to be conducted by someone else.

Before you post any photographs of Tristan on the internet, be sure to ask for her permission.

I had hoped that Mr. Strelzin would take an objective look at the case, and look not just at what was presented to the jury, but also what was not presented to the jury.

You wrote that Mr. Strelzin “identified the same lies that I have.” The only reference I saw Mr. Strelzin make to alleged lies by Chad was when Mr. Strelzin wrote, “lies you told during the investigation.” The only lie that Chad told the police, and maintained, was the “trampoline story.” It was stupid of him to do that, and his lawyers should have acknowledged at Chad's trial that it was an obvious lie, as Amanda had disclosed long before. Instead, Chad's lawyers led the jury to believe that Chad was still sticking to that story, which severely undermined his credibility. What other alleged lies are you referencing?

I accept that the “anonymous five” are passionate about their views of this case. What would be helpful in the interest of truth and justice would be if one or more of them could share with you WHY they seem to now believe in Chad's guilt. I ask the same question that I've asked you: what errors of FACT are there on this website or in EYE CONTACT to which any of the “anonymous five” can point which undermines the view that is innocent? Or is it that they want to believe what they want

to believe?

Regarding your last posting, it's not worthy of your previously stated commitment to justice, and the seriousness of this case.

5 October 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

### Bob Arnold

By the way, where's Mark C??? I wanted to set up a fall meeting for the Chad Evans Wife Beater Shirt Committee (CEWBSC). I'm going to see if Peter's Palace will host the event. I'm going to extend an invitation to Jeff Strelzin with the requirement that if he shows up, he better be wearing a wife beater shirt. We'll have McDonalds cater, and will have Staid perform. There will be sex toy door prizes too. We'll have a trampoline jump contest, and flip people off and tell lies all night. After the wiffle ball game, we're going to have a head dunking contest in the sink. We'll have our wives call everybody to meet at Bananas for appetizers, harrass the staff and call little kids names. Hell, we might even have a little kid smack-down, you know just like Chad. Then we'll go work out and snort some coke. Well drink a bunch of water and by the end of the night, we'll loose all the water bottle lids. And everyone will need to say "little bitch" and "retard" at least a thousand times. We'll create a shrine to Buwa Buwa, the bully god, and dance around it like wild animals. Hey, maybe we can beat some people up along the way, who knows? And if the cops show up, we'll just lie our asses off, it works everytime.

5 October 2012

### Bob Arnold

Uh oh, you removed the letter to Strelzin from the polygraph guy, what's up with that? I knew I should have downloaded that....

It seems the Rochester PD can't locate the photos of Tristen's bloody battered face, I suspect Strelzin still has them. I'm waiting patiently for them to be returned so I can post them on the internet.

You've asked me before about proof that Chad told many lies to the police, well look no further than Strelzin's letter. As you can see, he identified the same lies that I have.

The "anonymous five" are just as passionate about their position as members of the CEWCC.

Regards,

Bob

5 October 2012

### Morrison Bonpasse |

Bob,

Ok. I see what you meant by your "transparency" comment. Yes, I did delay posting Mr. Strelzin's letter to Chad until I had Chad's response. Similarly, I'm now transcribing Chad's April 30 polygraph examination video and will post that when it's ready, along with the State Police evaluation of the exam, and the video. All together.

Regarding the "anonymous five," I thought you were implying that they had new information because of their closeness to Chad. Now I understand that they are people who believe that Chad is guilty. That's understandable, as the police and prosecutors convinced many people of Chad's guilt, just as has been done in every one of the 900 exonerations of wrongly convicted people in this country since 1989.

You wrote that Chad "beat the holy dogshit out of three women." I'm obviously aware of his fighting with his former wife, Tristan, in 1999 and his pleading guilty to two counts of simple assault and his subsequent counseling. To my knowledge, she did not seek medical treatment after that March, 1999 incident, except for probably the replacement of the tooth cap which was broken.

I'm aware, from the police report posted on this site, that Chad's teenage relationship with Barbara (Brooks) Hamel involved fighting. The incident that you appear to be referencing with the quote, "I'll kill you, fucking bitch" occurred in Chad's Rochester apartment after their relationship ended. Chad's recollections of his relationship with Barbara and of that one night re-connection with her are in his published letters to me of February 18, 2010 and December 2, 2011. Please note that Chad did not fight with Mary P., the woman with whom he lived in the early 1990's, and the police didn't bother to interview her. His relationship with Amanda was physical, as is described in the "physical relationship" document in the Home Page, but Chad never hit her and they didn't fight. Yes, he WAS a "caring, loving and nurturing father" who was correctly portrayed in EYE CONTACT. Do any of the "anonymous five" have any information with contradicts that evaluation? We're not talking here about whether he was a good boyfriend, or even husband, but whether he was a good father. Being a good father and stepfather matter most, of course, because in this case Chad was convicted of murdering Cassidy, with whom he had a fatherly relationship.

5 October 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

## Ho Hum

Same old, same old I see. The burden is on Chad to show how he is innocent not on those that believe the justice system worked in this case.

Face it...the dude is going nowhere and deserves what he got.

5 October 2012

Bob Arnold

Morrison,

This website was transparent until the long delay in posting that letter from Strelzin.

I'm not going to reveal my confidential communications with these people for two reasons, first and foremost it's been requested that I don't, not to mention the attacks they will receive from followers of this forum.

CEWCC members demand that I provide evidence of Evan's guilt....I don't have to. You should be providing evidence, not me. But just to help you out, here are a few facts:

Chad beat the holy dogshit out of three women. Count them, three.

Here's a quote from Chad to Barbara Hamel:

"I'll kill you, fuckin bitch."

Not the caring, loving and nurturing father you've portrayed him as in EC.

5 October 2012

## Morrison Bonpasse |

Bob,

You made a disparaging comment "So much for transparency." Please tell me of another website of a person in New Hampshire, or the country for that matter, which has more information, and is more transparent, about the claimant of innocence and his/her case than this website.

Then, after your comment, you say, as you have done before, that there are anonymous people who know Chad and who are "working against you and your efforts." And you complain about lack of transparency?

Nonetheless, I ask you, are those five people interested in truth and justice? Do they have ANY information about the case which will help our search for truth and justice? Let's test that question. Please ask all of them to send me such information anonymously, to P.O. Box 390, Newcastle, ME 04553. Or, more simply, why don't you ask them for such information and you send it to me, or why don't you post it here? For all your claims of incriminating information from your anonymous sources, I don't recall you presenting a SINGLE new fact here which supports Chad's or Amanda's

convictions. Please, however, if I have forgotten such a fact, please refresh my memory. Your statement about the attendees of Chad Evans Wrongly Convicted Committee meetings is false. For example, Rochester's co-chair, Becky Boudreau, worked for McDonald's in Rochester and knew Chad there. In Keene, most of the non-family attendees knew Chad before his wrongful conviction.

Regarding Amanda, she has believed in Chad's innocence since approximately mid-November, 2000, after she recovered from the police pressure to agree with their theory of Chad's guilt. If you don't understand how that happened, read some articles about false confessions. She wrote the emails on Chad's behalf this year to Mr. Strelzin that you have read, and she attended the June statewide meeting in Concord of the Chad Evans Wrongly Convicted Committee. She has spoken by phone with Chad several times this year. On the other hand, she is trying to move on with her life and limit her direct involvement in our work for Chad, which she supports. It's not easy to lose a child and then be unjustly blamed and jailed for it.

*5 October 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

### **Bob Arnold**

Morrison & CEWCC:

I was wondering how long, or if ever you were going to post that response from Jeff Strelzin. So much for transparency. For your information, there are people who are working against you and your efforts. Namely, two individuals who testified at the trial, and two more who didn't testify, but who are named in your "who's who" section. That makes four people total, who I characterise as "main players" in this case. Oh, I almost forgot about a fifth who recently contacted me about Chad and his efforts to get out of prison.

It's interesting that of all the people who show up at the CEWCC meetings, none of them are named in the "who's who" section, (excluding family) and none of them actually knew Chad. Not one. So, where are all your friends now Chad?

As far as John Healy and his resignation from his polygraph internship, this was news to me. I was aware of issues with him, but I had no idea how much of a mess he created by administering polygraph procedures that "went against everything he was taught." Nice try.

In closing, I would like to know why Chad would waste anymore time penning a response to this bomb shell of a response from the AG's office. On the other hand, that's what he does best, he's persistent and persuasive, just like everyone tells me he is. Just ask Amanda. She paid the price for falling for his BS. She's has now learned, "fool me once, shame on you, fool me twice, shame on me."

Regards,

Bob

*5 October 2012*

### **Morrison Bonpasse |**

To "How Thrilling"

Well, "delightful" is probably not the best description. I hope they will be INTERESTING and THOUGHT PROVOKING to viewers and lead them to go to this website for more information. The two Dick Patten "Around Town" programs from June 2012 and the two from August 2011 should be soon linked on the website as well. Some technical issues have delayed that work. When the programs are linked, perhaps you can view them and post a comment here.

*28 September 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

### **How thrilling**

I'm sure these shows will be delightful. I bet the Chad Evans supporters will be peeing their pants

with glee, because it will be a slanted and bias show.

27 September 2012

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

If you live in Cheshire County (Keene) please take time to view the Cheshire TV (Channel 8) showings of two of the Concord TV interviews about Chad's case. Chad's case was the subject of two Concord Community TV segments of "Around Town" with Rep. Dick Patten. The first was Rep. Patten's interview with Christine Gagne and Morrison Bonpasse. The second was Rep. Patten interviewing Morrison and Jim Day, who was Chad's elementary and junior high school principal in Keene.

If you have friends or relatives in Cheshire County, please let them know.

Here's the schedule:

WEEK OF SEPT 30 - OCT 6:

Sunday, Sept. 30 at 7:00 p.m.,

Tues., October 2 at 6:30 and 10 p.m.,

Thurs., Oct. 4 at 10 p.m., and

Saturday, October 6 at 7:30 p.m.

To see the schedule at the Cheshire TV website go to <http://www.cheshiretv.org/Files/093012-CTVSchedule.pdf>

27 September 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Amanda Bortner's trial was in November, 2002, not 2001 as I stated in the comment below. Please excuse the error.

23 September 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Yes, you have stated before that EYE CONTACT contains fiction, and I believe that I've asked you before to help me identify such alleged fiction. So, I ask again, can you please tell me what specific statements about Chad you believe to be fiction? You have cited a "touchy-feely heart warming 'account' " of the morning of Cassidy's death, and I thank you for that characterization. The question, of course, is whether it is true, and I believe that it is. What part or statement do you allege is not true?

EYE CONTACT doesn't "target" anyone. It's presented for reading by anyone who is interested in justice (and injustice), New Hampshire or the Cassidy Bortner case in particular. One of Amanda's jurors just finished reading it. That juror now knows a lot more than was presented at Amanda's trial in 2001, and the juror says that s/he can now "see both sides." However, the juror is reluctant to actively question the verdicts and the system.

It's coincidental for me that you use the expression "lost souls," because I just began reading the book, "Barbarous Souls," about the wrongful conviction of Darrel Parker in Nebraska for the 1955 murder of his wife. Last month (2012!) he was finally awarded \$500,000 by the State of Nebraska for his wrongful conviction and the state's attorney general apologized. Fortunately, he had been paroled in 1970, but his life was ruined by police and prosecutors who pursued their theory and ignored the evidence. See [http://qctimes.com/news/local/state-clears-moline-man-of-murder-conviction/article\\_64872750-f384-11e1-9cb7-001a4bcf887a.html](http://qctimes.com/news/local/state-clears-moline-man-of-murder-conviction/article_64872750-f384-11e1-9cb7-001a4bcf887a.html)

Have you read any books about wrongful convictions? In addition to "Barbarous Souls," I recommend "A Criminal Injustice: A True Crime, a False Confession, and the Fight to Free Marty Tankleff," the story of the wrongful conviction of Marty Tankleff for the murders of his parents on Long Island in 1988.

23 September 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold**

Morrison,

The problem, and I've pointed this out to you before, is that EC is embellished with a lot of fiction that paints an inaccurate picture of Evans. Writing a book filled with facts is one thing, but what you've done is ambush the reader with a touchy-feely heart-warming "account" of the morning of Cassidy's death. You're preaching to the choir with that type of writing and pissing people off who know better than to fall for such nonsense. Your book targets those who either already believe in Evans' innocence, or who are as I like to call them, lost souls (people who believe in big foot, lochness monster, JFK conspiracy jokers, 911 conspiracy freaks, occupy wallstreet punks, etc...)

22 September 2012

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

It's natural to want to think that our judicial system is right every time. It's also natural to want to think that we know what happened to Cassidy Bortner on November 8th and 9th, 2000 and that a criminal is being properly punished. However, hoping and thinking that justice was done is no longer enough.

The National Exoneration Registry (<http://www.law.umich.edu/special/exoneration>) has records of 891 exonerations in the U.S. since 1989, and every single one of those 891 was found guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. Two hundred ninety seven of those exonerations were accomplished with DNA testing, through the Innocence Project Network.

We no longer can have the naive confidence of the pre-DNA years that our judicial system always gets it right. It obviously doesn't.

The problem in the Cassidy Bortner case is that we simply do not KNOW what caused her death. However, after nearly three years of work on this case, I can say with ever-increasing confidence that Chad Evans did not assault or murder her. How the case against him was theorized and then assembled and prosecuted and how an uninformed jury (through no fault of its members) convicted him is an incredible story. I tried to tell it in the book, EYE CONTACT, but I understand that it's not perfect, and obviously not sufficiently persuasive to lead the New Hampshire Attorney General to do what it is right, which is to re-investigate the case.

The police and prosecutors in this case are good people, but they pursued their theory, instead of the facts. When the facts (stubborn as they are) interfered with the theory, they were ignored or attributed to lies told by witnesses.

Why won't the Attorney General take just a few steps toward uncovering the truth? For example, why not ask the Maine Medical Examiner for the reports of Cassidy's medical appointments on August 10 and September 11, 2000? Dr. Greenwald had those reports in 2000, but they never made it to the trial. Why not? Why did her autopsy report say that those appointments occurred in 1999 and not 2000?

22 September 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold**

I can't help but think he did it

22 September 2012

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Thanks Christine,

Good comment. Might I add that we aren't sure of the source of the stains on Cassidy's parka? At first I thought they were blood, but when we went back to the courthouse a second time, it appeared that they could have been vomit. In any case, the stains need to be tested. The key point, as you noted, is that Amanda recently confirmed that there were no such stains on the parka when she took Cassidy to the babysitter's on the day she died. Once again, the jury had no knowledge of any such stains and, of course, no explanations for them.

22 September 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Christine** | 

Might I add that not only did the jury not know about the blood under all 10 of Cassidy's fingernails;

there were no open wounds on Cassidy, so where could this blood have come from??? And it was also recently discovered that Cassidy's new jacket also had blood all down the front of her new jacket. Noone was aware of this as Amanda has stated there was no stains on the 4 day old jacket when Cassidy was dropped off that morning. This tells me that something happened that dreadful morning at the sitter's house. But what??? Sadly, we may never know.....

22 September 2012 - NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

To "To Hmmm:"

Your astonishing anonymous prediction shows the weakness of the views of those who continue to believe that Chad Evans murdered Cassidy Bortner. Similar predictions were likely made about the 300 people exonerated by the Innocence Project since 1989. Your labeling your opinion as "FACT" shows how little you seem to care for real facts, many of which Chad's jury did not see. For example, the jury did not know that Chad had taken Cassidy to his sister's for most of Sunday, November 5, where several adults, including an elementary school nurse, saw Cassidy and saw Cassidy with Chad. On that day, Amanda was shopping with her sister and mother for clothes for Cassidy with \$300 which Chad had given her for that purpose. The jury didn't know Cassidy had blood under all ten of her fingernails, despite having had a bath the previous night. The jury did not know that there were many other photographs available of Cassidy during the period from August 1 through November 9, 2000, in addition to the one photograph the jury saw of a bruise-free Cassidy on October 1. (The jury found Chad not guilty of the count of Second Degree Assault for the period that included that photograph.) The jury did not know that there is a New Hampshire statute which permits parents and their authorized agents to use reasonable force when disciplining children. (Holding Cassidy's face to obtain eye contact, even when that holding caused bruises, was well within the scope of "reasonable force." Chad never hit or even spanked Cassidy.) The jury did not know that Amanda had taken Cassidy to see her regular pediatrician on August 10 and an orthopedic surgeon on September 11, which appointments occurred during the period of Chad's indictments. These are relevant FACTS.

Do you want to try again, and state here FACTS which you think support your view that Chad murdered Cassidy?

21 September 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**To Hmmm**

The truth is that it does not matter what you think or I think or what anyone on the face of the earth thinks. Not one of anyone involved is going to be able to get Chad free. His family will never see him outside of the bars again. He will never spend a day walking as a free man eating McDonalds again. That is FACT. As this website always declares "Prove me wrong" Anyway Hmmm you know and I know that the day these people are all looking forward to will never come. Chad needs to read this!

21 September 2012

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

To "Hmmm:"

True. There has been a lull in news, but that says nothing about the commitment of Chad and his supporters to achieve his exoneration from his wrongful conviction, and the exoneration of Amanda Bortner, too.

Chad is working, together with others, on his upcoming Motion for Habeas Corpus, to be filed in Merrimack Superior Court. As this Motion is extremely important, the work is proceeding carefully and slowly.

We are asking another polygraphist to look at the video and charts of Chad's April 30 polygraph exam. Setting up that review has taken some time.

Chad has received a letter from Senior Asst. Attorney General Jeffrey Strelzin which declines Chad's request that the State of New Hampshire re-investigate his case. Chad has been working on a thorough response to Mr. Strelzin. When he mails it, both letters will be posted on the website.

I have no idea why you wrote, "Please move on and accept his guilt. I'm sure he has in his mind."

Why should I, or anyone, accept an opinion of Chad which seems contrary to what I've learned and

written about his case over the past two-plus years? Over those two-plus years, I've become more convinced, not less, that he did not assault or murder Cassidy Bortner. He held her cheeks to obtain "eye contact," as a parent figure, and that's not a crime. How could you possibly say that you are "sure" that Chad has accepted his own guilt "in his mind." It sounds like just one more bizarre speculation in this case for which there is no evidence or support.

Have you read EYE CONTACT? Have you read Chad's letters to me, which are on this website and which are now published on [www.amazon.com](http://www.amazon.com) as Volumes 2 and 3 of EYE CONTACT? If there is ANYTHING in those volumes or in the website that you question, please bring that/those question/s to this Comment utility.

*18 September 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Hmmm**

No new news that is relevant, huh? Still plodding along this path of guilt trying to re-pave it as one of innocence.

Please move on and accept his guilt. I'm sure he has in his mind.

*18 September 2012*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

To "Chad Bad:"

Since I don't know who you are, I don't know what to expect. However, if you give me an address, I'll send you a copy of EYE CONTACT with one condition: that you agree to write your comments about the book on this site. Specifically, I'll ask that you point out the errors in the book. No one has found any errors, so far, which detract from the conclusion that both Chad Evans and Amanda Bortner were wrongly convicted after the death of Cassidy Bortner. Or, if you purchase a Kindle copy for \$3.00, I'll reimburse you with a check.

The "trouble" I have with this case is to see all of the work that Chad and I and many others have done to present the truth about the case, and we still see people like yourself who, anonymously, make unfounded or bizarre statements. Please give us one solid reason why you believe that Chad Evans murdered Cassidy Bortner. Do you agree that there are innocent people now in New Hampshire prisons and those in all the other 49 states and in the Federal prison system? Thanks.

*14 September 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Chad Bad** | 

You really expect me to read and buy a book published by someone trying to free the convicted cold blooded child killer Chad Evans. Obviously Chad has ate to much Mcdonald's grease while being employed by them to not realize he is at fault. Someone with the academia credentials such as yourself should have no trouble realizing Chad is Bad and he did do it.

*14 September 2012 - Not in Jail*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

To "so what:"

Chad's finances in 2000 are important to his case for several reasons. First, the police theorized that Chad took his alleged anger out on Cassidy because he had money problems. Jeff Marshall had told the police that Chad had gambling debts, which was not true, and led to this exchange during Chad's interrogation:

LM: Do you have some debt in that?

CE: Do I have any debt, no.

LM: You don't have any gambling debts?

CE: No, none.

LM: You have no gambling debts? Because we're ...

CE: Zero.

LM: ... we were told you have some gambling debts.

CE: Not at all. Notta.[Nada]

Second, Chad's finances were important because he talked with his financial advisor about setting up an education IRA for Cassidy, just as he had done for his son and stepson. Chad's jury did not know of this plan.

Third, Chad's finances allowed him to help support Cassidy, above and beyond food and shelter. On Sunday, November 5, he gave Amanda \$300 for clothes for Cassidy, and that night Amanda showed Cassidy and Chad what she purchased, including the pink parka which Cassidy wore on November 9. The jury did not learn that Chad gave her money for Cassidy's clothes four days before she died.

Regarding Chad's alleged anger, see the comment below.

*14 September 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

To "so what:"

You wrote that "his anger got the best of him, like it's always done." In fact, Chad Evans was not a stereotypical angry man. His months with Amanda and Cassidy were among the happiest in his life. On November 8, he had a productive day at his office to which his secretary of eight years, Melissa Allard, could have testified. He was not angry when purchasing a chocolate bar from Mandy Allard, Melissa's daughter, after work. He was annoyed, but not angry, at Jeff's home when he learned that there was no car seat for Cassidy. Jeff testified that Chad was not angry, and that they talked about politics as Chad was leaving. Note that Chad was annoyed that he was unable to PROTECT Cassidy more than he did by seat belting her into the back seat, using his jacket as a buffer. Chad was driving with Cassidy to pick up his son at daycare, one of the best times of his day. Without any evidence of anger, the prosecution speculated that Chad hit Cassidy during that drive hard enough to cause her death the next day. Again, it was pure speculation, but the jury bought the theory because the trial did not present them with the available information about Chad's innocence and his love for Cassidy.

Regarding the rest of your comment, about finances, see the comment above.

*14 September 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**so what**

Are we supposed to be impressed by his preconviction salary? So what if he made 70k, he was still found guilty and for good reason. He has no money because his anger got the best of him, like it's always done. Beating his ex girlfriends, ex wife, other people, etc....

*13 September 2012*

**Sandy**

Bob,  
I will absolutely do that!

*9 September 2012 - Somersworth*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Sandy please let me know if there's any hunting, camping or fishing items.

Thanks,

Bob

*5 September 2012 - Rochester*

**Sandy**

We are having a yard sale to benefit Chad on Saturday September 15 and 16, anyone willing to participate or donate items, please contact me. [definitelysandy@yahoo.com](mailto:definitelysandy@yahoo.com)

*5 September 2012 - Somersworth, NH*

To "Chad Bad,"

1. Why do you use such aliases? Why not use your real name?
2. You wrote, "... here is a fact nobody can discount: Every single thing that Chad did after Cassidy's death pointed to guilt. Everything. There isn't a single thing that he did that would indicate innocence." What do you think of Chad's voluntary participation in his police interrogation? What do you think of his encouragement to the police to search his car and home? What should innocent people do when accused of a serious crime?

(continued below)

5 September 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

(continued from above)

3. You wrote, "He hid and played games with the police, used codes to facilitate contact with Amanda, influenced Amanda to take his side, influenced others to help in his flight from prosecution." We agree that he violated his bail conditions when he spent time with Amanda, but there was no evidence that he sought to influence her to "take his side." She testified at Chad's trial that he told her to tell the truth. That's what he told everyone before the trial.
4. You wrote, "He lawyered up, refused to cooperate, refused to participate in the investigation into her death." Besides the obvious fact that Chad retained lawyers to represent him, what is your evidence of his alleged refusal to cooperate and refusal to participate in the investigation? The police asked Amanda to ask Chad if he would take a polygraph and he told her "yes" and she told the police "yes." The police never asked him.
5. You wrote, "It's unbelievable that there are people out there who believe he was wrongly convicted." Unbelievable? Have you read EYE CONTACT? Are there any misstatements of fact that you can bring to my attention? Did the jury know about the Nov. 5 family gathering to which Chad took Cassidy? Did the jury see more than one photo of Cassidy during the period of Chad's indictments? Did the jury know that Amanda took Cassidy to two doctor appointments during the period of the indictments against Chad?
6. Regarding the polygraph, Chad voluntarily took the exam on April 30, 2012. The first two scorings indicated that he passed it. The third review found breathing irregularities that voided the exam, at least in the opinion of the two reviewers. Granted, it would be better if the first two scorings still stood, but he didn't fail the exam. Also, he's willing to take another.
7. Regarding Voice Stress Analysis testing, I've never heard of police use of such tests on suspects or defendants who do not know that they are being tested. Can you refer me to a website or article about your claim?

5 September 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

## Chad Bad

I've read everything there is to read in the documents section, and here is a fact that nobody can discount: Every single thing that Chad did after Cassidy's death pointed to guilt. Everything. There isn't a single thing that he did that would indicate innocence. He hid and played games with the police, used codes to facilitate contact with Amanda, influenced Amanda to take his side, influenced others to help in his flight from prosecution. He lawyered up, refused to cooperate, refused to participate in the investigation into her death. It's unbelievable that there are people out there who believe he was wrongly convicted.

Spinning his polygraph results is very sad. Promoting his voice stress results does nothing to help your cause, since voice stress is only accurate when used on someone who has no knowledge of the monitoring taking place.

5 September 2012

To "Shame:"

What is sad about responses here to those in doubt?  
Where do you see expressed a "need to quiet those who think differently?"  
What questions do you have about this case?  
Why do you, apparently, believe that Chad Evans murdered Cassidy Bortner?  
Please be specific. Thanks very much.

5 September 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

### Shame

It is so sad to see the responses on this site towards those in doubt. Maybe it is time to create a site for the people who believe in his guilt. The need to quiet those who think differently is exactly what you are accusing happened to him.

5 September 2012

### Morrison Bonpasse |

To "Looking for an inexperienced polygraph examiner:"

We are looking for a good polygraph examiner for another exam. The more experience, the better. The polygraphist who performed the April 30 exam has a solid record in law enforcement and is a very good man and citizen. He offered his services without charge. To ensure that the grading or scoring of the April 30 exam was as accurate as possible, Chad asked that the exam be reviewed by others, and that was how the breathing irregularity was found. There was no charge for the review.

Before his wrongful conviction, Chad was earning \$70,000 a year, but has been virtually penniless since the trial. Perhaps you would like to recommend a polygraphist. Also, perhaps you would want to contribute funds toward the costs of his next polygraph exam. Chad's PayPal account is at committee (at) chadevanswronglyconvicted.org, or you could send a check to the Committee at 71 Sullivan Street, Keene, NH 03431.

5 September 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

### Looking for an inexperienced polygraph examiner

What a major blow to the Chad Evans supporters and a victory to those who always believed in his guilt. By all means, get another examination, however it's doubtful you'll be able to find a less experienced polygraph examiner than the one you hired (ie less than one month out of the course, no other examinations ever done, etc...). Perhaps you could advertise on Craigslist, "looking for a polygraph examiner, no experience required.:"

Nice try.

5 September 2012

### Anonymous

Thank you, Morrison. So, essentially, Chad had irregular breathing during questions not relevant to the case, correct? Thanks

4 September 2012

### Morrison Bonpasse |

To Anonymous,

"Safety Valve" questions are, as I understand them, questions unrelated to the case. The four questions about the case were asked along with six "safety valve" questions, and all ten questions were asked four times, in different order, and perhaps with some different phrasing.

To "Tell the Truth",

Everyone who had contact with Cassidy wishes they had done more to help her, and sooner. No one knew that Cassidy was in mortal danger. If Amanda or Chad had understood the danger, they would have taken Cassidy to see a doctor, regardless of the concerns that they might be accused of

abuse.

3 September 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

---

**Tell the truth**

Maybe Chad is not being 100% honest. To say that he faulted her by not bringing her to the doctor is not owning the truth. Dig deeper into the truth and you may just stop trying to convince yourself your doing the right thing.

2 September 2012

---

**Anonymous**

"Safety Valve" questions? I don't understand what that means. Please explain.....

31 August 2012

---

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

I've been told that the breathing irregularities occurred during the "safety valve" questions. Nonetheless, by the standards of the profession, they were determined by the reviewers to require voiding the results of the test. Not "pass" or "fail" but voided. I've asked for more details. We are looking for another polygraphist to conduct another exam, but first it's important to learn more about the reasons for the reviewers' recommendation.

31 August 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

---

**Bob Arnold** | 

"voided the test" what does that mean? He either passed it or failed it, did he fail it?

30 August 2012 - Rochester

---

**Anonymous**

Were the breathing irregularities noted with questions pertaining to Cassidy or the death of Cassidy, or were they noted on questions that didn't concern the case...such as "state your name, please." ?

30 August 2012

---

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

One of the two experts was David Crawford who is the head of the New England Polygraph Institute. I don't know the name of the other.

The first scoring was by the April 30 polygraphist, John Healy. He also did the June scoring with the software program. The third scoring or review was done manually by David Crawford and another, and they found breathing irregularities on the charts which they said voided the entire test.

27 August 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

---

**Bob Arnold** | 

Were the first two reviews done by the two experts, or were they done using the computer program? Who were the two "experts"?

Thanks,

Bob

27 August 2012 - Rochester

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

At Chad's request, the charts of his April 30, 2012 polygraph exam were reviewed by two polygraph experts, in order to ensure the most accurate scoring. In May and June, the first two scorings indicated that Chad told the truth and that no deception was found. On this third review by the two experts, together with the polygraphist who gave him the exam, the result was different. Because of perceived breathing irregularities which were not initially noticed, the experts on this third review were not able to grade the exam and they consider the first two scorings to be invalid. This third look at Chad's polygraph exam does not affect the results of his 2010 Voice Stress lie detector test which also found "no deception indicated." Chad has said that he is willing to take another polygraph. More information will be released as it becomes available.

*26 August 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Unknown**

"Your continued silence shows you do not care."

~~ Unknown

*22 August 2012*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Chad recently sent me a "Union Leader" article about a website, [www.myjailbird.com](http://www.myjailbird.com). It's a website designed to assist family and friends to connect with inmates. I set up an account for him, and sent a sample letter (@\$1.95, charged to a debit/credit card) but did not purchase any of the offered services packages. (See the "Pricing" tab.) I'm not sure of its utility for an inmate such as Chad, who is very well connected by phone, visits and U.S. Mail. Still, never say "never," so I signed up. Any tool which offers the possibility of improving communications with an inmate and his/her life is worth investigating. Comments are welcome, and also at this "Online Comments" section of Chad's website.

One of the offered services is telephone service at \$0.06 a minute. I'm checking with Chad to see what he pays now.

Morrison

*20 August 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Becky B** | 

"Your very silence shows you agree."

~~ Euripides

*15 August 2012 - Rochester, NH*

**Just a Thought**

Chad's case, in many ways, is just like the biblical story of David and Goliath. Chad is fighting to prove his innocence...and like David against Goliath, the odds are stacked against him. One man, against a public that hates him. Nonetheless, the battle continues. The final stone, or "final truth" needs to be revealed so Chad can be released from the grip of his "Goliath". Chad Evans did NOT kill Cassidy Bortner

*7 August 2012*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Chad is convinced he did not assault and murder Cassidy Bortner, because he didn't. He held her face to obtain eye contact, just as many many parents do, but that wasn't assault. I've never heard of erasing memory as a technique of evading a polygraph. Chad has a superb

memory.

Why can't the state just FIX this? Good question. Around the country, prosecutors have generally been reluctant to re-investigate claims of wrongful conviction, but we continue to hope that the Attorney General of New Hampshire will be an exception.

Regarding the number of supporters, it's hard to build support for a man convicted of what was presented by the media and the prosecution as a horrible case of child abuse and murder. That's why we have this website and why I wrote the book, EYE CONTACT. Still, it takes time.

Thanks for the questions.

7 August 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

### Where are they now?

I understand. Was he able to convince himself that he was innocent because so many years have passed? I heard that people can pass lie tests because they can erase their memory. Do you think that he may have done that? Why can't the state just fix it if they were wrong? Were they really wrong? It is hard to believe that he will ever get free. This is an interesting story but doesn't have many supporting followers.

6 August 2012

### Morrison Bonpasse |

Dear "Where are they now?"

As you posted your question anonymously, you surely understand the issue of privacy, and that issue affects how Chad's former wife and Amanda Bortner have responded to Chad's (and Amanda's) plight over the years. It's not easy being the former wife of a man convicted of what was presented as a horrific period of abuse and murder of a beautiful child. Chad's former wife has also been concerned about how their son, now 15, had been, and is being, affected by Chad's conviction.

Amanda is the more central person in this tragic story and, she has tried to move on and away. Let's remember that she, too, was imprisoned for allegedly ignoring Chad's abuse of Cassidy, and, essentially, watching him kill Cassidy. What a horrible burden to cast upon a mother who has lost her child. However, the renewal of hope that Chad's, and her, wrongful convictions can be overturned, has brought her back to the case. She has recently written emails to the Office of the Attorney General to indicate her support and her willingness to work with that office to better ascertain the truth of what happened to her daughter, Cassidy. In June, Amanda attended the statewide meeting of the Chad Evans Wrongly Convicted Committee in Concord. She has also talked by phone with Chad several times, after a long period of no communication.

For both Chad's former wife, and Amanda, their roles in this 11+ year tragedy were not chosen by them to play. The tragic, and still mysterious death of Cassidy, was a terrible loss to Amanda and Chad and their families. The States of Maine and New Hampshire compounded that loss by quickly taking the position that Cassidy's death was a homicide and then prosecuted and convicted two innocent people. The costs of wrongful convictions are immense and wrenching.

29 July 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

### Where are they now?

Where is the mom of Chad's son and the mom of Cassidy now? Are they openly supporting him? If yes how can we see this? If No then why not? Just feel that those are two important people in this case? Not really my right to know but if you want more support we need to see that everyone involved stands by Chad even after the many years that have passed.

29 July 2012

### Christine |

I think the jury should have been aware that Cassidy fell from a large pick up truck within 12 days of her death. It is VERY POSSIBLE she was suffering from a traumatic brain injury. Witness statements concur that she did have symptoms similar to a brain injury. Which at Cassidy's age

would be a "silent killer".....I think these symptoms were mistaken for SBS.....

27 July 2012 - United States

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

It's been a year since the first edition of EYE CONTACT was distributed as a .pdf file to New Hampshire and Maine law enforcement people and many others. Since then, several errors have been corrected, but there have no recommendations for corrections of any facts or statements which might affect the conclusion of the book, which is that Chad Evans did not assault and murder Cassidy Bortner. Since the initial emailing of the book, it has been published on Amazon.com and distributed on this website. The book has been followed by Volumes 2 and 3 which are his letters to me in 2011 and 2012 respectively. These letters say a lot about Chad and his relationship to Amanda and Cassidy, his wrongful conviction and his struggle for justice. Why is it that Chad remains in prison, without reinvestigation - so far, despite the publication of the unchallenged facts about Chad and about the case?

There is certainly room for different opinions about the case, based upon these facts, as we have seen here in these "online comments." However, if Chad's jury had known about the facts presented in EYE CONTACT and on this website, it would not have been possible that those twelve jurors would have presented a verdict of guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

26 July 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Becky B** | 

My buddy, Kevin just asked me, like so many others have, WHEN will I take OFF my winter boots?? WHEN Chad isn't forced to wear green Dickie's everyday.  
WHEN Chad is home & with his family!  
Until then my boots will be worn daily....  
& will be subject to discussion :)  
Set Him Free!!

23 July 2012 - Rochester, NH

**Sandy G.**

Today I got an email from Jodi Picoult (famous NH writer) reminding me that she already has a book out about wrongful conviction. It's "Salem Falls". Good book, I've read it.

18 July 2012 - NH

**Mystic Mel Fisher Fitton (via Morrison Bonpasse)** | 

Comment from the United Kingdom on Chad's Support Group on Facebook at [https://www.facebook.com/groups/supportchadevans/447652281935787/?notif\\_t=group\\_activity](https://www.facebook.com/groups/supportchadevans/447652281935787/?notif_t=group_activity).

Mystic Mel Fisher Fitton

I am reading eye contact - I'm from the uk and feel that this case was not investigated fully - its shocking -poor baby she was mis-treated but from what I'm reading I don't think it was by Chad.

14 July 2012 - United Kingdom

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Sometimes coincidence in this work can be satisfying. Yesterday, I was at the NH Supreme Court Law Library doing research for Chad's upcoming Habeas Motion and I asked the librarian for help in finding the "New Hampshire Evidence Manual." She led me to the bookshelves and pointed to the top shelf and said, "There it is, right next to your book." And there it was - a copy of "EYE CONTACT" right next to the "Evidence Manual."

Note: It was not a surprise that "EYE CONTACT" was in the library's collection, as I had donated a copy, but it was a pleasure to actually see it on the shelf.

12 July 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Posted today in the "Latest News" section is this announcement:

"June 28, 2012 Using the OSS-3 computerized scoring algorithm, Chad's polygraph exam responses of April 30, 2012 were verified as being truthful when he answered "NO" to the following three questions:

1. Between Nov 8, and Nov 9, 2000, did you hit, punch, kick, or strike Kassidy Bortner?
2. Are you the one who caused those injuries to Kassidy Bortner between Nov. 8 and Nov 9, 2000?
3. Between Nov 8 and Nov 9, 2000 did you inflict those injures to Kassidy Bortner?

Recently, private investigator John Healy used computer-based Objective Scoring System-3 (OSS-3) software to verify the data obtained during Chad Evans's April 30, 2012 polygraph exam. The OSS-3 software was developed by Ray Nelson, a recognized polygraph expert, and others, and is said to be the most accurate computerized scoring system available. Nelson taught Healy how to use the software at a recent seminar at the New England Polygraph Institute in Center Harbor. The result was "No significant Reactions" and a "P-Value" of 0.011, which means a .1% probability that Chad's results were produced by a deceptive person. Conversely, there was a 98.9 % probability that Chad was being truthful. "

Paraphrasing Bob Dylan's "Blowing in the Wind," How many years will it take before people see the truth for what it is?

*29 June 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

The comment below, made on June 22, with a quote in Arabic purportedly from Herman Melville, was not made by Becky. The Google translation is:

"I am the hunter who does not feel comfortable at all. Hunter, who has no country. The above mentioned security, which is still flying in front of me; I Satbaha, With it led me to beyond the mountains, Across the seas with no suns, In the night and death. "

Perhaps the quote came from MOBY DICK. It doesn't seem to have any obvious relationship to Chad's case, and doesn't need to be removed. It's just remains there as posting from an unknown person whose views on Chad's case remain unknown.

*29 June 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Amy**

Thank you, Morrison.

*24 June 2012 - Southern NH*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Amy,

I just "clicked" on the "five page letter" link in the "Latest News" section, for date, June 10, and the letter came to my screen. Try the direct link at

<http://www.chadevanswronglyconvicted.org/documents/120605ChadlettertoScottKinneyofFosters.pdf>

If that doesn't work, let me know. I'll can easily email it to you. Just send me an email address, via email.

*22 June 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Amy**

Has anyone else had trouble accessing the letter to the editor of Foster's that Chad wrote a short time ago? I cannot seem to access it. Any ideas out there? Thanks a lot!

*22 June 2012 - Southern New Hampshire*

## Becky B

وأنا الصياد الذي لا يرتاح أبداً  
هل نطو ال يذلا دايصل  
يما م أ ريظت ل ازت ام اندصقأ ي تلو  
اه عبتأس ان أو  
ل ابجل اءاروام ل ي ن تداق ان أ عم  
عبر بحار بلا شمس  
”تومل او لي ل ل ل خاد  
— Herman Melville

22 June 2012

## Becky B |

"We cannot live only for ourselves. A thousand fibers connect us with our fellow men; and among those fibers, as sympathetic threads, our actions run as causes, and they come back to us as effects"  
- Herman Melville -

22 June 2012 - Rochester, NH

## Christine |

Happy Fathers Day Chad!!

17 June 2012 - United States

## Chad Evans (posted by Morrison Bonpasse) |

[In the next two posts are Chad's notes for his presentation to the combined statewide meeting of the Chad Evans Wrongly Convicted Committee on June 10. Because of the background noise of the river and traffic, Chad was unable to present this to all of us. [Next time, we'll bring an I-phone amplifier.]]

As most of you know, I love quotes. This morning I was still thinking about what exactly I wanted to say when I opened Investor's Business Daily and this quote jumped off the page, begging to be shared.

"When you're in your 90's and looking back, it's not going to be how much money you made or how many awards you've won. It's really what you stand for. Did you make a positive difference for people."

-Elizabeth Dole, Senator

Someone recently reminded me that I was the "life of the party" when we were out together. To be honest, I was, and I enjoyed it. Conversely, I'm uncomfortable being the center of "need" based attention. I much prefer to give help than receive it. I'm smart enough to realize however that I cannot get the truth out and be reunited with Kyle without the help of each and everyone of you.

This entire experience is very humbling for me. I obviously hope to one day repay everyone's kindness. I also hope that you will all be able to look back in your 90's as Mrs. Dole states, and be proud of the difference you made for me and others affected by this tragic loss.

(continued below)

15 June 2012 - New Hampshire State Prison, Concord, NH

## Chad Evans (posted by Morrison) |

(Chad presentation, 6/10/12, continued from above)

In the next newspaper I picked up, I read an interesting quote by Mr. Strelzin of the Attorney General's Office. Mr. Strelzin claims that in NH most homicides are solved within 1-3 days. As of today, it has been 4,233 days since they jumped to conclusions, made the wrong assumptions and sent all of us on this journey. I can't help but wonder how much misery could have been spared if instead of assuming they knew what happened just 3 short hours after Cassidy's death they kept an open mind and followed the evidence for a little bit . . .

Regardless this is where we find ourselves today. For the first time in many years I feel hope. I feel closer to vindication than ever before. This is due to Morrison's efforts and the contributions you have all made. This is still a marathon, there will still be days when it feels that no progress is being made however, with all the "hills" yet remaining, there is also a finish line that I can imagine.

Thank you all for believing in me and showing me that my life does have value. Even in the toughest days, I will pursue truth.

Chad

*15 June 2012 - New Hampshire State Prison, Concord, NH*

wendy | 

Chad- you are a standup guy and a great Dad.

*13 June 2012 - nashua-nh*

Chad Evans | 

As many of you are aware, I recently took and passed a second lie detection test regarding my involvement (or lack of) in Cassidy's tragic death. I wanted to thank everyone for your patience as our request slowly worked its way through the approval process. Amazingly, I do not have a right to such a test in an effort to help prove my innocence. Whether or not I would be allowed to take the test was at the discretion of Commissioner Wrenn and Warden Gerry. I publicly thank them for the courage in allowing me to take the test. I also want to thank Morrison for his integrity and his dogged approach to obtain approval.

Now that this second test has come and gone, I am hopeful that it will help secure things for everyone who has contributed comments to this site since its inception. For those who have passionately supported our efforts, I hope this renews your faith and the time you have dedicated. For those who have vehemently opposed me, I hope this latest test will put the issue to bed for you. As I understand it, there are several who said specifically that if I passed a polygraph test they would become a believer in my wrongful conviction, or move significantly in that direction. I am hopeful that they will be true to their word.

I purposely use the word "wrongful conviction" vs. "innocence" because I don't feel innocent. Cassidy by the letter of the law may not have been my biological responsibility, but she was my moral responsibility. No one, except Amanda, feels worse about Cassidy's death or like a bigger failure than me. My mistakes and poor decisions in life are well documented. I think about and miss Cassidy every single day. I am a flawed human being just like every person I know and every person that takes the time to comment on this website. However, for all my flaws, I did NOT kill Cassidy. I do NOT believe in corporal punishment and have NEVER: kicked, punched, slapped, thrown into a wall, or even spanked Cassidy.

CONTINUED BELOW

*12 June 2012 - New Hampshire State Prison, Concord*

Chad Evans | 

CONTINUED FROM ABOVE

From the day of Cassidy's death I have been willing to take lie detection or ANY other test to prove my innocence. I first said this to Sgt. Matthew Stewart of the Maine State Police and then to Amanda days later when the police asked her to ask me. Weeks later, I told my attorney, Alan Cronheim, that I was willing to take a lie detector test. Five years ago, I told my first private

investigator, Ron Rice, that I would take any type of test available to help prove I was telling the truth. I even requested that Mr. Rice find the other three adults that had time alone with Kassidy during her last two days of life and ask them if they were willing to take such a test if I paid for it. Finally, Morrison came along and made it happen; twice! I share this information with the people over the last several months who have accused me of ducking such a test. I apologize if I sound angry or bitter but the truth is, I'm a little of both. I have lost nearly 12 years of life with the most important person in my life, for a crime I didn't commit! Prior to Kassidy's death I was considered by most a stand-up guy; a hard working man with integrity. I was active in my community and enjoyed helping those in need. I believe that most people that observed me for 30 seconds with my son or stepson would get the impression that I was a great dad. In fact, I can't think of a single person who didn't trust me with their own children. This isn't to say I didn't have flaws. I've heard them all over the last 12 years and agree with most of them: "He was cocky sometimes." "Chad was grouchy sometimes." "Sometimes he drank too much." "Chad could sometimes say mean things." "I saw Chad fight with guys a few times in high school." "He was sometimes an abusive husband." The thing is, none of these things make me an abuser of children and a murderer. Mostly, I am just a big goofball who loves children. When I was free and went to a cookout, it was the kids I played with because they were more fun and interesting than the adults.  
CONTINUED BELOW

*12 June 2012 - Concord State Prison, Concord*

**Chad Evans** | 

CONTINUED FROM ABOVE

As I write this, I think about the fact that if there was concrete DNA available in this case we wouldn't even be discussing these issues because I would not be here! I am bitter because I have to jump through hoops to prove what I already know to be true and still people doubt. Unfortunately, our jury system is not infallible. My integrity "pre"-Kassidy is still intact. It is the way I was raised. If I am asked a question I am going to give anyone an honest answer.

Going forward, I hope that we can all work together so that I may have another chance at life; a chance to be a dad and for the first time watch my son throw a football and ski down a mountain. If you support me, thank you. If you still oppose me, well, thank you for staying involved. Most of all, please aim your comments at ME. There has been enough pain over the past 12 years and no one that posts here deserves to be chastised or ridiculed for their beliefs. Some of the personal attacks aimed at others I've read here break my heart.

Thank you.

[The comments above, are posted by Morrison Bonpasse at Chad's request in a recent letter.]

*12 June 2012 - New Hampshire State Prison, Concord*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Amy,

Sorry. I meant to link Chad's letter to Scott Kinney, but forgot. Unfortunately, I'm away from my PC for a few days, and won't be able to link the letter until Wednesday evening. Thanks for letting me know.

Yesterday's statewide Chad Evans Wrongly Convicted Committee meeting was very successful. As planned, Chad called during the meeting, and we turned on the speaker phone. Several people talked with Chad who hadn't talked with him for 12 years. We have several ongoing projects to gain more media attention and public support. We are urging members to write "Letters to the Editor" to their local newspaper, and to the statewide newspapers, too: the Concord Monitor, Press Herald, and Union Leader. Can you write such a letter?

Chad is now reviewing a draft of his upcoming Motion for Habeas Corpus which argues that his conviction in 2001 was a mistake for several reasons.

*11 June 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Amy**

Morrison,

Thanks for posting the excerpt from Chad's letter to the Foster's. Will the rest of the letter be shared

with us?

I hope you had a great turn out for yesterday's meeting! How did it go?

11 June 2012

wendy | 

Nice work on the you tube video.

4 June 2012 - nashua

Becky B | 

<http://www.youtube.com/user/FreeChadChannel>

Is up and running with 1 video.  
More to come!!!

31 May 2012 - Rochester, NH

Morrison Bonpasse | 

We need ALL "minds" to help with the Campaign for Justice for Chad. We just passed the 1,000 supporters mark, which is an important milestone. (See the "About Us" section of Chad's website at <http://www.chadevanswronglyconvicted.org/about-us.html>) Let's get to 2,000 soon! Ask friends and relatives and others to sign one, two or all three of Chad's petitions, at the same "About Us" section, and join the Chad Evans Wrongly Convicted Committee by writing to [committee@chadevanswronglyconvicted.org](mailto:committee@chadevanswronglyconvicted.org).

31 May 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

Becky B | 

"Great minds discuss ideas, average minds discuss events,  
small minds discuss people."  
~~Admiral Hyman G. Rickover

30 May 2012 - Rochester, NH

Chad Evans (via Morrison Bonpasse) | 

Comment from Chad in his letter to me of May 22:

I appreciate all of your comments and feedback. As most of you know, Morrison mails them to me from time to time as I have no internet access. If you ask me a question on here I am happy to answer it. Please allow several extra days for turnaround. If you would like an answer faster and Morrison's response isn't sufficient please feel free to write me directly. Chad Evans #75414 PO Box 14 Concord, NH 03302. Mr. Arnold, I understand that you are very busy man but if you can fit it into your schedule sometime, I would love the opportunity to meet with you in person. We can discuss the case or anything else you have on your mind. If interested contact Morrison and we'll get the approval process started.

I hope you all have a great week. -Chad

30 May 2012 - Concord, New Hampshire

Morrison Bonpasse | 

Since the creation of Chad's website, I cannot remember a gap between posts as long as 10 days. There certainly is no letup in support for Chad, especially since his passing the polygraph examination. Only one newspaper, Foster's Daily Democrat, published an article about the

polygraph exam. It's hard to arouse public interest in a claim of wrongful conviction, but we are making progress.

We are working on Chad's upcoming Motion to the Superior Court for Habeas Corpus, on the grounds that his 2001 trial was unfair and a violation of his rights to due process.

On Sunday, June 10, the two chapters of the Chad Evans Wrongly Convicted Committee will have a joint meeting in Concord from 1-5 p.m.

Any questions? Concerns?

27 May 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Please know that Chad will testify wholeheartedly at any future judicial proceeding where the defendant is allowed to speak. He declined four opportunities in the past (trial, sentencing hearing, sentence-increase hearing, and Jeff Marshall's defamation lawsuit) to tell his complete story. He was advised on each occasion that it was best to play the "game" to win (or minimize loss), rather than fulfill the higher goal of the justice system which is to present the truth. During his deposition in Jeff's lawsuit against him, Chad answered every question but those about the crimes for which he was convicted. He was advised by his lawyers, including his in-house prison lawyer friends, to decline to respond on Fifth Amendment grounds. He was advised that he might be liable to MORE prison time if he said something that would expose him to more charges. As a man wrongly convicted, his fear was well-founded, but he misunderstood the compelling need for the State of New Hampshire to hear his truth under oath.

Chad asked me to post the note below for Bob:

"Mr. Arnold,

In preparing for my first lie detection test, that I passed, I came up with an exhaustive list of questions that I wanted asked. I purposely listed everything I could think of so no one would have the ability to pick the test apart or claim I was ducking anything. This list I prepared was offered to Mr. Healy as well. Unfortunately, I've learned this is just not the way any of these tests are conducted. The NH State Police were instrumental in my wrongful conviction and it was one of their own retired Lieutenants who came up with the questions. I can only trust that he knew what questions to ask. I only wish there were some 'hoop' I could jump through to prove to you I am telling the truth. My guess is that you would be a formidable asset."

[Note by Morrison: Chad's list of questions is at

<http://www.chadevanswronglyconvicted.org/documents/ChadquestionsforVSAtesthepreparedforexamandbroughttosession.pdf.>]

17 May 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Amy**

Hi Wendy,

Chad didn't testify in court, upon the advice of his lawyers. He trusted them and did as he was advised.

I agree, he needs to share his side of the story.

16 May 2012 - Southern New Hampshire

**Bob Arnold** | 

Wendy, he had a chance to speak in court and he passed.

16 May 2012 - Rochester

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

You wrote on May 12 that, "I do know that Chad created a very hostile environment on a daily basis in that household, and there were many instances of physical assaults including choking, pushing, shoving and head-butting."

Actually, Chad's months with Amanda and Cassidy were the happiest in his life. It was a good time for Amanda and Cassidy, too, until the descent to her death which apparently began around mid-October. Chad was never a man consumed by anger. Instead, he was usually cheerful and a

motivator for his employees. True, he was very upset when he thought his marriage was falling apart, and it led to the incident on the night of March 27-28, 1999, during which he and his wife hit each other.

Living with Amanda was very different. Chad had a list of "anger management" techniques on a wall at home, which Amanda discarded, while saying to Chad something like, "You don't need this anymore." Chad wrote of his relationship with Amanda in his letter of July 15, 2011, "As I said in my June 29, 2010 letter. Our play was much more rough and violent than our disagreements were." The allegation of "head-butting" as a form of intentional violence is false. On a warm day in August, Chad thought that he and Amanda had planned to go boating with the children in the afternoon after his work. When he came home, he learned that Amanda had made plans to go shopping with Cathy Nuernberg, apparently forgetting the boating plan. They argued about the misunderstanding, which seems normal to me. They went to the basement, where some laundry was in process and each of them bent down to retrieve a piece of clothing and their heads collided. Amanda thought at first that the "headbutting" was intentional, but later realized it was an accident. Chad wrote in his May 10 letter to me, "The 'headbutt' incident happened in our cellar one early afternoon. Cathy showed up alone and Amanda and I had planned to take the kids on a boat ride. Cassidy was there and I believe I had just picked Kyle up. I was sure the girls were going shopping somewhere and I took the kids to the boat." As Chad noted, he took Kyle and Cassidy boating that afternoon. Does that sound like an angry man to you?

13 May 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

wendy | 

He needs his chance to speak. He never had that chance in court. Iv'e only known chad since he's been in concord ...i have never doubted him.

12 May 2012 - nashua. nh

Bob Arnold | 

Dave,

I can't comment on their joint parenting experiences because I just don't know. I do know that Chad created a very hostile enviroment on a daily basis in that household, and there were many instances of physical assaults including choking, pushing, shoving and head-butting. Does this make him a monster? No I don't think so, it just shows that he needed to get help dealing with his anger. You and I will have to meet some time and I will fill you confidentially fill you in on the written details that I have. Of course none of this is relevant to the polygraph, but I think it does help understand Chad's general disposition during the time frame of the divorce from Tristan and later the death of little Cassidy.

I agree and support further review of John Healy's polygraph results, if not by the State Police then with another police agency with access to a veteran polygraph operator. I don't want to diminish John's reputation because he does have an impressive resume and I thank him for his life-long public service. I just have to know about these polygraph results.

Amy,

Sometimes it gets hot in this kitchen, but we all want to know the truth, and we'd all like to take comfort in knowing that our justice system works for all of us. My first Senior Chief in the Navy used to tell us "there's no such thing as a dumb question."

Regards,

Bob

12 May 2012 - Rochester

Dave G | 

Amy,

None taken! I was actually more worried that I had upset you in some manner. I have only seen a handful of comments from you, (good ones though) Because I had to step behind the scenes for a few months. I do not know how much or how little you know Chad, So I will just say this. Do not be afraid to ask anything Good or bad. Chad welcomes it, As does the committee. Even if you were to have a doubt about the littlest thing Ask it! Chad also enjoys hearing from different people, Sometimes people are not comfy asking something here and would rather do it privately, You are welcome to do that too. There is also an ask Chad button where you can get his address and speak directly with him through mail. IF you already knew all of this then I apologize for stating to you what you already know. In any event, welcome to the comments board.

Again, I agree with your last post too!

11 May 2012

**Amy**

Dave,

Thanks for your post. I mentioned your comment because it emphasized my point (I meant no disrespect to you at all). Chad screwed up with Tristan, but that doesn't make him a monster. And it doesn't make him capable of murdering a toddler, either.

11 May 2012 - Southern New Hampshire

**Dave G** | 

Amy,

I completely understood what you said! I also completely agree with what you said! No complaint here :) Did you think I had one? Feel free to email me if you did?

11 May 2012

**Amy**

Dave

In a previous post, you said that "No one is above making mistakes, Correcting them and making things right is what it's all about."

Mark,

You previously posted that "people do make horrendous mistakes and deserve an opportunity to be forgiven."

This is exactly the point of my previous posts. Chad should have never laid hands on Tristan out of anger. But he did, and he cannot take that back. He recognized that his behavior was unacceptable. He sought additional counseling on his own. And he learned from it.

Bob:

I do not know Tristan, yet it is easy to infer that she and Chad co-parented well (based upon his letters to Morrison). There are several references to this in the text. Am I off base to think that? Do you disagree with me on this point?

As far as the polygraph, I support having it looked at. I support having another expert giving him an additional test.

Chad will pass these tests because Chad is not responsible for the death of Cassidy Bortner.

11 May 2012 - Southern New Hampshire

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Mark,

Thanks for your support for asking that the Attorney General have the State Police Polygraph Unit evaluate Chad's polygraph. I've already made that request. I hope that you and Bob Arnold, and others, will do so, too. Attorney General Michael Delaney's email is: michael.a.delaney@doj.nh.gov. Regarding a psychological test, I've spent many hours trying unsuccessfully to arrange different types of tests, in order to respond to questions such as yours and reassure doubters that he is perfectly normal. However, I've been told many times that a test of Chad NOW is not the same as a test of Chad in 2000. Thus, it would not have much relevance.

Please know, however, that there were NO psychological tests done on Chad in 2000-2001. There was absolutely no need or consideration of doing so. He was, and is, a well-adjusted normal, energetic, intelligent man. He was a manager of nine McDonald's restaurants, with about 200 employees. Please remember that he participated in the court-ordered counseling after the March, 1999 incident with Tristan, AND he voluntarily sought out another counselor to help him better understand himself and how he could have done what he did. That counselor saw nothing indicating a need for any psychological tests and none were conducted.

11 May 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Dave G** | 

MARK,  
Thanks, in support of the State Police polygraph unit reviewing the Healy test and/or giving Chad another one.

Does this mean you are willing to ask the Governor and Attorney General to evaluate Chad's April 30 polygraph results?

11 May 2012

**Mark C**

Morrison...I am in support of the State Police polygraph unit reviewing the Healy test and/or giving Chad another one. To me, that is something that should be done to verify the results, the credibility of the examiner and his procedures.

I'll ask again because I didn't see an answer...has Chad ever been given a psych evaluation?

Clearly, if he has and was found to be "normal" and the Healy test is confirmed, then you are in a very good position to get the State to re-examine the case, IMO.

11 May 2012

**Dave G** | 

Morrison,  
Agreed,  
No one is above making mistakes, Correcting them and making things right is what it's all about.

11 May 2012

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Well, I just (tongue in cheek) wanted a chance to restate that when I make mistakes, I try to correct them. Whenever anyone has pointed out mistakes in this website or in the book, EYE CONTACT, I've sought to correct them. So far, however, no mistakes have been reported which detract in any way from the conclusions of EYE CONTACT, which is that Chad Evans did not murder Cassidy Bortner.

For two and a half years, I've been working to persuade the State of New Hampshire that it, and the State of Maine, made many tragic mistakes in the investigation, prosecution and conviction of Chad and Amanda. Someday, those mistakes will have to be acknowledged, and Chad will be freed.

11 May 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Dave G** | 

Thank you Morrison. we cleared it up at same time.

11 May 2012

**Dave G** | 

Morrison, thank you for the info, I'm confused though. March 27/28 1999 is Saturday/Sunday according to my calender not Monday/Tuesday.

11 May 2012

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Sorry. My mistake. I looked at the dates for March, 2000. David is correct, the 27/28th of March in 1999 was Saturday/Sunday.

11 May 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

The March, 1999 incident took place during the night of Monday/Tuesday the 27/28th. According to the Arrest Report linked at the "Chronology" at <http://www.chadevanswronglyconvicted.org/documents/990328arrestreportWandgunsseized.pdf>, Bail was set the next morning at \$5,000.

11 May 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Dave G** | 

ANYONE, Correct me if I am wrong, but I think Chad spent 2 nights in jail because this happened on the weekend and the bail was set at such, where he was unable to cover it so it's wait and see a Judge during normal business hrs?

11 May 2012

**Dave G** | 

Bob,

Thanks for that info, I will keep It in the back of my mind because I have never read that before.If accurate, that info describes a woman doing whatever she thinks is needed in order to quietly leave.

That info however, does not answer the question that was asked, regarding "brutal beatings" Often stated here

11 May 2012

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,  
I retract "intuition" and would like to replace it with "gut feeling," not to plagerize Mark, but his gut tells him the same thing my gut tells me, and this is why: All of the evidence used against him, I found, was dead-on accurate, as if the stars were all aligned perfectly to produce this result. I've considered all other possibilities about what could have happened, and I find that nothing is more clear than the portrait of Chad that the prosecution was able to paint for the jury. Everytime I look at new information (Tristan Evans assault police reports) it solidifies what I've believed all along. As far as the polygraph, I have no confidence in it because it was performed by a rookie examiner who only recently took the course and is nowhere near an experienced expert.

Dave,

You want to know details? How about this, that Tristan waited for angry Chad to fall asleep before she sneaked the kids out of the house. She put the kids in the car, turned the key just short of starting it so that she could put the shifter into neutral, physically pushed the car out of the driveway onto the street, then started the engine and took off to her mom's. All this, in order to avoid waking him up and enduring more physical assaults. Imagine that, waking your kids up at 3am in the morning, keeping them quiet so daddy doesn't wake up, and quietly sneaking them out of the house.

Speaking of assaults, this wasn't the first one, but it happened to be the last because chicken shit Chad got a rude awakening when he had to spend two nights in the county jail. But old habits never die and less than two years later he's right back to throwing violent tantrums, chooking, pushing, shoving and who know what else, and lying about it just like he lied to the Rochester Police when they came to his house to arrest him the first time around. It's funny how Tristan changed her story later, kinda like Amanda changed hers. Think about that for a minute and consider this: Chad influenced her the same way he influenced Amanda. He handled the police in the same arrogant manner, but the second time around it didn't work out too well for him.

Regards,

Bob

*10 May 2012 - Rochester*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Last week, Chad took a very significant step. He voluntarily took a polygraph and passed it with "No Deception Indicated." This was a step that was vigorously urged by Bob Arnold and Mark C. I wrote in a May 9 posting, attention to Bob and later asked Mark C the same question: "3. In your February 9, 2011 posting, you wrote, "I would like to see Chad take an actual polygraph test." Since then you wrote about the importance of Chad's taking a polygraph about 15 times. "Mark C" made similar requests in nine postings. After Chad passed his April 30, 2011 polygraph, you questioned the validity of the exam and the credentials of the polygraphist and whether we had given Chad other undisclosed polygraph tests. All your questions were answered. Now, are you going to ask the Governor and Attorney General to evaluate Chad's April 30 polygraph results? Your taxpayer dollars pay for a large professional "Polygraph Unit" in the New Hampshire State Police, and a polygraphist in that unit could easily give a professional evaluation of Chad's exam. (See <http://www.nh.gov/safety/divisions/nhsp/isb/polygraphy/index.html>)"

Later Bob addressed Christine and Amy in a posting and said "I'm shocked that he passed a polygraph. My intuition tells me that something is amiss with that."  
His "INTUITION"?

In this case, the police were very eager to have Jeff Marshall, Amanda Bortner and Jennifer Bortner Conley take a polygraph, as stated in Sgt. White's "Investigative Plan." The police asked Amanda to ask Chad if he was willing to take a polygraph and she reported back to the police that he said "yes." The police were so eager and confident that they told Jeremy Hinton that Jeff had already passed a polygraph. THEN, Jeff declined to take his polygraph, and the police interest in polygraphs dropped to zero, apparently because it was interfering with their theory of the case. Bob and Mark C have wanted Chad to take a polygraph, surely expecting that he would fail, BUT he passed. Now Bob doesn't want to accept the result because his "INTUITION" tells him "something is amiss with that." Polygraphs are okay for him and the police, except when the results are not what they want? Please, Bob and Mark C, ask the Attorney General to have the State Police Polygraph Unit evaluate Chad's polygraph exam.

*10 May 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Christine**

I agree with Dave G, this "debate" has gotten off course here. We are wasting time debating about something that has nothing to do with Cassidy's death.....

**Bob Arnold** | 

Mark,  
Don't disclose your email address, you'll start getting tons of spam email thanks to one of the Chad supporters. Don't use your real name either, they'll hunt you and your family down.

Regards,

Bob

10 May 2012 - Rochester

**Bob Arnold** | 

Amy,  
Not opinions, facts. You never answered my question so it looks like you don't know what you're talking about.

10 May 2012 - Rochester

**Dave G** | 

Ok We really need to get off of Tristan and move forward to the passed lie detector test pertaining to the Death of Cassidy Bortner

10 May 2012

**Mark C**

A "decent, kind and caring person" and a "good man" does not hit a woman unless he was defending his life or the safety of a loved one.

People do make horrendous mistakes and deserve an opportunity to be forgiven, but let's stop glossing over his despicable behavior in connection with Tristan's beating.

10 May 2012

**Amy**

Bob,  
Are you some kind of therapist?

Four following comment is nothing more than your own opinion:

"You are correct, he stopped his daily abuse of Tristan after he was arrested, because the thought of going to prison scared the hell out of him."

What makes you the expert on what Chad was thinking? Did you somehow get access to his therapy records?

Chad, whether you want to accept it or not, is a decent, kind, and caring person. He made a mistake. He owned up to it. He has grown from it.

Get over it.

10 May 2012 - Southern New Hampsha

**Dave G** | 

Bob,

I have much respect for Tristan for standing up and reporting possible abuse to Cassidy. She Did what many others chose not to do. I have no axe to grind with the Lady.

By your own words,

"The assault on Tristan was much worse than anyone here knows. The police reports are accurate, but leave out a lot of details about what happened that night".

IF your statement is 100 percent accurate, Why in the world would a Police Officer leave alot of details out of an extremely important Official Legal Report? That would be HORRIBLE police work! I say this because when reading all reports, a couple red marks and scratches all but faded implies to the reader that this would be a typical Assault and not a "horrible beating" that has been described in here on occasion. To most of us Here, A horrible beating would be something like what just happened to the homeless man by four Officers, Or Rodney King or Reginald Denny, You agree those were horrible brutal beatings?. Based on Police reports this pales in comparison. Another thing that disturbs me about the reports. I recall one officer saying, "dont tell us what you did just what he did" That's no way to get to any truth about anything. Again, implies they have no interest in truth. Simple Assault by definition is unprivileged contact. which she admits too, Point being, If You can only say what someone did to you and you cannot say what you did to them, it is pretty obvious that its easy to paint a horrible picture of another. I have do doubt that Chad hit her, I have no doubt that she hit him!

10 May 2012

**Becky B** | 

PSYCHO: Short for "psychotic," someone suffering from a mental illness that interferes with correct processing of input.

The result is an inability to co-exist (work with, live with, play with) other human beings--or in being with other human beings, the psychosis causes aberrant behavior.

Chad is so far beyond that definition!  
He's a good man!!

Your comments are rude & unwanted & uncalled for Mr. Arnold!!

Take Dave's challenge, I dare you!!

10 May 2012 - Rochester, NH

**Bob Arnold** | 

Christine,

Good job getting those police reports. I'd like to point something out about her later statement, that things were "blown out of porportion." This, I believe is an example of how Evans is able to sway his victims, another example is how he would assault Amanda and turn right around and make things better. This is exactly what he did to her after Cassidy died, he influenced her.

The assault on Tristan was much worse than anyone here knows. The police reports are accurate, but leave out a lot of details about what happened that night.

Amy,

You are correct, he stopped his daily abuse of Tristan after he was arrested, because the thought of going to prison scared the hell out of him. He did spend two nights in the county jail over that.

Is Chad a psyco? Yep. I'm shocked that he passed a polygraph. My intuition tells me that something is amiss with that.

Regards,

**Mark C**

Morrison...I agree with your comments and understand that you are not suggesting he be let free but the case re-investigated. I'm not sure if Healy's test results are just highlighting relevant questions or if they were his only questions specific to Cassidy. I leave the analysis of the test procedures, the questions, etc. to the experts. If the State Police believes the test was accurate, fair, etc., then so be it.

Let me ask a question connected to my previous post...has Chad had a psych evaluation? Either part of this case or in connection with his anger management situation?

Christine...relax. I'm not insinuating that he is a sociopath. Just want to be clear if he has or has not been evaluated.

10 May 2012

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Hello "Mark C,"  
Welcome back.

Regarding your comment, "but the claim does have some merit. I do believe certain individuals have the ability to convince themselves of one thing or another and believe they are being truthful." I know of no studies or other evidence that such people pass lie detector tests any more than anyone else. Ronald Reagan apparently believed for a moment or longer that he was present when a concentration camp was liberated in Germany, just as he had seen in the movies. I doubt, however, that he would have passed a polygraph test.

There is no question that polygraphs are not infallible. If they were, then their results would be admissible in court. With Chad's results, we are not asking that the State Government accept them 100% and open the prison gates for him. We are asking that the case be fully re-investigated, including re-interviewing Chad and others, and including previously ignored doctor reports and photographs and family gatherings (e.g. Nov. 5) If the State of New Hampshire believes that polygraphs are accurate enough to require them for all local and State Police applicants, and accurate enough to fund a substantial State Police Polygraph Unit for 30+ years, then why not give enough credence to Chad's tests to initiate a re-investigation? Aren't two tests (VSA and polygraph) enough to raise "reasonable doubt," if not considerable doubt, about Chad's conviction?

In an earlier post, I asked Bob, "Now, are you going to ask the Governor and Attorney General to evaluate Chad's April 30 polygraph results?" I ask you the same question. If you doubt the validity of the results, why not ask that the State Police Polygraph Unit evaluate the Chad's exam?

Finally, I've done a lot of research over the past several months on the use of lie detectors (mostly polygraphs) in cases of wrongful conviction, and claimed wrongful conviction. I know of NO cases where an exoneree or claimant of innocence has taken two lie detector tests and passed BOTH of them and still have been kept in prison. In fact, I don't know of any case where anyone has passed a test, and been doubted and then took another, and passed that, too.

10 May 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Christine** | 

Mark,  
Chad is far from a sociopath. Yes, he had his flaws as with EVERY HUMAN BEING. However, this does not make him a child killer! Insinuating that Chad is a sociopath is the farthest fetched thing I have ever heard in my life. Sociopaths may be able to make themselves and others believe far fetched stories, but Chad's stories were truthful (other than the trampoline story and minimizing Amanda living with him) I know they were truthful because there were pictures, taken by police, that PROVED Chad was telling the truth.

10 May 2012 - United States

## Mark C

Morrison...I said if Chad passed a lie detector test, I would post again.

While this recent development doesn't completely change my gut feelings about this case, it certainly is something that can help his cause.

Going back and reading prior posts to get caught up, someone made a comment about sociopaths and insinuating that they have the ability to pass lie detector tests. While that seems to be a comment targeted to undermine the recent test results, that thought did cross my mind early on when it was disclosed that he passed the voice stress test.

Now, I'm not calling Chad a sociopath, but the claim does have some merit. I do believe certain individuals have the ability to convince themselves of one thing or another and believe they are being truthful.

10 May 2012

## Christine |

Regarding this "brutal beating", here are Tristan's exact words: "This was all a big misunderstanding that got all blown out of proportion."

10 May 2012 - NH

## Christine

This is Tristan's statement, in her words, what happened that night that Chad was charged with assault. She should know, she was

there....<http://chadevanswronglyconvicted.org/documents/Undatedsummaryofincidentof990328byTristan.pdf>

10 May 2012 - NH

## Bob Arnold |

Dave,

I don't believe the information that this person has could exonerate Chad. If I had information that would prove innocence, I would not withhold it. As far as my source, it's been requested that this person not be mentioned at this particular website. I don't know you, however I know Morrison and I trust him. Perhaps sometime in the future I will discuss with him in private. I forgot to mention, there is a second source who worked for Chad in one of his stores that gave me the same description of the assault, however he heard it second hand. I can't name him either, but I can tell you they are both listed in the "Who's who" section of this site.

As far as Peter's Palace, I think everyone is taking my statements the wrong way. I was simply pointing out an example, from the police officers point of view, of how Chad was deceptive in his interrogation. Watch closely how Lance McCleish zeros in on the suggested meeting place for the pickup. Chad avoids any suggestion that he wanted to meet at Peter's Palace, contrary to what Jeff stated earlier. The police were trying to confirm what Jeff stated, and by this point in the interview they had become convinced that Chad was being deceitful based on other answers and statements he had given. Keep in mind, they had various descriptions of the toy ball that hit Cassidy, they had the trampoline story, they also had statements that contradicted what Jeff, Jen and Amanda had told them i.e. living arrangements with Amanda, his earlier conversation with Tristan, etc etc. I could go on and you will just come back and argue these things, and that's fine but I'm looking at this from the eyes of the police, mind you, and there's nothing you can say that can change what their impressions were of Chad.

Morrison,

I'm glad you cleared the air about Jeff Marshall, because lately there's been more and more information being posted on Facebook that appears to accuse him. I'm a little confused by all this new activity since the polygraph. I'd like to remind everyone that we are not in the bottom of the

ninth inning.

Amy,

Your comment about Tristan sounds as if you know her. Do you know her?

Regards,

Bob

9 May 2012 - Rochester

**Braden Reed** | 

I'm recently working on a second letter and hopefully a better reply. I am also going to include Chad passing the second polygraph test. WE'RE GETTING THERE, HANG TIGHT!

9 May 2012

**Morrison Bonpasse (for Chad)** | 

(This three-section post from Chad came to Morrison in Chad's letter #426 of May 1, which arrived on May 9.)

As many of you are aware, I recently took and passed a second lie detection test regarding my involvement (or lack of) in Cassidy's tragic death. I wanted to thank everyone for your patience as our request slowly worked its way through the approval process. Amazingly, I do not have a right to such a test in an effort to help prove my innocence. Whether or not I would be allowed to take the test was at the discretion of Commissioner Wrenn and Warden Gerry. I publicly thank them for the courage in allowing me to take the test. I also want to thank Morrison for his integrity and his dogged approach to obtain approval.

Now that this second test has come and gone, I am hopeful that it will help secure things for everyone who has contributed comments to this site since its inception. For those who have passionately supported our efforts, I hope this renews your Faith and the time you have dedicated. For those who have vehemently opposed me, I hope this latest test will put the issue to bed for you. As I understand it, there are several who said specifically that if I passed a polygraph test they would become a believer in my wrongful conviction, or more significantly in that direction. I am hopeful that they will be true to their word.

(continued below)

9 May 2012 - New Hampshire State Prison

**Morrison Bonpasse (for Chad)** | 

(continued from above)

I purposely use the word "wrongful conviction" vs. "innocence" because I don't feel innocent. Cassidy by the letter of the law may not have been my biological responsibility, but she was my moral responsibility. No one, except Amanda, feels worse about Cassidy's death or like a bigger failure than me. My mistakes and poor decisions in life are well documented. I think about and miss Cassidy every single day. I am a flawed human being just like every person I know and every person that takes the time to comment on this website. However, for all my flaws, I did NOT kill Cassidy. I do NOT believe in corporal punishment and have NEVER: kicked, punched, slapped, thrown into a wall, or even spanked Cassidy.

From the day of Cassidy's death I have been willing to take lie detection or ANY other test to prove my innocence. I first said this to Sgt. Matthew Stewart of the Maine State Police and then to Amanda days later when the police asked her to ask me. Weeks later, I told my attorney, Alan Cronheim, that I was willing to take a lie detector test. Five years ago, I told my first private investigator, Ron Rice, that I would take any type of test available to help prove I was telling the truth. I even requested that Mr. Rice find the other three adults that had time alone with Cassidy during her last two days of life and ask them if they were willing to take such a test if I paid for it.

Finally, Morrison came along and made it happen; twice! I share this information with the people over the last several months who have accused me of ducking such a test. I apologize if I sound angry or bitter but the truth is, I'm a little of both. I have lost nearly 12 years of life with the most important person in my life, for a crime I didn't commit!  
(continued below)

9 May 2012 - New Hampshire State Prison

**Morrison Bonpasse (for Chad)** | 

(continued from above)

Prior to Cassidy's death I was considered by most a stand-up guy; a hard working man with integrity. I was active in my community and enjoyed helping those in need. I believe that most people that observed me for 30 seconds with my son or stepson would get the impression that I was a great dad. In fact, I can't think of a single person who didn't trust me with their own children. This isn't to say I didn't have flaws. I've heard them all over the last 12 years and agree with most of them: "He was cocky sometimes." "Chad was grouchy sometimes." "Sometimes he drank too much." "Chad could sometimes say mean things." "I saw Chad fight with guys a few times in high school." "He was sometimes an abusive husband." The thing is, none of these things make me an abuser of children and a murderer. Mostly, I am just a big goofball who loves children. When I was free and went to a cookout, it was the kids I played with because they were more fun and interesting than the adults.

As I write this, I think about the fact that if there was concrete DNA available in this case we wouldn't even be discussing these issues because I would not be here! I am bitter because I have to jump through hoops to prove what I already know to be true and still people doubt. Unfortunately, our jury system is not infallible. My integrity "pre"-Cassidy is still intact. It is the way I was raised. If I am asked a question I am going to give anyone an honest answer.

Going forward, I hope that we can all work together so that I may have another chance at life; a chance to be a dad and for the first time watch my son throw a football and ski down a mountain. If you support me, thank you. If you still oppose me, well, thank you for staying involved. Most of all, please aim your comments at ME. There has been enough pain over the past 12 years and no one that posts here deserves to be chastised or ridiculed for their beliefs. Some of the personal attacks aimed at others I've read here break my heart.

Thank you.

9 May 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Hi Amy,

That's fine. I wasn't saying that you had crossed the line. It just seemed like a good time to present that legal distinction, i.e. rational alternatives precluding guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, on these postings.

Thanks for your attention to this case and postings on this section. Someday, I hope we'll meet.

9 May 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Amy**

I am not accusing Jeff Marshall of any misconduct where Cassidy is concerned. I am pointing out that similar to Chad, he also had issues with his anger. Anything beyond that is inference.

9 May 2012 - Southern NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

I want to make clear here that no member of the Chad Evans Wrongly Convicted Committee, and no one who supports Chad's innocence is accusing Jeff Marshall of any crime. That was done at Chad's trial where the charge was protected by judicial immunity, but it's not done here, where it's not protected from the laws of defamation outside the courtroom.

There is a legal rule adopted by the NH Supreme Court, and backed by common sense, that in a

circumstantial case, where there are two or more reasonable explanations for a death or other apparent crime, a jury cannot determine that one of those explanations is true beyond a reasonable doubt. The most cited source for that rule is the 1991 case of New Hampshire vs. Leon Evans (no known relation to Chad), where the court stated, "The jury may properly infer guilt from circumstantial evidence if that evidence excludes all other rational conclusions." (Incidentally, the Court affirmed Evans's guilty verdict in that case.) As former prosecutor, and now Judge, N. William Delker stated in a Foster's Daily Democrat story about Chad's case last year, this is a circumstantial case.

Thus, when I or others take note of Jeff Marshall's actions on or before November 9, we are presenting evidence that those actions appear to make his culpability in Cassidy's death at least as reasonable or rational as Chad's. As we are insisting that Chad Evans is innocent of murdering Cassidy, we are assuming that Jeff Marshall is innocent, too.

9 May 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Amy**

I would also like to point out that though Chad made the a huge mistake by assaulting Tristan, he owned up to this mistake and later even shared a friendly co-parenting relationship with her. Chad never harmed her again. On the contrary, Jeff Marshall has an abusive rap sheet that speaks volumes. VOLUMES. Just sayin'

9 May 2012 - Southern New Hampsha

**Dave G** | 

Regarding Bob's quote,  
"I've not talked to the officer, and would rather keep my source confidential because disclosure would do more harm than good."

A huge issue for the committee is a wealth of information was not "disclosed" to the Jury, which if had been, none of us would be here today. So question is, Is your "source" such a wealth of information that if she/he were named, it could be possible that chad would be exonerated and that is what you mean by it would do more harm than good? If this is not the case then explain "would do more harm than good." In previous statements of yours, you have exclaimed that you would do nothing to help chad. Is this where it would do more harm than good because naming the source, You'd be helping chad?

9 May 2012

**Christine** | 

Here is the follow up with Tristan regarding the night in question:

<http://chadevanswronglyconvicted.org/documents/990407NarrativereportsofChadarrestandincidentbyfourRPDOfficers.pdf>

9 May 2012 - United States

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

1. Whatever the source of the quoted assessment of Chad's fight with his wife on March 28, 1999 as the "worst beating in New Hampshire" in a domestic violence case, it is clearly incorrect for the reasons previously presented and documented here. Your anonymous source is wrong. Period.
2. Regarding Chad's request by phone to Jeff on the afternoon of November 8, 2000 that Jeff bring Cassidy to a more convenient transfer place so Chad could get to his son's day care center sooner, Jeff declined. So why is it relevant or important that Chad didn't precisely state the planned meeting location? Chad's reference to Newington on page 77 of his interrogation is not as you understand. That is where Chad and Jeff met to transfer Cassidy from Jeff to Chad on Thursday, October 19. (See the "Chronology" on this website, and Chad's Letters to me of March 23, 2010 and May 17, 2010.) Thus, it was an optional, known and convenient transfer point for November 8.
3. In your February 9, 2011 posting, you wrote, "I would like to see Chad take an actual polygraph

test." Since then you wrote about the importance of Chad's taking a polygraph about 15 times. "Mark C" made similar requests in nine postings. After Chad passed his April 30, 2011 polygraph, you questioned the validity of the exam and the credentials of the polygraphist and whether we had given Chad other undisclosed polygraph tests. All your questions were answered. Now, are you going to ask the Governor and Attorney General to evaluate Chad's April 30 polygraph results? Your taxpayer dollars pay for a large professional "Polygraph Unit" in the New Hampshire State Police, and a polygraphist in that unit could easily give a professional evaluation of Chad's exam. (See <http://www.nh.gov/safety/divisions/nhsp/isb/polygraphy/index.html>)

9 May 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

P.S. (continued from my comment below)

Agreed, Jeff embellished it, however the actual words uttered by the officer were something to the effect that the assault was the worst he had seen as a police officer. I doubt Jeff ever had a conversation with Tristan about this, but I don't doubt Tristan had conversations with some of Chad's associates at the stores. From what I understand, this is how it spread. I don't believe Jeff heard it from Amanda. Now this is all second hand/third hand info, however I reiterate that the words uttered from the officer were confirmed by me by someone who was actually there when it happened.

Regards,

Bob

8 May 2012 - Rochester

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,

That quote "they quote, unquote, called it "the worst beating in New Hampshire, in a domestic abuse beating in New Hampshire," came from Jeff. He got it from someone else who was there when it happened. The actual quote that Jeff repeated came from one of the Rochester police officers who responded to the call. I've not talked to the officer, and would rather keep my source confidential because disclosure would do more harm than good. I would be willing to sign an affidavit that I've independently confirmed the quote with another party who was physically present when the officer uttered it.

As far as the misleading statements concerning pickup for Cassidy, see pages 76 through 79. He did mention the adult book store, but never admitted that he suggested the meet there, even after he was given three opportunities. Furthermore, he injects the Newington McDonalds in there, as if to imply that was what he told Jeff. You really need to watch the video over and over to see the complete interaction clearly.

Regards,

Bob

8 May 2012 - Rochester

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Going back to earlier postings, you wrote on Nov. 13, 2011 "AND, back to the assault on Tristan, Jeff stated to the police detectives that to his knowledge, it was one of the worst domestic assaults in NH history. This is what he heard from the store managers who were under Evans. Now, I'm going to confirm this because I believe it's important. Eye Contact makes a very brief mention of the assault, but apparently it was reported in Foster's newspaper as a very serious assault. "

I responded as follows on Nov. 14, 2011:

Regarding Jeff's statement about Chad's 1999 domestic violence with Tristan, I've pasted below what I wrote on page 111 of the recently released paperback edition of EYE CONTACT:

"Linscott asked about Chad's abuse of his wife, and Jeff said,

'... I know he went to court over the assault and stuff ...his name's in the newspaper, you know, he, they quote, unquote, called it "the worst beating in New Hampshire, in a domestic abuse beating in New Hampshire," that's what, you know, everyone at the stores had said, uh, but I never really, I guess this is where the stupid part from me comes out, because I never said, "I got these two together," ..... (p. 1311)

Regarding Jeff's understanding of the fight between Chad and Tristan on March 28, 1999, it's a tragic truth that the "worst beatings" suffered in domestic violence cases result in death. The basic source of Jeff's statement was apparently Amanda and she apparently based her statement upon what Tristan told her during a heart-to-heart conversation. However, Jeff embellished the story, as no newspaper had ever called the incident a "worst beating in New Hampshire." There were no separate articles in any newspaper about the incident, and Foster's Daily Democrat did not include the incident in its regular section, "Police Log" for Rochester. The "Police Log" in the April 6, 1999 Rochester Times did contain five entries for March 28, including this entry, '2:48 a.m. - Chad Evans, 27, of 191 Milton Road is charged with second degree assault, a weapon offense and criminal restraint.' "

8 May 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Please give us the page in Chad's interview where he allegedly "lied to the police about where he suggested to meet for Cassidy's pickup, even after the officers gave him multiple chances to tell the truth." As noted in my posting below, he told them about "Moonlite Reader" and one officer didn't know that it was the same place as "Peter's Palace." That was at pages 78-79. Also, he told them at page 76 that he went to Moonlite Reader, "an adult bookstore," before going to Jeff's. What, again, is the lie you are referencing?

Regarding the March 28, 1999 fight between Tristan and Chad which was the subject of his March 24, 2000 guilty plea, it's a bit misleading to refer to dislodging of a tooth cap as "the tooth that he knocked out of Tristan's mouth."

Finally, we addressed many months ago the issue of the alleged statement that the incident was the "worst case of domestic abuse" someone had ever seen. See your posting of December 6, 2011, to which I replied on that same day:

"Bob, So the quotation that the injuries to Tristan were 'the worst he'd seen in his career as a police officer,' came in 2011 from a Rochester police officer who wishes to remain anonymous? Did that police officer participate in the police work surrounding the incident? How does that quote square with the Rochester Police Arrest report which is posted at Chad's website for March 28, 1999 which said "INJURIES: Apparent Minor Injury"? (see Discovery page 624,

<http://www.chadevanswronglyconvicted.org/documents/990328arrestreportWandgunsseized.pdf>)

Thank you for your offer of reconciliation if Chad passes a polygraph test. You are right that Becky and Christine are 'decent ladies.' "

If you are insisting on bringing it up again, please name the police officer, as there were several at Chad's home on the night of his arrest on November 16, 2000. Otherwise, please refrain from presenting anonymous allegations.

8 May 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Amy,

He lied to the police about where he suggested to meet for Cassidy's pickup, even after the officers gave him multiple chances to tell the truth.

Christine,

Don't forget the tooth that he knocked out of Tristan's mouth, and the comments made by the arresting officer, "worst case of domestic abuse" he'd ever seen. This came from an eye witness

who was there.

Regards,

Bob

8 May 2012 - Rochester

**Dave G** | 

Christine,

I completely agree Chad doesn't "appear" to be the violent one here based on history that you show. Violence against anyone is wrong! However, If I were to strike you in any manner it is called "Simple Assault" If I were to strike my wife in the exact same manner it is called "Domestic violence." Even though it may be the same action it is considered much more serious when done to your partner. That is why one of the first q's an officer will ask is, do you live with him/her?. Simple assault, typically you go to anger management classes usually 6 months, Domestic violence, you go to Domestic violence classes, typically 9 months. Basically same classes only longer. Just the term "simple assault" vs Domestic Violence. You agree Domestic violence "sounds" far worse? I believe this to be the reasoning the sitters history was sort of brushed aside. (that is only opinion) Funny thing though, did you know that when it's "Domestic violence" there is a Federal Law that is automatic, They take your guns, Even if they they had NOTHING to do with the act. You lose your 2nd amendment right to keep and bear arms. THIS IS NOT NECESSARILY the case with 'Simple Assault' which again shows the differences between the two. Just an fyi in a nutshell.

8 May 2012

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Chad told the police during his interrogation exactly what happened with the "starter baseball" and "hard rubber ball." He never changed his account of that accident, except to provide more details in his LETTERS to me. It was not a "story." The problem was, as you noted, that other people told the police and the jury their inaccurate or imprecise understanding of the accident. Chad's attorneys should have clarified the issue at Chad's trial, including the type of ball that was involved, but they didn't. It was one of the many problems caused by his lawyers' recommendation that he not testify. I don't understand your comment, "he did hold back about some things, one of them was the meeting place he suggested to Jeff to pick up Cassidy." How did Chad "hold back?" He told the police exactly where he had been, on his way to Jeff's, which was "Moonlite Reader" also known as "Peter's Palace." To Amy's point, the jury wasn't told about "Moonlite Reader" stop because the judge and Chad's lawyers thought the information would be prejudicial to Chad. I agree with Amy that it shouldn't have, as it had nothing to do with the charges against Chad, but that was the decision.

8 May 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Amy**

Why does it matter where Chad picked up Cassidy? Are you suggesting that because Chad shopped at Peter's Palace he was capable of murder? Really?? What is the relevance of the bookstore, other than Jeff didn't want his company truck seen there? As far as Cassidy is concerned, none.

8 May 2012 - Southern New Hampshire

**Bob Arnold** | 

Christine,

I agree with everything you state. Jeff was no angel, and had a lot of issues in the past. What I'm getting at is some of the things that shed a bad light on Chad:

First, the trampoline story. The baseball story, which changed several times-assuming by Chad. Again, assuming because the discription of the ball changed from person to person, so it appeared as though Chad had described it differently to different people. Everyone had a different description they told the police, so it was assumed that Chad told them different stories. Again, it's assumed and the prosecution was able to make it look more like a fact.

Another thing, if you look at the video interview, he did hold back about some things, one of them was the meeting place he suggested to Jeff to pick up Cassidy. It didn't match what Jeff stated, this is why the police called down to Peter's Palace to find out if Chad had been in there that evening.

Regards,

Bob

8 May 2012 - Rochester

**Bob Arnold** | 

Christine & Morrison,

Give me a little bit to reply to your posts, I need to read through them but I feel I need to address "Dave G" sooner than later....

Dave,

You're unbelievable, you know that? Instead of seeing my posts as an opportunity to debate this case in a spirited fashion, you're now acting like a baby. I welcome debate with you, however when you attack me in a hostile fashion you get the same in return. Morrison has always welcomed spirited debate here, I suggest follow his lead. Besides, if you can't handle my heckling, how are you going to handle someone on the street? Oh, I imagine you've never once stood on a street corner with your petition, talking to people about this case and garnering support the hard way. I see posts on Facebook about "seven new signatures" (no offense to Christine), I hardly think that is a victory. You need tens of thousands of new signatures, hundreds at a time, not sevens.

In closing, if you feel so strongly about this case, I suggest you "put up or shut up." No, I don't hide behind a keyboard, I don't hide my name or my email address, and yes I've met Morrison several times, and I've devoted considerable time researching.

Regards,

Bob

8 May 2012 - Rochester

**Dave G** | 

That's the best you can come up with? More of the same?

Simply unacceptable! No furthercomment needed.

8 May 2012

**Christine** | 

Here is a copy of Jeff Marshall and Chad Evans criminal history. Hard to believe the state could consider Jeff Marshall as a "credible" witness....

Jeff Marshall criminal past

12/93 Arrested for simple assault

5/94 Harassment complaint filed against Jeff Marshall

1/95 Jeff Marshall pled guilty to the offense "violation of protection from abuse"

3/95 A complaint of criminal threatening against Jeff Marshall was dismissed w/o prejudice  
1/96 Jeff Marshall arrested for driving after suspension/revocation & criminal mischief  
2/98 A temporary protective order issued against Jeff Marshall on behalf of Nicole Mitchell  
3/98 An order of protection from abuse was ordered against Jeff Marshall  
7/98 Two complaints against Jeff Marshall  
1) Violation of a protective order from abuse  
2) Criminal threatening for placing Jeff Foye in imminent bodily injury by threatening "I'm going to kill you"  
2/99 Jeff Marshall pled guilty to criminal threatening the violation of the protective order was dismissed in view of a plea to criminal threatening  
5/00 Jeff Marshall arrested on simple assault and criminal threatening of Scott Cormier

Chad Evans criminal past

3/99 Chad arrested on a domestic violence complaint on behalf of his wife Tristan  
3/00 Chad pled guilty to 2 counts of simple assault from the 3/99 incident

Chad doesn't appear to be the violent one here....these police records speak for themselves, yet the prosecution was able to paint such a horrid picture of Chad to the jury.....

*8 May 2012 - United States*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Moving forward, you raised an interesting issue: "inconsistencies, namely some of the things he told the police." What was inconsistent with what? Can you give some examples?

You are right, that "The prosecution was able to paint a picture to the jury that did him in." I used the "painting" metaphor many times in EYE CONTACT. Below are a few examples:

"However, what White wrote here became the basis for the First Degree Assault charge against Chad, which was the only charge relating to Amanda, and not Kassidy. By combining the charges at the trial, the prosecution was able to paint a picture of a violent man." (page 294)

"The picture being painted for readers [by the media] was horrifying, as the one-sided trial in the media continued." (page 299)"

As the police and prosecutors were sure that they knew what the truth was, they painted the canvas for the witnesses, the jury and the media." (page 394)

"The State was trying to paint a picture of Chad, the intimidating child murderer, and woman batterer, who sought to influence Amanda's testimony at his trial." (page 408)

"The prosecution was painting the picture of an angry, out-of-control man, so it sought favorable interpretation of ambiguous statements in the hope that the picture was convincing." (page 420)

"The anger picture painted by the prosecutor had another devastating effect which was to discourage him from testifying in his own defense. His lawyers would later be concerned that he would show his anger on the stand, and that such anger would be misinterpreted by the jury. Rather than persuade the jury that his anger was correctly aimed and justly strong, they advised him not to testify at all. But that came later. He remained in his defendant's chair as the prosecution painted their picture of him. With each cross-examination, the defense lawyers would change the hue of this stroke or that stroke, or even the removal of some paint, but the picture would remain the same for the jury unless a different picture was painted." (page 420)

*8 May 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Gee Dave, have a heart attack why don't you.

Christine,

I have to disagree with you on that one, I think Chad's biggest problem at the trial was inconsistencies, namely some of the things he told the police. The prosecution was able to paint a picture to the jury that did him in. I do wonder if there would have been a different outcome if he testified.

Morrison,

OK I'll extent an apology to "Dave G" because you asked. I must admit, I'm becoming concerned about him and his blood pressure. I don't want him to end up in the hospital, drooling all over himself shaking with convulsions on account of me.

Best Regards,

Bob

7 May 2012 - Rochester

Christine | 

Cut and paste the links below to see the Chad's character.....<http://chadevanswronglyconvicted.org/documents/ChadPoemTheGift2010.pdf> And here is another.....<http://chadevanswronglyconvicted.org/documents/961104FostersDailyDemocratTwoRescuepeople.pdf>

7 May 2012 - United States

Christine | 

Yes he will be Becky! The truth is what it is and will ALWAYS surface! One thing that has been consistent in this WHOLE case.....Chad's facts/statements were ALWAYS backed up by photos. Unlike Jeff Marshall's statements where he told police that he "rushed Kassidy to the kitchen to splash water on her face" in an effort to revive her. Yet in the photos taken by police you can CLEARLY see there is NO water ANYWHERE around the sink, IN the sink, or IN the dishes that were in the sink....how does that happen??? Pictures are worth 1000 words, perhaps if the jury saw photos of Kassidy during the "alleged abuse" they would have seen a different story.....

7 May 2012 - United States

Becky B | 

Thank you Dave!!  
& I support your challenge to Bob!  
I appreciate you standing up for us too!

@Christine, I agree with you too!  
I tend to see that people can't handle the truth  
& would rather judge then learn something new.  
Either way... Chad will be coming home & this forum will just be a memory!

FREE CHAD!!!

7 May 2012 - Rochester

Christine | 

Maybe if everyone spent more time researching this case instead of attacking others that are trying to help we could get somewhere.....

7 May 2012 - United States

Dave G | 

Bob,  
you have been on the attack since before the first time I posted asking mark C to use his name if he wanted to be taken seriously. You jumped me right from the start calling me every name in the book! then you whine tonight when I addressed you when You asked Morrison a question. from the get go here, you have been nothing but foul language and trying to intimidate those who

do not see things your way!, Becky, Christine, Myself, Chad and others. you have also rudely attacked Morrison and his book and Alfred Trenkler! You have brought up some good points However, your other behaviors have seriously taken away from those points. let me get this straight, according to you, I'm not helping, Becky not, Christine not, Morrison's book of fiction is not. Seems like everyone willing to stand up to you is not helping! So that said, the only one(s) doing any good are You and Mark C with your rude name calling, profanity, and names you have logged in here with and anyone else who may disagree? Explain how this has helped? Dont talk to me about debate, quite frankly I choose not to debate with you because of your behavior. MorrisonMAY choose to not address it on every instance but I surely will, ESPECIALLY when it is directed towards a woman in here. I have zero tolerance for it. I can be a best friend or your worst enemy,I let others decide which one they want me to be. (i LIVE BY THAT) If I ran this forum you would already be blocked from coming here because of behavior issues. DO I really care that you think chad is guilty? No I do not, What I don't like is the way you Disrespect others here when they dont agree with your opinion. As I have said, this is a pattern from day one. So no I do not have any respect for anything you do i see you as a complete nuisance Respect is earned not given!

7 May 2012

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob, your reasonable comments are appreciated, but not the attack on David. Why give a person an uncomplimentary label? I hope you will apologize.

Regarding previous posts by all of us, there were many such posts which their writers might now want to retract.

Speaking of past posts, I wonder if Mark C will return to writing comments here. He said he would, once Chad passed or took (I forget) a polygraph exam.

6 May 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Thanks Morrison, you are correct that I hold the polygraph in high regards, and I did state that it would be a turning point for me if he passed. I still have questions, but apparently "Dave G" can't respect that. Looking at his prior comments several months ago, I'm reminded of his lack of debate skills, as well as his goofy posts. Maybe that's what the G stands for, "Dave Goofy?"

I just read the Fosters article and I'm suprised by it. They presented a balanced article that included information that shows the other side of the case. I might reconsider starting my subscription to their paper again.

In closing, I'd like to say that I'm being pulled in your direction, though I'm kicking and screaming along the way. As far as wacko comments coming from "Dave Goofy," they really aren't helping.

Regards,

Bob

6 May 2012 - Rochester

**Dave G** | 

Thanks Sandy! :)

6 May 2012

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Please see today's article in Foster's Daily Democrat by Scott Kinney. It's linked to this website at the "Articles - post 2002" section.

6 May 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Sandy**

Congrats Dave!

6 May 2012 - NH

**Dave G** | 

Morrison,  
not sure when, fourth Grandchild born 9am this morning,so I'm sure plans are in the works.

6 May 2012

**Dave G** | 

Yes you and I DO agree on Chad's INNOCENCE,

6 May 2012

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Agree to disagree. That sounds good to me. However, you and I DO agree on Chad's INNOCENCE, even though we seem to differ from time to time on how we express our views about the case. Bob and I agree to disagree, too, but that's about the core issue of Chad's innocence. Still, he is, like you, committed to learning the truth. In prior postings, he wrote that Chad's passing a polygraph WOULD make a difference to him. How much of a difference remains to be seen. Some prosecutors continue to believe in the guilt of some DNA-exonerees, despite the obvious DNA evidence of innocence. I think Bob is better than that. We'll see.

6 May 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Dave G** | 

Btw Morrison, I have a Dvd that belongs to you, somehow it went south, I'll send it to you so you can continue to share it.

6 May 2012

**Dave G** | 

Morrison, you and I will just have to agree to disagree.

6 May 2012

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Ok. Nonetheless, let's move forward. I know you and I know Bob Arnold and respect the interest in truth and justice that you both share. If you met each other, I'm confident that you would find some common ground and learn from each other. Maybe someday. For now, we meet and communicate on this "online comments" site.

6 May 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Dave G** | 

It appeared I started profanity? Please Morrison,  
profanity here starts where it always starts!  
one person!

6 May 2012

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

David, You're right. I addressed the "civility comments" to you because it appeared that you initiated the profanity. Nonetheless, I agree, Bob's response included similar terms which he, too, could have omitted.

Please, gentlemen, let's move forward with mutual respect and without profanity. I, for one, respect you both.

6 May 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Dave G** | 

My last line? OMG. you tolerate what he said? but i cant say that? whatever!

6 May 2012

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

David, We just posted simultaneously. Yes, your posting was civil until the last sentence where you asked Bob Arnold to look in a mirror. Please raise the civility level a little higher. Thanks.

6 May 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Dave G** | 

MORRISON YOU NEED TO DIRECT YOUR LAST COMMENT TO BOB.

6 May 2012

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Please, David. Strong feelings are okay, but not profanity or personal attacks on others who post comments here.

6 May 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Dave G** | 

Oh and Morrison, I was civil !

6 May 2012

**Dave G** | 

Wow Wasn't that mature Bob! You Proved you don't care about the truth (AGAIN) with your little rant. I knew you weren't a big enough person to be willing to find someone you could believe in. So the challenge was not stupid. I wanted to help you to believe, But you have no interest in that! OH you want credit for being a good boy for the last couple months? OH PLEASE! I'm not the one who needs to resort to name calling and using profanity and all the other little stunts/games you pull in an attempt to undermine all the good that has been done, I leave that up to you because you are so good at it. go back and look at your posts since day 1, look in the mirror Bob, if you truly want to see an asshole in here.

6 May 2012

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Responding to Bob's questions:

1. Yes, the polygraph on Monday, April 30, was the only one given to Chad by John Healy or by anyone. Please understand that it's not easy arranging for a polygraph of an inmate. It was a process that took us several months. Given the knowledge within the prison of the scheduled polygraph, it would be foolish for me to try to schedule an exam and then pretend or deny that it happened.
2. Those three questions were the only three asked for test purposes. There was background

discussion, which is considered to be good polygraph examination protocol. In my work for Alfred Trenkler, there was one polygraph conducted by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms in the case, and there were three questions. An alternate suspect in that case was reported to have responded deceptively to each of the three questions. See the results at <http://www.alfredtrenklerinnocent.org/documents/911106ATFLiedetectortestGiamarco.pdf>. I did a little search on the Internet which supports the view that the number of questions asked in a polygraph exam is limited. Here's what one site said:  
"Number of Questions: The margin of error for interpreting lie detector results purportedly increases when more questions are asked. Pacific Polygraphs -- a nationwide lie-detection provider -- suggests the number of relevant questions be limited to five; its website says this number has provided an accuracy rate of 98 percent. When the number of questions is increased beyond five questions, the accuracy rate may drop by as much as 50 percent. Other polygraph providers may limit the number of questions to as few as three questions."  
([http://www.ehow.com/list\\_7366111\\_protocols-lie-detector-examiners.html](http://www.ehow.com/list_7366111_protocols-lie-detector-examiners.html))  
Regarding other "comments" here, let's all continue to be civil, despite the strong feelings about this case.

6 May 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

"Dave G" or whatever your name is, quite frankly I could care less about who you are or hear your opinions. My question was directed to Morrison, not you, you child. I still think Evans is guilty and I don't like the phrasing of those three questions. This is supposed to be an open forum, and I've done a good job of being more civil in the past few months, however assholes like you make it hard to be civil.

One other thing, issuing idiotic challenges does nothing to help your cause, it only makes you look stupid. You can put that yard sign up your ass.

Bob

6 May 2012 - Rochester

**Dave G** | 

Bob,

As Morrison already stated, "The prosecution's theory was that Chad killed Cassidy Bortner with blows to her abdomen and head on the afternoon of November 8 and/or later that evening. John Healy's question to Chad about blows "Between Nov 8 and Nov 9, 2000" surely covers that period".

ALL pertinent questions were asked based on prosecution's theory. Sorry you can't accept that. You have Found issue with Everything this committee has done, So i am not surprised you find issue yet again.

It's time to put up or shut up, "If Morrison AND Chad Allow" I challenge you Bob, find someone that is SATISFACTORY in your mind to review it, I'll pay for it! HOWEVER when it is agreed NDI. You pay for it! Also when it is agreed NDI, YOU must put a 4ft x 8ft sign in your yard stating you were wrong and FREE Chad, You further agree to stop the nonsense.

6 May 2012 - New Hampshire

**Sandy**

My guess is...Chad could take 100 polygraph tests and pass every one of them, and there would still be people who would doubt.

I know Chad personally, and I never doubted he would pass the polygraph or any other polygraphs.

6 May 2012 - NH

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,

I'm not satisfied with John Healy's "full report," namely the lack of information. He only lists three "relevant" questions, and those questions are worded strangely. Can he provide a complete list of all questions that were asked?

Also, is this the first polygraph test given to Chad, or have there been other attempts by Mr. Healy?

Thanks,

Bob

*6 May 2012 - Rochester*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

In further response to Bob's questions, in addition to Christine's referral, there is more information about John Healy at his polygraph website, [www.polygraphnh.com](http://www.polygraphnh.com). Further, see his resume at <http://johninnh.powweb.com/CV.pdf>. Visitors to John's two websites are not paying attention if they are not impressed with his experience, integrity and leadership. He graduated from the New England Polygraph Institute last November, and was elected president of his class. Since then, he's administered many polygraph tests. The Institute is one of 16 polygraph schools accredited in the U.S. by the American Polygraph Association. Its website is at <http://www.newenglandpolygraphinstitute.com>.

For "Polygraph Questions," The prosecution's theory was that Chad killed Kassidy Bortner with blows to her abdomen and head on the afternoon of November 8 and/or later that evening. John Healy's question to Chad about blows "Between Nov 8 and Nov 9, 2000" surely covers that period. Inferences that John's results are distorted because I contacted him are off base. After studying Chad's case last year, John offered to do the polygraph testing pro bono.

*4 May 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**wendy yates** | 

Allways a believer in you chad evans

*4 May 2012 - nashua., nh*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Christine,

Thanks, I already went through his website but couldn't find anything about his actual polygraph experience.

Regards,

Bob

*4 May 2012 - Rochester*

### **Polygraph Questions**

"Between Nov 8 and Nov 9, 2000 did you inflict those injures to Kassidy Bortner?"

Is the examiner referring to November 8-1/2, 2000?

Doesn't surprise me that the results indicated by this "expert" engaged by Morrison are favorable to Chad.

...just saying.

4 May 2012

**Christine** | 

Here is information on John Healy's experience:  
[http://www.litigationintelligence.com/index\\_files/PrivateInvestigatorProfile.htm](http://www.litigationintelligence.com/index_files/PrivateInvestigatorProfile.htm)

4 May 2012 - NH

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,  
Please share with us how many polygraph examinations Mr. Healy has performed, just so that we can get an idea of his experience in performing these examinations. Also, please provide the date of his graduation from the polygraph school.

Regards,

Bob

3 May 2012 - Rochester

**Sarah** | 

I knew you would do it Chad I am so excited for you and your family. Your one step closer!!  
3 May 2012 - Orlando, FL

**Becky B** | 

For Monday April 30, 2012

Twitter's Trend: Today is National Honesty Day & #Chadevans2 passed a polygraph. If that's not a sign! #wronglyconvicted & needs to be home w. his family!

How bitter sweet that on National Honesty Day, Chad Evans passed his 2nd lie detection test. Chad is far from being a sociopath!  
Interesting though you refuse to post your Real Name and location...

"People who do not admit they were wrong love themselves more than they love the truth."  
~~Unknown

FREE CHAD EVANS!!!

2 May 2012 - Rochester, NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

What would be "interesting" would be if "Interesting" could give examples relevant to this case of "Glibness and Superficial Charm," "Manipulative and Conning [cunning?]," "Grandiose Sense of Self" and/or "Pathological Lying." Is "Interesting" referring just to Chad Evans? Or to others as well? Regarding the most serious characteristic, "Pathological Lying," what is the evidence that pathological liars can pass lie detector tests? It is true that some criminals have passed polygraph exams, e.g. Aldrich Ames, but was that due to errors by polygraphists or other reason? Chad Evans has told only one lie in this tragic 12 year old saga, the "trampoline story," which he told to about three people, plus the police during a three week period from mid-October through November 9, 2000. Such a record hardly fits the definition of pathological liar. What else does "Interesting" have in mind?

The full report of Chad's April 30, 2012 polygraph exam will be posted on this website this afternoon.

2 May 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

### Interesting...

This website summarizes some of the common features of descriptions of the behavior of sociopaths.

Glibness and Superficial Charm

Manipulative and Conning

They never recognize the rights of others and see their self-serving behaviors as permissible. They appear to be charming, yet are covertly hostile and domineering, seeing their victim as merely an instrument to be used. They may dominate and humiliate their victims.

Grandiose Sense of Self

Feels entitled to certain things as "their right."

Pathological Lying

Has no problem lying coolly and easily and it is almost impossible for them to be truthful on a consistent basis. Can create, and get caught up in, a complex belief about their own powers and abilities. Extremely convincing and even able to pass lie detector tests.

2 May 2012

Christine | 

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CpZ7FVIn2GM>

2 May 2012 - United States

Amy

Wooo-hoooo!! Congrats, Chad!! We all knew you would pass with flying colors, but it IS wonderful to share these results with the people who doubt you.....keep the faith...truth WILL prevail!!! FREE CHAD EVANS!!

1 May 2012 - southern new hampsha

Sandy

I had no doubt you'd pass! I'm sooo proud of you!

1 May 2012 - NH

Christine | 

Well, well, well.....looks like Chad passed that long awaited polygraph test that so many have been waiting for!! We believed in you all along Chad!!!

1 May 2012 - United States

Braden Reed | 

Chad I was kicking back at the fire today, having a great time then my mom told me. She told me you passed the polygraph test. I said that was awesome and couldn't stop smiling. At that moment I pictured in my mind me meeting you for the first time shaking your hand and a tear running down my cheek.

30 April 2012 - New Hampshire

Susan Bolden | 

That's fantastic, Chad. Sending you lots of love.

30 April 2012 - United States

Becky B | 

Way to go Chad!!!!  
Fighting hard everyday to bring you home!!  
My kiddos are screaming with JOY & doing a HAPPY dance!!!  
FREE CHAD!!!!

30 April 2012 - Rochester

Morrison Bonpasse | 

Today, Chad Evans was given a polygraph examination by John Healy, a retired New Hampshire State Police Lieutenant and graduate of the New England Polygraph Institute of Center Harbor (<http://www.newenglandpolygraphinstitute.com/>). I understand from John that Chad passed the exam with a "No Deception Indicated" evaluation. The full report will be coming in a day or two and I will post it on the website. John's websites are <http://www.litigationintelligence.com> and <http://www.polygraphnh.com/>.

New Hampshire uses polygraphs in many criminal investigations. State and local police must pass polygraphs as part of the employment process. A State Police person can be fired for declining to take a requested test, as happened to Officer Tracy Waterman in 2003. Polygraph examinations are given in the State Prison to evaluate sex offenders for treatment programs. In short, New Hampshire believes that polygraphs are important and useful.

Now Chad Evans has passed a polygraph examination, and New Hampshire should take this result seriously and re-investigate the death of Cassidy Bortner and the wrongful convictions of Chad and Amanda Bortner. Chad has now taken two lie detector exams: the polygraph, and the Voice Stress Analysis exam in 2010, and passed them both with "No Deception Indicated." No other person involved in the Cassidy Bortner case has taken a single lie detector test. Even though the New Hampshire State Police anticipated, in its written investigation plan, giving polygraphs to Jeff Marshall, Amanda Bortner and Jennifer Bortner Conley, those plans were apparently scrapped when Jeff Marshall declined to take his polygraph examination as scheduled on Tuesday, November 14, 2000.

Justice requires that New Hampshire fully consider the results of Chad's polygraph and VSA exams.

30 April 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

Morrison Bonpasse | 

(Chad Evans letter to Braden Reed)

Braden, April 23, 2012

How are you doing my friend? I just wanted to write you a letter and thank you for making a comment in the comment section of our website. From time to time Morrison will send me a print of the online comments. With this most recent batch, Morrison pointed out that we have- some new contributors and proudly added, "Braden's comments are the best." After I read it, I was smiling from ear to ear and had to agree.

You are an amazing young man and I am proud to have you as part of this team; speaking out for our cause. It's quite a thing to be 12 years old and already caring about the world around you. I wasn't exactly a slouch at your age and still, I was most concerned about which baseball cards I needed to complete my collection.

You are getting a valuable education on how the world works. If you have been reading the comments surrounding your letter to the Governor and your involvement in our campaign, you can see that it has evoked strong emotions on both sides of the cause. Some people are for it and others are against you being involved. Such is the case with life; often people can't agree on what is right and that is why we debate.

Some people have stooped to making nasty comments about your mom pushing you to be involved

and your letter itself. It's tough not to take those things personally when they are said about someone you love. My advice is to look at these types of comments as a victory of sorts. Often, people stray into these areas of personal attack when they don't have anything intelligent to say about the issue at hand. Often violence is committed, especially by men, when they try to respond to these attacks and "one up them."  
(continued below)

27 April 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

### Morrison Bonpasse |

(Chad letter to Braden Reed continued from above)

If you keep things professional, much the way you did in your response, the situation de-escalates. Once you allow people to "bait" you, it's hard to keep emotions out and the facts in. This is a skill that you will use throughout the rest of your life, especially if you continue to be a voice for those in need of one.

Everyone is entitled to their opinion and I'm proud of you for sharing yours.... I applaud your mom for believing in you and feeling that you are mature enough to make up your own mind and then supporting your decision.

Another part of growing up and becoming a man is taking responsibility for the mistakes you make in life. We all make mistakes and poor decisions at times. Often, these mistakes are our best teacher. It is through the error that we find a different often better way to do something.

I certainly have made my share of mistakes with Kassidy. I made mistakes before she came into my life and I've made a bunch since then. However, I've never maliciously set out to hurt anyone physically or emotionally. One of the things that I often preach to [my son] is to "think twice before you act once." It sounds easy but when you are in the moment it is tougher to do. It's just a preventative step that will help you avoid making mistakes. Often we act on impulse and this extra second of thinking slows us down enough to think about right and wrong.

As I look back over the course of my life, I can see that had I "thought twice before I acted once" more often, I

would have made fewer mistakes, saved myself a lot of regret and not hurt some of the people I love most in the world. As you get more involved in this case, I want you to feel free to ask me anything that you want to know or don't understand. I will answer anything to the best of my ability. Well, I am going to close for now. Thanks again for your help.

Sincerely,

27 April 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

### Oscar Wilde

One of the many lessons that one learns in prison is, that things are what they are and will be what they will be.

24 April 2012

### Becky B |

"The so called negative feedback is often love in disguise.  
Take full advantage!" - Unknown

"Many fear competition from others.  
But the biggest critic should be the person in the mirror." - Unknown

"Remember that everyone you meet is afraid of something,  
loves something, and has lost something." - H. Jackson Brown Jr.

24 April 2012 - Rochester, NH

### Amy

According to Elisabeth Kubler-Ross, expert psychiatrist and grief counselor, "People's grief, and

other reactions to emotional trauma, are as individual as a fingerprint."

Mr. Arnold, what makes you the resident expert on grief? Who are you to judge Chad OR Amanda on how they responded to the news of Cassidy's death?

Anyone who has lost a child knows the emotional trauma and toll it takes on a parent. Have YOU ever been in their footsteps.

If not, then stop casting judgement..

23 April 2012

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Respectfully, my statement that "people react to stress, death and tragedy in different and ambiguous ways," and Bob Arnold's statement, "All people experience the same emotions upon the death of someone close to them. The intensity of these emotions vary, depending upon how close the loved one was." sound similar to me. I would add to Bob's statement that the intensity of emotions may vary due to any and all the issues surrounding any particular circumstance. In Chad's case, he was with Cassidy only about 10 hours before he was told that she was dead. He was not told how she died. He was told by a policeman, and not by a doctor in a hospital or a relative. All these factors, and many more, played a part in how Chad reacted on November 9, 2000 during his interrogation. In this case, there are too many people who believe they know how people SHOULD react to circumstances. The best example was Kittery Detective Steve Hamel's opinion that Amanda didn't react to the news of Cassidy's death as he thought she should have. He, of course, had never been a teenage single mother whose child had died and who was not permitted by the police to see her body. See Hamel's report at <http://www.chadevanswronglyconvicted.org/documents/001109ReportWbyDetSteveHamelofAmandademeanorwhentoldofKdeath.pdf> It's not "safe to say to say that he was putting on a show," unless it's agreed that all of us "put on a show" whenever we talk with people. See the 1959 book by Erving Goffman, "The Presentation of the Self in Everyday Life," which I remember reading in college in 1966.

Regarding the jokes that Bob claims that Chad told the police during his interview, please tell us what those jokes were, and on what page of the interrogation do they appear. Regarding the alleged "lies," the only lie Chad told was the "trampoline story." Also, he minimized his relationship with Amanda, but I don't call that lying. To what other lies does Bob refer?

22 April 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,

You are incorrect sir. All people experience the same emotions upon the death of someone close to them. The intensity of these emotions vary, depending upon how close the loved one was. Judging by Chad's disposition during that interrogation, I believe it's safe to say that he was putting on a show.

Yes, he told jokes, he made wise cracks, he smiled, laughed and tried to smooze the police. One moment, he's laughing and within seconds he's pretending to cry. Yes, he did tell jokes, as well as lies and fabrications.

Regards,

Bob

22 April 2012 - Rochester

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Regarding Chad's police interrogation, people react to stress, death and tragedy in different and ambiguous ways. Laughter at some points during a three hour, 13 minute stressful interrogation doesn't indicate anything about Chad's innocence or guilt.

Claiming that Chad told jokes to the police is a surprise. I recall no indication of Chad telling the police any jokes. There were recollections of humorous incidents with Cassidy, but no unrelated jokes. What is the evidence of such a claim? [The transcript of the interrogation, with Chad's June 2010 comments, is at [www.chadevanswronglyconvicted.org/documents/001109MSPintAnnttd100714ChadEvansbyMcCleishLeClairStewart110208.pdf](http://www.chadevanswronglyconvicted.org/documents/001109MSPintAnnttd100714ChadEvansbyMcCleishLeClairStewart110208.pdf)]

21 April 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Christine,  
You might want to go back and read Dr. Greenwald's deposition:

Kassidy died of a "combination of mechanisms" which included "head injury with cerebral edema and swelling..... and some anoxic changes, loss of oxygen to the brain cells" which clearly indicated "a component of head injury".

In addition, Cassidy had "multiple fat emboli....which could have originated certainly from any or multiple injuries that were present".

Kassidy died of multiple injuries over a period of 12 hours to several weeks.

Morrison,

True, we've arrived at different opinions. However, I do believe the video taped police interview with Chad on the evening of Cassidy's death reinforces much of what I've been saying all along. I wonder how Chad was able to casually laugh and tell jokes to the police officers. Try to explain that one to me.

Regards,

Bob

20 April 2012 - Rochester

**Christine** | 

As I read Morrison's comment below, it reminded me of something. We all know that Cassidy died from a fat emboli. There are 3 causes of an emboli; 1) a burn 2) a traumatic tissue injury 3) a fracture of a long bone. Well, Cassidy DID have a fracture to the left tibia. When Amanda questioned Jeff why Cassidy was limping upon returning home from being with Jeff. Jeff claimed (even in his police statement) that "he tripped over her running for the phone". Is this the fracture that caused the fat emboli? If so, Chad was already found not guilty of this charge. Or could the fat emboli have been caused from the horrific bruise that witnesses and Jeff himself claim he left on Cassidy's bottom???

19 April 2012 - NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Correction.

Correcting what I wrote in the comment below, it was for the First Degree Assault charge for fracturing Cassidy's leg that the jury found Chad Not Guilty. The charge for allegedly fracturing her arm was dismissed by Judge Nadeau before the case went to the jury. She said on December 17, 2001, "Considering the evidence in the light most favorable to the State, I cannot find that there is sufficient evidence for a rational juror to conclude, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the defendant fractured Cassidy's arm." (Page 17 of transcript. Page 492 of EYE CONTACT.)

19 April 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

Reaffirming what has been written before, reasonable comments are welcome from everyone, including those who believe that Chad Evans assaulted and murdered Cassidy Bortner. It's remarkable, is it not, that Bob states, after more than a year of posting comments, that he believes, "without a doubt, that Chad is guilty." I've been working on this case for 30 months and I believe that without a doubt, Chad did NOT murder Cassidy Bortner. It's amazing that two reasonable people can look at the same set of facts and not only differ as a matter of degree, but differ at entirely opposite ends of the belief/disbelief continuum. Someday, we'll will hopefully determine, within reason, who is right.

I believe that Chad's "grabbing and squeezing" Cassidy's face to obtain eye contact was not a crime as he was acting in loco parentis, with Amanda's permission, and he had no criminal intent. Chad's role in the argument he had with Amanda on the night of November 8 should not have been prosecuted as a crime. It was only charged in order to support the otherwise baseless allegation that Chad was angry that night.

If Bob had been on Chad's jury, would he have joined the others in finding Chad NOT GUILTY of the remaining First Degree Assault charge for allegedly fracturing Cassidy's arm? Would he have found Chad NOT GUILTY for one of the six Second Degree Assault charges for "grabbing and squeezing" Cassidy's face during the period of October 1-7?

Let's focus on the murder charge for which Chad was found guilty.

When does Bob think Chad hit Cassidy with the blows that subsequently killed her? No physical evidence of any such assault was found in Chad's car or in his home.

What is the evidence that Chad "grabbed and squeezed" Cassidy's face and caused bruises during the month of September, and during the periods of October 8-14, 15-21, 22-31 and the month of November? (Amanda testified that such "eye contact" holding caused bruises 1 or 2 times, but there was no determination during the trial of when.)

Guilt "without a doubt?" I doubt it.

*19 April 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

Bob Arnold | 

Becky:

It's nice to see you posting quotes again, but I'd rather have debate than read one-sided dialogue.

Sarah:

Your entire comment was an emotionally-charged, well thought-out, completely unorganized piece of garbage. I come here to have spirited debate, and all I get from you is an order to get off this website. You might want to check with Morrison before you issue such orders, it undermines the very reason for having this comments section.

Christine,

I have to back you 100%. I find it offensive that an adult would berate a 12 year old. Now, as far as your comment concerning the actions of the CEWCC being dissected, it comes with the territory. It also serves it's purpose as a means of revealing the true intellect of it's members. A true, professional organization would respond to criticism with coherent, well structured responses (please see all of Morrison's responses to my comments). It would also stick to the facts of the case, and avoid attempts to mislead people who happen upon any of its web-based material. Besides, if you can't compete with my criticism, how can you expect to debate someone on the street?

There are two sides to this case, and I would hope that those who believe in Chad Evans guilt would be welcomed here. The CEWCC should be honored and delighted to have all guests to this website, regardless of what they think. Unfortunately that is not the case.

I would strongly suggest that all members of the CEWCC consult with Morrison before you try to chase anyone else away.

In closing, I'd like to say that I do believe, without a doubt, that Chad is guilty.

Best Regards,

Bob

18 April 2012 - Rochester

**Becky B** | 

"If you can't be criticized for it, it's probably not remarkable.  
Are you devoting yourself to something devoid of criticism?"  
- Unknown

~~~~~

"Nothing is impossible, the word itself says 'I'm possible!'"  
-Audrey Hepburn

FREE CHAD!!!!!!

18 April 2012 - Rochester, NH

**Sarah**

I was there the day Braden came home from school and received the letter from Governor Lynch. He was so upset at the results but you could tell he wasn't going to give up. I saw the passion in his eyes. He didn't write that letter at his mother's will he did it on his own. I didn't even know what was going on at this point, which now I am fully on board with freeing Chad. Braden may be 12 years old but he acts more mature than most adults do. All kids have to do now a day is go online and they can find anything and everything. All they need is something to spark their interest and don't you think that happened when the case was all over TV? So for those who say he is being used by his mother for this cause need to go somewhere else with those comments because they are hitting a brick wall here. We will not lower ourselves to give you the attention you so desperately need. I just have one question for you. If children are backing this cause than don't you think that's saying something for Chad's innocents?

18 April 2012

**Braden**

Dear Haters,  
From the first time I talked to Chad on the phone, I knew he was a nice guy. So I told Morrison I wanted to get involved. I wrote a letter the next week and sent it out to some people. My mom asked me if I was sure and I said yes I want to. That letter was my choice. So wasn't my second one were when I got home I did my homework then I took 1 hour to write my second one. My mom asked me if I wanted To AND I DID. What I'm trying to say is the LETTERS WERE MY CHOICE. I love my mom she is caring and smart. Maybe if you talked to my mom she can explain why chad didn't do it and the possible reasons of kassidy's death.

18 April 2012 - NH

**Christine** | 

I think Braden acts more like an adult than all of you on here. Why is it that EVERY LITTLE thing that the CEWCC does is dissected? It was Braden's choice to get involved. All it takes is a little reading, which he is more than capable of doing. He IS an honor roll student. It was also Braden's choice to write a letter to see if he could make a difference. That's the kind of person he is. For those that don't know who Braden is why don't you grow up, start acting like adults and stop talking smack about a 12 yr old that is just trying to make a difference in this world. Maybe if you people dissected this case the way you have Braden's letter, you would be able to see the truth too. I find it disgusting that adults would actually comment here, under an alias mind you, and bash a child for his penmanship and grammar.....are you kidding me??

**Bob Arnold** | 

Let's not criticize his penmanship, this goes over the top. I never intended to berate CG's son and I don't agree with any criticism directed at him. My efforts had more to do with allowing a 12 year old access to the details of this case, as well as having him write a letter and posting that letter here at this website, which I believe is usury at a reckless level.

Becky, as far as "meeting" you at the Rochester Bands concert, I wouldn't characterize it as such. I'm not sure what that was, but I can assure you that I knew it was you after I said hi back. Just to let you know, I would have said hi first, and it was good seeing you there. I think we can both agree that it was a great concert, and our kids made us proud.

Regards,

Bob

17 April 2012 - Rochester

**Despicable**

The committee is despicable for using a 12-year old to seek attention in this useless effort to free a child killer.

Better yet, the mother is despicable for putting her kid in a position to be criticized.

Clowns.

17 April 2012

**Lisa**

I find it despicable to call a toddler 'retarded' and a 'bitch.'

17 April 2012 - Logan UT

**Amy**

Dear Grammar:

I find it despicable that you are taunting a twelve-year old. You may not appreciate his opinion, however that doesn't make it okay for you to disparage his efforts. Shame on you.

17 April 2012 - Southern New Hampshire

**Becky B** | 

Dear Grammar & Penmanship:

If you would use your real name, I might be able to address your concerns more seriously!

Thank you!

17 April 2012 - Rochester, NH

**Grammar and Penmanship**

Braden needs to work on both if he is to be taken seriously. My 6 year old writes better than him.

If he wants to act like a big boy and join the cause, he better pull on his big boy pants. That includes the ability to take criticism.

You really want him to be exposed to that type of stuff?

**Becky B** | 

No one is using children here, Bob.  
 Braden is a very intelligent 12yr old!  
 No one asked him to write the letter, he sat down & wrote that letter himself.  
 As for the section  
 Students Write About Chad this has been part of this website from the beginning, before Christine became a dedicated, loyal & very important committee member. She's one in a million, & she's absolutely amazing!!!  
 Maybe you should get to know us before you cast judgement on us!!  
 I know my 4 children know a lot about this case & not because I forced fed them it either.  
 My 11yr old begged me to let her read EYE CONTACT.  
 So if you want to put me on the chopping block and judge me like you've judged Christine, go ahead.  
 You only encourage us to work harder.  
 I really should have asked you for a tissue a few Saturdays ago...  
 I couldn't help but get emotional when the chorus sang "Lean On Me"  
 Nice meeting you by the way =)

17 April 2012 - Rochester, NH

**Bob Arnold** | 

Hmm. I suppose Chad has a lot of explanations. I'm a father of two girls, and not once have they ever had the bruising and injuries that Cassidy had. Never. Chad's current explanations have no merit. He had every opportunity to work with the police, and he refused. He had every opportunity to keep in touch with the police and show interest in their investigation. He refused. He had the opportunity to stay out of trouble and adhere to his bail conditions, and he refused. He had the opportunity to testify at his own trial, and he elected not to. Are we to believe that Chad Evans did all these things by accident? Or were they well thought out, deliberate and intentional?

Least we not forget the night of the 9th, when Chad had the opportunity to be honest with the police. Was he honest? No. He lied, one lie after another, this is why the police zeroed in on him, there is no point in trying to explain away his lies with confrontation because the police, the AG and the jury all came to the same conclusion: Chad was and extremely deceitful person.

Please save the explanations for the "trampoline story" because it happened. A lie to explain severe bruising to little Cassidy's face.

Regards,

Bob

16 April 2012 - Rochester

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Regarding the "trampoline story," Chad was embarrassed by the bruising to Cassidy's cheeks by his holding them to obtain eye contact. At the time, he and Amanda thought the "trampoline story" was a better explanation. In retrospect, of course, that "white lie" played a large role in the investigation, trial and conviction of Chad and Amanda. It was a mistake with huge unintended consequences. Chad was not responsible for any bruising to Cassidy's face except for the eye contact bruises in October. He was also not responsible for the bruises in the same place on Cassidy's cheeks which he and Jeremy Hinton saw on Cassidy on Tuesday afternoon, October 24, after Cassidy had spent much of the day with Jeff Marshall. At Chad's trial, Amanda recalled 1-2 such bruises, and Chad recalls 3-4, but no new such bruising in November.

On the morning of November 9, Chad and Amanda were aware of, and thought they understood the source of several bruises: from the kitten, from hitting the coffee table, and from the Tee-ball. Chad had also observed the night before a sore inside Cassidy's lower lip, the source of which he did not

know.

There is no contradiction and no lie between Chad's telling Tristan, Jeff and Amanda on Wednesday night that Kassidy was hit with a "ball," and his telling police the next day that the "ball" was a "starter baseball" or a "hard rubber ball." Chad never told anyone that it was a wiffle ball. Below is Chad's most recent recollection of the aftermath of the ball accident, from his "Letters from New Hampshire Prison."  
(See posting below.)

15 April 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

(Chad's recollection of the aftermath of the ball accident, from his November 4, 2011 letter to me.)  
"The area immediately got a little red so I set her on the counter by the sink and I believe I grabbed one of the small cloth towels that we have in the kitchen and put a few ice cubes in it. I held that to Kassidy's eye. This is when she actually started to cry. She wanted no part of that cloth. I tried reassuring her that the ice would make her feel better, but she wasn't interested so I stopped. Probably 30 minutes later she was in the bath and the redness had really started to come in. I seem to recall at least first, you could see little lines where the stitches in the baseball were on the underside of the eye. I don't know if this will make any sense or not but it seemed like I was making a bigger deal about the incident than Kassidy was. It was over in seconds. She never cried (until I tried to apply ice.) She just kind of went "ugggh" when the ball hit her. The only thing that made me think the hit was serious at all was the way her eyeballs kind of "fluttered" up. Then I tried to call mom, and later spoke to Tristan. She had a calming effect on me. Then I thought about Amanda stating that Kassidy did that very same thing with the eyes a week or so earlier when Jeff brought her home after falling out of the truck. It seems stupid now, but I wasn't sure if it was just something she did."

15 April 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

We can agree to disagree about including children in the CEWCC crusade to free Chad. However, the use of children to garner support for Chad is shameful. I stress the word USE. You are using children, end of story.

The wiffle/starter/T/baseball issue is a mess that Chad created himself. Chad used multiple descriptions of this alleged ball, namely his telephone conversations with Jeff and Amanda on the evening of the 8th. A lie manifests itself when the teller is not able to keep their story straight, and this is exactly what happened with Chad.

The "trampoline story" is further evidence that Chad lied to friends, family and the police to explain away the severe bruising he inflicted to Kassidy's face. If he didn't cause repeated injuries to Kassidy, then why make up stories?

14 April 2012 - Rochester

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Where do the supporters of Chad Evans draw moral and ethical lines? Well, one such line is that innocent people should not be convicted and sent to prison for 43 years to life. Another line is that anyone who can write and think can express an opinion on this site about justice and about the Chad Evans case. Why should age make a difference? The question of whether this Campaign for Justice for Chad is an "effort to free a convicted murderer" or whether it is an effort to correct an injustice and free a wrongly convicted man, is, of course, the central question.

Regarding the ball that hit Kassidy on the evening of November 8, Chad told the police during his interview that it was a "starter baseball" and "hard rubber ball." The balls in the collection that fit that description are called Tee-balls. Later references to the type of ball were mixed up because, the Tee-ball was amidst a collection of wiffle balls in Kyle's room, and assumptions were made about the type of ball that was involved.

Yes, Kassidy did play on the trampoline, usually with Kyle and other times Amanda. Chad

purchased the trampoline for family fun, and it continues to be used at his parents' home in Keene. There was no guard fencing around it in 2000, but there is now. Once, when Chad was jumping with Cassidy, she almost fell off, and Chad caught her. That was the source of the "trampoline story," but the part that wasn't true was that Chad didn't catch her by her face on that occasion. The story was used, unnecessarily in my view, to explain the bruises Chad caused 1-2 times, according to Amanda's testimony, by holding Cassidy's face when securing eye contact.

11 April 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

The "student write about Chad Evans" section is not only sickening and pathetic, it reveals a lot about the CEWCC. So where do you draw your moral and ethical line? Apparently, the CEWCC has no moral or ethical boundaries so it's ok to include children in their efforts to free a convicted child murderer.

Dear What?, did you get a chance to look at the heart-felt youtube video about Chad? That video was made by the same parent in question. By the way, Chad never took a polygraph, as the video claims. You can draw your own conclusions.

11 April 2012 - Rochester

**Bob Arnold** | 

Wait a minute, I thought it was a wiffle ball....wait, maybe a baseball? I can't get it straight.

Speaking of playfull activities, you forgot to mention the trampoline. Like the time Chad reached out like Spiderman and saved Cassidy from falling off. Oh, wait a minute, that's right, that was a made-up story to explain her facial injuries. Hummmm....I'm stumped. I'm trying to come up with a joyful time while Cassidy was in Chad's control, you know I can't think of a thing. All I come up with is assaults, name calling, him laughing at her and calling her stupid, throwing her around and of course grabbing her little face so he could establish "eye contact" with her.

I believe I can sum Chad Evans up with two words: Control freak. Make that three words: Abusive control freak.

11 April 2012 - Rochester

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Thanks, "What?" for the segue back to the substance of the Chad Evans case, which is about a wrongly convicted man who has been unjustly removed from his family and son. It's ironic, is it not, that the parenting activities you mentioned played a part in this case. The photo on the upper left of each page of this website is of Chad and his son, Kyle, at a Rochester park where they went on June 10, 2000 to watch Chad's stepson's play baseball. The second photo from the left is a photo Chad took of Kyle, Cassidy and Amanda at York's Wild Animal Kingdom on June 22, 2000. Chad loved to throw a ball to his son and stepson for batting practice. We have several photos of such fun at Chad's home. Tragically, on the evening of November 8, 2000, a T-ball was in the collection of balls thrown to Chad's son, and he hit it back into Cassidy's face. Whether that accident had anything to do with Cassidy's death the following day is part of the mystery of her death. Regarding ice cream, some of Chad's fondest memories of Cassidy are of walking with her, Amanda and Kyle to Lone Oak Ice Cream on the Milton Road in Rochester for a treat. The only activity on "What?'s" list that Chad was not able to enjoy with his son was to go with a movie. Chad has been in prison during the time Kyle became old enough to go to movies.

10 April 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**What?**

I want to completely disagree with the involvement of a child writing a letter on behalf of a mothers interest in a murder case. Time better spent with a child might be taking them to a park, throwing a ball, swinging, icecream, or a movie.

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

The relation of Chad's case to the O'Shell's is that the special tragedy of a child's decline or death can be compounded when incorrect conclusions are drawn from the symptoms of ill health or death. For the O'Shell's, they were charged with abusing their daughter and causing 11 fractures, and they were devastated. The father killed the mother and then killed himself. Chad was charged with abusing and murdering Cassidy and he was wrongly convicted of both.

What was Chad thinking about Amanda when he was with her in 2001? They were in love, and they were struggling with Cassidy's death and Chad's upcoming trial, in which he was confident he would be acquitted. It was a very difficult time for both of them. He always told Amanda to tell the truth at the trial, just as he told his other friends and relatives who expected to testify. For his own words on this subject, see his letters of January 20, 2010, March 16, 2010, May 27, 2010, and April 12, 2011, among others, in "Letters from New Hampshire Prison." The letters are on the website as Key Document #11 on the Home Page, and available from Amazon.com. (Search for EYE CONTACT Evans, or EYE CONTACT Cassidy, etc. )

7 April 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

I don't see any relation between the O'Shell case and the Evans case. Based on everything I've read about Chad and Amanda, and judging by their actions after the death of Cassidy, it appears that Chad is guilty. As far as the police jumping the gun and determining homicide, well the evidence is there too see why they did what they did.

I'd like to know what Chad was thinking when he spent as much time as he could with the state's star witness. Grooming her testimony and influencing her thoughts. It's sad that someone would stoop to that level, but here it is in black-and-white, all you need to do is read through the police and court documents.

As far as the youtube video blunder being duly noted here, I'd like to know why the link to that video is still made available. I'd also like to know why CG deleted my comments on that video, as well as blocking me from making any further comments in regards to its accuracy. Her "search for the truth" includes misleading people with fabricated facts and word games, blocking people who don't agree with her from their input and refusing to answer to her actions by hiding.

6 April 2012 - Rochester

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

The ABC News story about the triple tragic O'Shell case, including the murder/suicide of the parents who were accused of child abuse, is at <http://abcnews.go.com/Health/false-child-abuse-charges-trigger-murder-suicide-colorado/story?id=16074344>. All cases are different, but it IS interesting, nonetheless. Thanks for letting us know about the case.

Initial x-rays showed 11 broken bones in 3-month-old Alyssa O'Shell's body and the doctors and police first believed the cause to be child abuse.

On the day that the distraught Dave O'Shell, a police officer, killed his wife, also a police officer, and then himself, doctors determined that the cause of Alyssa's fractures was Spinal Muscular Atrophy. The deaths occurred before they learned of the real cause of their daughter's plight. Alyssa died of that disease four months after the deaths of her parents.

In Cassidy's case, the doctors and police were very quick to determine homicide and the result was the quick decision to charge one of the two men in her close circle. Believing the medical and police theory of homicide, the defense attorneys then blamed the babysitter. Neither side sufficiently explored other possible causes of Cassidy's bruises, injuries and death.

6 April 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**SMA Story**

Interesting article on Yahoo News today about the O'Shells story with Spinal Muscular Atrophy.

While I don't think it fits this case, I found it interesting nonetheless.

6 April 2012

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Typos happen.

5 April 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

I've rekeyed Braden Reed's letter to Governor Lynch, so that viewers can read it more easily. It's on the "Students Write about Chad Evans" page of this website at

[http://www.chadevanswronglyconvicted.org/students\\_write.html](http://www.chadevanswronglyconvicted.org/students_write.html). As for his ability to write the Governor, Braden stated, "I'm twelve and I'm old enough to know what's going on here."

Regarding his mother's posting of a video show about the case on YouTube, the only clear inaccuracy comes when it says, after stating that Chad took a voice stress lie detector test, that he passed the polygraph. The word "the" implies that the video refers to the voice stress test. The words "lie detector test" should have been used rather than "polygraph." That relatively minor error has been acknowledged here before, and it's now acknowledged here again. Errors in the book, EYE CONTACT have also been acknowledged and corrections noted on this website, and the circulated copies do not need to be recalled.

I visited with Chad today, together with his loyal and loving father, Chet. Chad hurt his ankle in a basketball game and has to continue wearing a brace for another six weeks.

5 April 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,

OMG I'm laughing so hard right now, I gotta share this with you. I'm in tears laughing at this.....I just read a Winston Churchill quote on the Facebook page posted by CG..."A lie gets halfway around the world before the truth has a chance to put its pants on."

How ironic, CG posts a sham youtube video that lies about polygraph, then she parades around with this quote.

I gotta feel for you Morrison, not only do you have to deal with state reps, attorneys, prison officials, etc etc....but you have to deal with nonsense in your own committee. It would be nice if committee members took initiative and made corrections where needed. It's too bad that's not the case.

My condolences.

Regards,

Bob

5 April 2012 - Rochester

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,

I don't know how you can compare Samantha Smith's letter to what we're talking about here.

There's a big difference between a kid writing a letter to a world leader, and a kid being educated about a child murder/murderer.

No, I can't let the youtube video thing go, because it's the principle of the matter. This website claims it is "dedicated to truth", however there are links in bright blue letters that will take visitors to

a sham youtube video created by someone who claims to have vast knowledge about this case. This same person has made a similar claim here, and when I challenged her, she went into hiding. It's one thing if this person was just an occasional visitor here, it's quite another if it's an actual CEWC Committee member. Let's think about that for a moment, an actual committee member. Hmmm. I gotta wonder about all of you. You preach about truth and justice, and turn a blind eye to your own actions.

As far as the morning of the 9th, the fictional account of Chad Evans is embellished to an extreme level that I find unnecessary, but you find useful in gaining more support from those who don't know anybetter.

Regards,

Bob

*5 April 2012 - Rochester*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

The other "small world" connection of the Chad Evans case to Samantha Smith is that the Auburn, Maine airport where her plane crashed is a few miles from the Martindale Country Club where, five years later, in 2000, Amanda Bortner worked. It's also only a few miles from the home where she lived with her mother and stepfather and with Cassidy. Amanda met Chad on Friday, June 2, and brought Cassidy to Rochester to meet Chad on Friday, June 9.

*4 April 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

"Getting children involved in a murder case," does not sound nearly as good as getting children involved in justice, or resolving injustice. Children have a good sense of what is fair and moral. There is nothing wrong with encouraging children to care about justice.

I'm reminded of 10-year old Samantha Smith of Maine, who in November 1982 wrote a letter to Soviet leader, Yuri Andropov, which said, "Dear Mr. Andropov,

My name is Samantha Smith. I am ten years old. Congratulations on your new job. I have been worrying about Russia and the United States getting into a nuclear war. Are you going to vote to have a war or not? If you aren't please tell me how you are going to help to not have a war. This question you do not have to answer, but I would like to know why you want to conquer the world or at least our country. God made the world for us to live together in peace and not to fight.

Sincerely,  
Samantha Smith"

Eventually, he responded and invited her to the Soviet Union for a visit. She was not able to meet with him because of his illness, of which he later died, but she became known around the world as "America's Youngest Ambassador." She traveled to Japan and met with the Japanese Prime Minister. Tragically, she and her father died in 1985 in a plane crash in Auburn, Maine. Mikhail Gorbachev and President Ronald Reagan sent condolences to Samantha's mother.

My "small world" connection is that Samantha's mother was in my sister's class in college. A summary of Samantha's story is at Wikipedia at [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Samantha\\_Smith](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Samantha_Smith). Regarding the other points in your April 3, posting, can we let the YouTube video go for now? The account of the morning of November 9 in EYE CONTACT (see pages 12-14) is accurate as far as I know. It's consistent with Amanda's testimony at Chad's trial. Finally, what "new evidence" or what claim of "new evidence" are you referencing? There is no question that a lot of information in this case has been found that the jury did not know and some information that Chad's attorneys and even the prosecution did not know.

Morrison

*4 April 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,

I beg to differ with your opinion. Getting children involved in a murder case, I believe, is immoral and unethical. Not to mention the fact that the victim was a child. I find it hard to believe that a parent would involve their child in such an endeavor. Furthermore, children of that age may appear to be opinionated and able to draw conclusions, however those opinions and conclusions are heavily influenced by an adult.

As far as the video, well here we go again. I suppose I can equate this to turning a blind eye. Hey, if it drums up support, so what. The video itself contradicts everything this committee claims it represents: Seeking truth. What a sham.

Smoke and mirrors, well I'll stop beating the dead horse-video thing and move on to the fictional account of the morning of November 8th, as described in EC. There's also the touchy-feely-geeky-loving father portrayal of Evans. I'd also like to point out the previous claim of "new evidence" which wasn't new afterall.

Regards,

Bob

*3 April 2012 - Rochester*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Dear "Keene Resident,"

Sure. I'm eager to ask Chad about any aspect of his work as a young McDonald's supervisor and manager, who was quickly promoted by his company. However, please provide more details than simply referencing an "incident in the Keene McDonald's in the freezer." I've never heard of any incident involving Chad and the freezer at the Keene McDonald's. As you can see from Chad's "Letters from New Hampshire prison," which will soon be published in two volumes on [www.amazon.com](http://www.amazon.com), Chad has provided considerable detail about his life and this case. I cannot think of another claimant of wrongful conviction who has laid open as much of his or her life for all to see, as Chad has done these past two years.

I assume you wrote about the period that Chad was working at the Keene McDonald's right? He was promoted to Rochester in September, 1992, at the age of 20. That was eight years before Cassidy Bortner's death. Eight years. It was before he was married, and became a stepfather, and before he became a father. Without more details, it hardly seems useful to ask Chad for HIS recollections of an alleged incident that you present anonymously.

Please consider accepting Bob Arnold's offer and tell him the details about the incident that you recall. Perhaps Bob can then present details of the incident. If presenting details might compromise your anonymity, then Bob can figure out a way around that. Either that, or he can recommend that if the alleged incident involves you personally, that you have the courage to step forward and identify yourself and tell readers here what was involved that you felt was sufficiently relevant to mention.

Morrison

*1 April 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Keene Resident,

Please drop me a line at [bobarnold45@yahoo.com](mailto:bobarnold45@yahoo.com). All communication will be kept confidential.

Regards,

Bob

*1 April 2012 - Rochester*

**Keene Resident**

I don't believe that Chad is innocent! Mr Bonpasse please ask Chad about the incident in the Keene McDonalds in the freezer? Please post his recollection of the event here. Chad is a self-centered person who viewed himself higher then all other human being. Chad is where he belongs as I do think he had the ability to hurt that child. His ex-wife doesn't appear to be a liar and she made claims of his abuse.

1 April 2012

**Christine** | 

Dear Confused, my 12 year old is not ushered outside to play while I am working on this case for hours and hours. He is an honor roll student that happens to have a heart and is concerned about the flaws of our justice system! But thanks for your concern.....

29 March 2012 - United States

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

You're excused to puke. There's a lot in this case that could make me sick, too. For starters, an innocent man has been imprisoned for eleven years for something he didn't do. That should make everyone in the "Live Free or Die" state of New Hampshire sick. Let's work to find a remedy, i.e. a re-investigation or retrial or both.

What is the problem with presenting what young people have written about this case? There are only two, so far, and I've met them both. If you know of a young person who would like to submit something for this section of the website, please have him or her send it to me. With their youthful idealism, children can bring a different perspective to life and to this case.

Regarding "smoke and mirrors," your complaint about the YouTube video's reference to "polygraph" when it should have said "lie detector" has been presented here on this website and noted. The major point is that Chad Evans has volunteered to take an available lie detector test. He took a "voice stress analysis" test because it was immediately available to him in 2010, and he passed it with "no deception indicated." No other person in this case has taken any kind of a lie detector test. What other "smoke" and what other "mirrors" are you referencing?

Morrison

29 March 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,

Excuse me while I puke. The "Students Write" section is over the top. Then again, here is another example of how the CEWCC hurts itself by it's own actions. By all means, go ahead and post more letters from children. It will further undermine the efforts of this committee.

As far as CG's video which is still available for viewing via her Twitter link at this site's homepage...it's still available on youtube. I do not believe Christine and her claims of a "computer crash." I do agree that she's done a lot of good work for this committee, which includes undermining you and your efforts.

At what point does one conclude, based on the evidence presented, that a hard decision must be made in regards to her Twitter link? Of course I love to see that link, because I think Chad is guilty anyway. This just supports what I've said all along, that CEWCC members use smoke and mirrors to get people to sign their petition.

Regards,

Bob

28 March 2012 - Rochester

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

What's more sad is a presumed adult who posts anonymous character attacks on others, rather than addressing the merits of a very serious criminal justice case. Comments about the Cassidy Bortner/Chad Evans case are welcome here. Attacks on contributors are not.

28 March 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

### Confused

Not sure which is more sad...A 12-year old getting pulled into this case and being used as some kind of pawn to garner attention or the fact that his mother makes him go outside and play while she hunkers down on the web for hours upon hours upon hours "researching" this case.

Tough one.

Gotta go with the latter.

28 March 2012

### Braden Reed |

Thank You Amy, I'm Just Trying To Get The Truth Told And Chad Set Free.

20 March 2012

### Amy

WAY TO GO BRADEN! It's wonderful to see your enthusiasm for justice. What a bright and caring person you are! Be proud of yourself!

19 March 2012 - southern new hampshire

### Morrison Bonpasse |

Bob,

I understand from Christine that she no longer has the ability to modify her video because it was lost in the crash of her computer last fall. Presumably, it can be removed somehow, but I don't recommend that step. It's a thoughtful look at Chad and the case, but it's tough to compress a big case into a little video. The error about the statement of Chad passing a polygraph, rather than stating that he passed the VSA test, is an error to be sure, but it doesn't justify tossing the entire thing. I have acknowledged the error here on Chad's "official" website in these "online comments." If an error is identified in the book EYE CONTACT, I'll correct it here on the website, and in future editions; but I wouldn't expect to ask for all previously distributed copies to be returned to me. Regarding Christine, Chad much appreciates all the volunteers who are helping him. She has done some very good work and continues to be very helpful. I wish we had a thousand "Christine's," or even a hundred or ten! Recently, her 12-year old son, Braden Reed, wrote a wonderful letter about Chad to Governor Lynch and I'll be posting it soon.

Regards,

19 March 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

### Bob Arnold |

Morrison,

I beg to differ. VSA is junk science. The entire VSA industry is under a lot of fire from all directions, including lawsuits they are losing, the Dept. of Defense, the FBI and all of the unsuspecting law enforcement agencies that have bought into their claims.

As far as CG's video, as of the time of this communication it has not been corrected. Furthermore, the link to both of her Twitter feeds on the Homepage of this very website are still available. Although there has not been any activity on either of her Twitter feeds in the past thirty days, there are multiple links to this youtube video made available to anyone who clicks on these links.

What kind of show are you putting on here Morrison? I mean, you've devoted not one but two links

to CG's Twitter feeds on the main page of this website, in BOLD letters, at the top of the page. This goes against the very principles that this website claims it's purpose is...to find the truth. You see, when people see crap like this, you loose potential supporters as well as credibilty.

You never answered my question, what do I have to do, join the committee to remove her? Sure, I think Chad's guilty, but I'd like to play on a level playing field and CG doesn't.

I STRONGLY recommend the immediate removal of CG from this committee, as well as links to her frivoulous Twitter links, and any other links that would take an unsuspecting visitor to a site that she's created. Furthermore, if she's a bonefide member of this committee, where is she? I see no remarks from her concerning this matter, which I find extremely troubling. Perhaps she is taking a page from the Chad Evans defense playbook: Run and hide?????

This is not going to go away. Members of the CEWCC (other than Morrison) I highly recommend you get your acts together. You have a responsibilty, since pledging yourself to this office, to act in a more professional manner. You are failing. You are failing, and your committee is failing because of you.

Regards,

Bob

*18 March 2012 - Rochester*

#### Morrison Bonpasse |

I posted today on "Latest News" a 14 page "work memoir" by Chad, and recommend it to viewers of this website. It came to my attention when I read a letter last week by Chad to Mr. Brien, and I wrote to Chad to ask about Mr. Brien and the referenced "memoir."

He responded as is presented below in his letter 414 of March 8.  
(Chad's comments are below.)

*16 March 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

#### Morrison Bonpasse |

(from Chad letter of March 8, 2012 to me)

"You asked about Mike Brien. Mr. Brien was an employee of Family Connections Center (FCC) that lost his job when FCC lost part of the federal grant they were working under. FCC operates within the prison to try and keep families close during incarceration. In addition to working here, I believe Mr. Brien has also been a college professor that teaches creative writing. He ran a three week seminar about creative writing for us here during October of 2011. The topic he chose for us to write about was a memoir about our work history.

When we shared our first draft during the second week of writing, Mr. Brien was struck how this memoir might be an incredible gift for the friends and family I mention in the story. At first I balked at the idea but as I began to "flesh" it out, I could see where he was coming from. I had no intentions of sharing it with Peter, Sal, Jeremy, Dan, etc. as Mr. Brien suggested but I thought it would be nice to give to Kyle and my dad for Christmas. My dad, because much of my work history involves him and Kyle because it provides a lot of information about my life, lessons I've learned, etc. I can't give Kyle as much as I want in life but I know I would have loved reading a piece like this by my dad. Mr. Brien showed such an interest in the piece and inspired me to keep writing that I thought he might like to read it when it was complete so I sent it to him several months ago. Thus, the response I received back from him on the subject and the letter that you saw.

I didn't share the piece with you because it was written mainly with my dad in mind but since he was fine with it, I am including a copy. It's not that there is anything that I believe is that personal in it (hell, my entire life has been filleted open) It's more that when I do something for someone I love, or try to explain something, my motives are always questioned as if I am incapable of genuine efforts and feelings."

*16 March 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,  
I watched the video/slide show and there is a screen which states that Chad took a lie detector, "VSA". The NEXT screen says that he passed "THE polygraph test," (emphasis added here) which implies that it was the voice stress test that was passed as it uses the adjective "the." Still, a polygraph, though often used interchangeably for the term, "lie detector test," is not a voice stress analysis test. I've asked Christine to modify the "polygraph test" screen.

Regards,  
Morrison

*15 March 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,  
I agree, however defending CG's actions in this regard is a monumental task. I say this because here we have a committee member who has spent (as she claims) over 2000 hours researching this case. How is it that someone with that amount of knowledge can make such a silly blunder?

I've not spent nearly that amount of time researching the case, however I can attest to the extent of my research, which has included branching out to topics such as VSA's, polygraphs, lead poisoning, time-elapsed trauma, etc etc. Perhaps CG can explain to all of us why this video is still readily available on youtube.com? (please see the video for yourself: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CpZ7FVIn2GM>) . No changes have been made to the video. Judging by her ability to instantly delete my comments to this video, I can only assume that she has intentionally left the video as-is. Here is an example of how the CEWCC undermines itself by it's own actions. Not to mention the fact that the link to this video is made available by a link at the home page of this very website.

Regards,

Bob

*13 March 2012 - Rochester*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,  
I wish we had more videos, too. As I've said before, if we had a video of Cassidy when she was with Chad at Chad's sister's home on Sunday, November 5, 2000, this case would have turned out very differently. Even still photos would have made a big difference. Regarding Christine's error about calling a voice stress analysis test a polygraph test, I wouldn't jump to the conclusion that it was "intentionally inaccurate." Why not give her the benefit of the doubt? Putting something "intentionally inaccurate" on the internet where everyone can see it is not a good strategy. When I first saw the video with that inaccuracy, I pointed it out to Christine and assumed that it had been fixed. I don't know how many people later saw the original version, or how many caught the error. In any case, he DID pass a voice stress analysis test, and for many people (though I realize, not you and many others) that's as good a result as passing a polygraph.

Regards,  
Morrison

*13 March 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,  
Thank you. I just want you to know, I don't have issue with youtube videos of Chad, and frankly I'd like to see more. The issue I had was the statement that was made in that video, which was intentionally inaccurate. Things like this do more harm than good and it stains the reputation of this

committee.

Regards,

Bob

13 March 2012 - Rochester

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Can we move forward instead of focusing on the slings and arrows of the past? Several people have written items, and made statements, in the past that might not be written today.

There is considerable evidence that Chad was, and is, a loving nurturing father. In her "My Life Story," Amanda said that was part of what attracted her to him. (EYE CONTACT, page 26.)

Evidence would have been introduced about his fathering love and skills but Judge Nadeau ruled that such evidence was irrelevant. She did, however, permit Chad's attorneys to introduce evidence of Chad's parenting with Cassidy, but his attorneys made little effort to present such evidence.

Below is what I wrote in EYE CONTACT on that subject of parenting skills at the trial.

Regarding the claim of passing a polygraph, I've been assured that Christine's YouTube video no longer makes that claim. Older versions may still be on the internet, but the current version doesn't have that claim.

Regards,

EYE CONTACT, pages 364-365 re: Chad's parenting as presented and not presented to court.

"State Motion to exclude evidence regarding Chad Evans's character with other children.

Even though it is intuitively obvious to citizens that one's treatment of one child is relevant, even if not dispositive, to how one treats other children, Brown argued that Chad's treatment of his son and stepson should not be presented to the jury. He argued that under the Rules of

Evidence, they were not relevant. Alan Cronheim responded that "it's not our intent... to introduce single events to show good character. It is, I think, the circumstance in the case that the flavor of Chad's parenting with Kyle is going to come out as a necessary element and a relevant element to Tristan's testimony." (p. 57)

(continued below)

12 March 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

(continued from above)

This was an important issue, as there were many witnesses waiting to testify that Chad was a wonderful father. In the real world, away from the Rules of Evidence, wonderful fathers do not abuse other children, and at the very least, such conduct should be considered during a trial of charges of assault against and murder of a child.

That's precisely the question that Judge Nadeau asked Alan Cronheim, "And how is it relevant to say because I was a good parent before, then I couldn't have committed this crime?"

(p. 58) and Alan Cronheim responded, "I think it that he's experienced. He understands - - I mean, a possibility would be that he has experience with kids." (p. 58)

Except for Chad's case, I cannot think of a single instance where a wonderful father has been convicted of assaulting and murdering a child in the manner charged in this case. Excluding this information about Chad deprived his jury of a fair opportunity to evaluate the charges against him.

Alan Cronheim did state that Chad's "parenting is a pertinent character trait. But beyond that, I think it's going to be part of the testimony a whole." (p. 57) He also noted the irony of how "as I'm standing here, that anything that's sort of negative about Chad seems relevant. Anything that seems to be helpful to broaden a perspective on who he is, doesn't seem to be relevant, according to the State."

Judge Nadeau decided in her order, very carefully, as follows: "The defendant, however, will be permitted to introduce evidence regarding his experience with caring for children to explain why he could conclude that Cassidy was not well after being in the care of Jeff Marshall. In addition, the defendant may introduce evidence of others' observations of the defendant's parenting of Cassidy.

Finally, the defendant will not be permitted to introduce general testimony about his parenting style of any other child. Whether or not the defendant abused or did not abuse other children is not relevant to this issue of the defendant's guilt regarding the treatment of Cassidy Bortner." (p. 4-5) This ruling ensured that the jury's understanding of Chad would be limited."  
*12 March 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,  
I couldn't agree with you more, and as my record shows, I've made every effort to be more civil (recently) in this debate, but I gotta tell you, you need to reign in Christine G. See, this was the whole reason why I started my own website, because I came under personal attacks from CEWCC members, as well as having my comments deleted by them at various websites including Facebook.

I have a major issue with the video on youtube that Christine G. is using to gain support for the efforts of this committee, and I will explain it plain and simple: There are gross misrepresentations of facts in that video, namely that Chad was a "loving, nurturing father" (no evidence of such) and that he "passed the polygraph" (never happened). And she wonders why I started my own website?

I'm seriously thinking of bringing back my website, you know if she wants to spread incorrect info on the web, I can up the ante with some facts of my own. Besides, I have people angry at me over taking the site down.....

She is a member of your committee, do you not have any control over what she is doing?

Regards,

Bob

*11 March 2012 - Rochester*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,  
Whether difficult or not, it's still vital to the resolution of the Chad Evans case that his advocates be civil. Similarly, we ask that all visitors to this site be civil, i.e. respectful. Despite the failings of the criminal justice system, it is still an achievement that arguments about justice can be resolved in that system in a civil manner. Last Thursday, before visiting Chad, I ran into Sr. Assistant Attorney General Jeff Strelzin. Despite our different perspectives on Chad's case, we had a polite discussion. Incidentally, he said he has completed most of his review of Chad's case and he has asked NH Medical Examiner Dr. Tom Andrew to review it as well.

Most of us have made errors in our postings and other writings, and such errors should be pointed out and acknowledged and fixed. If there are errors in the postings of Chad Evans Wrongly Convicted Committee members on Twitter, Facebook or elsewhere, please let us know, respectfully. We want the truth to be presented about the life and death of Cassidy Bortner, especially her last several hundred hours. Regarding the number of hours that Christine has put into this campaign, please be assured that it's been a lot of hours, and they continue to accumulate. All her hours, and all the hours of other Committee members are voluntary and take the place of other important claims on their time. For that, Chad is very grateful. Also, it's not always popular to support the plight of a person convicted of murdering a child, but Christine and others have stood up to be counted. We need more such volunteers to help persuade the State Government of New Hampshire that Chad's conviction was a terrible and tragic mistake.

Regards,  
Morrison

*11 March 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,

It's hard to show civility when you got Christine G out there posting videos on Youtube that contain gross distortion of facts, and posting countless links to that video via Twitter. One must wonder, what kind of operation do you have here? Do you have committee members who are motivated to find the truth, or are they more motivated to add new members to the cause with distortions of the facts? Not to mention that CG claims to have "over 2000 hours" researching this case.....?????

It is very alarming behavior.

Regards,

Bob

10 March 2012 - Rochester

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

I vote for mutual respect and civility. We are all interested in truth and justice.

9 March 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Becky,

Please calm down. You're obviously getting emotional about the facts that I've pointed out:

Fact 1: I was pointing out to Morrison a statement that is, at this point in time, an opinion (Chad Evans is wrongly convicted). You have not proven that he IS wrongly convicted. You have, however, bestowed your volumes of admiral quotes on us and presented alternate theories which have no merit.

Fact 2: Christine G. has decided to take it upon herself to post a youtube video, in which she states (as a fact) that Chad passed a polygraph (which is not a fact). See, this is childish and completely misleading. I wonder how many hits that youtube video has had. Furthermore, if you go back to my 16FEB posting in regards to Chad's letter from prison, dated 6JUL, you'll see why I made that statement. Christine has repeatedly made false and misleading statements in her free time on the web, and I've called her on it every time.

This is all I'm going to say about the subject just mentioned. I will not discuss it further.

As far as you bestowing your respect upon me, well that's up to you Becky. Why do you think I still come here? Did that ever cross your mind?

Regards,

Bob

8 March 2012 - Rochester

**Becky** | 

In quoting Bob, as he mocks Morrison & CG from our committee.

"In New Hampshire, Chad Evans is one such wrongly convicted man," THIS IS NOT A FACT...BETTER TO STATE "WE BELIEVE CHAD EVANS IS INNOCENT."

Fact is: Chad Evans is INNOCENT!

"And, he has REFUSED to take a bonafide POLYGRAPH EXAMINATION."  
~bassfearmee

[http://www.youtube.com/all\\_comments?v=CpZ7FVIn2GM](http://www.youtube.com/all_comments?v=CpZ7FVIn2GM)

That is NOT TRUE!

Chad has NOT REFUSED to take a polygraph! Nor has he EVER refused to take one, you must have you main characters mixed up in this story. I can only think of ONE person who refused & continues to REFUSE & that is NOT CHAD!

I'm finding it really hard to respect anyone who can't respect others.

8 March 2012 - Rochester

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

1. Books have been written about how to reduce the U.S. prison population. We could restrict the use of prisons to violent offenders. Let Bernie Madoff do community service, with severe lifestyle restrictions. We could legalize and regulate most drugs now classified as illegal. We could increase the use of parole for deserving offenders.

2. I oppose the death penalty for several reasons, including the risk that courts make mistakes and convict innocent people. Sadly, the U.S. is among a minority of countries which still execute ordinary criminals, including China, Iran, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia.

3. The "tens of thousands" number of wrongly convicted people in the U.S. comes by multiplying the estimated percentage of such people, 3-5%, times the number of inmates. That means between 69,000 and 115,000. Even if the percentage is 1%, that still means there are 23,000 innocent people in our prisons. Even that number is an appalling number. Agreed? Incidentally, at 1%, that means that about 20 NH inmates are innocent.

4. Sure, I BELIEVE Chad Evans was wrongly convicted. With inadequate and incorrect information, a jury was persuaded in 2001 to BELIEVE that he murdered Cassidy Bortner. The book, EYE CONTACT, and this website present the facts about the case and there can be little question that if a jury heard those facts today, Chad would not be found guilty. Nobody has shown that any of the facts presented in EYE CONTACT or on this website are false.

5. Yes. Wrongful convictions occur, or have occurred, in every state in the country. See the lists at the Center on Wrongful Convictions ([www.law.northwestern.edu](http://www.law.northwestern.edu)), the Innocence Project ([www.innocenceproject.org](http://www.innocenceproject.org)), Justice Denied ([www.justicedenied.org](http://www.justicedenied.org)), and Truth in Justice ([www.truthinjustice.org](http://www.truthinjustice.org)).

6. We agree that prison is an appropriate punishment for people who are fairly convicted of violent crimes.

Regards,

7 March 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,

With all due respect, I have to say I'm suprised you wrote that:

"There must be better ways to provide criminal justice to our citizens without keeping 2.3 million men and women in our jails and prisons." -WHAT DO YOU PROPOSE, THAT WE RELEASE THEM?

"That's a higher absolute number and higher percentage than any other country in the world." - I AGREE, SOME COUNTRIES JUST KILL THEM.

"Among the tasks of the proposed commission will be the challenge to assist the states further in preventing and correcting the wrongful convictions of tens of thousands of U.S. citizens." -TENS OF THOUSANDS? HOW DID YOU ARRIVE AT THAT NUMBER, WHEN THEY'RE ALL INNOCENT?

"In New Hampshire, Chad Evans is one such wrongly convicted man," THIS IS NOT A FACT...BETTER TO STATE "WE BELIEVE CHAD EVANS IS INNOCENT."

"Wrongful convictions occur in every state in the country." MAYBE...

"Over the past twenty years, exonerations through DNA testing have shown and proved what many have long known, which is that prosecutors are prosecuting more innocent people than they knew and courts are convicting them. The Innocence Project estimates that about 3% of inmates in this country are innocent. As most crimes do not involve DNA, we need to do more to correct the convictions of the wrongly convicted. It is a national problem. " I LIKE. THIS IS GOOD TO GO.

"We have asked the State of New Hampshire to re-investigate the case of Chad Evans, because his jury did not see or hear a lot of the evidence which is now available. So far, the State has not seized the opportunity to correct a probable injustice, or the opportunity to save the estimated \$33,000 annual cost of incarceration. With the creation of a National Criminal Justice Commission, the people of New Hampshire will see that the problems of our criminal justice system are national, and that includes the State of New Hampshire." NOW WE'RE BACK TO CHAD AGAIN. THE \$33K PER YEAR COST IS REALLY STRETCHING IT, I DON'T CARE WHAT THE COST IS, IF SOMEONE IS CONVICTED OF A SERIOUS CRIME, THE SHOULD BE LOCKED UP.

Regards,

Bob

*6 March 2012 - Rochester*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob referred, in his posting below, to a webmail I sent to each NH Senator and Congressman last week. The common text of those webmails is in the posting below, and is posted on the website in the "Latest News" section of this website. (Moved from original posting.) Today, I had a serious discussion with Congressman Guinta's office about the proposed Act and about Chad's case. The possible federal role in Chad's case is debatable, but I sometimes use the hypothetical of "What would Chad's Senators or Congressmen do if Chad were wrongly convicted in a foreign country?" If a Senator or Congressman would call the Secretary of State in such a case, why not help when a U.S. Citizen is wrongly convicted in one of the U.S.'s own 50 states?

Yes, I agree that the assessment that Chad Evans was wrongly convicted is my opinion and the opinion of many others.

What part of the webmail, the preferred way to send email to Senators and Congressmen, needs further clarification?

Morrison

*5 March 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

[Webmail sent on Feb. 29 to Senators Ayotte and Shaheen and Congressmen Bass and Guinta]  
Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

Please support the proposed National Criminal Justice Commission Act of 2011. The primary sponsor is Senator Jim Webb.

There must be better ways to provide criminal justice to our citizens without keeping 2.3 million men and women in our jails and prisons. That's a higher absolute number and higher percentage than any other country in the world.

Among the tasks of the proposed commission will be the challenge to assist the states further in preventing and correcting the wrongful convictions of tens of thousands of U.S. citizens. In New Hampshire, Chad Evans is one such wrongly convicted man, and there are surely others.

Wrongful convictions occur in every state in the country. Over the past twenty years, exonerations through DNA testing have shown and proved what many have long known, which is that prosecutors are prosecuting more innocent people than they knew and courts are convicting them. The Innocence Project estimates that about 3% of inmates in this country are innocent. As most crimes do not involve DNA, we need to do more to correct the convictions of the wrongly convicted. It is a national problem.

We have asked the State of New Hampshire to re-investigate the case of Chad Evans, because his

jury did not see or hear a lot of the evidence which is now available. So far, the State has not seized the opportunity to correct a probable injustice, or the opportunity to save the estimated \$33,000 annual cost of incarceration. With the creation of a National Criminal Justice Commission, the people of New Hampshire will see that the problems of our criminal justice system are national, and that includes the State of New Hampshire.

Again, please support the creation of a National Criminal Justice Commission.

Sincerely,

Morrison Bonpasse

Executive Director

Chad Evans Wrongly Convicted Committee

71 Sullivan Street

Keene, NH 03430

207-586-6078

morrison@chadevanswronglyconvicted.org

www.chadevanswronglyconvicted.org

5 March 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Chad Bad:

Watch the use of quotation marks, Morrison will call you on it every time.

Regards,

Bob

5 March 2012 - Rochester

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,

Did you edit that S.306 email that was sent out by the CEWCC? I'm asking this because the email appears to wander, it's got some statements in it that don't seem relevant, and it states that Chad Evans is wrongly convicted which has not been proven and is simply an opinion. I don't think it was well written at all.

I'm pointing this out as an example of things that are being disseminated by the CEWCC that are not written well and contain troubling statements that are made to appear accurate. It would be difficult for any lawmaker to take this email seriously.

Regards,

Bob

5 March 2012 - Rochester

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Dear "Chad Bad," (whoever you are)

Your comment appears to be a quote from something that I wrote, but I cannot find the exact language in EYE CONTACT or elsewhere. If it is a quote, can you credit the source?

Also, what is your point in making that comment or quoting it from another source? Do you agree or disagree with that assessment?

4 March 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Chad Bad** | 

"Chad "palmed" Cassidy's face, in order to get her attention through eye contact, as he had done several other times. "Palming" was the holding of Cassidy's face with one hand, under her chin, with

the thumb on one side and fingers on the other. However, this time he squeezed hard enough to leave bruises on the lower sides of her face."

*4 March 2012 - Not in jail*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Terri,

My apologies, I'm used to finding myself on the defensive most of the time in regards to this case.

I must admit, this is a very interesting case because the conviction was based entirely on circumstantial evidence. Entirely. This is why I've devoted so much time to it. I don't have any other information other than what Morrison has presented here. He's done a good job of making available all information that he has, including the actual trial docs and police interviews.

Sure, it is possible that Chad is innocent....remotely possible. The fact that there may even be a remote possibility of his innocence is worth spending time and effort to better understand the case,

I do believe he is guilty, however I still have an open mind. I do receive messages here on this forum, as well as emails from individuals who are on both sides of the issue of his guilt. I have to take what they say with a grain of salt because so far, nobody has come up with anything either way in regards to his guilt or innocence. So I just hang out and wait for something new to develop.

For god's sake, if he is innocent, I'd like to see the truth come out. Until then, he'll continue to serve the sentence imposed on him by the state.

Regards,

Bob

*27 February 2012 - Rochester*

**Terri**

Hello Bob,

Sorry if you felt misled by my question. I need extend my heart to you as you seem to be very defensive. I think what you are doing here is great as you are standing your ground to what you believe in and support. Your interest has a true value to the case as the questions you ask do have to have answers. With out you bringing to the table all of these interesting points of view and unanswered questions, the case would remain weak and unheard. Some of your points have made me pause and ask questions of my own. I am not contributing on this site for argument purposes, rather seeking more documentation/ information to justify a long un- answered, and many times disputed question that lingers in a small town where we grew up with Chad. Years passing made it easier to keep an open mind while reading, yet I feel something is missing in the equation of this guilty verdict. I could be wrong and you could be right. There is no argument from me in reference to who is right or wrong. There is no winner as this is no game; I merely seek the knowledge to lead me to believe the truth and justice for all of those involved.

*27 February 2012*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Terri is new to the Campaign for Chad, although she has known Chad for a long time, since Keene. I thought she was complimenting you and the depth of your knowledge. I thought her question was not to challenge you, but simply to ask about the foundations of your beliefs.

Morrison

*26 February 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Terri,

You're making another feeble attempt to discredit me by asking if I was even there when Chad killed Cassidy. This is another example of a weak position that you, as well as several CEWCC members have taken. Perhaps you can include the jury (both sets) in the category of "people who weren't there."

You say you've come to the conclusion that Chad is innocent. I'd like to hear why you think that. As far as having an "open mind," as I've stated before, I originally started looking into this case with an open mind. My mind was made up after considering all available information, including but not limited to the information that was provided to both the grand jury as well as the criminal jury in this case.

Regards,

Bob

*26 February 2012 - Rochester*

**Terri**

It is amazing how you (Bob) have dedicated so many hours of your life to this case. I was just wondering if you were there or involved in the case at the time of the crime. I am not convinced that there was enough evidence to convict Chad. Do you have more information? The information I read leads me to believe that it could have been someone else and/or unfounded medical condition. I read with a completely open mind and I am not convinced that Chad caused the death of Cassidy.

*22 February 2012*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Hi Amy,

Yes, there are reasons why Chad has not yet had a polygraph exam in prison, and those reasons are not attributable to Chad. Sorry, but I cannot explain further at this time. Please be patient.

Thanks.

Morrison

*20 February 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Amy**

Morrison,

Is there a reason that Chad has been unable to take a polygraph at this point? I understand he is willing to do so, but wants to be mindful of the expense. Is there something preventing him from getting this done? Thank you.

*20 February 2012 - southern nh*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Amy,

I do too. Part of me wants to believe that he is innocent. I just can't get past his behavior after Cassidy's death.

Maybe I'm off on this, but I do believe that he skillfully brushed-off the suggestion by Morrison to get a polygraph.

Regards,

Bob

*16 February 2012 - Rochester*

Ree N. Vesti Gate, (Morrison Bonpasse) | 

Paul,  
Thanks for writing to Chad. He wants to take you. Please be patient.

*16 February 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Paul E. Graph**

Chad - I know you used to be a power lifter and probably still work out to pass the time in the joint, but...do you think you can take me?

Do ya?

*16 February 2012*

**Amy**

Bob,  
Thank you for your response.

When I read that some time ago, I understood that Chad did not want to spend more than was necessary on the polygraph. I did not sense an unwillingness to take the exam. \$700 is a lot of money and it COULD be used for other expenses. I would however, like to see Chad take the polygraph soon so that the truth may be revealed.

Regards,  
Amy

*16 February 2012 - southern new hampshire*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Amy:

July 6th, 2011; " I understand people's views on the polygraph and I know the need. What I was trying to say is John Q. public does not care who is administering the test. All that they care about is PASS or FAIL. Only people close to the polygraph world care about who does it. Do you know what I mean? It doesn't matter to me if it is done by a "Corvette" for \$1500 or a Yugo" for \$800. All I see is \$700 in savings that can go towards something else or stay in the family pocket a little longer. I'm just trying to be practical about it."

This is the basis of my question regarding my sense that Chad wants to avoid a polygraph.

Best Regards,

Bob

*16 February 2012 - Rochester*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Amy,  
Thanks for asking Bob that question. I'd like to know what Bob was relying upon, too. At the time of Chad's taking the Voice Stress Analysis lie detector test on July 26, 2010, he had hoped that the finding of "No Deception Indicated" would be enough to persuade the Attorney General to re-investigate the case. Unfortunately, that didn't happen. Since then, he had indicated his willingness to take a polygraph, too.

Below are the questions asked of Chad and his answers in the Voice Stress Analysis Examination:  
Did you cause the serious injuries that Cassidy died from? NO

Did you intentionally injure Cassidy between November 8th and 9th, 2000? NO  
Did you ever punch or kick Cassidy? NO  
Did you ever seriously injure Cassidy? NO  
Did you cause the blunt force trauma to Cassidy? NO  
Did you know how the injuries occurred that killed Cassidy? NO  
Did you know who caused Cassidy's death? NO  
Did you inflict any serious injuries on Cassidy? NO  
Did you know for sure who caused the serious injuries to Cassidy? NO  
Did you in fact cause the blunt force trauma to Cassidy? NO  
Did you cause Cassidy's fatal injuries? NO  
Did you ever intentionally hurt Cassidy? NO  
Did you cause the blunt force trauma on Cassidy? NO  
Did you cause the pin prick injuries to Cassidy's feet? NO  
Did you know who caused the serious injuries to Cassidy? NO  
Did you intentionally injure Cassidy after picking her up from [the babysitter's] on November 8th, 2000? NO  
Did you ever punch or kick Cassidy? NO

15 February 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

### Amy

Bob,  
I am just wondering, would you please reference the page where Chad "brushed off (the) suggestion for a polygraph in...letters from prison" July 2010. " I don't recall reading or inferring that. Thanks for your help.

15 February 2012 - southern new hampshire

### Morrison Bonpasse |

Bob,  
Thanks for the heartfelt description of life for a young girl in a loving family. For reasons we may never know, Cassidy Bortner will never experience what you describe. Whatever the cause(s) of her death, Chad Evans did not strike and murder her, and he is a wrongly convicted man. His musings about what life would be like for a 13 year old Cassidy seem genuine to me. Chad has watched his son grow to be a teenager, and has a niece about Cassidy's age. Last year, he watched his other niece grow past Cassidy's 21-month barrier. From the beginning, he has felt badly that he didn't do more to prevent Cassidy's decline and death, whatever the cause(s).

15 February 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

### Bob Arnold |

Morrison,  
I'd also like to comment on Chad's letter in regards to Cassidy's 13th birthday. I sense a sham. The same guy who distanced himself from her on the day of her death is trying to drum up emotional support for his "missing" her. I'll be more than happy to answer Chad's questions, since I'm a proud father of two little girls, and know a thing or two about these things:

She'd have a full schedule, at 13 she'd be in 7th grade, likely at Rochester Middle School. She would have various interests, including but not limited to dance, music, science, sports, and of course boys. When she's not glued to her Nintendo DSi, she'd be asking (again) for her own cell phone. She has an addition to "Nick Jr." and isn't allowed to watch tv until she does her homework. She's proficient in math, but finds English boring. Her favorite shows are "Are You Smarter than a 5th Grader" and "Wizards of Waverly Place". She hides the remote control. Though she cleans her room daily, it's always a mess.

She leaves for the school bus every morning at 8:15, and she's home by 2:30. Tuesday and Thursday nights she has dance class from 6pm-7pm. Band is every Wednesday at 4pm. Every other Sunday is Girl Scouts. When she's not hosting a sleep-over with her closest friends, she's going to one about every other Friday or Saturday night. She has a dance recital coming up in April,

and dress dues are due by next week. Did I mention the Girl Scout nature hike later this month? Oh, parent-teacher conference is coming up too.

I hope this answers his question, as you're aware I have a problem with Chad using Kassidy to advance his cause. I really find it offensive.

Best Regards,

Bob

*14 February 2012 - Rochester*

---

**Bob Arnold** | 

I don't know Morrison....how did you feel when he brushed off your suggestion for a polygraph? Please see "letters from prison" July 2010. He has to do it. As I see it, he doesn't want to.

In regards to his statement that he had been acting with Amanda's "permissions" in disciplining Kassidy: As I recall, Amanda explicitly told him "I'll to the disciplining." Correct me if I'm wrong, but Chad can't claim to the police that he doesn't "run her kid" but at the same time claim that he has authority to discipline. You see where I'm going here? On the one hand, he claims one thing, then does a complete 180 if it suits him.

Sure, I wouldn't plead guilty of something I didn't do. I also wouldn't hide from the police, falsify information, mislead the police, etc etc, if I were in that situation. I'd want to know what happened to Kassidy, not try to cover my tracks and what not.

"The great expense of time and money wasted by the State of New Hampshire to catch Chad in violation of his bail conditions was not Chad's responsibility".....Of course not. It wasn't Chad's fault tha the state had to expend considerable funds to ensure he respected his bail conditions, kinda like it wasn't Gary Dodd's fault that the state spent hundreds of thousands of dollars trying to locate him. Hell, that was the state's decision to do all that.

Regards,

Bob

*14 February 2012 - Rochester*

---

**Mark C**

No reluctance to take a polygraph...yet he still hasn't taken one.

I won't post again until he does nor will I support any effort to have his case re-investigated.

Pretty simple thing. After all, he has all the time in the world.

*14 February 2012*

---

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

There is absolutely no reluctance felt by Chad to take a polygraph.

My discussion of Chad's purchase of a boat, as an indication of his character, was with a former law enforcement officer, unrelated to Chad's case. It wasn't a strongly held view and can be relegated to the category of idle musing. When the idea was mentioned to me, I didn't even ask a followup question, and don't plan to do so now.

Regards,

*11 February 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

Bob Arnold | 

Morrison,

I sense some reluctance on Chad's behalf to follow through with a polygraph. I've only found one mention of it (7/6/11). Maybe I missed another mention of it somewhere else?

I'm wondering what the protocol is for the use of a police polygraph. The police administer these during investigations, but have they ever used one after the fact, free of charge?

Who was the guy who claimed that Chad is bad because he owned a boat?

Best Regards,

Bob

*11 February 2012 - Rochester*

Morrison Bonpasse | 

I received today a letter from Chad, dated February 4. He wrote, "Hard to believe that Kassidy would have been 13 years old today. It just eats at me a lot, especially around Kassidy's birthday. I sit and wonder so many things. What would she look like now? Would she like school? Would we have to battle with her to get out of the bathroom so Kyle could use it in the morning? Would she still have inquisitive eyes? Would she keep her blonde hair long or short? Would she be tall like her mom? Would Kassidy be interested in boys yet? Would she still like vegetables? Would she enjoy playing sports? What would her favorite type of music be? Etc. etc. The questions are endless. It is so unfair. I miss her and still have a hard time believing she is not here. I know she's gone but wherever she is and if there is an afterlife somewhere I hope she is ok. I hope she she can forgive me for being stupid and failing her. God, why the hell wasn't I paying more attention?????"

*10 February 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

Morrison Bonpasse | 

Bob,

1. Would YOU plead guilty to something you didn't do? I doubt it, especially if the offense was a felony and especially if it involved a prison term. Speaking of prison term, can you tell me your source for the allegedly offered term of ten years? I don't recall that a specific recommendation for a prison term was mentioned to Chad's attorneys, or by Chad's attorneys to him. At page 281 of EYE CONTACT, I wrote, "Around this time, Chad's lawyer, Mark Sisti, had plea bargaining discussions with the prosecution and he communicated an offer to Chad for pleading guilty to manslaughter in return for a less-than-maximum prison sentence. Chad's response to Mark was, 'I'm not taking a plea bargain for something I didn't do.' The idea was not addressed again by either side." (See the paragraph, in the previous posting, from Chad's Feb. 7, 2001 letter to me about plea bargain discussions.)

2. The great expense of time and money wasted by the State of New Hampshire to catch Chad in violation of his bail conditions was not Chad's responsibility. If the police and prosecutors really wanted to ensure that Chad was abiding the bail condition that he not communicate with Amanda, the police could have contacted Chad's attorney. To my knowledge, they did not.

3. Yes, we DO have some information which warrants the state's re-investigation of the case. It's on Chad's website and in the book, EYE CONTACT. If the State can re-inspect the Memorial Bridge in Portsmouth, and then change course and close it, why cannot the State re-investigate this criminal case. I agree that such re-investigations are rare, but so are wrongful convictions. Whenever there is substantial reason to question the fairness of a guilty verdict, the State should re-investigate, and it should do so in Chad's case. The State should leave no stone unturned to ensure that the people whose liberty it has revoked are, indeed, guilty of the serious offenses for which they were convicted.

Regards,

*8 February 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

(as referenced in above posting)

Chad wrote in his February 7, 2010 letter to me:

"I don't recall the circumstance of the plea bargain discussions. It was early on and it might have been Sisti just throwing things about as I would later learn that plea bargaining seems to be his specialty. I think I was on the phone with him (which is rare as I mostly dealt with Alan) right before I was indicted for second degree murder and all the separate assault charges. I was originally arrested and charged only with manslaughter which by NH statute is punishable by a 15-30 year sentence. I think the state offered that sentence because Sisti asked and I said, "I'm not taking a plea bargain for something I didn't do." All I remember is thinking it must have pissed state off because I was soon facing 2nd degree murder and a ton of assault charges. We never discussed plea bargain again until one day in the middle of the trial while sitting in a side conference room. It literally felt like we were kicking ass but I still had an uneasy feeling. I thought by reading the statute now I was guilty of 2nd degree assault for grabbing Kassidy's cheeks, even though I was acting with Amanda's permission as a parental figure, and the accumulation of just those charges, if found guilty, I was facing something like 50-90 years. I asked Sisti what he thought they would offer for a plea bargain now. He said, "They would probably start somewhere in the neighborhood of 25 years and we'd try to work them down from there. I can go check with them if you'd like? We've never seriously pursued because you said you didn't do this and we were going to fight it to the end." Sisti told me they would want the 25 years because of the 2nd degree murder charge. To that point in trial, I didn't think for a minute I would be convicted for murder but was worried about all those separate face-grabbing charges. Sisti told me, "Relax about those. Up until a few years ago, that face grabbing was a misdemeanor. You aren't going to do 50 years for those. They charge you with all of those to scare you into bargaining. In fact, you've already done enough time for those." ...."

*8 February 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Amy**

Bob,  
Thank you for your response.

*8 February 2012 - southern new hampshire*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Amy,

I can appreciate your desire for a reinvestigation, however one must look at this entire case from the standpoint that Chad was offered a ten year sentence in exchange for a plea (which he refused). Chad decided to go to a jury trial. There was a risk involved with that decision, namely the likelihood that he'd be found guilty and endure a much longer sentence, and this is exactly what happened.

From the state's point of view, you can't have your cake and eat it too. Not to mention the efforts they went through to find him in contempt of his bail conditions. The police had to go to great lengths to investigate Chad and Amanda. Based on their hard work, there was sufficient evidence for a grand jury to indict him as well as a criminal jury to convict him.

What you're asking the state to do is give him another shot at the title, and the state rarely if ever does that.

Now, if you have some information that could help, we would appreciate hearing it. Otherwise, your efforts to put me on the defensive are pointless.

Regards,

Bob

*8 February 2012 - Rochester*

**Amy**

Bob,

I am glad we share the belief that a person should not be incarcerated for a crime that he did not commit.

Your comment that the burden lies with us to prove his innocence is understandable and resonates with me. This is exactly the purpose for wanting a reinvestigation into this case. In collaboration with the state and its delegates, a reinvestigation could provide some closure for everyone involved in it.

Would you mind sharing your opposition to a reinvestigation? I understand that you feel Chad is responsible for Cassidy's death. However, a reinvestigation would yield one of two things. The outcome would either affirm your beliefs and he would remain in prison. Or, facts would be found that prove his innocence. Why do you feel he isn't entitled to a reinvestigation?

Thank you for taking down your website. I mean that, sincerely.

Amy

8 February 2012

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

1. Agreed. None of us wants innocent people in prison.

2. Agreed. It's better for contributors to these "online comments" to present their names and city/towns and email addresses. However, for supporters of Chad and for supporters of the jury's verdict, there may be a price to be paid for honest comments here. This situation is sad, but this is one reason why more of Chad's friends have not stepped forward in their support, and why a few supporters of the verdict have approached you secretly. My view has always been that it's better for information to be presented and discussed anonymously than not at all.

3. I look forward to persuading you further with "appropriate evidence." If the State of New Hampshire would re-investigate this case, I'm confident that such appropriate evidence would be found. For example, several yet-uninterviewed witnesses could be interviewed, and several unexplored subjects could be explored much more fully, e.g. the Sunday, November 5 gathering at Chad's sister's with Cassidy and six adults.

4. Regarding the Chad Evans Wrongly Convicted Committee, all members are volunteers except me, and my work could be said to be partial-volunteer. We do the best we can with the skills and experience among us. We try to be open to all points of view, and these "online comments" are a good illustration of that commitment. Most websites on behalf of claimants to wrongful conviction do not have such pages.

5. Instead of criticizing some of our members for their efforts on the side of truth and justice, maybe you could ask the States of Maine and New Hampshire to re-investigate the case. Maybe you could ask, for example, why Cassidy's medical records were not provided to Chad's defense team.

6. Regarding Chad's offer to Sgt. Matthew Stewart to "hook me up" to a polygraph, I have not asked Sgt. Stewart whether he recalled that offer. I did send him a copy of EYE CONTACT in July 2011, but did not receive a reply, just as I did not receive a reply from most of the other law enforcement officers. However, you can disregard Chad's claim that he said what he said to Sgt. Stewart, and go to what Amanda told the police about Chad's willingness to take a polygraph. After all, the police had ASKED Amanda to ask Chad. All that is in the transcripts of her interviews.

Regards,

7 February 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Amy (whatever your name is):

I'm not offended by your reindeer games with words, nor am I not bothered by your efforts to hide your identity. However I do get frustrated sometimes by comments from Chad Evans supporters. I'd like to point this out to you because I, like most of the citizens of New Hampshire do not wish to see an innocent person behind bars. You see, it's you who need to make every effort to convince the rest of us of his innocence. And for the record, I'm who I say I am and I'm not afraid to reveal my identity: Bob Arnold, Rochester resident, former Gulf War vet, owner of Bob Arnold Contracting here in Rochester. I'm happily married, have two wonderful little girls, proud owner of one of the most

notable homes in Rochester, and law-abiding citizen. So there.

Morrison:

I hope you know that I stand by what I've told you before, that I could be swayed with appropriate evidence. However, up to this point, I've found the evidence against Chad, although circumstantial, overwhelming.

The concerns I've heard are rather general, namely this: The CEWCC meetings are chaired by people who lack detailed knowledge about Cassidy and Amanda. That these people seem to be there for fun and games, and present theories for all to hear that are over-the-top and far-fetched. The meetings take on the form of a raw-raw session, and if someone makes a challenge to their theories, they are quickly silenced. It's almost like a gang of thugs who are ready to pounce on you if you beg to differ with their support of Chad Evans.

Generally speaking Morrison, I do believe that you have some individuals on that committee who are better suited to be out in the audience. It's nice that you have people who are willing to give their time, but how much authority should they be given? If they want to help, let them push a broom.

Now as far as a conversation with Sgt. Stewart in the parking lot, I have to doubt this. The reason is that the police do put a high value on polygraph results, and I believe that if they had the chance, they would have administered one to Chad. Is there a way that this can be independently verified?  
Best regards,  
Bob

*7 February 2012 - Rochester*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Amy,

Welcome to "online comments" and thanks for your detailed understanding of Chad's wrongful conviction.

Bob,

Chad has not yet received a response from Sr. Asst. Attorney General Jeffery Strelzin. In Nov., he wrote that it would be "several months."

Question: You have written that you believe Chad is guilty. Does that mean that if you were on a jury today, and you know a lot more than Chad's 2001 jury knew, you would vote today for "guilty beyond a reasonable doubt"? Or does it mean that you haven't seen enough evidence yet to convince you that the 2001 jury made a mistake.

You wrote yesterday that "Some of the key players in this case, namely family and very close associates of Evans have made contact with me over the past year and have voiced their concern about the fictitious events that are coming out of the CEWCC." Setting aside for now the issue of anonymity, can you specify what "fictitious events" you were referencing? That is, what facts have those anonymous sources disputed? I realize that some facts are known to only a few people, so that you will be unable to respond to my question in some instances because revealing the disputed facts may lead to identifying your source. Nonetheless, there must be SOME specific fact that you can present as being "fictitious," as you put it. If you cannot cite any specifics, can you please stop writing that something is false or fictitious?

Generally:

- Chad's willingness to take a polygraph came twice before his trial. First, he made the offer to Sgt. Matthew Stewart in the parking lot on the evening of November 9. Chad recounted that offer in his letters to me of Feb. 7, and March 16, 2010. As Sgt. Stewart filed no reports during his entire participation in the investigation, we have no corroboration of Chad's recollection. Secondly, the police asked Amanda to ask Chad about a polygraph. She did and she told the police he was willing to take one. See EYE CONTACT pages 241-42. The police did nothing with that communication of Chad's willingness to take a polygraph.

- Regarding Cassidy's pajama bottoms, I noted in EYE CONTACT at page 430 that Mark Sisti never asked Jeff Marshall about when and why those pajama bottoms were removed. The prosecution did

not ask, either.

7 February 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Amy,

Why do I need to clarify what I said? Did you not understand my comment? I do believe it was simple and straight forward.

The attack mentality of the Chad Evans supporters is comical. You try to put me on trial because I believe he is guilty. If anyone should be making an effort to convince, it should be you, as it's your convicted child killer who sits behind bars.

Morisson,

Any new news from Jeff Stelzon (sic)?

Best Regards,

Bob

6 February 2012 - Rochester

**Amy**

Bob,

I quoted you in a previous comment and requested that you respond to my concerns. The comment read:

"As far as her pants being removed, there really is no apparent explanation for this, however I doubt that if this was presented to the jury, it wouldn't affect the outcome of his trial. "

You "doubt" that it WOULDN'T affect the outcome of his trial? Please clarify because if you doubt it WOULDN'T affect his trial, then you must agree that Chad's trial could have had a different outcome.

Likewise, if you meant to say you doubt it WOULD have affected his trial, then you are saying her missing pants didn't matter...that this info is irrelevant, etc.

Would you please take time to clarify what you said, and why you feel this way? Thanks

6 February 2012 - southern nh

**Bob Arnold** | 

Amy,

I appreciate what you're saying, and commend you for your efforts. However, I, along with 24 impartial jurors beg to differ with your position. I say 24, because there were 12 on the grand jury that found sufficient evidence of manslaughter against Evans, and another set of 12 who correctly convicted him of his crimes.

24 total, impartial adults who found him guilty. Think about that for a minute. Here's another thing to consider, there are a lot of people who believe in his guilt, many times the number who think he is innocent. Some of the key players in this case, namely family and very close associates of Evans have made contact with me over the past year and have voiced their concern about the fictitious events that are coming out of the CEWCC. In addition, there are no close associates of Evans who have dedicated their time to this cause. Zero. For a guy who had a lot of friends and knew a lot of people, it's surprising that not one of them have come forward to help in with his claims of innocence.

You can continue looking at this case through rose colored glasses, and I will continue waiting for some real, tangible evidence of his innocence.

Best Regards,

Bob

*5 February 2012 - Rochester*

**Amy**

Bob,  
Something else...you say Mr. Marshall was not on trial. I concur, he was not on trial. However, he was involved with Cassidy's care while she was alive. You cannot finish a puzzle without all the pieces....nor should someone be convicted for a crime without all the facts being laid out on the table....

The puzzle was never finished. There are pieces still out there waiting to be placed. Meanwhile, Chad, a vibrant, loving, and wonderful man is sitting in prison.

Wrong, wrong, wrong, wrong....

*5 February 2012 - southern nh*

**Amy**

Bob,  
You stated, "As far as her pants being removed, there really is no apparent explanation for this, however I doubt that if this was presented to the jury, it wouldn't affect the outcome of his trial. "

You "doubt" that it WOULDN'T affect the outcome of his trial? Please clarify because if you doubt it WOULD'NT affect his trial, then you must agree that Chad's trial could have had a different outcome.

Likewise, if you meant to say you doubt it WOULD have affected his trial, then you are saying her missing pants didn't matter...that this info is irrelevant, etc.

Please clarify what you meant.

Thanks.

*5 February 2012 - southern nh*

**Bob Arnold | **

Amy,  
You've got a good point, this is something that I've thought a lot about: Why did Jeff think she was still alive at the time of his 911 call, and why was she cold to the touch at the time the EMT team arrived...

If you look closely at the statements Jeff gave to police, you'll find that they are all very consistent. He stated he felt a pulse. I believe Jeff Marshall had no medical training, and he was using his thumb to feel for the pulse. I'm sure that Christine and Becky can testify that the thumb is not the digit you use to check for a pulse, due to the vein that runs through it. I believe Jeff felt his own pulse and thought it was Cassidy's.

As far as her pants being removed, there really is no apparent explanation for this, however I doubt that if this was presented to the jury, it wouldn't affect the outcome of his trial.

Regards,

Bob

5 February 2012 - Rochester

**Bob Arnold** | 

Christine,

The medical report you are referring to was made after the time frame we are talking about, but just in case you forgot, my challenge was to the number of individuals who were interviewed prior to Chad, one of those individuals was Dr. Brock via telephone conversation. The contents of that conversation are summarized in the police report.

As far as trash talking, I thought we were having a spirited debate about a very important topic: The conviction of a man you claim is innocent. My apologies, I will revisit our earlier conversation in regards to claims you've made about Chad telling the police that he'd submit to a polygraph (something he never did).

As far as reading everything on the website, I've read everything more than four times and it didn't take me over 2000 hours as you've claimed it took you.

As far as Cassidy's pants, that's a good question, however Jeff Marshall is not on trial, nor was he ever on trial. The blood under Cassidy's fingernails is a mystery that I have a theory about: When Chad beat her on the night of the 8th, she spit up blood on herself. This is why Chad gave her a bath. However the bath failed to remove all traces of her blood, some of which stayed under her fingernails.

Regards,

Bob

5 February 2012 - Rochester

**Amy**

Okay, so let's talk facts.

Officer Creamer and Paramedic Frechette both documented that Cassidy was COLD and BLUE, and UNRESPONSIVE, and AYSTOLE, when they arrived at the scene. Ok, now you don't have to be a brain surgeon to know that people who die don't get COLD and TURN BLUE within minutes, which is a good approximation of how much time passed between Mr. Marshall's call to 911 and arrival of emergency personnel on the scene. COLD and BLUE indicate rigor mortis..look it up. Something sent that sweet angel to heaven long before the call was ever made to 911 on that morning. Cassidy was in bed that morning while he was watching the news. Ok, then why would a child who has allegedly been left to sleep have blood under all her fingernails? How did THAT happen? Wouldn't that indicate some kind of struggle took place? Really? While she was sleeping? Oh, and the same sleeping child mysteriously loses her pants? One might ask himself, "Where were Cassidy's pants and why wasn't she dressed in her PJ's when EMS showed up?" Wasnt she supposed to be sleeping when Mr. Marshall found her, eyes rolled back and gurgling? Why would he take her pants off? I've never seen anyone do CPR down THERE...HMMMM. Finally, why wasn't any of this discussed at trial? The jury was ill informed. The investigaton was biased and Chad was convicted before he ever stepped into an attorney's office. Open your eyes, people who think Chad is responsible for Cassidy's death. He isn't. Chad Emery Evans is innocent. And THAT is a fact.

5 February 2012 - Southern NH

**Christine** | 

Happy birthday KCB! Your spirit lives on and we will continue to see that justice is served for you sweet angel xoxox

4 February 2012 - United States

**Christine** | 

Bob it appears that you have NOT read everything on the website. If you had you would have read the part where Dr. Brock stated the following "very large hymenal ring to the vaginal vault for age. No active bleeding but a trace of blood in the vaginal vault. Anus is without obvious bleeding but does seem generous size diameter for age." And this was also repeated in the DCYF report. The photos taken by the police show men's pants and boxers on Jeff Marshall's bed right beside young Cassidy's pants. As for evidence supporting a possible TBI; the autopsy report and the list of signs and symptoms reported by witnesses in the days/weeks prior to Cassidy's death show that it is very possible that she was suffering from a TBI. It is medically known that seizures and other serious side effects can come from a head injury. You don't think a 21 month old child falling out of a full size truck could have a TBI?? Once you have read every document on the website and have done your research than we will have more to talk about. Until then I would appreciate if you stop trash talking me saying that I am just pulling things out of the air!

*4 February 2012 - United States*

**Becky** | 

Happy 13th Birthday Cassidy!  
Forever loved, forever missed  
& forever fighting for your peace!

*4 February 2012 - Rochester NH*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Even though Jacqueline Conley's interview began at 8:00 p.m., which was 50 minutes after Chad's interrogation began, it's possible that one of Chad's detectives learned something from Jacqueline's interview before telling Chad at approx. 9:40 p.m. that he was their primary suspect. Thus, Jacqueline could have been included in the "everybody" who Det. McCleish told Chad supported the police theory that Chad assaulted and murdered Cassidy. However, Jacqueline's only incriminating statement was that Chad told her the trampoline story, which the police correctly believed to be mostly false. It was a "white lie" to hide Chad's embarrassment that he had caused bruising when holding Cassidy's face when obtaining eye contact. In hindsight, of course, the truth would have been far better to communicate.

Because Jacqueline was not told about the change in plans for Cassidy on Sunday, November 5, for Chad to take Cassidy to his sister's home, instead of the closed York's Wild Animal Kingdom, Jacqueline suspected something worse. However, her suspicions were unfounded, and may have been a good example of how witnesses incorporate police theories of a case into their interpretations of incompletely understood events. Except for the trampoline story, Jacqueline told the police nothing that supported their quickly formed theory that "clearly indicates" that Chad assaulted and murdered Cassidy.

Regarding the falls from Jeff's truck, I agree with Christine's assessment of brain injuries to Cassidy, but I believe the fall that Will Peirce witnessed was a second fall, and was not the fall of October 26 or 27 which caused those head injuries.

*3 February 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Don't forget Jacqueline Conley. The interview start time shows 2200 hours with an end time of 2025 hours, obviously a typo but none the less, she was being interviewed at the same time as Chad (see detectives occasionally exit the room to get additional info from other officers). They also interviewed Amanda twice because she was initially lying to the police.

Christine: As far as Doctor Bock's assessment of sexual abuse, where did you come up with that? Test boxer shorts for what? You're reaching for air. Furthermore, you state that Cassidy showed signs of "traumatic brain injury" after her fall from Jeff's truck....please explain yourself because there was no evidence that supports your claim.

It's unfortunate that there are still individuals who are presenting fiction as evidence in this case.

Regards,

Bob

3 February 2012 - Rochester

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

When I wrote that the police only interviewed three people before starting the interview with Chad at 7:10 p.m., I was thinking of transcribed interviews with questions and answers. As Bob Arnold correctly notes, there were two other interviews: of Dr. Bock and William Peirce. Also, we should add the non-transcribed interview of Jeff Marshall by Kittery Det. Steve Hamel at Jeff's home when the EMT's were trying to save Cassidy.

Det. Baker interviewed the ER doctor, Anthony Bock, for ten minutes beginning at 5:25 p.m. and filed this report, in its entirety:

"I interviewed DR. ANTHONY BROCK, who was the attending emergency room doctor when CASSIDY BORTNER was brought in by ambulance. DR. BROCK stated that CASSIDY had multiple bruising on her head and face. He noted that her feet had small scabs on the bottom of them. It appeared to be small needle like pricks. DR. BROCK showed me x-rays of the CASSIDY and stated that there were no signs of broken bones.

DR. BROCK gave me a copy of his notes and a briefing on his findings. They are attached to the continuation report. END OF INTERVIEW."

Note that there is nothing stated in this interview which indicates, let alone "clearly indicates," that Chad Evans murdered Cassidy Bortner. There was no mention of Chad.

In the posting below is the full text of Sgt. Avery's interview of Will Peirce. Again, there is nothing, except for Jeff Marshall's allegations and suspicions, to indicate that Chad Evans murdered Cassidy Bortner.

The others that Bob Arnold mentioned (Creamer, Hackett, Frechette, Avery and Hamel) did file reports, but none could be said to have been interviewed, whether transcribed or not. None of the others said anything about Chad Evans except that Detective Hamel reported what Jeff Marshall told him.

My earlier comment stands, which is that when Det. McCleish told Chad the police theory of the case at approx. 9:40 p.m. "after talking with everybody here," he was referring to Jeff, Jennifer and Amanda. Actually, the police had formed their theory sooner than that. Det. Angela Blodgett told Amanda in her first interview, beginning at 4:20 p.m. that "people" were saying that Chad bruised Cassidy. The "people" were Jeff and Jennifer.

2 February 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

(continued from above)

Report of interview of William Peirce by Kittery Sgt. Ronald Avery:

"INTERVIEW OF WILLIAM C. PEIRCE

Mr. Peirce advised that he had spoken to Jeff Marshall recently as he had told him that the infant had been coming to his residence with bruises as, according to Peirce, Marshall suspected that these bruises were occurring in the home where she was living. Mr. Peirce thereafter provided the following information from his observation of activities earlier on this date:

- At approximately 8:20 A.M. he observed that Amanda Bortner's car was just leaving the driveway from #51 Rogers Road. as he explained that Amanda regularly brought her daughter, Cassidy. to Jeff Marshall's apartment for day care.

- At approximately 9:00 A.M. Jennifer Connelly (who lives at #51 Rogers Road with Jeff Marshall) was seen leaving the apartment to go to work.

- Mr. Peirce advised that he did not see anyone else enter or exit from the residence at #51 Rogers Road until the ambulance arrived at approximately 12:40 P.M.

Although Mr. Peirce observed no further activity at #51 Rogers Road. he did note that Jeff Marshall had spoken with him on at least two occasions as follows:

Initially, approximately two (2) weeks ago, reportedly Jeff Marshall spoke with Mr. Peirce, telling him that he had observed bruises near Cassidy Bortner's eyes; and secondly, approximately seven to

ten days ago Jeff was said to have informed Peirce that bruises were visible on the child's chin (as if she had been grabbed and held). In providing the above information, it was noted that according to William Peirce, Jeff Marshall had also told him that he suspected Chad Evans as the person responsible for inflicting bruises on infant Cassidy Bortner. With no further information provided by William Peirce, this report was completed and remains on file pending further investigation."

*2 February 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

### Christine

There were several other people that were interviewed prior to Chad's interview with police. However, what insight can the police give just coming into this situation? They only insight they could provide is that others were pointing the finger at Chad. Will Pierce was interviewed and agreed that Cassidy had bruises. He didn't indicate where they came from. However he DID reiterate that he witnessed Cassidy fall out of Jeff's truck. (After this incident is when Cassidy started showing signs of a traumatic brain injury.) And Dr. Brock was also interviewed; he suggested that Cassidy had been sexually abused. The police SHOULD have tested the men's' boxers and pants that were found on the bed next to Cassidy's little red fleece pants. Jeff claimed he did nothing with Cassidy that morning other than check in on her. So how did her pants get removed? The investigation seemed to stop there. Had the police followed up on this perhaps it would have lead them to who was "hurting" Cassidy.

*2 February 2012 - NH*

### Bob Arnold |

State Police also interviewed the following prior to Chad's interview:

Dr. Anthony Bock  
William Pierce  
Officer Creamer  
Detective Hackett  
Robert Frenchette  
Sgt Avery  
Detective Steve Hamel

Regards,

Bob

*1 February 2012 - Rochester*

### Morrison Bonpasse |

Mark,

Yes, the interrogation began with small talk, which was initiated by Detective Rick LeClair when he asked Chad, "Do you play hockey?" LeClair asked a few more sports questions and then Detective Lance McCleish said that he played football at the University of Maine, which led to more trivia. Such small talk is used to try to make interviewees comfortable, and it ended when LeClair asked Chad for his date of birth.

I disagree with your assertion that what Chad said about his son was trivial. It was very important for the police to know about Chad as a father. Unfortunately, they stuck to their theory of Chad's culpability and ignored what he said about his son and his rearing of his son.

The conversation about weightlifting began when Detective LeClair asked Chad if was taking any "medicines or prescriptions" and Chad could have said, "No." Instead he said he was taking protein powder and Xenadrine for his power lifting. Later LeClair asked "Are you currently active physically, working out and stuff?" Where do you see a problem in Chad's responses to these questions?

As for the body language, we agree that Chad's body language showed that he was nervous or that he felt awkward. I would, too, if I was being interviewed by police about the death of my girlfriend's daughter and if I was already on probation for domestic violence. Being nervous is not the same as showing guilt or being guilty. I don't "shrug off" Chad's body language. I just don't see that an interpretation of guilt is justified.

What do you think of Lance McLeish's statement to Chad at about 9:40 p.m. "And what I'm telling you is is after talking to everybody here our investigation clearly indicates that you are the cause of these injuries." Chad responded, "No way." It was approximately nine hours after Cassidy's death and the "everybody" the police had talked with consisted of Jeff Marshall (another suspect), Jennifer Bortner Conley (girlfriend of other suspect) and Amanda Bortner (also a suspect). After those three interviews, their investigation "CLEARLY INDICATES" that Chad killed Cassidy? Don't you agree that the police drew their conclusions much too soon?  
Regards,

1 February 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

## Mark C

Morrison...

Chad spent alot of time small talking about trivial stuff, like football, lifting weights, his son, etc. The entire exchange before the police got into the more important questions and issues was ridiculous and bizarre.

Chad showed no emotion and seemed more concerned about talking about stupid stuff than the fact that Cassidy was dead and the cause of her death.

Ask Chad why he seemed cold and uncaring during that interview. Most parents of children, or those who really loved them, who have just died would have been hysterical. Chad seemed more concerned about telling the detective how great a power lifter he was.

Defenders of Chad shrug off the body language aspect of that interview which is a mistake.

GUILTY!

1 February 2012

## Morrison Bonpasse |

Mark,

It would be very helpful if you could give the exact quotes from Chad's interrogation that you are referencing. He absolutely did not think of Cassidy's death as trivial. At the bottom of the home page of this website are 18 "key documents," of which Chad's interrogation is the 9th. The transcript is annotated with his 2010 comments, at <http://www.chadevanswronglyconvicted.org/documents/001109MSPintAnnttd110620ChadEvansbyMcCleishLeClairStewartWORD.pdf>. Yes, I agree that Chad would have reacted differently if his son had died, but one would have to look carefully at the actual reaction. After all, Kyle was his biological son and three years old. Cassidy was the daughter of his girl friend and she was 21 months old. Wouldn't you react differently if you were in his shoes?

What do you think of the series of questions below by Lance McCleish about what he believed was Cassidy's murder, and Chad's responses, with his 2010 comments in brackets.

LM: Okay. What, what do you think should happen to - Let's just say you know, what do you think should happen to the person that would do this?

CE: That would do what? [Here the police were implying that somebody did something to Cassidy. At this point, I still had not been told how Cassidy died and was assuming it was due to a car accident or something.]

LM: Cause injury like that to her, that that would cause her death okay?

CE: Not a good thing, sure.

LM: Yeah. What do you think should happen to him?

CE: Probably should string him up by the nuts or whatever. Certainly I mean kids no matter what you know, you know like I told you before one of the things that I've learned since

being a parent is patience you know what I mean. [Certainly, if someone caused Cassidy's death, I would have no mercy. She was innocent, defenseless and adorable. I still don't see how it could be possible that someone could have intentionally hurt her.]

LM: Yeah.

30 January 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

## Mark C

How does Chad explain his reactions during the police interview...talking about Cassidy's death like it was something trivial like lifting weights? Seems extremely odd, and sterile, to me.

I'm sure he'll claim that he was in shock...it was surreal, blah blah blah.

I'm sure he would have acted much differently if it had been his son who died.

30 January 2012

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

The prosecution's closing argument is discussed in Chapter 8 of EYE CONTACT on pages 504 to 527. The closing argument is separated into 177 statements, and most of them I believe were false. Further, many of the true statements were irrelevant to Chad's guilt or innocence, such as #122, "that Travis left that house at nine o'clock that night..." Which of the 177 do you believe support your statement here that Chad told "countless" cover stories?

Regarding your question about your observation that Chad "distanced himself" from Cassidy and Amanda, I'll note first that Chad's comments and responses reflect his ambivalence at the time, which is not unusual in a new relationship, right? Before the 9th, he felt most of the time that he was deeply in love with Amanda, but sometimes he felt that he was moving too fast into the relationship. Amanda and Chad briefly discussed her moving to an apartment to give them time to ensure their relationship was solid. He was also fearful that moving too fast would endanger the implementation of the divorce agreement. Unfortunately, he didn't know in early November that his divorce was already final on October 4, so that cause of friction between him and Amanda was actually eliminated, even if he didn't know it.

In his interview, Chad said at pages 1499-1500 about the relationship, "it's kind of a strange situation because like she's a nice girl and, and she's totally in love with me and I really like her a lot. But I'm so burnt from the last thing that ... I'm very distant you know.... And she's been staying with me an awful lot." (See also page 1509.)

Regarding the absence of questions by Chad about Cassidy during his interrogation, he had been told at approximately 4:30 p.m. by Sgt. Matthew Stewart about Cassidy's death. According to Chad in 2010, he asked Sgt. Stewart several questions about Cassidy at the time, but we don't have any confirmation because Sgt. Stewart prepared no reports of his activity on that day. (EYE CONTACT, page 149)

Regarding the photographs of Cassidy's body, it seems perfectly normal for a parent or parent figure to not want to see photos of the body of the child who was alive only a few hours earlier.

Regards,

30 January 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

The prosecution's closing argument is discussed in Chapter 8 of EYE CONTACT on pages 504 to 527. The closing argument is separated into 177 statements, and most of them I believe were false. Further, many of the true statements were irrelevant to Chad's guilt or innocence, such as #122, "that Travis left that house at nine o'clock that night..." Which of the 177 do you believe support your statement here that Chad told "countless" cover stories?

Regarding your question about your observation that Chad "distanced himself" from Cassidy and Amanda, I'll note first that Chad's comments and responses reflect his ambivalence at the time, which is not unusual in a new relationship, right? Before the 9th, he felt most of the time that he was deeply in love with Amanda, but sometimes he felt that he was moving too fast into the relationship. Amanda and Chad briefly discussed her moving to an apartment to give them time to ensure their relationship was solid. He was also fearful that moving too fast would endanger the implementation of the divorce agreement. Unfortunately, he didn't know in early November that his divorce was already final on October 4, so that cause of friction between him and Amanda was actually eliminated, even if he didn't know it.

In his interview, Chad said at pages 1499-1500 about the relationship, "it's kind of a strange situation because like she's a nice girl and, and she's totally in love with me and I really like her a lot. But I'm so burnt from the last thing that ... I'm very distant you know.... And she's been staying with me an awful lot." (See also page 1509.)

Regarding the absence of questions by Chad about Cassidy during his interrogation, he had been told at approximately 4:30 p.m. by Sgt. Matthew Stewart about Cassidy's death. According to Chad in 2010, he asked Sgt. Stewart several questions about Cassidy at the time, but we don't have any confirmation because Sgt. Stewart prepared no reports of his activity on that day. (EYE CONTACT, page 149)

Regarding the photographs of Cassidy's body, it seems perfectly normal for a parent or parent figure to not want to see photos of the body of the child who was alive only a few hours earlier.  
Regards,

*30 January 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob Arnold** | 

I have more examples to substantiate my statement, however one only needs to review the prosecution's closing arguments to see what I'm taking about.

I would like to know, if Chad "loved" Cassidy as he now claims, how can he explain his behavior on the 9th? The fact that he distanced himself from her and Amanda, the fact that he didn't seem at all concerned about what caused her death? And lastly, why he refused to look at the photographs of her?

Regards,

Bob

*29 January 2012 - Rochester*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

The past few posts have referenced your claim of "countless examples of the use of cover stories concerning Cassidy's injuries." We agree that the "trampoline story" was one such cover story, but I asked you for examples of just four more. So far, to my knowledge, you haven't presented any. I don't see the problem with Chad's stating that he drove 2 1/2 hours, when in fact it seems to have taken 1 hr and 50 minutes (2:20 - 4:10 p.m.) Why is that a problem? His estimate of the time waiting for his interrogation was underestimated by an hour as he waited for exactly three hours instead of two. Why is that a problem?

Is understating the importance of a romantic relationship an attempt to mislead the police? At page 1497 Chad estimated that his first date with Amanda was at a Staind concert in July. Actually it was June 2. At 1499 Chad was asked if he and Amanda were living together and he said, "Not really." Is that misleading or simply showing a different understanding of the highly sensitive term, "living together?" At page 1502, he estimated that he had known Cassidy for four months, whereas it was actually five. And so on.

I hope you agree that talking about a recently deceased person is often difficult and awkward. Do you refer to the person in the present tense or past tense? Can you give examples of what you find troubling about Chad's references to Cassidy? At page 1492, Chad said of Cassidy in the present tense, "she's kind of a quiet kid." Is that a problem? Again, can you please give a few examples? When you wrote, "he was telling stories to explain things away," you seem to imply that the "stories" were false or misleading. Can you present one such "story" and explain why you think it's false or misleading?

Regarding the alleged "distancing" of himself from Cassidy, isn't that one of several possible natural responses to the situation? As has been often said, Chad felt terrible about Cassidy's death. He knew that he should have taken Cassidy to see a doctor on the 8th, the previous day. He knew that he should have urged Amanda to take Cassidy to see a doctor. He was the older of the two adults and he was already a parent. Isn't "distancing" a normal reaction?

Regards,

*21 January 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Wait a second Morrison, there are repeated attempts to mislead the police during his video taped interview. He immediately began the interview by nervously refusing to sit, stating that he drove 2 1/2 hours to get there, that he'd been sitting for 2 hours. His description of his relationship with Amanda, as well as their living arrangement, was misleading. His repeated references to Cassidy (the kid, the girl, that girl, etc) were an attempt to distance himself from her. His story about Banannas, his explanation for talking to his ex-wife on the phone, he was telling stories to explain things away. The police caught him off guard when they asked further questions about what he was saying, his nervous responses were evidence that he knew he was in for a long night if they were going to ask him to explain all of his stories.

I understand there was a concern about Amanda's eligibility in the ASPIRE program, however it's unconscionable that someone of Chad's intelligence would knowingly mislead the police during a death investigation because he was concerned about a state program. Furthermore, his general demeanor during the interview, I think, was an act which was intended to distance himself from Cassidy.

*21 January 2012 - Rochester*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Mark,

I believe that every one of Chad's statements, whether in 2000 or in the years since then, about such accidents and falls is true. He told the police on November 9 about the Tee-ball, while calling it a "hard rubber ball" or "starter baseball." There was corroboration by the intensity of Chad's phone subsequent conversation with Tristan, and Kyle's statement to Tristan about the incident.

Several people had commented on Cassidy's stumbling, and it was Chad's mother, and then Chad, who urged Amanda to take Cassidy to the doctor about the toed-in condition. Amanda DID take Cassidy to the doctor on August 10, and then to the orthopedic surgeon on September 11.

Kassidy's hitting the coffee table around Monday, November 6 was witnessed by Travis Hunt and Amanda. Chad wasn't there, and I don't think he ever mentioned it to anyone in 2000.

The accident when Chad was carrying Cassidy downstairs was not witnessed by Amanda, but I recall that Chad said that Amanda quickly came to the scene in response to crying. There were no bruises, to my knowledge, caused by playing on the bed.

None of these incidents were included in any Chad "cover" story. The only "cover" story Chad told was the trampoline story about the bruises on Cassidy's cheeks which were caused by his "eye contact" holding. Note that in his police interview, Chad ALSO told the police the true story about those SAME bruises, i.e. that he caused such bruises by holding her face to get eye contact.

I reiterate. The only clear lie Chad told the police or anyone in this tragic saga was the trampoline story. Everything else was the truth. (I don't view his minimizing of the live-in relationship of Amanda as a lie.) I'm reminded of exoneree and former Warwick, Rhode Island policeman Scott Hornoff who initially lied to his own police peers about his extramarital affair with a murder victim. That led to his conviction for murder and a life sentence until about 6 years later when the real murderer confessed.

*20 January 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Mark C**

Morrison, do you mean other claims by Chad like her being hit with a tee ball, falling down due to her toe-in condition, bumping head on tables, bouncing her head off a wall while carrying her downstairs, "tossing her gently" on beds, etc.?

*20 January 2012*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Agreed. A person's full character can be shown in many ways. Also, we agree that Chad's teenage relationship with Barbara Brooks was not the healthiest of relationships. However, I never saw that he was accused of being irrational, but perhaps that's a matter of definition. What interests me is that after the police interviewed Barbara Brooks, which was after she contacted the police, the

police did not seek to interview Mary Paquette with whom Chad was living before he fell in love with Tristan. The only time Mary was interviewed was by Officer Steve Carlisle for the post-conviction pre-sentencing report. Mary told him there was zero violence in her relationship with Chad, and Chad concurs with that assessment.

You wrote there were "countless examples" of Chad's use of cover stories concerning Cassidy's injuries. "Countless?" I can count ONE, i.e. the trampoline story and he told that story only to Tristan, Jacqueline Conley and the police. I know you can count to five (attempt at humor), and "countless" is surely a very large number, but can you give us at least four other "cover stories," as allegedly stated by Chad? You may have meant to include what Amanda stated to others, but can we focus here on what Chad said to anyone?

Regarding Sunday, November 5, Chad had planned to take Cassidy and Kyle to York's Wild Animal Kingdom, which Amanda related to her mother, Jacqueline, before their planned shopping trip. However, the weekend parental custody plans for Kyle were swapped between Chad and Tristan, and Chad realized that York's Wild Animal Kingdom was closed. So Chad and Cassidy went to his sister's for the day in Belmont. I don't know why Amanda apparently did not clarify with her mother that Chad and Cassidy's plans had changed. In any case Cassidy was at a place with several adults, and not being hidden from anyone. Amanda had a good day with her mother and sister, and purchased clothes for Cassidy. Chad more fully describes the circumstances surrounding that very important day (Nov. 5, 2000) in his March 19, 2010 letter to me, at <http://www.chadevanswronglyconvicted.org/documents/LettersKeyDocument11.pdf>.

*20 January 2012 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Mark,

I can see why Morrison is pointing out the fact that Chad was a school board member and once declared as a hero, these things do provide insight into his character. However, there are other facts that shed light on the type of person he is/was: Police interviews with his ex-girlfriend who stated that Chad was irrational and short-tempered. His friends (Bruce, Jeremy) discussed what they knew of the assault on his ex-wife to the police. And there's the assault conviction as well. In addition, there were countless examples of the use of cover stories concerning Cassidy's injuries, namely the trampoline story, which Chad actually shared with the police on the evening of the 9th. The police knew that this was a fabricated story which was confirmed with Amanda.

I think Chad made a lot of mistakes, namely not telling the truth in his police interview, and not staying in touch with the police, not to mention the willful contact with Amanda.

Morrison,

I'd like to know Chad's explanation about the events on the Sunday prior to Cassidy's death....Jackie Conley told the police that Amanda and Cassidy were supposed to come see her on that day, but Cassidy wasn't there. Amanda told her that Chad took Cassidy to York's Wild Kingdom, a park that had already closed for the season. As you can see, this appears to be another example of hiding Cassidy due to her facial injuries.

Thanks,

Bob

*18 January 2012 - Rochester*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Campaigns for exoneration of wrongly convicted people often take a long time. Among the most recent exonerations, (and exonerations they were, despite the legal jargon) the West Memphis Three were in jail and prison for 18 years for murders they did not commit. In Virginia, Thomas Haynesworth was exonerated with the support of the Virginia Attorney General after 27 years in jail and prison for a rape he did not commit.

Chad Evans has served 10 1/2 years in jail and prison. It's been almost two years since this website was created and a lot has been learned since then about the Cassidy Bortner case. Sometimes our

progress is slow, but it continues inexorably toward exoneration. It would be helpful if more people who are interested in this case would ask New Hampshire Attorney General Michael Delaney to re-investigate the case. That would accelerate the search for truth. The State Police could begin by interviewing people who were not interviewed in 2000, but who saw Cassidy only a few days before her death. The State Police could request copies of all available photographs of Cassidy during the period from June-November 9. The State Police could request copies of all of Cassidy's medical records, none of which were available at Chad's trial. We have submitted to the Attorney General a three page outline of such a proposed re-investigation. Enough problems with the case have been exposed to warrant such a re-investigation.

18 January 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

### Mark C

Just because Chad was involved with a school committee and was in the right place at the right time to "save" the people in that car accident means nothing as it relates to this case. I'm sure someone could attest to good things done by many bad people, especially those who get caught up in moments of rage and tantrums.

What is comes down to is his state of mind, and his behavior, involving Cassidy when she wasn't acting in a manner he wanted.

Sorry to say that this case is going nowhere fast ...

18 January 2012

### Morrison Bonpasse |

Bob,

Several posts ago I made the point that it must be extremely unusual for a person to be elected to a school committee, and later to be recognized for risking his/her life to save the lives of others and only a few years later to be found guilty of assaulting and murdering a child. By citing the nearly irrelevant story of Timothy Logsdon, you seem to support my point.

Sexual abuse is wrong and sexual abuse of children is despicable. In the early stages of the investigation of Cassidy Bortner's death, there were indications of what police thought could have been sexual abuse, but those signs were apparently explained by other factors, and no charges were prepared. Sexual abuse is not part of the Cassidy Bortner case.

Unfortunately, there surely have been cases of school committee members, or former members, sexually abusing children, but I was not able to find an instance of such a person murdering a child. With more searching, such a person could probably be found, but then it would be extremely unlikely that that same person would also have previously been recognized as a life-saving hero. That was my point, and I made it because those circumstances did NOT occur in Chad's case either. He is former school committee member and he saved three lives and he did NOT assault and murder a child.

Regards.

15 January 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

### Bob Arnold |

Speaking of former school board members, I'm reminded of Timothy Logsdon:

Fosters Daily Democrat

Ex-Somersworth school panelist gets 10-30 years for sexually abusing his young daughter

By JASON CLAFFEY

Wednesday, December 2, 2009

DOVER — Former Somersworth School Board member Timothy Logsdon was sentenced to 10 to 30 years in state prison Tuesday after pleading guilty to sexually abusing his daughter when she

was as young as three.

In a negotiated plea deal that reduced a possible sentence of 25 years to life, Logsdon admitted to touching his daughter's genitals and telling her to keep it a secret in exchange for promises of chocolates. The abuse began in July 2006 when the daughter was three and continued for two years, prosecutors said in Strafford County Superior Court.

As part of the plea deal, Logsdon waived a sentence review that could later reduce his prison time. He will also be forced to register as a sex offender for life.

Logsdon said he struck the deal because "the idea of 25 to life ... is kind of scary."

Regards,

Bob

14 January 2012 - Rochester, NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

After publishing "EYE CONTACT - The Mysterious Death in 2000 of Cassidy Bortner and the Wrongful Convictions of Chad Evans and Amanda Bortner," copies have been accepted by the Maine and New Hampshire State Libraries. The book is now available on Amazon.com as a paperback (@\$25.00) and electronically on Kindle (\$3.00).

However, the Rochester Public Library (RPL) has declined to purchase the book or even to accept it as a gift for stocking on its shelves.

In contrast, the RPL recently purchased a copy of "Innocent until interrogated: the true story of the Buddhist temple massacre and the Tucson four." This book is about the wrongful convictions in Arizona of four men for a 1991 multiple murder. Also on the RPL shelves is John Grisham's "The Innocent Man," about the wrongful conviction and death sentence for Ron Williamson in Oklahoma in 1988 for murder. I counted 14 books related to wrongful conviction in the RPK catalog, but none of them is about a Rochester resident who claims wrongful conviction. At least not yet. (Yes, to paraphrase the late Senator Lloyd Bentsen, I know I'm not John Grisham.)

What should be done to persuade the Rochester Public Library to make EYE CONTACT available to the people in Rochester and surrounding towns?

13 January 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Mark,

As you know searches on the web are very particular about words and letters. I searched for "Board of Education" and "murder" together and found 15 million hits. The first several were the murders OF members of boards of education. When I added "Keene," Chad's case came up twice on the first page, so I'm confident that his case is among the 15 million, too.

I think that you, Bob Arnold and I agree that character means something and people usually act consistently with their character. You and Bob have correctly noted that Chad's fighting with his wife and conviction, by guilty plea, of domestic violence makes it more likely that he could also have been a child abuser. However, a major reduction in the probability arises for Chad because he sought out additional counseling after the end of court-ordered counseling. Not many people in his position do that, as far as I know. Still, there is a connection between domestic violence and child abuse.

On the other hand, I've been pointing out that there are other parts of Chad's character that are very inconsistent with abuse and murder of a child, i.e. election to the Board of Education and being recognized by Governor Shaheen and the Union Leader as a "hero" for saving lives, at some risk to his own.

The police focused on the domestic violence character probabilities and seemed to ignore the probabilities that I've cited about Chad. Nonetheless, there are often exceptions to rules and probabilities, so I'll never say "never."

Do you have any questions now about the case? What would you ask Chad if you met him or wrote

to him?  
Regards,

3 January 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

### Mark C

The name I gave was produced after only a few minutes of searching on the web. I'm sure there are many individuals that have been elected to school boards, "saved" lives and were subsequently convicted of murdering a toddler...unfortunately.

Not all stories are obtained through web searches. In fact, Chad's name did not appear when I ran the query. So, there goes that argument.

3 January 2012

### Morrison Bonpasse |

May this be the year that the wrongful convictions of Chad Evans and Amanda Bortner are reversed and that Chad will be released from prison and returned to his family and son.

This will happen if the State of New Hampshire carefully re-investigates the case. We may never know why Cassidy Bortner died, but we CAN reasonably determine that Chad Evans did not murder her.

Happy New Year 2012

1 January 2012 - Newcastle, Maine

### Morrison Bonpasse |

Mark,

Agreed. Seemingly good people can become very criminal, but Arthur Gary Bishop never was elected to a school board and never saved anyone's life.

Bob,

That's an interesting study that you presented. Thanks. I hope we can agree that some people recant what they told police for the reasons that were described in the study, and some people recant what they told police because what they said wasn't true. All the research on false confessions can be said to include the second category, as suspects told the police things about themselves which were not true. In Amanda's interviews, she told the police things about Chad, or assented to police statements, that were not true. Given that her subsequent statements about the case, i.e. the "flashbacks" document, and "My Life Story," and her short exchange with Sgt. White in Vermont in 2001 were all after she had some contact with Chad, there is no way to authoritatively establish the true reasons for her recanting. For me, what is most persuasive is that she wanted to be with Chad and relied upon Chad after Cassidy's death and wanted to marry him. This is not merely returning to someone who allegedly committed domestic violence. This is loving the man the police claimed murdered her daughter. Paralleling my challenge to Mark about Chad's election, "hero" status and murder charges, when in real life or in literature has the mother of a child remained in love with the man who she allegedly knew abused and murdered her daughter?

30 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

### Mark C

Arthur Gary Bishop went from being a honor student, Eagle Scout and teenage missionary to an obsessed pedophile and child killer.

30 December 2011

**Mark C**

Morrison,

Its pretty simple...the Board of education and life saving events boosted Chad' ego and made him feel like he was doing something good in the eyes of the public. Beating Cassidy took place behind closed doors, outside of the public's eye. Its one thing to try to do good things, but its another thing to react violently towards a child that you have little control over.

You can't connect these events and say that just because he was involved with educational interests (to some degree) and was in the right place at the right time to "save" those individuals that there is no way he could have beaten Cassidy and caused her death.

*30 December 2011*

**Bob Arnold | **

Becky,

I'm suprised that there are still people working there who knew Chad Evans.

*30 December 2011 - Rochester*

**Bob Arnold | **

Power of persuasion:

WEDNESDAY, Sept. 7 (HealthDay News) -- A new study reveals how men facing charges of felony domestic violence often persuade their victims to withdraw the accusations of abuse.

Ohio State University researchers listened to recorded jailhouse phone conversations between 17 accused male abusers in a Washington state detention facility and their female victims who decided not to follow through on the charges against the men.

The detention facility routinely records detainees' phone conversations and all the couples in the study knew they were being recorded.

The study authors, who examined between 30 and 192 minutes of phone conversations between each of the couples, said their findings may change how legal officials work with domestic violence victims to prosecute alleged abusers.

"The existing belief is that victims recant because the perpetrator threatens her with more violence. But our results suggest something very different," lead author Amy Bonomi, an associate professor of human development and family science, said in a university news release.

"Perpetrators are not threatening the victim, but are using more sophisticated emotional appeals designed to minimize their actions and gain the sympathy of the victim. That should change how we work with victims," she said.

Bonomi and her colleagues identified a five-step process that begins with victims determined to proceed with charges and ending with them agreeing to recant their testimony against the accused abuser.

*30 December 2011 - Rochester*

**Morrison Bonpasse | **

Mark,

My rhetorical question, "Huh?" is not odd at all. What's odd was that the police and prosecutors didn't slow down their conviction train to ask the same question, "Huh?" as soon as they learned about Chad's election to office and his "hero" award. Did they interview any of Chad's fellow Keene Board of Education members? Did they inquire about Chad's goals on that Board of Education? Did

they interview any of the three men who were saved? Did they contact the Union Leader to ask for more information about the 1996 lifesaving incident? No, they did none of these things. I wasn't "implying that Chad COULDN'T have been responsible," but I WAS implying that the first two events make the third far less likely, and should have given the police and prosecutors pause. People who run for elected school committees are usually committed to the well-being of children. People who take bodily risks to save the lives of others usually have a high regard for life. With all the resources on the Internet, can you, Mark, find a SINGLE other instance where an elected official has personally saved one or more lives and later been convicted of assaulting and murdering a young child? Can you find any set of circumstances even close to this scenario?  
Regards,

29 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Becky** | 

@ Mark  
I left it within the hands of an employee who was very pleased to take it!

29 December 2011 - Rochester

**Mark C**

Becky...left it where? In a booth, on top of the trash where people return their trays...?

29 December 2011

**Mark C**

Morrison,

Your "Huh?" comment is odd. You are implying that Chad couldn't have been responsible for Cassidy's death because of his past accomplishments. Doesn't make sense to me.

"Chad was elected to the Keene Board of Education, and in 1997 he was given a "Hero" award by the Union Leader and Governor Shaheen for saving three men's lives and in 2001 he was convicted of murdering 21-month-old Cassidy Bortner. Huh?"

29 December 2011

**Becky B** | 

Just left a copy of EYE CONTACT  
@ McDonalds in Rochester! :)

28 December 2011 - Rochester

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

On December 26, the Keene Sentinel editorialized against the New Hampshire death penalty. ([http://www.sentinelsource.com/opinion/editorial/the-legislature-gets-set-to-expand-the-death-penalty-regardless/article\\_9e060c16-7740-5f4f-a0a5-2d7e9e8d04f9.html#.TvtlsB8LxDQ.email](http://www.sentinelsource.com/opinion/editorial/the-legislature-gets-set-to-expand-the-death-penalty-regardless/article_9e060c16-7740-5f4f-a0a5-2d7e9e8d04f9.html#.TvtlsB8LxDQ.email)) I posted the comment below at the newspaper's website:

"Another argument against the death penalty is the possibility of executing a wrongly convicted, but innocent person. Some say that the chances of convicting an innocent person in a capital case are "infinitesimal" in New Hampshire. However, many of the 282 wrongly convicted people exonerated by the Innocence Project since 1989 were originally sentenced to death. In New Hampshire, Chad Evans, formerly of Keene, was wrongly convicted in 2001 of second degree murder, which has nearly the same elements as first degree murder. In 1991, Chad was elected to the Keene Board of Education, and in 1997 he was given a "Hero" award by the Union Leader and Governor Shaheen for saving three men's lives and in 2001 he was convicted of murdering 21-month-old Cassidy Bortner. Huh?"

For more information about Chad's wrongful conviction, see his website at [www.chadevanswronglyconvicted.org](http://www.chadevanswronglyconvicted.org) and/or read the book (online and paperback) about the case, "EYE CONTACT - The Mysterious Death in 2000 of Kassidy Bortner and the Wrongful Convictions of Chad Evans and Amanda Bortner." We are currently trying to persuade Attorney General Michael Delaney to re-investigate this case."

28 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Agreed. Most the publicity painted Chad and Amanda in a bad light. In part, that was because they were advised by Chad's lawyers not to talk with the press. On the other hand, others WERE talking with the press.

Chad's life lost its structure when he took an unpaid leave of absence from McDonald's. It was his idea, as a loyal manager/employee, to withdraw from the direct and public management of about nine restaurants. In retrospect, he agrees that his company loyalty gesture was devastatingly expensive. If he had to face the same situation again, he is confident that he could have negotiated a behind-the-scenes job with McDonald's until his trial and expected verdict of "Not Guilty."

However, he went on unpaid leave and lost his substantial income, which would have been helpful, generally, and with legal expenses. He lost his company car. Then Chad had to look for another job, but he found nothing in the Rochester area. So he looked for and found work in the Keene area and stayed with his parents while working there. He found a low-paying pizza delivery job, and then a job with a food distributor, and, at one point, a third job. Travis Hunt and Travis's sister continued to live at Chad's house in Rochester, and Chad lived there from time to time, but his work was miles away. He regularly came to the Rochester/Dover/Portsmouth area to see his son and sometimes his lawyers. On such days, he sometimes stayed at his house, but his work was far away.

A further complication was that Amanda had no home and she was estranged from her family, members of which blamed her and Chad for Kassidy's death. Amanda then stayed in Texas for a while and then returned to New Hampshire and stayed with her friends and friends of Chad and then in the summer in the woods of Vermont with a woman friend of hers. Chad came from time to time, as on the night of the previously noted police surveillance chase in July.

It was all chaotic, and the chaos ended in August, 2001, when Chad's bail was revoked. In addition to suffering the loss of Kassidy, Chad's life, and Amanda's life, were significantly damaged and disrupted, even before their convictions.

23 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,

Well that explains why Mark Sousa's name sounded familiar to me. I remember when all that happened, I didn't realize it was the same guy.

As far as news stories, there was extensive, continuous coverage of this case. Most of the articles do paint a picture of Evans as the guilty party.

One thing I don't understand is why he seemed to go into hiding after his indictment. He was using multiple vehicles, staying here and there, and generally stayed away from Rochester where his house was.

Merry Christmas,

Bob

22 December 2011 - Rochester

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Mark,

As I live in Maine, I've seen coverage of the Ayla Reynolds story. There's even a physical resemblance between Ayla and Cassidy and their ages are close. There are other similarities and differences in the two situations, but there is no need to detail them at this point. Hopefully, Ayla will be found alive, and okay, and will live a full and healthy life.  
Regards,

21 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

### Mark C

Interesting case involving Ayla Reynolds in Maine. One difference between this case and Chad's case is that the dad seems to be doing everything he can to assist police.

Maybe a CEWCC member can share information about bruising with the Reynolds...

"On Tuesday, Trista Reynolds' family said that the 20-month-old had been taken from their custody by the Department of Health and Human Services and placed with her father. Trista Reynolds said the baby, who broke her arm at her father's house two weeks ago, had begun showing mysterious bruising on her leg. While DiPietro did not comment on the girl's alleged injuries, he disputed the Reynolds family's account of Ayla's custody."

21 December 2011

### Morrison Bonpasse |

Bob,

It would be helpful to explore with you the news coverage, "much of which was very damning for both Chad and Amanda." Can you present some specifics.? I'm not challenging your characterization, but am seeking to explore the details of what was published. What caught your attention as "very damning"?

It's interesting that you mentioned the newspaper articles which quoted Mark Sousa, the funeral home person, and member of the Kittery Town Council. He drove, or helped drive, Cassidy's body from the York Hospital to the Maine Medical Examiner's lab in Augusta. In February 2001, he vociferously supported the Maine "Kassidy Bortner bill" which provided for greater penalties for not reporting suspected child abuse. There are three articles on Chad's website, for February 24 and 26 and June 24, which quote him extensively. (See [http://www.chadevanswronglyconvicted.org/article\\_links.html](http://www.chadevanswronglyconvicted.org/article_links.html)). Sousa is mentioned in EYE CONTACT at pages 157, 316, 317 and 329. Not only did he transport Cassidy's body, but he held her body while the police took photographs at the hospital. I tried to contact Mark Sousa, but was unable to locate him, perhaps because of his own subsequent legal problems. He was removed from the Kittery Town Council in 2005 because he was convicted of Federal firearms violations. He had been convicted in the 1970's of a felony in Massachusetts, and thus was not permitted by Federal law to possess a firearm. He was arrested in 2003, after he fired a semi-automatic pistol, aiming at what I don't know. At that time his possession of a firearm and felon status were noticed by the Federal authorities and he was charged and convicted.

Regards,

18 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

### Bob Arnold |

Morrison,

I wasn't aware of that. Of course, I grew up in Missouri where there's a much larger population as well as newspapers that typically report only on regional news. It's common practice to request change of venue for individuals who are accused of violent crimes. The caveat is that the venue almost always goes to Clay County (where I grew up, within the KC city limits). Clay County was and still is notorious for being harsh, but sometimes it was better to go there than to stay in the local area to defend yourself.

There certainly was a huge amount of media coverage about this case, much of it was very damning for both Chad and Amanda. The most emotional story was that of the funeral home

attendant Mark Sousa. There were many others but I found that particular story very upsetting.

Regards,

Bob

18 December 2011 - Rochester

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Hi Mark,

Yes, "Bad Luck" seems to apply. We exchanged comments in November about Chad being unlucky. In retrospect, some of his choices of action or inaction were bad choices, but he was unlucky with the consequences. For most of us, such bad choices are forgotten as nothing of consequence resulted. For example, around 1973, I dropped my nephew on his head when playing with him when he was about three years old. Fortunately, no permanent harm developed. At the time, we (his mother/my sister) and I and others didn't even consider taking him to a doctor. I forget if there were any post-fall symptoms. I was lucky.

When I was a teenager, I had a problem with drinking before driving. I was lucky that my only accident was when I hit a small tree and uprooted it in the front lawn of a friend. I did go to court for that accident and was put on probation and lost my license for a year. I was lucky that my stupidity never led to an injury to anyone or death.

Chad was unlucky at several points in this case. A few examples are:

1. The failure of DCYF to promptly and effectively followup to Tristan Evans' October 31, 2000 call about bruises she had seen on Kassidy. Even if the bruises had nothing to do with Kassidy's death, the DCYF intervention would have assured medical attention and a "WAKEUP" call for Amanda and Chad.
2. The loss in the 2001 fire of photographs of Kassidy, Chad and Amanda.
3. Chad's offer to pick up Kassidy at Jeff Marshall's on the afternoon of November 8. If Kassidy had stayed overnight at Jeff's and Jennifer Bortner's that night and died the next day, the police's theory of the case would have started with Jeff and Jennifer, and not Chad. That likely would have made a difference in who was charged.
4. The unlucky shortage of openings at daycare facilities led to Amanda accepting Jeff's offer to babysit for Kassidy until a daycare opening occurred. If Kassidy had been enrolled in a daycare center on the first day of Amanda's work at Old Navy, more professional attention would have been paid to Kassidy. She might still have died from the accidents and other possible conditions, but a licensed daycare center would have brought better prospects for Kassidy.

Regards,

18 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Mark C**

Prison Bound is a great song to hear live. No implied connection between Chad and the song other than the word Prison. I also like Ball and Chain.

I would bet Chad would think Bad Luck was the song more appropriate for his situation.

Mike Ness...Lynn, MA's finest.

18 December 2011

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Good question. Motions for Change in Venue due to pre-trial publicity are not favored in New Hampshire. I did some legal research and found several highly publicized cases where Motions for Change in Venue were denied, e.g. Pam Smart, Michael Addison, and Jesse Brooks. I was unable to find a single case where an appellate court ruled that a Superior Court's denial of a Motion for Change in Venue was an error.

Chad's attorneys surely believed that making such a motion would be futile in Chad's case. The NH

Supreme Court stated the basic criterion for approving a Motion for Change in Venue in the 2008 NH v. Jenot case. The court said, "To obtain a change of venue, the defendant must prove that the jury was so tainted by pretrial publicity that he could not obtain a fair and impartial trial in the county in question." (<http://www.courts.state.nh.us/supreme/opinions/2008/jenot137.pdf> ) In most cases, judges believe that careful selection of jurors, to exclude those who have been influenced by the media coverage, is a sufficient way to ensure an impartial jury.

It's unlikely that in his upcoming Motion for a New Trial Chad will cite his attorneys' failure to request a change in venue, or his appellate attorneys' failure to raise the issue on appeal.

Regards,

18 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,

I don't understand why Chad's lawyers didn't request a change of venue. I would think it would have been granted if requested, however it was never requested and as a matter of fact, it looks like his lawyers wanted the trial in Strafford County, despite the overwhelming amount of media coverage. What say you?

Bob

17 December 2011 - Rochester

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Mark,

Below are the lyrics to the song Prison Bound by Social Distortion, from your YouTube link below. It's about prisoners who have committed the crimes for which they were convicted. Thus, it generally does not apply to Chad, but one line seems close which is "But some day I'll return." That "some day," when he is exonerated, should be sooner, rather than later.

"Well, I'm goin' to a place where the tough guys go  
and come out even tougher.

A place where a man don't show his feelings,

A place where a man don't cry.

Well they say I'm being punished

And they say I can be reformed

But some day I'll return.

Did they really think that  
this time it would work.

You knew all along it wouldn't

CHORUS:

Oh, I'm prison bound

I did a crime one too many times.

It's on the outskirts of town, by the railroad tracks

Where the country moon shines.

Oh, I'm prison bound

Tell my girl I'll be back one day.

Oh, I'm prison bound

I may never know any other way.

Well, they take away my freedom of expression or action

Johnny says I'll walk the line

With three hots and a cot

and a lot of talk

With lock-up, concrete, and steel.

Well it's cold and it's clammy

Man, it's colder than a pimp's heart

But I've gotta do my time

There's a lesson to be learned here

but what a price to pay.  
You know, I may never learn-  
CHORUS:  
Oh, I'm prison bound  
I did a crime one too many times.  
It's on the outskirts of town, by the railroad tracks  
Where the country moon shines.  
Oh, I'm prison bound  
Tell my girl I'll be back one day.  
Oh, I'm prison bound  
I may never know any other way."

17 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Mark C**

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RQWROgtUjIQ>

16 December 2011

**Mark C**

Morrison,

I applaud your disclosure of the meeting and that Jane didn't agree with your sentiments regarding the case. Definitely shows me, and others, that you are not more concerned with highlighting opinions that are just consistent with your own or of the committee. Thanks.

16 December 2011

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

I met this afternoon with a former NH State Senator and her friend, who is called "Jane" here. Jane read EYE CONTACT this week and felt strongly afterwards that Chad abused and murdered Cassidy Bortner. Jane had no previous knowledge of the case before reading the book, but she was knowledgeable about child development and child abuse. We agreed on a few aspects of the case, such as the view that Cassidy seemed young to understand "time-outs," but also that there is a wide range of acceptable parenting styles and child behaviors to match. The good news is that EYE CONTACT apparently provides enough factual information for people to reach different conclusions. While Jane's conclusions were initially disappointing to me, I was pleased that she was able to forthrightly share her views with me. This is a difficult case, and the truth is not obvious to anyone. I told Jane and the former State Senator that I would update them from time to time on developments in our Campaign for Justice for Chad.

16 December 2011 - Logan Airport, Boston (waiting for my sister-in-law)

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Mark,

Your interest in a rapid resolution of this entire matter is much appreciated. I've been working on this case for two years, and it's not easy work. Sometimes ducks need to be lined up in order, and that can take time. Believe me, I understand your points.

Does anything ELSE about this case interest you at this point?

Regards,

14 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Mark C**

Morrison,

My point is...why wait? Will waiting until the State decides to re-investigate somehow put him in a better position?

This has nothing to do with what I believe or what I do not believe.

Its been over a decade that he's been in prison. If it were me, and I was truly innocent, I would be willing to do whatever it took to put myself, and case, in a better position...as soon as I could.

I'm not suggesting going from A to Z, just from A to P...as in Polygraph.

Waiting for the State to make a move is like watching grass grow or paint dry. Why not force their hand a bit? Clearly, they all know what a positive polygraph could mean.

*14 December 2011*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Mark,

Sometimes life is complicated, right? Sometimes the route from A to Z doesn't go through M or N. Can we set this issues of the timing and initiation of a polygraph exam aside for a while? In the meantime, I say again that Chad is willing to take a polygraph. That was his position on November 9, even if some people don't believe that he stated that same position to Sgt. Matthew Stewart that night. That was his position when, at the behest of the State Police, Amanda asked Chad if he would be willing to take a polygraph. He told her, "yes," and she passed that expression of willingness on to the police. That is his position now.

It's understood that until he takes such an exam, or other corroborating evidence appears, you may disbelieve what you and others wish of what Chad has said and written about the events of 2000.

Regards,

*14 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Mark C**

I'm confused. Help me out, Morrison.

Why not proceed with as many steps you've identified as part of your re-investigation plan without regard to the State's position?

Waiting and hoping for the State to just magically decide to re-investigate doesn't seem like an approach that will lead to success.

If you want the State to get things in gear, what better way to open some eyes than Chad passing a polygraph? We all know it is not admissible in court, however, it very well may convince someone to look more closely at his case.

*14 December 2011*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Thank you for your posted comments, which you also sent by email. I replied by email before seeing the posting here. Let's resolve this offline and in good faith. Let's see how we can work together, and communicate openly in the future, consistent with our mutual interest in justice.

Morrison

*14 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob Arnold** | 

14 December 2011 - Rochester

**Morrison** | 

Morrison,

It's obvious that I've gone overboard with my recent comments and wish to appologize. Presenting opinion and having a spirited debate has turned into something ugly which is something that should never have happened, my comments about your character are inexcuseable and have caused me to do much soul searching in the past few days. I've also looked closely at the wording on my website, and have decided to take in down.

I hope that we can continue to have debate about the Chad Evans case. I stand by my comment that if he passes a polygraph, it would have an impact on my opinion.

Regards,

Bob

14 December 2011 - Rochester

**Morison Bonpasse** | 

Mark,

As noted before, Chad and his Committee have asked the Attorney General to re-investigate his case, and a polygraph test for Chad is part of the proposed re-investigation plan. Chad looks forward to such a polygraph test, and toward the rest of his case being re-investigated. Although you and Bob have said that a polygraph test would influence how you might view the case in the future, it's not clear that taking a polygraph would make a difference for the police or prosecutors, i.e. the Attorney General. That's one reason for suggesting that the police conduct such an exam.

I just finished reading "The Central Park Five" by Sarah Burns. In that wrongful conviction case, one of the teenaged defendants passed a polygraph exam before trial. The police and prosecutors paid no attention, and the boy was convicted. He was released from prison at the completion of his term, as were the other four boys, before the police identified the man who assaulted and raped the "Central Park Jogger." The rapist had told someone that HE was the Central Park rapist and the police verified his admission with DNA testing.

13 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Mark C**

Any update on Chad taking a polygraph?

13 December 2011

**Becky** | 

"Pay no attention to what the critics say.  
A statue has never been erected in honor of a critic."  
~Jean Sibelius

11 December 2011 - Rochester, NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Your previous post, which begins, "Becky, you are incorrect," is defamatory to my reputation and

character. I don't have the ability to remove the posting with my web editor, so I'll contact our Internet Service Provider (ISP) in the morning to have the posting removed. Then I'll seek to recover from you the cost of that removal and also damages for the harm you have caused to my reputation, and punitive damages.

In addition to being a civil offense, defamation is also a crime in New Hampshire. See Chapter 644, Section 11 of the NH Revised Statutes which says: Criminal Defamation.

I. A person is guilty of a class B misdemeanor if he purposely communicates to any person, orally or in writing, any information which he knows to be false and knows will tend to expose any other living person to public hatred, contempt or ridicule.

II. As used in this section "public" includes any professional or social group of which the victim of the defamation is a member. Source. 1971, 518:1. 1992, 269:17, eff. July 1, 1992.

<http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/rsa/html/lxii/644/644-mrg.htm>

Please stop making defamatory statements on this "online comment" section or anywhere else.

*11 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

Bob Arnold comment deleted.

**Becky** | 

Oh!

& there are many, many, many people who knows Chad is NOT guilty!

I carry knowledge :)

You carry judgement :(

*10 December 2011 - Rochester*

**Becky** | 

Mr. Arnold,

You are so wrong on so many levels!

How's your research on the autopsy??

May the truth set you free sir, for you

do NOT have your facts straight!

*10 December 2011 - Rochester*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Can you present here just ONE fact that either adds to our collective understanding of the Chad Evans case or that identifies an error in what has been written here on this website or in EYE CONTACT? Can any of the "key players" who have contacted you provide such a fact?

*10 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

Bob Arnold comment deleted.

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

1. I have met with Amanda and a member of our committee has talked with her several times, as recently as this month. She supports our campaign for justice for Chad.

2. I'm curious, too, about your "many emails from key players in the case." It would help our quest for the truth if you or they could present their facts and comments on these pages. If any of them wishes more space than this "online comments" section permits, I promise to post anything such a "key player" sends to me (or to you and from you to me.)

3. In wrongful convictions cases, it's not unusual at all that people formerly close to the wrongly convicted person begin to believe the police and prosecution theory of the case. That is, I believe,

what happened to Amanda in her police interviews. Last month, I met Richard Miles, an exoneree from Texas. His father was a minister, and members of his father's church left that church because he was the father of a convicted murderer. (See <http://forejustice.org/db/Miles--Richard.html>)

4. I don't understand your objection to the use of photos of Cassidy, some of which Chad took himself. These are photos of Cassidy during the period that Chad was allegedly abusing her. Amanda does not object. What is your objection?

5. I don't understand your objection to my trying to contact people involved in the case. Isn't communication the best way to understand and resolve our differences, and to find the truth? Isn't face-to-face communication an excellent type of communication? I still don't understand why you will not meet with me. You seem quite willing to write unkind words about me and Chad's supporters, but seem reluctant to engage in a meaningful face-to-face discussion.

6. It's interesting that you label your efforts as a "campaign for justice," as that's exactly how we supporters of Chad Evans view our work on his behalf. With that common ground, we should be able to resolve our differences through a concerted search for the truth. In other divisive issues in our society such as abortion and gay rights, people on opposing sides have been able to engage in sincere discussion. Why aren't you and your "key players" and the writers of your referenced emails similarly willing to engage?

*10 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob Arnold** | 

One other thing,

I'm curious, why have I received so many emails from key players in the case, individuals who are in complete agreement with me? Why is that Morrison? Why is it that none of the key players are actively engaged in the efforts of the CEWCC? I find it interesting that not one key player has posted on this website in favor of Chad. Why is that? Where's all the key players? Where's Amanda? Humm?

Your use of Cassidy's pictures to help free her killer from prison is deeply disturbing, selfish and immoral. You and Chad are dispicable. You claim you want justice, then do the right thing and remove all photographs of poor Cassidy. Let her rest in peace.

You have some never posting these photos of her, right next to the photo of Chad the wife-beater, wearing his wife-beater shirt. Shame on you.

*9 December 2011 - Rochester*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,

The efforts of this committee, as well as Chad and yourself, are simply dispicable. I'm offended by the images of Cassidy that you so proudly parade around, the lies and the twisting of facts. I also find your efforts to contact individuals including myself and other key players who do not believe that Chad is innocent to be offensive. Have you no shame? Have you no courage to set aside your own personal agenda, and look at all the facts surrounding this case and draw the same conclusion that a jury came to?

My campaign for justice continues, justice has been served. Chad Evans, despite his claims, is guilty of the murder of Cassidy Bortner. Without question. His lies and weak explanations for his unconscionable actions during the police investigation can be summed up like this: Chad is a cold, calculating, driven individual who will stop at nothing to get what he wants.

I have no doubt that Chad inflicted intentional bodily harm on Cassidy. He ruined her on both a mental as well as a physical level. You cry fowl when I present rock solid evidence of his guilt and think it unfair when I write my account of what I believe really happened. I do this to show that there is another side to this story which is highly likely what actually went on in the mind of this child killer.

It was another wonderful day in the great state of New Hampshire, where justice has prevailed and

a violent child-killer remains behind bars.

"Chad bad"

-Kassidy Bortner, just prior to her murder by Chad Evans

Regards,

Bob

*9 December 2011 - Rochester*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,

I could say the same thing about the title of your book...."the mysterious death of Kassidy Bortner." Judging by the evidence, her death was no mystery. As far as fiction vs. non-fiction, I believe that Chad's explanations and recollections of events are pure works of fiction.

*9 December 2011 - Rochester*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

What you have written is profane, inaccurate and not helpful to the pursuit of truth about the Chad Evans case. You have written in the past that my book, EYE CONTACT, is fiction. Well, it's non-fiction. You may not believe people or documents that are used as sources for EYE CONTACT, but you can be sure that it's non-fiction. However, what you have written here, and in the previous posting really IS fiction. It reflects your beliefs but it comes out of your own head and not from reliable sources.

Regards,

*9 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob Arnold** | 

My book continues:

"I got a message from DCYF about the kids...I'm thinking what the fuck, now I'm getting pissed. I don't have time for this crap. Who's DCYF anyway? I called them back and left a message, told them to call me on Tuesday, I'm going out of town. (Maybe the bruises on Kassidy will clear up by then). I start calling around town, because I want to know who the fuck reported me. I called Jeff and confronted that son of a bitch, he claimed ignorance. Great. Son of a bitch, if this is about Kassidy, I'm kicking both those bitches out.....

I get a call from the Kittery PD. Now what, they want me to come to the station. This is bullshit, I'm going to kill that little bitch. I called Jeff, what's going on man? Jeff tells me to get my ass to the station, I told that son of a bitch that I'd kick his ass for that. Now I'm worried, it's got something to do with the little retard. I called my friends, I called Tristan, I told them to come to the station, maybe if I have a support group there things will be better. I take my time to get up to Kittery, because I don't want to show up without my friends. I stop by the store in Portsmouth and shoot the shit with Jeremy. I get Tristan on the phone, that bitch better show up is all I'm going to say.....

If anyone finds errors in my book so far, please let me know. Otherwise I will consider it an accurate account of the days events.

*9 December 2011 - Rochester*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,

On the contrary, I believe it perfectly matches the prosecution's theory and their closing statements.

Much of it is corroborated through witness testimony. I believe it more closely matches the truth, vs Chad's recollection of events during the early morning of the 8th. I can't see Chad telling Cassidy "go back to sleep baby." I also can't see Chad clumsily rushing to the car, yelling "wait, I didn't kiss Cassidy," and saying to Amanda "honey, she can open the baggy!" Only to be harshly spoken to by Amanda "she's been able to do that for a month, I got to go!"

My story is much more believable, wanna know why? Because in reality, Chad is not the clumsy, dorky, loving and caring family man that he (and you) portray him as in the opening chapter of Eye Contact. He's more like a short-tempered, controlling, loud, abusive person who puts the smack down when he sees fit.

*9 December 2011 - Rochester*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob and Mark,

Respectfully, the story barely parallels the prosecution's theories and isn't worth further comment.

*9 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Mark C**

As much as the supporters don't like to hear it, I do think Bob's story below is pretty accurate.

I don't think Chad tried to kill Cassidy. I think he just snapped and hit her because he couldn't reason with her. She was one person he couldn't control through intimidation or any other tactic.

He knows the truth about what went on between the two of them when no one else was around.

Take the polygraph, son. Prove the doubters wrong.

*9 December 2011*

**Bob Arnold** | 

I'm writing a book myself. It's called  
"Smack Down...the Brutal Murder of Cassidy Bortner."

It starts during the early hours of November 8, 2000. "I was so tired from being up late the night before, putting the smack down on Amanda, and I was pissed because she wouldn't give me a piece of ass. That bitch thinks she works harder than me, I'll kick her ass out if she doesn't give me some ass pretty quick. Suddenly I hear Cassidy crying. It was 5:30am, and she's waking me up already? That little bitch. This is MY fucking house, I pay the bills and this little bitch is waking me up. I yelled at her to shut the fuck up. She stopped, probably because she knew what would be coming next. Like the smack down I put on her in the car last night. I still can't believe that little retard said no to me! I'm driving her ass home to MY house, and she's going to tell me no? I saw complete red, and I instantly reached back and smacked her as hard as I could. That shut her up. But then I noticed she was drooling and she'd lost control of her head. Oh shit, did I go too far this time? I better make some calls, I'll call Jeff because Amanda's going to ask him about her. This was all Jeff. I'll call him and put some blame on him, he's an idiot anyway."

What do you think?

Bob

*9 December 2011 - Rochester*

**Sandy**

Bob, I'm confused...you say what a horrible person Chad is, yet you act exactly the way you accuse him of being. Why?

9 December 2011 - NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,  
No I won't ask him. The question is incredibly crude and inexcusable.

9 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

As a matter of fact, could you please ask Chad if he is satisfied with the anal sex he is getting in prison, vs the anal sex he forced on Amanda, and likely all his other female partners? I'm just wondering, does he find the male sphincter more pleasing? If so, he may not want to leave prison so soon.

Thanks,

Bob

8 December 2011 - Rochester

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,  
Ok. You're welcome.  
I don't know if "circling" was an accurate description of Chad's and Amanda's appearance at the police parking lot, but I didn't ask Chad about that detail. It's not consistent with Chad's explanation of their reason for going to the police station, but you didn't believe that explanation, anyway. They drove there and saw that Bruce was already talking with the police and they left. Incidentally, the current Rochester Police station was built after 2000, so the parking lot was different then. Also, FYI, Bruce's home was on Winter Street, which is about a half-mile from the police station, thus it wasn't a big trip from Bruce's.  
Any other questions about the case or the book or website?  
Regards,

8 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,  
Thanks, I missed it the first time.

So, are we to believe that Chad and Amanda were just trying to say thanks to Bruce? This is the most ridiculous explanation that Chad could have given. Following Bruce around, and circling the parking lot of the Rochester PD is simply bizarre paranoid and guilty ridden behavior.

8 December 2011 - Rochester

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,  
The four comments which included Chad's response to your request for his explanation of the November 15, 2000 "circling the parking lot" report were posted here on December 5.  
Regarding the referenced "letter to Bruce," can you tell me the source of that reference? The only document that I recall Amanda writing when she was at Bruce's was the "Flashbacks" document which Chad did send to his lawyers, and which is posted on this website.

7 December 2011 - Rochester, New Hampshire

**Bob Arnold** | 

Mark,  
I agree, the letter to Bruce mysteriously disappeared.

Morrison, I'm still waiting on the explanation from Chad Bad about the parking lot incident, but just ot refresh your memory:

Bruce described this letter to the police, who asked if he'd get it for them. He agreed, however when he got to the house the letter was gone. He confronted Chad and Chad told him that he had allegedly turned it over to his attorney. At this point, Bruce asked Chad and Amanda to move out. Bruce was extremely upset over this issue with the letter. But Morrison claims that Bruce kicked them out because of police pressure. Horse shit. Upon Bruce's return to the Rochester PD, Chad and Amanda were observed following Bruce in a vehicle, circling the parking lot. Now this is a prime indication of the type of person Chad is. He controls, when he can no longer control then he takes action.

The letter that Morrison has produced does not match the description of the actual letter that Bruce described. In all likelihood, the letter was destroyed by Chad.

This is yet another good example of how Chad tampered with witnesses as well as evidence. He was uncooperative, evaded police questioning and refused to help the police in any way.

Chad is a sinister, deceptive, aggressive and violent individual.

Regards,

Bob

*7 December 2011 - Rochester*

**Mark C**

Just a comment about the pictures...if you think using any of the pictures from this website would help, they are not good enough - too blurry and grainy.

If only that mysterious fire at the camp hadn't happened. Hmmm.

Oh wait...the lost pictures probably would be damning to the plight to re-open this case.

Surely, even Chad would have realized that dated stamped photos showing Kassidy without bruises would have helped his case. Not a surprise that any photos to the contrary would have been tragically lost forever.

Like the letter to Bruce. Huh. Chad has terrible luck.

*7 December 2011*

**Becky** | 

Thank you!

*6 December 2011 - Rochester*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,  
So the quotation that the injuries to Tristan were "the worst he'd seen in his career as a police officer," came in 2011 from a Rochester police officer who wishes to remain anonymous? Did that police officer participate in the police work surrounding the incident? How does that quote square with the Rochester Police Arrest report which is posted at Chad's

website for March 28, 1999 which said "INJURIES: Apparent Minor Injury"? (see Discovery page 624,  
<http://www.chadevanswronglyconvicted.org/documents/990328arrestreportWandgunsseized.pdf>)  
Thank you for your offer of reconciliation if Chad passes a polygraph test. You are right that Becky and Christine are "decent ladies."

6 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,

I received this information within the past week. As far as naming the source I have to ask myself, am I on trial here? I've stuck to the facts and have retracted any statement I've made in the past that was incorrect....this I know for a fact from first hand information that a Rochester patrolman believed that the assault on Tristan Evans was the worst case of domestic violence he had ever seen as a police officer....this information slowly leaked around to the McDonald's people, and it was also shared with Jeff Marshall who also stated this in his police interview.

I will have to think long and hard about citing any of my work, since I'm not here to prove Chad's innocence and I don't need to actually prove anything at all...as a close friend (who thinks I'm crazy for hanging out here) recently told me, "so what Bob, the guy's in prison." I would not post something here that I didn't believe to be the truth, I've confirmed the statement of this officer and will not name them. This piece of information is one of many that have solidified my impression of Evans...a short-tempered violent abuser who inflicts physical harm on others....this has been my whole point about his assault on Cassidy.

I'm still working on independent confirmation that Chad's case will not be reopened by the AG's office, it's taking longer than I thought. I do know this, that the "new evidence" that you are claiming you have has not materialized, it's just the same information that's been re-hashed over and over. You may be able to produce hundreds of signatures to your petition, but without habeas corpus (which has been exhausted) or overwhelming new evidence (which you don't have), Chad Evans will not get out of prison anytime soon.

I do believe in the polygraph. If Chad takes an extensive polygraph and the results indicate sincerity, I will gladly give you [chadevansguilty.com](http://chadevansguilty.com) for free and you can do what you wish with it. I might even come to one of your meetings and ask Becky and Christine for their forgiveness (which I'm sure they'll give because they seem like decent ladies).

Regards,

Bob

6 December 2011 - Rochester

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Can you please give the source of the quoted statement by a Rochester police officer that the domestic violence between Chad and Tristan Evans in March 1999 was "the worst he'd seen in his career as a police officer."?

Several officers wrote reports about the incident.

Thanks.

6 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,

When you speak with Chad Bad, would you also express to him how lucky he should feel that Bob was not the father of any of those girls/women that he assaulted? It's important that he know that there are fathers in this world who would have beaten the dog shit out of him for the violent assaults

he's inflicted on Barbara Hamel, Tristan Evans, Amanda Bortner, Cassidy and all the others who he slapped around when things weren't going his way.

It is well documented that Chad was a wife-beater, girlfriend-beater, and a child-beater. I doubt he is in general population, as you've suggested, because guys like Chad are at risk of being assaulted and killed by other inmates...ask him what it feels like to be on the receiving end of abuse.

*6 December 2011 - Rochester*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison:

1: Pure conjecture. You have no idea why he was not found guilty on that one assault charge.

2: It is a well documented fact that his family has done everything possible to enable him, even if it meant a possible jail sentence. Furthermore, all they do is defend him, instead of the more responsible thing and confront him, like Mark Hacking's family did with him.

3: Everything you said is BS. He was angry about the car seat (see Jeff's interview, see also Chad's police interview). The calls to Jeff were highly abnormal, they were a skilled attempt to frame Jeff.

Chad became enraged and did in fact assault Amanda on the evening of the 8th, contrary to your explanation which is eerily similar to your explanation of the beating he inflicted on Tristan Evans, which was described by one of the Rochester police officers as "the worst he'd seen in his career as a police officer."

I see through all your attempts at explaining away important events that point to Chad Evan's true character and demeanor: A lying, manipulative short-tempered, volatile, extremely abusive and controlling person. This is a bonafide, well documented fact.

Regards,

Bob

*6 December 2011 - Rochester*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

1. Regarding the single photograph. The jury found Chad Not Guilty on the assault charge for the period which began on the date of that photograph. What would have happened at Chad's trial if the jury had seen all of the photographs of Cassidy during the periods of the indictments, from August 1 through November 9? There are several such photographs in the Appendix to EYE CONTACT, and many more were available during the investigation, but never requested by the police or by Chad's attorneys.

2. Chad's sister and brother-in-law told the police during their interviews on November 9 about that gathering. The police AND Chad's lawyers, and their investigator, should have fully explored the activities and participants of that day in Belmont.

3. Chad on the 8th? He made a rushed decision to use an adult seat belt for Cassidy instead of other alternatives. In the past, I've made some decisions like that, which I regret. The calls to Jeff were not to coverup anything. He was not angry that evening, except that he and Amanda had an argument before they went to bed around midnight. There was no "rage," and probably less anger than you often show in your comments in this website section.

*6 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,

I've read those transcripts, it doesn't help Chad's case. Chad had every opportunity to discuss

taking a polygraph with the police, and avoided it. He misled the police, withheld information, intentionally lied to the police officers and was generally unhelpful. Furthermore, the police gave him their business cards and told him to call whenever he felt the need, he never called. Never followed up, never took any interest in helping the police investigation. These are all unconscionable actions of someone who would be in that kind of situation, unless of course they were guilty. Chad went to great measures to hamper the entire police investigation, including the willful tampering of a key witness. The prosecution proved this beyond a reasonable doubt.

"The presence of only one photograph of Cassidy, alive, at Chad's trial" - So what.

"What do you think of the family gathering on Sunday, November 5, to which Chad brought Cassidy?" - Chad's family has a history of covering up his deeds, enabling his illegal activities, and defending him regardless of what the evidence says.

"What do you think of Cassidy's two doctor appointments, on August 10 and September 11, " - As I've pointed out in the past, this does nothing to exonerate Chad. It only proves that the abuse gradually worsened, and by the evening of November 8th, his familiarity with her added fuel to his rage with her.

Let me ask you this, what do you think of Chad's behavior on the evening of 11/8/00? About his anger with the car seat not being available? His repeated calls to Jeff in order to cover up the assaults on Cassidy? About the rage of anger that resulted in his choking Amanda? Hum?

*6 December 2011 - Rochester*

---

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Mark,

Responding to the first of your two comments, your recommendations for a polygraph test will be forwarded to Chad.

*6 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

---

**Mark C**

Taking matters into your own hands and being a vigilante as it relates to these so-called troublemakers doesn't make you question a person's temper and ability to control it?

I bet the chief of police never said anything about troublemakers, was simply checking out a report of people on the land, and Chad, in classic fashion, is making it up to support his actions...after-the-fact.

Chad was just a Chuck Norris wannabe, I guess. Tough guy looking to lay the smack down on anyone who dared follow him!

Sounds like a well-adjusted individual with a perfect handle on his temper.

Chad Evans, omnipotent defender of Vernon!

*6 December 2011*

---

**Mark C**

Morrison,

Please ask Chad, directly, if he would submit to a polygraph in the next 30 days to answer questions about Cassidy's death. If the prison requires additional time to approve of the test, please post a tentative testing date once it is known.

Surely Chad's innocence is worth whatever it will cost to have the polygraph administered. Right, Committee members?

If he refuses to take it, then my thoughts about his guilt will remain unchanged.

Please have the test administered by an independent, unbiased individual so no one can claim BS...that it was some kind of set up to make him look good. Bob and I can assist in developing questions, if needed.

Will you pass this request on to Chad?

Thanks.

6 December 2011

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

I never said that the police officers were at fault. I wrote that IF the police thought the situation on July 4, 2001 was dangerous, they could have easily stopped it.

Chad was never asked, directly, to take a polygraph. He recalls telling Sgt. Matthew Stewart on the night of November 9 to give him a polygraph test. Sgt. Stewart filed no reports, to my knowledge, of his work on this case, so we don't have any corroboration of Chad's statement. However, we DO have a transcript of the police asking Amanda to ask Chad if he was willing to take a polygraph and we DO have a transcript of Amanda telling the police that he would. Period. (See EYE CONTACT, pages 239, 241-242, 244) The police also asked Chad's friend, Jeremy Hinton, if Chad would be willing to take a polygraph and Jeremy told them, "I would say he would be, yeah." (See EYE CONTACT, page 248.)

What do you think of the presence of only one photograph of Cassidy, alive, at Chad's trial?

What do you think of the family gathering on Sunday, November 5, to which Chad brought Cassidy?

What do you think of Cassidy's two doctor appointments, on August 10 and September 11, during the period of Chad's charges for child endangerment and assault, respectively?

6 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,

Yea you're right, it's the police officer who was at fault, not Chad....because he should have turned on his lights. Great. Another example of blaming someone else for something. You're becoming like Chad! Unbelievable. The facts are the facts, you can't deny them Morrison. Fact: Chad had a violent, uncontrollable temper which is well documented. Fact: Chad liked to control, this is also well documented but if you really want to see it for yourself, watch the police video taped interview with him. Fact: Chad is a liar, this is documented over and over. Again, see it for yourself in the police video.

As far as the letter, no that is not the same letter that Bruce described. Furthermore, the real letter was likely destroyed by Chad. As far as inconsistencies with the Bruce Aube interview, here we go again....deny (straight from the Chad Evans playbook).

There is no doubt that Chad Evans is guilty of the crimes he has been found guilty of by our justice system. Chad is a liar.

Mark, to answer your question about why he never took a polygraph: Because he's guilty and he knows it. Contrary to what the CEWCC claims, he never offered to take a polygraph during the police investigation. Never did he even offer to take one. Never did he call the police to followup, to ask what the status of the investigation was....he never did any of that. Instead, he hid like a scared jack rabbit. And as far as his taking leave from his job to save the company any negativity, give me a break. Chad's boss told the police that it was a mutual agreement, he didn't say that Chad was on personal leave, he said his departure was a MUTUAL agreement. What does that tell you?

"Chad bad"

-Kassidy Bortner, prior to her murder by Chad Evans.

6 December 2011 - Rochester

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Mark,

It was the local police chief who told Chad about some troublemakers in the area. While you or I might have responded differently to being followed early on a summer morning, I don't see how you come up with such labels as "can't control his temper" and "likes to dominate."

If the police thought that the situation was becoming dangerous, a policeman should have turned on a flashing blue light, stopped Chad's car, and identified himself.

In any case, this is a long way from Chad's wrongful conviction for assaulting and murdering Kassidy Bortner.

6 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Mark C**

Yeah, a ton of hell raisers in Vernon. That place is like South Central, and Chad was gonna teach them a lesson!

Seriously...what kind of idiot decides to challenge people and welcome road rage incidents? I'll tell you. A person that can't control his temper and likes to dominate at all costs.

You really should editorialize for him, Morrison. He isn't doing himself any favors with these explanations.

6 December 2011

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Moving back to another issue raised earlier, I wrote in my "online comment" of November 20 that I would ask Chad the police report that when they were talking with Bruce on Wednesday, November 15, 2000 in the Rochester Police Dept. parking lot, Bruce identified Chad and Amanda in a car that Officer John Marasco wrote that he saw "circle the police parking lot." (See that report at <http://www.chadevanswronglyconvicted.org/documents/001121AssorteddocsWbeginwithAnchorageInn.pdf> pages 1069-70)

Below, in three sections is Chad's response in his Nov. 28 letter to me. This will also appear in his November "Letters from NH prison" when they are posted next week.  
(continued below)

5 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

(continued from above)

You asked for my memories on the Bruce situation with the letter that Amanda wrote at his house and Bruce's meeting behind the Rochester Police Station where Amanda and I drove through the parking lot and saw him with the police.

First of all, that particular report is full of inaccuracies and many of them are easily verified. I am not sure if it is because of the gravity of the situation, Bruce being nervous, perhaps trying to distance himself, or if it was simply police error. After all, it was conveniently another one of those interviews that was not recorded. Some of the inaccuracies include: Bruce stating Amanda wrote a letter to him. (You know this was the handwritten letter that Amanda wrote that discussed her thoughts on things, memories of different ways I and Jeff had treated Kassidy, how confused she was, etc.)

Amanda wasn't actually writing the letter to anyone as I recall. The reason she wrote things down at all is because she was so overwhelmed with the entire situation.

Bruce's girlfriend, Jessica Edmands, actually came up with the suggestion for Amanda to take some paper and write things down as they come to her. "This will help you sort things out in your head rather than everyone pulling you in different directions." I thought this was an EXCELLENT idea. I

encouraged Amanda to do it. Every now and then, Amanda would go into Bruce and Jess's bedroom which at that time was on the first floor, close the door and write. She kept the letter in there away from everyone.

I don't know what day the follow up meeting with the Rochester police took place but it was obviously not November 9th as the report states because that was the day Cassidy died. As the days went on I recall feeling that the police were only focused on me. I felt that anything Amanda had written in her letter whether good or bad about me and or Jeff would never be known to my lawyers if it was turned over to the police and it wasn't helpful to them. So, I asked Amanda if I could make a copy of it to send to my lawyer. I believe I mailed a copy of the letter to Alan's office.  
(continued below)

*5 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

---

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

(continued from above)

(Another point of how little influence I had over Amanda, I was staying there with her and encouraged her to write everything, even bad things about me if she felt them. This was about Cassidy. As we know, Amanda did in fact write some things about me that were not flattering and I sent the notes as she had made them. I didn't try to edit or delete them. Amanda had the police already working her over pretty good with what she should be saying and feeling. She didn't need that from me too.)

Anyway, Amanda and I were staying at Bruce's house with him and Jess. This entire thing was incredibly stressful for Bruce. He was tortured about the entire thing and it was eating him up. Only for the reason that this is the person that Bruce Aube is. He tries to understand everything down to the last detail and there was no understanding the death of a 21 month old child! Bruce came home quite agitated and told Amanda and I that he wanted us to leave. I could tell someone had gotten to him because he wouldn't even look me in the eye. I had known this man for 8 years. He knew everything about me right down to how much I loved kids. He used to laugh at how Tristan would reprimand me because I let Kyle and Brent pretty much do whatever they wanted. I was likely the last person that he would ever think killed a child. I felt betrayed! He asked for the letter and I believe I told him; the letter was mailed to my lawyers and informed him the police could get it from them. Bruce then left the house and Amanda and I began packing our stuff. I can't recall if I knew he was going to see the police or if he told me he was.

Immediately after he left, I started feeling badly. Bruce was my friend and I loved him and knowing the man he was, I knew this was hard for him. So Amanda and I got into the car to catch him and thank him for all he's done. I had no ill feelings for him and understood. I planned on giving him the copy of the letter so he could do whatever he wanted with it.

(continued below)

*5 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

---

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

(continued from above)

(At this point, I had no idea what the letter said. I was giving it to him on Faith because I knew I didn't kill Cassidy and never maliciously hurt her. If Amanda was being honest in the letter I would be ok.) However, we were too late.

When I pulled into the parking lot minutes behind Bruce he was meeting in the parking lot with the police ... So Amanda just packed up our stuff. I believe my parents were also there. We went back to my house, a place loaded with Cassidy memories and where it was painful to be at that moment. A day or so later I was arrested.

I didn't talk to Bruce for a while after that. After I was bailed out of jail he apologized to me folding to the pressure. "I know that you didn't do this man and I'm here for you till the end." And from then on, he was. He even bought me a suit for trial and sport coat. This made a total of three suits I could wear during the course of my two week trial. Oh yeah, I mentioned some of the details being wrong in the report. I know that I already pointed out Amanda's letter wasn't specifically written to Bruce. Also, he mentioned only knowing Cassidy for 2-3 weeks. That was false. He may have been speaking of only seeing bruises in the previous 2-3 weeks. He knew Cassidy from almost the time that I knew her. We didn't spend as much time with Bruce that summer as I always had. I believe

this was because I was the only one of my inner circle that had young children so Amanda and I spent more time that summer with Bruce & Michelle Truell, as well as Jeff Jacobs, Glen and Deb, etc. It would have been a true statement if Bruce had said, "I haven't seen Chad as much as usual." The police mentioned in this report asking Bruce to wire a body wire. Bruce told me this, months later. I recall saying, "I wish you had. Then maybe these people would figure out they were going after the wrong person." Truthfully, I now am sure it wouldn't have mattered. I was the person in their sights and they had tunnel vision.

*5 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

It was not "dumb shit liberals" who stopped the U.S. from waterboarding. It's called the Geneva Convention which all nations must abide. I went to prep school and college with George W. Bush, and it's a permanent stain on his record as President that he allowed Americans to torture people in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Incidentally, I was waterboarded in my Special Forces training at Fort Bragg in 1969. Even though I knew that my "captors" were not going to kill me, it still was not a pleasant experience. My strategy worked, which was to fake symptoms of drowning, so they let me breathe sooner than they might have otherwise done.

*5 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison:

"You're bringing the truth to light?" What truth are you talking about? The truth you are peddling is fiction, designed straight from the Chad Evans's playbook: Deny, blame others, concoct, distance, explain away, etc.... These are the actions of a desperate man with a mild psychopathic personality (Evans).

As far as the VSA, its use is extremely limited, that is to say it's not used for employment or internal UCMJ investigations or for administrative reasons (it's not used on US personnel). However, it does continue to be used while interrogating enemy combatants and terrorists, Taliban operatives, etc.... It's the only covert device we have, since dumb shit liberals took away water-boarding. I suppose you sleep better at night now that we don't do that anymore, hum?

Getting back to the polygraph, I second Mark's motion and as a matter of fact, I'd give you rights to chadevansguilty.com for free if he passed an extensive polygraph with an experienced, certified operator at the helm.

Oh, tell Chad thanks for the creative explanation....he does have a great imagination. He still has not addressed the incident at the Rochester PD parking lot with Bruce Aube.

Regards,

Bob

*5 December 2011 - Rochester*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Moving back to an issue raised earlier, I wrote in my "online comment" of November 21 that I would ask Chad about the surveillance that the police reported during the morning of July 4, 2001. Below, in three sections is Chad's response. This will also appear in his November "Letters from NH prison" when they are posted next week.

You included a report of when the State Police were following me around on July 4, 2001 at 4:00 and asked me what I could recall about it.

It's kind of funny because this is one of those things that I remember clearly because I had no idea until I read the discovery months later that it was the police following me. I thought it was just some punks trying to cause trouble. Approximately a month earlier, when we set up on my grandparents land in Vernon, the Chief of Police there drove out into the woodlot to see who we were and what we were doing there. I'm 99% sure that it was me, Jason, and Amanda together. I introduced myself and explained that Emery and Margery Evans were my grandparents and that we were planning on camping out for a while. The officer knew my grandfather quite well (Vernon is a small town right next to Guilford where my grandfather had been for 87 years. Gramp had owned that land in Vernon for approximately 50 years.) At the mention of my grandfather the officer became real friendly and when he saw on my driver's license that my last name was Evans he appeared satisfied. He stayed for 5 or 10 minutes "shooting the shit" with us. He mentioned that there had been some hell raisers around town recently causing all kinds of mischief so he liked to check everything out.  
(continued below)

*5 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

---

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

(continued from above)

Anyway, on the night of the 4th it never dawned on me that it was the police following me, I assumed it was just the hell raisers that the chief spoke of. (After all, the middle of the night is when most hell raisers do their thing.)

What I recall about that evening was that I had worked until about 1:30 at Domino's. Amanda was in Vernon so I wanted to get to her but I was on my ass. I was so tired. I stopped at my parents' and napped for like an hour +/- so I wouldn't fall asleep driving to Vernon. When I left my parents house I was still groggy enough but sure I could make the 40 minute drive. I had no idea that anyone was following me but when I got to the turnoff to the Guilford Center Road (My grandparents farm is up that road about 3 miles) I thought it was weird that there was a Ford Bronco type vehicle just sitting there. He had plenty of time to pull out and didn't. The Guilford Country Store is right on that corner and there was a car there as well. I was half falling asleep but I quickly woke up when I realized that I had seen one of the cars about 5 minutes earlier. I started driving around Vernon to all these back roads to see if I was being followed or if I was being paranoid.

When I noticed both of these vehicles still behind me after about 15 minutes I was convinced they were trouble makers and I was going to shake them. I drove fast and then would slow up etc. I sped up around Tyler Hill road because I knew where the turnoffs were and was confident that I could shake them. I pulled into one of the gravel driveways and shut my lights off waiting for them to pass. One of them did and I pulled out right behind them and shined my 100,000 watt candle power light that I used when delivering pizzas to find addresses on the side of houses. I was convinced it was the trouble makers the chief spoke of and I was going to chase them down and we were going to get it on.

(continued below)

*5 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

---

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

(continued from above)

My imagination was running wild. One hundred yards into the woods on Tyler Hill Road was Amanda who also drove those roads late at night meeting her local friends or working her job at Pizza Hut. There is no way I was going to take the chance of these guys harassing her some night. We got to the bottom of Tyler Hill Road which turns into a major road through Vernon and my little 4 cylinder Toyota couldn't keep up with them. I flashed my lights, honked my horn, etc. to no avail. They wouldn't pull over. This was one night I wish I had been delivering pizza in my Rx7 vs. that pickup truck.

Anyway, I headed back to the Vernon land and cuddled up to Amanda to sleep for a few hours. In the morning, I told her all that had happened and told her under no circumstances should she stop for anyone. If she feels someone is following her, drive right back to town (Brattleboro) where there are lots of people. By July Amanda and I were being pretty "sloppy" with seeing each other and not really caring so much who knew. Had it been in February and people were following me, I might have been more suspicious that it was the police. I can't tell you the toll trying to avoid people and

always being paranoid that you are being watched takes on you. Looking back I am still shocked that this all happened at 4 am. I would have sworn on a stack of Bibles that it was earlier like 2 am. Amazing how our memory sometimes fails us over time.

5 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

### Mark C

I'm not saying I would believe he is innocent if he passed a polygraph, just that it would be something else to consider along with other aspects of the case.

I'm actually surprised he hasn't taken one already. Why not do everything he can to support his position sooner rather than later? What is he waiting for?

5 December 2011

### Morrison Bonpasse |

Mark,

Regarding a polygraph for Chad, it's an option. It's interesting that you "would be forced to at least contemplate Bad Chad's innocence," if Chad passed a polygraph. (We'll let Bob speak for himself as he is fully capable of doing.) Is your faith in polygraphs so much greater than it is for voice-stress lie detector tests that while the latter seems to have made little impression upon you, a successful polygraph test would make a significant difference?

5 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

### Morrison Bonpasse |

Mark,

In response to your comments about Amanda. This case has seen several people thinking they knew how a teenage mother who lost her child should behave. First was Kittery Detective Steve Hamel who wrote about Amanda when she was told that Cassidy was dead. He wrote, "...the spontaneous reaction by Amanda Bortner was not of genuine grief. In observing Amanda Bortner during this time, I noted that she seemed able to control her emotions, turning them on and off when she needed to. At the time of the death notification, Amanda Bortner made statements that I recorded in my notes. The statements made by Bortner are as follows: 1) "Did the baby fall or something?" 2) "I feel like such a bad Mom." 3) "How could this happen to me?" 4) "I don't feel like living anymore." (See Hamel's report at <http://www.chadevanswronglyconvicted.org/documents/001109ReportWbyDetSteveHamelofAmandademeanorwhentoldofKdeath.pdf>.) Amanda Donnell didn't think that Chad and Amanda should be enjoying themselves and laughing while shopping at TJ Maxx, six days after Cassidy died and called out to them, "Baby killer." (See Detective Hamel's summary of his interview with Amanda Donnell at <http://www.chadevanswronglyconvicted.org/documents/001128SteveHamelWintAmandaDonnell2pp215216.pdf>.) If you had lost your daughter, and been momentarily persuaded by the police that your partner beat your daughter to death, and then you were indicted when you tried to recant what you told the police, and then you were convicted yourself of child endangerment and sent to jail for 15 months, wouldn't you be apprehensive about stepping forward at this time? Amanda spoke at Chad's 2004 Sentence Review Board hearing and she followed up with a letter to the judges. (See <http://www.chadevanswronglyconvicted.org/documents/041004lettertoSentenceRevDivfromAmanda.pdf>.) So far, her requests for justice have been ignored. With no prospects for success, challenging the system is daunting. Now, as we are bringing the truth to light as best we can, the prospects are improving.

5 December 2011 - Morrison Bonpasse

### Mark C

Can't the Committee do a bake sale, a car wash or something to raise the cash for the polygraph?

If Chad were to pass a polygraph, then Bob and I would be forced to at least contemplate Bad Chad's innocence.

What's the damn holdup, Committee members? Don't let this decision take a decade!

5 December 2011

## Mark C

In the upcoming months? What's taking her so long to get on board?

To me, "trying to move on with her life" would include exonerating Chad if she knows he didn't kill Cassidy.

I certainly would want to see justice served against the killer of my child. That's part of the "moving on" process.

*5 December 2011*

## Morrison Bonpasse |

Mark,

Yes. Chad IS willing to take a polygraph. The "Proposed Re-investigation Plan" submitted to Sr. Asst. Attorney General Jeff Strelzin on October 13, 2011, contains the request that Chad be given a polygraph. (See

<http://www.chadevanswronglyconvicted.org/documents/111013LettertoJefferyStrelzinformeeting.pdf>)

Yes, the reason for noting the states in the earlier title version was to emphasize that Cassidy died in Maine and not New Hampshire, where she lived with Chad and Amanda.

Amanda does support Chad's innocence and her own. Some of the new information I was able to find in this case became available because Amanda signed a release. However, she is trying to move on with her life. She was devastated by Cassidy's death and then by the investigation, wrongful convictions of Chad and herself, and jail sentence for child endangerment, and by the destruction of her relationship with Chad. In the upcoming months, she will assist Chad if she believes that her participation will make a difference in securing his exoneration.

*5 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

## Mark C

So, is Chad willing to take a polygraph or not?

About the book title...referencing the states was intentional to distance Chad from Cassidy's death, right? I mean, she died in Maine but Chad was in NH at the time.

How come Amanda hasn't posted on here or attended meetings of this committee? I would think she would be a big advocate if Chad is innocent.

*5 December 2011*

## Morrison Bonpasse |

Bob,

We agree that Voice Stress Analysis lie detectors are not polygraphs. However, they are widely used, even if there was an military order in 2008 to stop using CVSA - computer voice-stress analysis. There has been criticism of that order (See

[http://www.familysecuritymatters.org/publications/id.5199/pub\\_detail.asp](http://www.familysecuritymatters.org/publications/id.5199/pub_detail.asp), but I don't know the current status of the order.) It's clear, however, that polygraphs are used by the Dept. of Defense. Polygraph testing has been around for a longer time and has many supporters.

In Chad's case, it's interesting that the police planned to give polygraph tests to Amanda, Jeff and Jennifer, and they asked Amanda if Chad was willing to take a polygraph. Amanda told the police that he was willing. However, after Jeff declined to take his scheduled test, the plans for other tests were abandoned.

I don't "cry foul" when you point out shortcomings in the book EYE CONTACT. I evaluate them and usually ask for clarification, and respond to you. In response to our recent exchange, I plan to add in the 2012 Edition of EYE CONTACT Amanda's statement about giving Cassidy a baggie of cereal on the morning of November 9. I also ask you to present in these "online comments" whatever errors you can find.

The earlier title of the book was EYE CONTACT - The Mysterious Death in 2000 in Maine of

Kassidy Bortner and the Wrongful Conviction of Chad Evans in New Hampshire.” I changed it to “EYE CONTACT - The Mysterious Death in 2000 of Kassidy Bortner and the Wrongful Convictions of Chad Evans and Amanda Bortner,” in order to include the injustice to Amanda. To make room, I removed the identification of the States where Kassidy died and where Chad was convicted. I have no idea why you believe that the change was in response to any of your feedback, but I’m open to hearing your reasons for that assertion.

5 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

VSA is not a polygraph, furthermore it is a very questionable technology and Pentagon has now banned its use.

You cry foul when I point out the shortcomings of your book. The statements and explanations that Evans gives are unbelievable, simply because Evans is unbelievable. I base this on factual police interviews that document his true character: Someone who lies, manipulates and stops at nothing to influence others.

Your book is highly bias in favor of Evans. At least you changed the title from what it was before I started complaining.

Regards,

Bob

5 December 2011 - Rochester

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

The book, EYE CONTACT, relies upon what people have said or written. Where I could see that there was a conflict between different accounts of the same events, that’s noted. Chad’s account of the events of the morning of Nov. 9 correspond closely to what Amanda told the police in her interviews. You identified three events.

1. Chad waking up to Kassidy crying.
2. Chad’s actions in the kitchen.
3. Chad’s actions on the driveway.

These events are all in Chapter 1 of EYE CONTACT, which is entirely about the morning of Nov. 9, until 12:38 p.m. when Jeff called 911. The chapter is the 2nd shortest chapter in the book, from pages 12 to 19.

1. Chad waking up to Kassidy crying. Not included in the chapter is Amanda’s statement to Detectives Blodgett and LeClair on page 7 (Discovery 826), “Um, I woke up this morning, woke up, actually my daughter woke me up this morning. She was crying and woke up, took a shower, got her ready to leave.” Amanda said that she woke up around 6:15 a.m. She didn’t mention Kassidy’s initial crying, when Chad called out to her to go back to sleep.
2. Chad’s actions in the kitchen. Some corroboration comes from the photographs of the box of Reese’s Puffs on the kitchen counter. This IS the box of cereal that Chad has stated that Kassidy selected. This IS the cereal that was leftover in the baggie found at Jeff’s apartment, and the contents of Kassidy’s stomach were consistent with eating that cereal. In her first interview, noted above, Amanda said, “I gave her actually cereal in a bag to take with her because we were in a hurry.” (page 7, Disc 826) At page 13 (832) Amanda said, “I gave her cereal in a baggie.” That doesn’t necessarily conflict with Chad pulling the box from the top of the refrigerator and packing the bag. Amanda said that Kassidy said to her, “Drink,” and Amanda said, “I gave her a drink.” (p. 13, (832)).
3. Chad’s actions on the driveway. I don’t have any independent corroboration of Chad’s recollection of those actions. I have nothing to conflict with that recollection either. What is it that you don’t believe happened and what is the basis for that disbelief?

Please remember that in 2010 Chad passed a voice stress lie detector test with "no deception indicated."

4 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

Bob Arnold comment deleted

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Mark,

You asked an excellent question, "Why kind of boyfriend would say something like that? Seriously." The answer is that Chad Evans was not and is not that kind of a boyfriend, or former boyfriend. He didn't make that statement to Barbara Brooks. They had a post-relationship evening together and she slept on the couch downstairs. From that scenario you get a quote like that?

Regarding memory, I agree that it's amazing what we can remember from long ago, but the exact words? Sometimes I think I remember exact words that I've used in the past and then I see that I wrote them down contemporaneously, and differently.

There's another point to make about the alleged quote. The expression, "I'll kill you," can mean more or less to different people. Tristan Evans told the police that she told Chad, after seeing bruises on Cassidy which she didn't understand, "I'll kill you," if she learned that Chad had abused their son Kyle. She testified at Chad's trial with the same quote. (EYE CONTACT, pages 197, 462) Did she mean that, literally? Was she a potential murderer?

3 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Mark C**

Morrison...

I may be in the minority, but I do recall arguments I've had with people that mean, or meant, something to me during my life. I can recall vividly an argument my sister and I had 35 years ago. Maybe I'm just an introspective person who weighs things differently though.

I can tell you without a doubt I'd remember an incident where a person threatened to kill me.

Why kind of boyfriend would say something like that? Seriously.

3 December 2011

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Mark,

There is a difference between lying and having a different memory of something. On the evening of Barbara's visit to Chad's apartment in Rochester in 1992 or 1993, he expected that she would be driving home to Keene after their visit. When she said that she was reluctant to drive home at that late hour, Chad said she could sleep at his apartment, on the couch downstairs, which caused the primary argument of the evening. Again, that was 7-8 years before Cassidy Bortner's death and 7-8 years before Barbara initiated her interview with the police. Of the arguments you remember having with people 7-8 years ago, do you remember exactly what those people said to you?

Here's another example of how recollections can be inaccurate. Jennifer Bortner and Jeff Marshall told the police that they sometimes babysat Cassidy when Chad and Amanda went to visit their respective parents, but Amanda and Chad allegedly did not want to bring Cassidy because they allegedly didn't want either set of parents to see Cassidy's bruises. (EYE CONTACT, pages 93, 97, 98, 133, and 218). The truth is that the only two times that Amanda and Chad visited Amanda's parents they had Cassidy with them, and Jeff and Jennifer were both present during those visits in Maine. During the only two times that Amanda and Chad visited Chad's parents in Keene, they brought Cassidy with them. Were Jeff and Jennifer lying about why they babysat for Cassidy, or was there a misunderstanding or a difference in recollection?

3 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Mark C**

So Barbara was not telling the truth when she gave that statement?

I find that hard to believe since most individuals would hesitate to make such outlandish claims to police knowing the potential ramifications and that the person you are talking about would find out what was said.

*3 December 2011*

**Morrison Bonpasse | **

Mark,

You asked about Barbara's motivations. First, former girlfriends/boyfriends and former spouses have lots of complicated feelings about their ex's. Need I say more? Second, the police announced their suspect very soon in the process, and it's a natural inclination for people to want to help the police solve crimes, especially apparent crimes against children. Just as people hear what they want to hear, we often remember what we want to remember.

Bob,

You wrote that you anticipate that visitors to your website will go to the police report with the police summary of the interview with Barbara Brooks Hamel. However, how will visitors know which report to examine if you don't tell them the source of the quote? Or did I miss it? It's irresponsible to present the quote without citing the correct source, and without acknowledging that Chad denies making the statement.

You wrote that you objected to the account in EYE CONTACT about the early hours of November 9, 2000. It's based on police interviews of Amanda, Chad, Jeff, Jennifer and Travis Hunt, and on courtroom testimony of Amanda, Jeff and Jennifer, and on my interviews with Chad and his voluminous letters. Also, there are phone records, and interviews with Old Navy employees and a teacher at Kyle's school. What is it that you object to? I don't recall a previous challenge to EYE CONTACT's presentation of November 9, but please tell me now your objection.

You also wrote, that I've "dodged challenges from key players in this affair who have appeared at your CEWCC meetings." What challenges? Tristan Wentworth and Dot Urrutia came to a meeting last Spring, and they were welcomed and we had several good discussions. You are welcome to come to the Rochester chapter meetings as well, as long as you are interested in contributing constructively towards the goals of truth and justice in this case.

*2 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob Arnold | **

Morrison,

I do like that quote on my website, it draws the visitor in. Hopefully they will go to the actual police report where they can find out who said it.

I will offer to completely remove this quote and replace it with something else, if you agree to re-write your book and make it less bias, remove the account of the early hours of 11/9, and stick to the facts of the case. If Eye Contact were re-written more objectively, then I would probably stop hanging out here and drop my website all together.

This is not a quid pro quo proposition, mind you. It's an effort to make Eye Contact more factual, unbiased and less about Chad Evan's make-believe story about what actually happened. He IS a snake in the grass you know...(a midwestern expression)

Best Regards,

Bob

*2 December 2011 - Rochester*

**Bob Arnold | **

Morrison,

Yes indeed, let's discuss irresponsible..... I've posted an actual quote made by a former girlfriend, in order to shed light on Chad Evan's true character. You, on the other hand, I feel, have acted irresponsible for your innaccurate portrayal of Evans as a decent, loving family man. So I ask you, what's more irresponsible, directing attention to a bonafide statement made to police who are conducting a murder investigation, or sharing Evan's make-believe account of his behavior on 11/9??? What's disturbing is the fact that his recollection of his character/disposition does not match what others had told the police.

I feel we are at war with one another, you and I. A battle of truth, and the truth is this: That you've made a huge blunder in your portrayal of Evans. Now, I've not once challenged the accuracy of the actual facts found in Eye Contact such as dates, times and so forth. I've challenged the accuracy of the story you've written as the backdrop for your book, the story which begins in the early hours of Nov. 9th. Now I've brought this to your attention many times and you continue to dodge this, just like you've dodged challenges from key players in this affair who have appeared at your CEWCC meetings. Why do you avoid this?

Morrison, I really admire and respect you, but I also feel sorry for you because I firmly believe that you've been lied to by Chad Evans, who I strongly suspect has a mild psychopathic personality.

The evidence is there to see, all you have to do is look at it. Oh, by the way what did he have to say about the encounter with Bruce Aube in the Rochester PD parking lot?

Thanks,

Bob

*2 December 2011 - Rochester*

---

### Mark C

Of course, Chad would deny saying something like that.

Do you really think he would admit it or that Barbara just made it up? What would be her motive to do so?

*2 December 2011*

---

### Morrison Bonpasse |

Mark,

I met with Chad yesterday and he told me the full circumstances of that one night visit by Barbara Brooks to his apartment in Rochester in 1992-93, during which visit Barbara claimed in her 2000 interview that Chad made such a statement. Providing the details of that night is not necessary, but I say again, Chad Evans denies making that statement to her. Period.

To post such a quote on a website without stating that the person alleged to have made the statement denies making the statement is irresponsible. The denial does not have to be believed, just as the original claim does not have to be believed. Now, given the clear denial, the claim should not be posted without acknowledging the source and without acknowledging Chad's denial.

*2 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

---

### Mark C

I think Bob's use of that quote is highlighting the type of person Chad is...a person who intimidates women and others if he doesn't get his way. Although the statement was made earlier than when he was involved with, and responsible for, Cassidy, it is a disturbing glimpse inside the mind of Evans.

Threatening to kill someone is not something a rational human being does. It supports the fact that he had a bad, combustible temper.

I suggest a 5 pt font disclaimer after the quote but agree with its use. It grabs the attention of visitors

2 December 2011

---

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

We agree. Every case is different. The exoneration of Chad Evans does not depend upon the guilt or innocence of anyone else, including Alex Stolte.

Regarding your website, please know that your leading quote, "I'll kill you, you f\*\*king b\*tch," is not an accurate quote of Chad Evans. It appears to come from a police summary of a November 24, 2000 interview with Chad's teenage girlfriend, Barbara Brooks Hamel. Again, Chad Evans denies making such a statement to Barbara Brooks. Long after that teenage relationship ended, Barbara Brooks visited Chad at his apartment in Rochester in 1992 or 1993. That was seven or eight years before Cassidy Bortner died and seven or eight years before Barbara's interview. Your use of such a disputed and unattributed quote is not a good indication of your interest in truth and justice. If you are not willing to stop its use, you should at least correctly attribute it to the correct source, i.e. a police summary of an interview about an alleged statement seven or eight years earlier.

*2 December 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

---

**Bob Arnold** | 

I've read just about all I want to read about Alex Stolte. I say he's guilty. That baby was under his care custody and control, there is no doubt about that. So even if he didn't inflict fatal injury to her (which I think he did) he is still responsible. Let's just say, for Morrison's sake, that an intruder did indeed come into the basement and kill her (which I doubt), while Alex is upstairs talking to friends on the phone and surfing the web, the baby he is responsible for is being killed.....well even if that's the case, he still belongs in prison because you never, ever leave a baby alone like that. Oh, the basement door was unlocked? So why aren't his defenders asking him about that? WTF? I say to hell with him, let him rot and get raped in jail, a young, skinny little white guy like him will surely become someone's bitch behind bars.

I find it ridiculous when you parade around with other cases where the accused claimed innocence or supposedly were proven innocent in order to strengthen your position that Chad Evans, too is innocent. The facts are clear, Chad Evans was responsible for Cassidy Bortners death. I'm confident that he is guilty and will remain in prison where he belongs.

As far as your claim of quotes I made to Fosters, those quotation marks where used correctly, but if you need the definition, here you go:

Punctuation marks ( " ") that set off dialogue, quoted material, titles of short works, and definitions.

As I've stressed repeatedly, your portayal of Evans as something that he never was, is accentuated with those quotation marks. I never claimed that this fictional account of his general demeanor as a human being was an actual quote.

I've been getting lots of hits at my website, and plan to up the ante with a large amount of money to push my website up the list of google, ask and yahoo searches. I'm also expanding my website soon.

It was another wonderful day in the great state of New Hampshire with Chad Evans safely behind bars. I'm confident that our justice system will ensure he stays there. Justice was dealt in a swift and just manner.

Regards,

Bob

*1 December 2011 - Rochester*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Mark,

Every case is different. When we first heard of Alex Stolte's case, it was after exculpatory DNA had been found, but still he was not allowed bail. Chad was allowed bail and was free pending trial, until he violated the no-contact terms of that bail. One aspect of being accused of a terrible crime such as murder of a child is that it can be very lonely. It's good that Alex's friends have stood by him, and have written several letters to newspapers asking for his release on bail. His mother was pleased to hear from us as she is going through what Chad's parents went through in 2000-2001.

*30 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Mark C**

You aren't kidding about these 2 cases having similarities...

Kassidy...Kyleigh

Young, single mom

Dating boyfriend for few months

Boyfriend history of violence

Boyfriend liked to drink and do drugs

Pre-emptive calls to others when child is in distress

Broken limb(s)

At least Stolte has the DNA angle. However, I wouldn't put it past any killer to plant evidence to make their case better.

Seems extremely unlikely that someone broke into the apartment, raped/killed Kyleigh without the kid hearing something.

*30 November 2011*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Charged with the murder of 1 year old Kyleigh McDaniel, Alex Stolte has been in pre-trial confinement in Vermont since March, 2010. In June, 2011, it was disclosed that DNA testing determined that the hair that was found in Kyleigh's vagina did not belong to Stolte. According to the Concord Monitor article of October 25, 2011, Stolte's lawyer stated that the unidentified hair meant that someone else could have been in the house where Kyleigh was killed, and where Alex was babysitting for her.

My suggestion that the hair might have come from an intruder doesn't seem as far fetched as you sarcastically implied, given that it didn't come from Stolte.

Interestingly, in the case of Kyleigh McDaniel, the police focused immediately on the male babysitter, Alex Stolte, who told police that he put Kyleigh to bed and then went to another part of the apartment and watched television.

*29 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Assault by an intruder, that's real good. Just like your alternate theories about Kassidys death.

*29 November 2011 - Rochester*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Mark,

Thanks very much for the lead, as there are some similarities between Chad's case and that of Alex Stolte. One key similarity is that the police in Alex's case appeared to develop their theory of the case early, and then didn't investigate other possible theories, such as an assault by an intruder. We've been in touch with Alex Stolte's mother by email and phone. Chad has written to her. We've posted a few of the articles about the case in the "Other Convicted Innocents/Unsolved Crimes"

section of Chad's website at [http://www.chadevanswronglyconvicted.org/convicted\\_innocents.html](http://www.chadevanswronglyconvicted.org/convicted_innocents.html). This past Sunday's New York Times Magazine had an excellent article about a prosecutor in Illinois who is also resisting the truth of DNA testing. See "The Prosecution's Case Against DNA," at [http://www.nytimes.com/2011/11/27/magazine/dna-evidence-lake-county.html?\\_r=1&hpw](http://www.nytimes.com/2011/11/27/magazine/dna-evidence-lake-county.html?_r=1&hpw) I've sent the article to Alex's mother. We hope that Alex will be released on bail, after a successful appeal of the denial of that bail. If the prosecution pursues a trial, it would be hard for the jury to find guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, if the evidence is the same as it appears today. Thanks again.

28 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

### Mark C

Chad should write to this guy and provide him with some words of wisdom - like, buddy, you need to take the stand! Interesting similarities...

A 21-year-old Vermont man charged with killing his New Hampshire girlfriend's 1-year-old daughter is appealing a judge's decision that he be held without bail.

The Valley News reported Saturday that lawyers representing Alex Stolte (STOHL'-tee) , of Chelsea, have filed a notice of appeal with the state supreme court.

They argue that Judge Harold Eaton improperly denied their request to consider new evidence, including DNA, during an October hearing when they asked that Stolte be released from prison pending his trial, scheduled for next summer.

Stolte is charged with second-degree murder in the death of Kyleigh McDaniel.

Stolte was taking care of the girl on March 17, 2010, when she suffered fatal head and other injuries.

28 November 2011

### Morrison Bonpasse |

Bob,  
Your November 25 Letter to the Editor of Foster's Daily Democrat has been posted on this website. (See Home Page for link).

Two paragraphs of the letter are presented below:

To the editor:....

There has been considerable effort by members of the CEWCC to gain support for a reinvestigation of this case. These efforts include the publishing of a book, "Eye Contact" which is filled with fictional accounts of Chad's demeanor, biased and unsubstantiated claims about his behavior, as well as a gross attempt at portraying Evans as a "loving, caring, nurturing family man." This couldn't be further from the truth.

The police interviewed many individuals who had a different opinion of Chad Evans. In summary, Chad was a manipulative, lying, self-centered abusive person who had a history of violent assault. Contrary to his claims, he refused to cooperate with the police investigation. He lied to the police detectives, withheld information and intentionally distorted facts. ...

Bob Arnold  
Rochester

Your general views are familiar to readers of these "online comments." You claim that my book contains "fictional accounts" but you are unable to cite ONE example of a factual error. You state in the letter that I have made "unsubstantiated claims about" Chad's behavior. What claims are unsubstantiated? You state that Chad "refused to cooperate with the police investigation." What is the evidence supporting that claim? You state that he "withheld information." What is your evidence to support that claim? What information was withheld?

I agree that his telling of the trampoline story was a lie and that he minimized his relationship with Amanda, but are there other lies or intentional distortions of facts that you are claiming? You claim that a statement appears in the book that Chad was a "loving, caring, nurturing family man." While I

generally agree with that statement, the quoted statement appears nowhere in the book. Once again, you have made a factual error, similar to your claim, later withdrawn, that Chad "slammed Amanda against the wall" on the night of November 8.

*27 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

We agree that Kassidy Bortner's death was a tragedy, and her promising life was cut far too short. However, such a tragedy does not justify injustice. The way to honor her life is to leave no stone unturned to determine the cause(s) of her death. If anyone is criminally responsible, that person(s) should be punished, but punishing an innocent man is not acceptable. The State of New Hampshire should re-investigate this case. Be assured that Kassidy did not die because Chad Evans "inflicted multiple blows to Kassidy's head and abdomen, thereby causing her death," as was stated in his indictment for second degree murder.

Your post below is the second time that you have noted that you have spoken with two "key players" who were close to the events of 2000, but you say nothing about what they have said to you.

Please share what you've learned.

Also, you wrote earlier (Nov. 20) that you were going to write to the Attorney General. Can you share here the contents of that letter or email? Or send it to me by email? I can then post it on this website.

Your reasons for not meeting with me don't sound real. Whatever the issue, isn't it good for people with opposing views to meet and discuss their views? I'm confident that we could both learn something from each other, so I repeat the invitation. I assume that meeting in Rochester would be convenient to you, so please name a time and place by a return email to me. I promise to come alone and not share the logistics details with others.

*26 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,

I can't believe anything that Chad has to say. Based on police interviews, court testimony as well as interviews I've done with two key players in this whole affair, I've found that Chad is a diabolical, evil, volatile, abusive, arrogant, violent liar who manipulates beyond comprehension. His skill at writing lies that paint him as a decent guy is an example of how he will stop at nothing to get his way.

I've proven beyond doubt that Chad isn't the nice, decent, loving "family man" you two portray him as in your book. Furthermore, it's a documented fact that Chad was an abusive, violent individual who had no respect for the law, no respect for others, and no respect for Amanda, Tristan, Barbara or any other girlfriend he ever had. Women (and men) are objects to Chad, objects to use and manipulate. This goes for you and the CEWCC, you're all just objects for him to manipulate to get his way.

I believe the streets of New Hampshire are much safer with Chad Evans behind bars.

As far as a meeting with you or with him, this would only help him. I pledge to do nothing to help a bonafide convicted child killer in any way shape or form.

It's sad that the CEWCC claim they want justice for Chad. What about justice for a little girl who will never visit Disney World, never experience another Christmas, birthday, Easter....she will never experience getting her ears pierced, a first crush, a favorite teacher. School bus rides, school plays,

field trips, the list goes on. She will never get to experience these things because she was brutally assaulted over and over by your wonderful "family man" until her little body finally died. Think about that for a minute.

Regards,

Bob

26 November 2011 - Rochester

### Morrison Bonpasse |

Bob,

Your praise of law enforcement agencies and the legal system is well-deserved, but everyone makes mistakes, and the convictions of Chad Evans and Amanda Bortner were two of them. The context of the alleged statement by Cassidy, "Chad bad," should have been explained. It was first recalled in an "online comment" on this website by Jacqueline Conley on July 31, 2010. It was not in her police interview or in her courtroom testimony or in her newspaper interviews.

I wrote to Chad in August, 2010, after reading Jacqueline Conley's recollection, and he responded in his August 6, 2010 letter.

"Regarding Jackie Conley's comments to our website and her claim about Cassidy's comment 'Chad Bad,' this is sad really. I can empathize with Jackie's pain. I can only imagine how much she misses Cassidy. I know how much I miss Kass every day, and she was Jackie's blood. The reality is, if Cassidy has really said something like that then, rest assured, Jackie would have told the prosecutors during their preparation meetings for my trial and they would have somehow worked it in during Jackie's testimony. I know Jackie wants so badly to believe it was me. That would be easier. I hope that someday she will be able to come to what she must know deep down. The only thing that I have ever heard that was remotely close was when she started stringing words together, Amanda would tell me upon arriving home, 'Cassidy has been asking for you all day. She keeps looking for you and saying, 'Where's Chad?'

Whenever I heard this, it made my day. How could it not? I recall one time several weeks to a month before Cassidy died, Amanda called my cell phone and said, 'Someone's been asking for you all day. Hold on a minute.' Next thing I hear is Amanda whispering in the background say 'Hi,' and then I hear Cassidy's little voice saying 'Hiiii'. It was perfect timing because I am 99% sure I was in Greenland having a rough day and this made it all better."

26 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

### Bob Arnold |

It was another wonderful day in New Hampshire with Chad Evans behind bars. I'd like to thank the NH State Police, ME State Police, Kittery PD, Rochester PD and all other police officers who worked tirelessly to ensure that our hard-working prosecutors had enough evidence to ensure a rock-solid and just conviction of Chad Evans. Thousands of hours were spent conducting questioning, interviewing, collection of facts and evidence, including the hundreds of hours spent conducting surveillance of Evans. These police officers acted in a professional manner and set the standard for future investigations of child abuse.

I'd also like to thank the members of the Grand Jury who handed up the indictments against this brutal murderer. Without question, you made the right decision.

The conviction of Amanda Borter was also swift and just. Although I believe she should have received a much longer prison sentence, I believe she got what was coming to her in the end.

Yes, it was another wonderful day in the great state of New Hampshire...the cowardly, lying, abusive convicted child murderer Chad Evans is still behind bars, despite his best efforts to lie and deceive his way back into our society. I'm grateful that he will spend at a minimum the next twenty years of his miserable life behind bars.

God bless our justice system, our police officers, and the prosecutors of our great state.

"Chad bad"  
-Kassidy Bortner

25 November 2011 - Rochester

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Mark,  
It was very hard to compile the events on the "Chronology" page of Chad's website. Most records are simply gone. One set of records which would have been useful would have been Amanda's earnings from the survey inputting work she was doing for Bruce Aube in October. Needing quiet time for that work, she brought Kassidy to Jeff for babysitting beginning in October, but I don't have specific dates for that work.  
The only specific dates I have were for the last week of Kassidy's life in November, and for the overnights at Jeff's and Jennifer's. They are given on the "Chronology" page, and also listed in a document linked on page 67 of EYE CONTACT at <http://www.chadevanswronglyconvicted.org/documents/110318110619ListofovernightsinceJune9KassidywithJeffandJen.pdf>. The dates are July 1, August 12 and 18 and then a gap until October 21, and then the double night from October 26-28.

Bob,  
Thanks for your kind comments and for the Thanksgiving wishes, which I reciprocate.  
Regarding the use of Kassidy's (formerly Brent's) bedroom for time-outs, the door was never locked. Actually, it didn't shut properly, so a sock was used to jam it closed, which Chad explained in his October 10, 2010 letter to me, which is quoted extensively on page 467 of EYE CONTACT. Amanda explained the use of Kassidy's bedroom for time-outs in her "My Life Story," which is quoted extensively on page 43 of EYE CONTACT. Amanda wrote in this excerpt, "So I really had to start disciplining her. Her fits were getting worse and worse. Even when we went to the grocery store if I didn't get her candy in the check-out, she would scream and throw her fits. So Chad and I decided to put her in her bedroom every time she'd throw her fits. In the beginning she'd just run out of the room and scream some more, so I would put a sock in the door so she wouldn't get out, and she could kick and scream all she wanted to. A couple months went by and she was doing much better. We barely had to put her in her room. And she didn't scream when Chad or Kyle came near me. The bedroom thing had worked."  
23 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

I would like to take this opportunity to wish everyone, whether we agree or not, a happy Thanksgiving holiday and a safe holiday season.

I'm thankful for so much in my life, my wonderful wife and kids, our good health, our home, the list goes on and on. But I'm most thankful that we live in a country where we can openly express our opinions.

I'd also like to thank Morrison, he's provided us with a platform to express our views and has been genuinely fair by allowing all views and opinions to be expressed here, regardless of how much we may disagree I'm sure we can agree that Morrison is a good man and has honorable intentions.

Happy Holidays and Best Wishes,

Bob

23 November 2011 - Rochester

**Bob Arnold** | 

Police interview with Tristan:

"Two days ago I said to him cause I don, she was just like crying when I, I've gone over to the

house before and she'll be upstairs shut in the bedroom just like balling....I hate that because she's only one and a half.....I mean I'd never do that to a kid.....I just thought it was weird, I just had a feeling that something else was going on.....(so I called) DHYS....and I made in anonymous because if I was wrong I didn't want anybody to be pissed off at me."

Please explain to me why Kassidy was locked in her bedroom, balling on multiple occasions? This is yet another example of how Chad dealt with a crying child, take it to the extreme....no don't hold her, or console her, or try to make things better for her.....just loose your temper, grab her face and leave marks, lock her in the bedroom, put her under a faucet. What say you?

*23 November 2011 - Rochester*

### Mark C

IMO = in my opinion.

How many times was Kassidy babysat by Jeff? What dates? Do you have that information available?

*23 November 2011*

### Morrison Bonpasse |

Mark,

Forgive my ignorance, but what does "IMO" mean?

Regarding your "seems odd" comment about the chronology, Kassidy's bruises began appearing in October, after the dated October 1 photograph, which was three months after she and Amanda began living with Chad. What also began in October was the increase of babysitting by Jeff Marshall. Chronological coincidence doesn't determine guilt, of course, but if you are going to argue chronological coincidence then don't you agree that it applies even more strongly to Jeff than it does to Chad?

*23 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

### Mark C

I believe the abuse he inflicted on Kassidy was doled out, periodically, over time, so Travis witnessing specific moments on November 8th where Chad wasn't going off on Kassidy is not relevant, IMO.

It takes only a few seconds to abuse someone and cover it up before another walks into the room.

Much like your accumulated accident theory, the abuse Kassidy endured finally got the best of her on November 9th.

Seems odd that she started getting all of these injuries and died shortly after she started living with Chad...I bet a day does not go by where he wishes he never met Amanda. 3-4 months of his life with Amanda and Kassidy, letting his temper get the best of him...for a life in prison.

*23 November 2011*

### Morrison Bonpasse |

Mark,

Do you believe that Kassidy seemed tired on the afternoon of November 8, as witnessed by Jeff Marshall and Chad?

Do you believe that Chad gave her a bath on the evening of November 8th, as was witnessed by Travis Hunt?

Do you believe that after the bath Chad gave Kassidy a popsicle while she was sitting on his lap in his office, as was witnessed by Travis Hunt?

If the answer is YES to the above, do these observations seem consistent with your theory of

Chad's alleged frustration and anger? If the answer is NO to any of the three questions, why NO? And a Happy Thanksgiving to you, too, though the idea of happy families together seems at odds with the subjects of this website. The thought is appreciated, nonetheless.

*23 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

### Mark C

Morrison,

I do believe that 75414 inflicted multiple blows to Cassidy's head and abdomen...especially her abdomen since those injuries aren't as noticeable to others like the bruises on her face.

I believe he hit her when he was pushed to the brink and didn't know any other way to deal with the crying, whining, lack of eye contact, etc.

Happy Thanksgiving.

*23 November 2011*

### Morrison Bonpasse |

Since my question this morning re: "your theories of when, where, how and why?" there have been a lot of interesting posts, but let me return to Mark's and Bob's responses.

Mark,

Chad was found guilty beyond a reasonable doubt of the follow murder indictment: "Evans recklessly caused the death of Cassidy Bortner, age 20 months, under circumstances manifesting an extreme indifference to the value of human life. Evans inflicted multiple blows to Cassidy's head and abdomen, thereby causing her death."

It doesn't appear from your response to my question that you believe he "inflicted multiple blows to Cassidy's head and abdomen" as he was charged. Do you think he should have been found guilty beyond a reasonable doubt given what YOU know now, which is far more than the jury knew?

Bob,

We appear to continue to look at the same interviews and statements with different lenses.

You apparently don't want to meet and don't want to, or cannot, point out any errors in the book EYE CONTACT.

*22 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

### Bob Arnold |

Becky,

By the way I have the upmost admiration and respect for single moms trying to raise their children and dealing with all of the things that take two parents to deal with. With that said, I'm also acutely aware of some of the males out there who prey on women, males like Chad Evans. Abusive, violent, controlling and combative. What kind of life do you think you could have expected to have if you hooked up with him? I reiterate, if Amanda, Tristan or Barbara were one of my daughters, there would have been grave consequences for Chad Evans, for beating them the way he did. This sounds shocking to Morrison, a man who's been suckered in by Chad and his lies.

I base my conclusions about Chad on the multiple police interviews with people who knew him. People like Tristan, B. Hamel, Amanda, Crystal Martin, Emily Conley, etc..... I do believe that Chad is an arrogant, careless predator who belongs locked up.

Regards,

Bob

*22 November 2011 - Rochester*

### Becky |

What I meant was if you are not 100%  
On every ailments definition, plz research it.  
I had explained the condition of her feet to once  
And u either dismissed or didnt see it.  
The condition on her feet is found inside her body too. & I would also like to add that after the  
Facebook comments, I had written to you & ended it on a positive note. Looking foward to your  
future comments.

*22 November 2011 - Rochester*

**Bob Arnold** | 

I'm not acquainted with fear. I don't understand what you want, you said to read the autopsy and  
define every word? I'll go over it again but it seemed self-explanatory, that Kassidy suffered from  
actual injuries to her head, stomach and feet.

Bob

*22 November 2011 - Rochester*

**Becky** | 

Bob, that's not nice.  
By chance are you afraid of my challenge?

*22 November 2011 - Rochester*

**Bob** | 

Whatever. You're full of shit.

*22 November 2011 - Rochester*

**Becky** | 

May I suggest you re-read the autopsy...  
When you can define every word in it, you should come up  
W. A different point of view.

*22 November 2011 - Rochester*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Becky,  
I'm not going to pick on you for your theories, but I do believe you're reaching for a life ring that  
doesn't exist. You believe in Chad's innocence so much that you're reaching for whatever you can.

I'd like to second Mark's remark, you're making this case much more complicated that what it is. Try  
re-reading the police interviews starting with the first and second interviews with Amanda, then the  
Tristan interview, Crystal Martin and so on.....when you're done, go back and read the Chad Evans  
interview.

*22 November 2011 - Rochester*

**Becky B** | 

OH & before anyone feels to rip me apart for my comments today...  
Why didn't so & so get sick from...  
I will ask why is it that some survive a shot to the face while others die right there? That's a  
mystery...

**Becky B** | 

HPV is a virus.  
It's been linked to throat cancer too.  
So, if it's known she had a virus, who are we to say what roll it played, without proper testing. Add in the mold exposure, the possible arsenic exposure, the fall from the truck, etc etc...  
Lead poisoning can cause lead lines in the bones, we know she was never tested for lead poisoning. It was debated whether or not she really had true bone fractures.  
Why not re~open the case, & re~look over what wasn't clear in 2000-2001.  
If today's technology proves me wrong, & it proves that Chad killed her, then let him sit...  
I know with a re~investigation, they will find facts that prove that Chad is innocent & did not abuse Cassidy!!  
Why not write to him Mark?

22 November 2011 - Rochester, NH

**Mark C**

Becky...

HPV has been linked to cervical cancer.

Are you suggesting that a wart on one's hand leads to some terminal illness?

22 November 2011

**Becky B** | 

Mark you have once again avoided answering my question (s).

22 November 2011 - Rochester, NH

**Mark C**

Becky...

Do you really think a killer wart was the cause of so many bruises, and fractures, on Cassidy?

Sometimes I get the feeling that people are looking waaaaaaay beyond the obvious. Like trying to find a disease as the cause for this baby's death, not the physical abuse she suffered.

22 November 2011

**Becky B** | 

Yes Mark, it is very sad that someone feels they have the right to harass someone over their beliefs. Please view all comments again, & see who's harassing who...

Like I have stated before it's not who killed Cassidy, it's WHAT killed Cassidy.

Have either one of you put much thought into the wart she had on her finger? I know you'll have fun picking at me for that possiblity too. BUT the FACT is that Cassidy picked at that wart & IT was in FACT Chad who encouraged Amanda to take her to the doctor and get that checked out.

We all know that HPV is deadly, can we agree on that?

22 November 2011 - Rochester, NH

**Mark C**

Bob...

Pretty lame if someone is harassing you for your comments or opinions of this case.

Some have no idea what they are doing and how close they are to putting themselves in harms way.

22 November 2011

### Mark C

Becky...

So Cassidy's killer is still at large? If you are saying that it isn't Chad and it isn't Jeff...then who is it then?

Wow. I just had an epiphany. Maybe it was the same person who killed Nicole Brown Simpson. We all know that her killer is still on the loose.

22 November 2011

### Mark C

Sandy...

Fair enough. However, what evidence do you have that he is innocent? I certainly hope you aren't basing your beliefs on just what he tells you.

I don't dispute that Jeff was somewhat of a sketchy character and a bad babysitter. However, his actions at the time of Cassidy's death, and after, paint a picture of an honest and forthright individual. Chad on the other hand...

If Committee members believe that Jeff killed Cassidy, then they should be focusing their efforts on determining whether or not Jeff has had any issues over the last decade that would rule him back in as a suspect. Leopards don't change their spots.

22 November 2011

### Becky B |

Mr. Arnold,  
I work two jobs & am raising 4 young children on my own.  
I don't believe any CEWCC member would conduct themselves in such behavior.  
Maybe investing into a camera with sound catching abilities or sort, you may find your person of interest.  
Great resume by the way, I'm impressed.

22 November 2011 - Rochester, NH

### Sandy

I'm pretty sure nobody on the committee knows where you live. Nor do we care to know.

22 November 2011 - NH

### Bob Arnold |

Becky,  
I believe you....however someone did make this threat to me and it did occur around the same time as the Facebook incident that you and I got into, and this is why I thought it was you.

Whoever it was, they were certainly active in the CEWCC, and they did a search about me and my

family on the internet. I hope they didn't waste any money doing a criminal check, because I have a clean record with a prior NATO Top Secret as well as a CYPTO clearance after an extensive FBI background check. I also had a criminal background check done a year ago for my conceal carry permit, and I routinely submit form 4473's to the ATF which always come back "clear."

I don't know why someone keeps honking in front of my house, which occurs late at night, some nights it happens several times but I do suspect that it's someone associated with the CEWCC, which only motivates me to work harder at challenging your efforts. This harassment is taken from a page of the "Chad Evans" playbook: Harass, intimidate, scare, attack....

Regards,

Bob

*22 November 2011 - Rochester*

**Becky B** | 

I'm not trying to free her killer.

Her killer has never been caught.

& I'm not pointing the finger at Jeff, he knows this.

Why don't you write him Mark?

*22 November 2011 - Rochester, NH*

**Sandy**

Actually, Jeff Marshall said Chad called her a "little bitch" and retard. If you want to point at woman beaters...take a closer look at Jeff. I do not feel we are disrespecting Kassidy by backing Chad, because we believe Chad is innocent.

*22 November 2011 - NH*

**Mark C**

Becky...

Chad referred to Kassidy as the little bitch. Maybe you should write to him and see why he called her that, as well as retard.

The bigger question is why are you trying to free her killer? Is that a show of respect?

*22 November 2011*

**Sandy** | 

I don't think we are disrespecting Kassidy by fighting for the truth. I did not originally think Chad was innocent. Only through hours of research did I come to that conclusion. Now I correspond with him and even visit him once in a while. I am proudly a member of the committee, and I know Becky is professional and not the threatening type. What is so threatening to you people about a new trial?

*22 November 2011 - NH*

**Becky B** | 

Mark, if this was your daughter would you want someone referring to your baby like this? It's called common courtesy.

*22 November 2011 - Rochester, NH*

Becky B | 

I have never mentioned such things here: who you are, where you live etc. Nor have I ever threatened you.

It's not my style, I think it's yours.

You've got your facts confused again Mr. Arnold.

I have always been Becky or Becky B.

All I ask is for respect for Kassidy.

Is that too much??

22 November 2011 - Rochester, NH

Mark C

Becky...

You are missing the point of the reference to "little bitch." Seriously...does it really need to be explained?

Bob and I post our opinions of the case out of respect for Kassidy. The fact that some are championing for this convict's release is the ultimate show of disrespect to a poor, defenseless baby that was murdered by his hands.

Please post some more quotes.

22 November 2011

Bob Arnold | 

Becky,

11 years is impressive, now is that 11 years with no sleep/breaks, or just 11 years working on this 8 hours a day? If the later, you're ahead of Christine by 1 year.

What difference does it make where I was when Kassidy died? You make it sound like you were in the morgue with her.....not to mention your Facebook post, that you never actually met her. But I'll give you benefit of the doubt because it sounds like you may have assisted with her autopsy.

Becky, neither you nor any members of the "committee" have produced an ounce of evidence that points to Evans innocence. Nor have you been able to convince me of Jeff Marshall's guilt. You point your finger at Jeff, when you should be looking closer at your beloved wife-beater.

Becky I respect your opinion and I'm not hear to abuse you, I'm here to debate with you in a spirited manner which you've obviously taken personally. You've also (I suspect it was you) made mention of my wife who has nothing to do with my endeavors here, and you've threatened to release my personal information for harrassment purposes namely my home phone and address. Around the time you did this, I began to notice someone honking their horn in front of my house on a daily basis.

I'm not afraid of any of you, I use my real name when making posts here. As a matter of fact, nothing scares me....after being shelled by Iraqi artillery, hog-tieing captured Iraqi infantry by the dozens, doning NBC protective gear on a daily basis and navigating the heavily cratered, moon like surface of a heavily mined Kuwaiti TO by the light of hundreds of burning oil wells, I can safely say that your scare tactics have no effect on me. I am committed to challenging the fictional accounts of Chad Evans' demeanor, the made-up story of Chad's pleasant, wholesome, "family man" image that you've painted, and pointing out the real facts of this case which clearly point to a just conviction.

Regards,

Bob

Becky | 

Mr. Arnold,  
I've been living, breathing, sleeping & talking about this case for 11 yrs.  
Just ask anybody...  
Where were you when Kassidy died?  
I fully respect your opinion of Chad, it's your opinion & you own it, & no one is going to take that from you. I do however do not respect the way anyone here disrespects Kassidy, whether you're you think you're quoting some eles or not.  
This issue has been brought up previously and yet it is ignored.  
Her name is Kassidy Caitlyn Bortner, her family called her "Cassie", for the love of this child, please refrain from calling her anything different.  
Thank you!

22 November 2011 - Rochester

Bob Arnold | 

Morrison,  
We are not here to prove Chad's innocence, we are here so that you can prove his innocence, which you have failed to do. But, if you insist:

- 1: Chad had the motive, as just mentioned by Mark. He was jealous, self-centered, possessive and selfish, as was proven by the prosecution. Furthermore and as I've proven through witness accounts to the police, he had a very short temper which always resulted in bodily injury, property damage and or outright fear instilled in others (see police interviews with Tristan Evans, Jeff Marshall, Amanda Bortner, Crystal Martin, Emily Conley, Barbara Hamel, Kathy Nuenberge, Tracy Foley, Melissa Chick, Amanda Donnell).
2. Extensive evidence of injuries inflicted on Kassidy in the weeks/months leading up to November 9. (See the before mentioned interviews, also see police interview with Robert Conley, Jen, DCYF report made by Tristan Evans)
- 3: Evans intentionally lied to others to cover up the assaults he committed on Kassidy. He also lied to the police during his police interview....lie after lie, lies to numerous to count (see video of police interview, also see all previous interviews with the exception of Barbara Hamel and Amanda Donnell).
4. Evans went to extraordinary efforts to avoid the police, tamper with key witnesses in this case to avoid prosecution. He failed to followup with the police, avoided any and all police contact and refused to testify at his own trial.

There was more than enough evidence to convict Evans. As I've stated and proved beyond doubt, Evans was a violent person with a documented history of inflicting bodily harm on others. Evans was a bully, a manipulator, a liar and a short-tempered wife-beater who had perverted sexual demands of anal sex, sex with multiple friends of his girl friends, appeals for nude photos of other women, etc. Evans, as you characterize him, is not nor was he ever the mild-mannered, loving, nurturing "family man" that you portray him in your book. Your book is filled with fantasy, lies and conjecture when it comes to the "family man" wife-beater, child abuser Evans.

You say he's innocent, you prove it.

22 November 2011 - Rochester

Bob Arnold | 

Becky, you're back....

It's ironic how you feel the need to "show respect" to Cassidy, while defending the abuser to was responsible for her death. Maybe you should spend some time researching this case? I can always tell when someone hasn't researched this case by their remarks on this forum....

*22 November 2011 - Rochester*

**Becky** | 

Her name is Cassidy!  
Please show respect.  
Thank you!!

*22 November 2011 - Rochester*

**Mark C**

When - whenever the "little bitch" got in his way, made him alter his plans, otherwise impeded his lifestyle or forced him to do things he didn't want to do. He didn't like having things dictated to him and not being in control.

Where - at his house, in his car, mostly when he was alone with her. At times, I'm sure his son was present but too young to know what was going on specifically.

How - a little push here, smack to the body there, teeball to the face, obtaining eye contact, forcing her into corners/against walls, throwing her on beds, "accidentally" smashing her head into the wall while giving a shoulder ride downstairs, etc.

Why - the little bitch wasn't his kid, she got in the way and disrupted his lifestyle, she was clingy and jealous of interactions he had with her mom. In short, the kid disrupted his plans and he didn't like it. The kid was something he had to put up with in order to keep his piece of ass around. However, he grew tired of not being in control of the situation.

Like I've stated previously, I don't think he meant to kill Cassidy. I feel that he reacted rashly and was abusive to her, mentally and physically. The number of eye contacts, however, added up and resulted in the baby's death. That's my theory in a nutshell.

*22 November 2011*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

For those (Bob Arnold, Mark C, others?) who believe that Chad Evans murdered Cassidy Borter with physical blows, can you share here your theories of when, where, how and why?

*22 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Mark C**

Super Chad...coming to a theater near you!

Are we really supposed to believe that 15 guys ganged up on Chad because one of those guys thought Chad keyed his car? Seriously? And, that not only did Chad feel comfortable with his odds against said gang, that they moved to another parking lot before he starting laying the smack down. Really?

Sounds like there is alot more to this incident than what Chad is telling you...much like the situation involving Cassidy.

As far as Bob's comments about smashing Chad or any guy that hurt his daughter...I'm right there with him. I'm not sure what kind of father would stand back and allow his little girl to be abused

without taking matters into his own hands. While I'm dead set against men abusing women, I'd be the first to snap the neck of the little prick who dared to lay his hands on any of my daughters. I liken it to a situation where someone breaks into your house. Defend your family at all costs. That's different than a hot head who can't control his temper.

22 November 2011

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

1. A person who writes on the Internet that he would have "beat the dog shit" out of someone seems ill suited to complain so angrily about the alleged violence of others.
2. In Chad's February 18, 2010 letter to me, he wrote about two of the incidents you address in your last posting: "On a different subject, in response to your question, I did get in a fight with a guy that was 3 years older than me in 1987. His name was Brian Eschelman and he formerly worked at the McDonald's. He thought I had keyed his car or something which was ridiculous. I came out of work one evening and he and 15 of his friends were waiting for me. We drove to another parking lot. Brian punched me in the head and I "lit him up." One of his friends jumped in and I beat him up too. An hour later, the Keene Police tracked me down and arrested me. When I went into the police station. A bloody Brian was sitting there on the steps. Of course, I had no friends there so it was my word against his. I think the charges were dismissed because Brian didn't show up to court later. I was involved in a motor vehicle accident with my Corvette. I had been drinking and it was a male passenger that I was with who jumped in the front seat. I never asked him to, it was his idea because he didn't drink. I was 17 or 18 and obviously making some dumb decisions."
3. I'm still waiting for you to identify ONE fact statement in EYE CONTACT which is inaccurate. There will likely be a 2012 edition of the book, and I want it to be as accurate as possible.
4. I'm waiting for you to agree to meet with me in Rochester. Just name the time and place.

22 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Mark,

I actually believe Chad is a very lucky man....because if Tristan E., Barbara H., or Amanda B. were one of my daughters, I would have beat the dog shit out of Chad. Without question, I would not have hesitated. He would not have been able to walk ever again. Because when dealing with an abusive, violent woman-beater like Chad, I could see things getting out of hand very quickly. Here's a guy that just beat the holy crap out of your daughter, and he's hog-tied and bloody, and his mouth starts going, that smart-ass loud mouth of his, spitting and cursing, threatening you, well you know anything goes at that point. That's when you realize that dragging him to a body of water and dumping his hog-tied ass in isn't what you planned to do, you value life too much, even if it's a pitiful, abusive liar like Chad Evans. He wouldn't be worth further effort. Satisfaction would come from seeing him all beaten and mangled, like he left your daughter.

Lucky you Chad Evans. You certainly are a lucky guy. You managed to violently beat not one, but three women (which is confirmed and a bonafide fact) and you managed to still be alive. What a lucky guy you are.

In closing, I'd like to say that once again it was a wonderful day in the great state of New Hampshire....we have an abusive, lying, violent child killer behind bars with no hope of getting out.

Looking forward to another wonderful day tomorrow!

"Chad Bad"  
-Kassidy Borter

22 November 2011 - Rochester

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,

You need to get with Christine and do more research about Chad.....

Brushes with the law:

Violent assault on Tristan Evans (I have knowledge of this assault and it was horrific)

Assault on an individual circa 1999 (he claimed in his police interview that it was self defense)

Drunk driving accident circa 1995 (see interview with prior girlfriend who confirmed this)...apparently he was at the wheel, but he convinced his girlfriend to switch seats with him so he wouldn't get charged with DUI.

These, including the biggest brush with the law, Cassidy's murder.

Another brush with the law: Intentional violation of his bail conditions, at one point he had seven different state police officers conducting surveillance on him....this included undercover officers tailing him, watching his house, watching his place of work, and reporting his activities....this is pretty serious, to have undercover officers following you around.

Go do some more research and get your facts straight so I don't have to slap you in the face with real facts.

*21 November 2011 - Rochester*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Mark,

1. As a person trained as a lawyer, I am appalled at how many innocent people are in our prisons. Every one of those innocent people, including Chad Evans, has a perfect right to be angry at what the American justice has done to them. Even people with tempers have a right to be angry, too.
2. So many brushes with the law? Please tell me about his brushes with the law before the death of Cassidy Bortner. Was Chad Evans ever arrested before Cassidy's death?
3. What is your evidence that ANYONE knew ANYTHING about broken bones for Cassidy? The answer is zero. No one knew. She saw an orthopedic surgeon on September 11, 2000. Did he see any broken bones? No.
4. Sure, Chad didn't have the best vocabulary in the world when talking about Cassidy and others. So what? People misunderstood his use of the word, "retard," for example, which he used for several people, and usually in a lighthearted manner. Your vocabulary on these pages, however, is sometimes worse than Chad's.
5. Thanks for the apparently familiar reference to Duxbury. Sometime, if you come out of your anonymity, you might share a bit of your life, and perhaps how you know about Duxbury. Offline is fine. You know my email address.
6. Yes, Chad's parents are paying me \$6.00/hour for my work, and that includes my time responding to comments on these online comments. When Chad is exonerated and he again joins the workforce, he will be able to pay me whatever we can negotiate. If he is not released, he owes me nothing. As I've promised him and his family, if I find persuasive evidence that he assaulted or murdered Cassidy, I will stop work on this case. I write on these pages in the slim hope that the information will be useful to readers who are seriously trying to understand this case. I appreciate your respect, and believe that sometimes you are seriously thinking about what you read here and in the book, EYE CONTACT, and on the website.
7. I've been working on this case for 23 months and remain convinced that Chad was wrongly convicted, of assaulting and murdering Cassidy Bortner. No, I never said he was perfect and never said that he was the "most unlucky" person in history and never said that he was flawless.

*21 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Mark C**

Morrison,

Wouldn't I be angry?

Quite simply...No, because I wouldn't put myself in the position Chad put himself in. I have better control over my emotions and anger.

He's characterized as the most unlucky son of a bitch in the history of this world. However, its no coincidence that he has had so many brushes with the law, confrontations with others, etc.

If a child, in my care or with whom I was associated, had multiple bruises and broken bones, I certainly would be all over the situation...not calling the kid a bitch, retard, etc. Just saying. (I love using tag lines of the nuthuggers.)

Morrison...I respect you. You are being paid to be his advocate. You have a nice resume...seem to be a decent guy from Duxbury. Well educated and very intelligent. I'd hate to see you wrapped up in a no-win situation. By the way...is it costing the Committee for you to respond to Bob and I. I don't question your motives because I honestly think that the sociopath has convinced you of his innocence.

Chad is where he belongs and can suck a dick, IMO.

21 November 2011

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Mark,

Chad had been indicted for terrible crimes he didn't commit. He resigned from his well-paying job in order to save the company from embarrassment. He had to work two, and sometimes three, jobs to make ends meet and to drive large distances to keep supervised appointments with his son and to see his lawyer. His girlfriend was basically homeless, as her family has abandoned her and he was trying to help her, and see her, too. Wouldn't you be angry?

Now, we have one police report, out of three officers participating in three surveillance cars, of Chad yelling at one of the cars and shining a flashlight at one of them. Was this incident serious enough for any of the police officers to turn on the flashing blue light or a siren and stop Chad? No, apparently not. As I wrote in a previous posting, I'll ask Chad for his recollection of this incident. You used the plural "incidents." Was there more than one that concern you, out of the many hours of such surveillance for which we have reports?

Yes, it would have been eminently reasonable for Chad to drive to a police station, but would also have been reasonable for the police to speak to Chad, with or without his lawyers, and advise that they suspected him of violating his bail conditions and ask him to stop. If their concern was really that they didn't want him talking with Amanda, they could have easily communicated that concern to Chad or to his lawyers or both. That, too, would have been reasonable.

21 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Mark C**

The surveillance incidents just show how volatile his temper was. So what if he believed he was being followed.

A rational person would not have flashed a light into the car, yelled at the driver and acted erratically. That's how irrational people with uncontrollable tempers wind up as road rage statistics.

Don't stop in the nearest police station or anything. That would make too much sense.

21 November 2011

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Yes, once again we agree. Chad didn't want the police to know he was seeing Amanda because it was a violation of his bail conditions. About those conditions, his lawyer reflected later that he could have sought conditions of bail which were less burdensome on Chad and Amanda's relationship. Chad didn't tell his lawyers he was seeing Amanda, and didn't know that it was possible to seek a modification of those conditions.

Regarding Chad's response when he was being followed by unmarked cars, I found the report that I think you were referencing. The last two entries of Trooper James Mayers' report (at pages 2005-07 of Discovery) are:

"0441 Hours. All units are in the area of Vernon Vermont behind the target [Chad] who is acting very suspicious as the only vehicle(s) behind him have been Trooper Huse and Sgt. Yorke for more than a half-hour.

0443 Hours: Surveillance has been terminated. The target began tailgating Trooper Huse on Taylor Hill Road, shining a spotlight on him, screaming for him to stop, and acting erratic."

Ok, so Chad was being followed by several cars at 4:40 in the morning and he shined a flashlight on a car and yelled at the car to stop? Why wouldn't the police just stop and identify themselves? Wouldn't you have been upset at being followed by three cars at that hour of the day? By the way isn't one of the goals of such surveillance to avoid being detected? If someone knows that he is being followed, should the police have simply abandoned the surveillance? Otherwise, it looks like harassment. On one of these "surveillance" missions, the police pulled Chad over for an "obstructed license plate," and a field sobriety test which he passed. (EYE CONTACT, page 330.) Do any of those reports indicate that any policeman simply asked Chad if he was seeing Amanda in violation of his bail condition? Again, the police spent a lot of time and money to catch Chad violating a bail condition.

In any case, I'll write to Chad and ask about his recollection of this non-event.

*21 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

---

**Bob Arnold** | 

Chad and Amanda didn't want the police to know they were seeing each other because it was in violation of his bail conditions.

The state police had to assign several officers to watch Evans. One night, while an undercover officer was following Evans, Evans freaked out and started tail-gating the officer while shining a bright spotlight at the officer's unmarked car, yelling and screaming out his car window.....Chad is psycho. Nuts. A rash, short-tempered bully.

-See police investigation into whereabouts of Chad Evans.

Morrison,

Let's start with the morning of the 9th....as your book claims, when Kassidy woke up crying, Chad yells "go back to sleep baby." I can't believe he said something so sweet to Kassidy.

*21 November 2011 - Rochester*

---

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Mark,

Chad and Amanda did not want to disclose to the police that they were seeing each other, but they both expected that Chad would be acquitted in the upcoming trial. After all, they both knew that he didn't abuse or kill Kassidy.

Unfortunately, Chad's lawyers did not ask either Chad or Amanda for documents, calendars and photos about their lives together from July through November. The photographs would have been very helpful, and many of them had photo date stamps.

It's possible that some of the photos showed one or more bruises on Kassidy, but people knew that she had bruises from time to time, and they thought they understood the accidental causes. Of the photographs in the Appendix of EYE CONTACT, Chad is not in some of them because he was the photographer. For others, he was not present, such as the day at Water Country or at Amanda's mother's home on October 1.

Believe me, the absence of photos of Chad and Cassidy is painfully felt. His sister, Nicole, wrote to me that regretted very much not taking webcam movies of Chad and Cassidy at her home on Sunday, November 5. I wrote in EYE CONTACT at page 565, "Nicole wrote about Sunday, November 5, 'I only wish I had my video camera running that day so that the whole world could have seen the Chad Evans that we all know and love, eating pizza with her on his lap, both saying, "mmmm" after each bite. Or singing ABC's, or just cuddling in a way that I could tell that shared a bond.' If Nicole had taken that video, perhaps Chad would never have been charged with Cassidy's murder."

*21 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

### Mark C

The fire incident is concerning to me.

It leads me to speculate that maybe there were pictures of Cassidy significantly bruised/abused and they were intentionally destroyed. After all, they were in the process of trying to cover their tracks.

For two people who loved to take snapshots of the kids doing funny things or whatever, it is bizarre to me that there are no pictures of Cassidy and Chad.

*21 November 2011*

### Morrison Bonpasse |

Mark,

Amanda kept most of her photographs of Cassidy in a package. It was one of her few possessions in the summer of 2001. She was camping on property owned by Chad's grandparents in Vermont, along with a woman friend. Yes, Chad lived there sometimes, too. One day, a police helicopter flew overhead and, fearing detection, Amanda and Chad left. The site was destroyed, with many items thrown into a campfire. Unfortunately, Amanda's precious package went into the fire, too. The fire is mentioned on several pages in EYE CONTACT: 41, 71, 137, 143, 192, 371, 389-90, and 548. On pages 321-22 are listed 21 photographs that Chad recalls that are now missing, most of which were lost in the fire. Some of those photos were of Chad and Cassidy together.

Regarding the subsequent lives of Amanda, Jeff and Jennifer, it's safe to say that Cassidy's death, no matter what the cause, affected all three, as well as Chad. Each person's subsequent decision to have, or not have, children can be interpreted differently, so I prefer to leave out the specifics of those private decisions.

*21 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

### Morrison Bonpasse |

Mark,

Amanda kept most of her photographs of Cassidy in a package. It was one of her few possessions in the summer of 2001. She was camping on property owned by Chad's grandparents in Vermont, along with a woman friend. Yes, Chad lived there sometimes, too. One day, a police helicopter flew overhead and, fearing detection, Amanda and Chad left. The site was destroyed, with many items thrown into a campfire. Unfortunately, Amanda's precious package went into the fire, too. The fire is mentioned on several pages in EYE CONTACT: 41, 71, 137, 143, 192, 371, 389-90, and 548. On pages 321-22 are listed 21 photographs that Chad recalls that are now missing, most of which were lost in the fire. Some of those photos were of Chad and Cassidy together.

Regarding the subsequent lives of Amanda, Jeff and Jennifer, it's safe to say that Cassidy's death, no matter what the cause, affected all three, as well as Chad. Each person's subsequent decision to have, or not have, children can be interpreted differently, so I prefer to leave out the specifics of those private decisions.

*21 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

### Mark C

I would like to know more details about that fire. What caused it, how was it reported/investigated, etc.

Also, anyone have current information about Jeff Marshall and Jennifer Conley? Did they get married? Any kids?

What about Amanda? What's she up to these days?

Any suspicious activities involving children and any of these three over the last decade? I mean, if they were more involved as some supporters would have you believe (especially Jeff), surely there must be current evidence that would make a person wonder if they got away with murder...right? As I said previously, leopards don't change their spots.

Its like OJ never giving up hope that the real killer would be found...funny how no new information ever surfaced to support his claims.

21 November 2011

### Mark C

Are we to believe that there is not one single picture of Chad holding, or posing with, Cassidy? I mean, I see Chad holding his son above and random pictures of Cassidy and Amanda.

I bet there were a bunch that were lost in that mysterious 2001 fire...right?

21 November 2011

### Morrison Bonpasse |

Mark,

Your point about the aging of bruises for easily bruising people makes sense. Chad's recollection is that during November, Cassidy seemed to be ailing and there was no strong eye contact holding of Cassidy's face. Thus, the absence of such eye contact-holding bruises on November 9, as analyzed by Christine, seems reasonable. I don't know when the most recent "eye contact" bruise faded away. By "ailing," I mean that Amanda and Chad thought Cassidy might have the flue, as Kyle had it earlier.

Bob,

Your attacks are so broad, they require a book to respond - and I've written it. Please present for discussion ONE factual mistake in its 699 pages.

21 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

### Bob Arnold |

You know, the "justice for chad and kassidy" youtube video is reminiscent of the fictional, "computer simulated" video that the Gary Dodds defense tried to present at trial (which the judge refused to permit), So full of lies and inaccuracies that it makes me sick to my stomach. Yet another example of the CEWCC parading lies around the internet.

21 November 2011 - Rochester

### Mark C

Is it even possible that someone who bruises so easily recovers from said bruises so quickly?

Its counter intuitive to me.

21 November 2011

### Bob Arnold |

Morrison,

Your continued defence of Chad is sad..... Chad only admitted to grabbing Cassidy by the face AFTER the police challenged him.

It's interesting that you're defending his disciplining of Cassidy, however during his police interview he stated several times that he does not tell Amanda "how to run her child" and that he did not discipline her. I find the volume of lies coming out of his mouth during the police interview to be shocking.

Furthermore, the police obtained statements from many individuals who all stated the same thing, that they had observed bruising and injuries to Cassidy, they had asked about them, and were told stories like the trampoline story....every time the story involved Chad.

See police interviews with: Chrystal Martin, Kathy Nuenberg, Jeff Marshall, Tristan Evans, Melissa Chick, Emily Conley, Amanda Bortner, Robert Conley, Jacqueline Conley.....

Chad consistently lied to the police, see his video taped police interview which contains a string of lies and distortions too numerous to count.

Chad was proven to be an abusive, violent individual....see police interviews with Tristan Evans, Jeff Marshall, Amanda Bortner, Kathy Nuemberg, Barbara Hamel, etc etc...

Chad intentionally made contact with Amanda Bortner, though his bail conditions stipulated no contact, in order to tamer with her testimony (a proven fact).

Bruce Aube kicked them out of his house NOT because he was intimidated by the police as you suggest (you sound so ridiculous Morrison) but because he would not put his friendship above the law AND he was fully aware of what kind of person Evans was (violent).

So tell me, where are all the key players now Morrison? Why aren't all these people (except his sister) involved in your endeavor? Where is Amanda? Humm? Let me guess, she wants to "move on" with her life? Where's all his old friends and associates?

*21 November 2011 - Rochester*

---

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Mark,

Yes, Chad acknowledged during his police interrogation that his holding Cassidy's face did cause bruising. (The reference is not entirely clear but see page 1545 of Chad's interrogation transcript.) Early in 2010 he made the more detailed comment that the bruising occurred on 3-4 occasions. For the first one or two occasions, neither he nor Amanda made the connection between the bruising they saw and Chad's holding. Once they realized the connection, Chad stopped squeezing as hard. He had held Cassidy's face to obtain eye contact on many other occasions without causing any bruising.

What Christine was analyzing were the bruises that the Medical Examiner identified on Cassidy's body and face after her death. Christine concluded that none of the bruises on Cassidy's lower cheek after her death were caused by Chad's holding and squeezing her face. Chad wasn't sure when the last such bruise-causing holding occurred. He thought it was not since the beginning of November, and Christine's analysis seems to support that conclusion as bruises fade away after a week or less.

In any case, as has been noted, the bruising from holding Cassidy's face had absolutely no causal relation to her death.

Also, let me note here that he should not have been convicted of assault for that face holding for two reasons. First, his intent was to obtain eye contact, and it was not to cause pain with a disciplinary purpose. Second, New Hampshire law permits parents, and their delegates to use reasonable force when disciplining children. That includes such corporal punishment as spanking and striking with a belt (but not often). Chad's lawyers did not make these arguments.

*21 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

## Mark C

Interesting how Chad has admitted to bruising Cassidy's face in attempts to get eye contact.

However, Christine has created a mold of Cassidy's head, obtained tracings of Chad's hands, and believes his dainty little hands aren't big enough to have caused the bruises on Cassidy's face.

So, even after Chad admits to bruising the baby's face, Committee members are still trying to convince people that he didn't do that...?

Strange.

21 November 2011

## Morrison Bonpasse |

Bob,

Responding to your two most recent posts.....

1. Yes, because it didn't seem useful and because brevity is sometimes a useful goal, I didn't finish what Trooper Skahan wrote that she said. He wrote, "Finally, B. Hamel stated that Evans, if he did do it, would not accept blame for his actions." (Incidentally, as I noted on page 289 of EYE CONTACT, Trooper "Skahan was from Keene and played football in the Pop Warner League at the same time as Chad. Chad was a good friend of Skahan's brother, Patrick." Skahan should have disclosed that relationship in his interview summary.)

Now as Chad has vigorously denied hitting or murdering Cassidy Borter, what's the point of my presenting that last statement? You implied that the omission meant something nefarious, so I present it here. Barbara Brooks Hamel's assertion that Chad would not accept responsibility for something wrong that he did is plainly not supported by several of his actions as an adult. He accepted responsibility by pleading guilty in his domestic violence case of 1999. He accepts responsibility for the few bruises which his face holding caused while obtaining "eye contact." (However, he denies that such holding was a crime.) He accepts responsibility for not taking Cassidy to the doctor or a hospital or for not more strongly urging Amanda to do so. He doesn't accept responsibility for assaulting or murdering Cassidy because he didn't.

2. Your reasons for not agreeing to meet with me don't seem reasonable, but they can be managed, nonetheless. How about just meeting to get acquainted? We don't even have to discuss the Chad Evans/Cassidy Bortner case. Very often, people on opposite sides of controversy can find some common ground. We were both in the Army, for example. We both agree that polygraphs can be useful forensic tools.

3. Do you remember the name of the Iraqi colonel? Or do you know where he is now? He was an officer in his country's army, fighting for his country, right? What else do you know about him?

4. Finally, you wrote that I haven't produced "one bit of information that would exonerate Evans."

Wow. That's quite an assertion. Not one bit of exonerating information in 699 pages of a book? I tried this before, but please tell me just ONE fact that is incorrectly stated in that book. Just ONE, for now.

20 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

## Bob Arnold |

Just know this, the winds of fate are blowing in the direction of this committee.....there are a lot of people who believe in Evans guilt. There is no doubt that Evans will never benefit from the failed efforts of this committee which include lies, distortions, fabrications and fictional stories and explanations. Evans was proven guilty, beyond a reasonable doubt, by a jury of his peers.

You've not been able to produce one bit of information that would exonerate Evans. Clearly, the efforts of this committee are futile, not to mention the people who are on the committee who have not contributed anything of substance and who have done more harm than good to your efforts.

20 November 2011 - Rochester

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison:

B Hamel interview....you left out the part where she stated "if he did do it, he will never take responsibility.'

A meeting with you would result in you leaving, a battle of wits resulting in your defeat, and you'd be mad at me for being right.

There is no doubt that Chad Evans is a manipulative, cold, calculating violent, abusive person....after reading everything about Evans, I'm reminded of an Iraqi colonel we took into custody in Desert Storm. That guy was cold and evil, you could see it in his eyes. A hard man who had no problems putting the barrel of his knock-off Browning Highpower to the head of a civilian and pulling the trigger....Chad Evans reminds me of that crazy colonel.

No, I'm at the point now where I'm convinced that any information that I divulge to you and this committee will be used to help Chad. This I will not do. Chad is already convicted, you've not proven anything to me that points to a wrongful conviction.

*20 November 2011 - Rochester*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

1. Why bother tell viewers of this "online comments" that you have received communications from people if neither you nor they are willing to present the contents of those communications, even with anonymity?

2. I, too, have reread Trooper Shawn Skahan's summary of his November 24, 2000 interview with Barbara Brooks Hamel. Near the end, he wrote, "I asked B. Hamel if she had ever observed Evans with kids and she indicated that she had not. She told us she was surprised that he had been accused of killing child." At the end, Skahan wrote, "B. Hamel stated that if Evans had done what he is being accused of, then she wants justice done. If he did not do it, then she does not want him to be falsely accused or convicted." Sounds good to me.

3. Your comments remind me of one of my mottos: "Never say never."

4. As you have referenced meetings in the State Government about the request for a re-investigation, have you read my October 13, 2011 letter to Sr. Asst. Attorney General Jeffrey Strelzin? Do you object or disagree with any of the 46 reasons stated in that letter for a re-investigation?

5. I plan to be in Rochester on Wednesday, December 14. Would you be willing to meet with me somewhere in Rochester before that 6:00 p.m. meeting, or after its 8:30 end time?

*20 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison:

I will not share any communications from these individuals so that you can enable Chad to use whatever leverage/influence he has (even in prison) to get back at them. Yes, that's the kind of guy he is. I've confirmed this, and there is no doubt in my mind that he would use whatever he could to do harm to them.

As far as your explanation of Barbara Hamel's police interview, I had to read it a second time to make sure I read it correctly. Your explanations are stunning. Have you thought about writing a novel?

I now have personal knowledge, which I will further confirm within the next week, that Chad will never be exonerated. The case will never be reopened by the AG. I also understand (I've not double confirmed this yet) that there was a meeting on or about October 27th, where the decision was made not to spend any further resources in investigating this case.

You see, I look for double back-up for everything, you and Christine on the other hand make things up as you go along.....kinda like your fictional account of Chad in your book "Eye Contact" aka "Grab the Little Bitch by the Throat as Hard As You Can."

20 November 2011 - Rochester

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

1. It's good news that you have received feedback from individuals who testified at Chad's trial. Please post what they have said to you, regardless of whether they wish to be identified. I prefer people posting their own comments with their real names, but anonymous comments can be better than none. I've defended anonymity in the past on these "online comments."
2. Regarding Barbara Brooks Hamel, I've already referred you to what I wrote and what Chad wrote about her relationship to Chad. She is 15 months older than Chad, so the relationship was unusual from the beginning. How many high school boys did you know who dated girls in the class ahead of them? Further complicating the relationship, Chad was her supervisor at McDonald's for at least part of the period of their relationship. If the police thought that her interview, initiated by her, was useful, why didn't the police interview Mary Paquette who lived with Chad in Rochester before he met Tristan Wentworth?
3. I thought that I did respond to your questions about the "flashbacks" note. If not, please state your question again. No, I did not state that Bruce lied to the police. I said that to the extent that his representation to the police of the contents of Amanda's "flashbacks" note differed from what is actually in the note, he was simply mistaken. There's a difference between lying and being mistaken.
4. Bruce asked Chad and Amanda and Chad's family to leave his home because he was intimidated by the police. See what I wrote in EYE CONTACT at pages 253-58.
5. Regarding Chad's presence at the police parking lot, I wrote in an earlier comment that I would ask him. That was this morning, and the mail will not go out until tomorrow, Monday.
6. I look forward to seeing your letter to the Attorney General which you said you would share.
7. I have a question for you. When Chad is exonerated, what might you say to him and his supporters about what you have written here on these "online comments?" I'm thinking not of the forthright questions and statements, but of the hostile and sarcastic comments. Are you proud of what you are writing on these pages?

20 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

To all "Free the Kid Killer" committee members:

I'm working on my website and would like some input. I really like the flames, they look like the gates of hell, surrounding the police mug shot of Chad, the evil look in his eyes go nicely with the hell theme, I think.....

Do you think I should add a wife-beater shirt?

I've recieved a lot of emails in the past month concerning my site, two of which are from "key players" in the Chad Evans trial. These individuals were close to Chad and Amanda, and both of them testified. Better still, both of them support my efforts in challenging this committee and the "facts" that this committee tends to fabricate. One of the biggest concerns has been the book "Eye Contact" aka "Grab the Little Bitch by the Throat as Hard as You Can."

As I've pointed out repeatedly, "Eye Contact" makes a grossly inaccurate portrayal of Evans as a "loving, caring, nurturing family man."

I look forward to your replies.

Bob Arnold

**Bob Arnold** | 

Barbara Hamel's police interview speaks for itself, and speaks volumes about what type of a guy Chad is. Abusive. Short tempered. Manipulative. Plain and simple, and I don't care to read anything that Chad has "written" because Chad is a liar and manipulator, this is a fact and I've backed it up with documentation, and I can continue to back it up with more documentation if you wish.

Christine Gagne got what was coming to her, as a member of the "Free the Kid Killer" committee, she has been extremely vocal about Chad's innocence with nothing to back up her claims. She has gone as far as presenting lies and fabrications to persuade her audience and gain support in freeing a child killer who was convicted with rock-solid evidence. She parades around the internet, making bold statements about Chad, and she has the nerve to claim she has complete knowledge of this case. Either she doesn't know what she's talking about, or her misleading statements and claims are intentional, which would make her a liar.

You've not answered my question about the note. Obviously you've made an attempt to present something (another note) as the previous note that Bruce Aube saw. Bruce appears to be a straight-laced, honest guy. Are you saying that Bruce lied to the police? I can't believe that Bruce would ever lie to law enforcement.

How do you explain Bruce kicking the two of them out of his house? You know he was in tears over that, but Bruce couldn't put his friendship with Chad above the law. Think about that for a minute, if you will.

And what about Chad driving around the police parking lot spying on Bruce? I'd love to hear this one....yes, this is another FACT that I've got to back up what I say, which is clearly documented by a police officer who was witness to it.

In closing, I'd like to say it's a wonderful day in New Hampshire. Each day that Chad Evans stays behind bars is a wonderful day.

I will be writing an lengthy letter to the AG's office soon, in support of their efforts as well as shedding light on the fabrications and bias stories coming out of the "Free the Kid Killer" committee. I can't wait to share it with you.

20 November 2011 - Rochester

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Responding to your seven most recent posts in chronological order.

1. Thank you for stating that you might support a re-investigation of the case if Chad passes a polygraph test.
2. and 3. For what I wrote in EYE CONTACT (Nov. 9 paperback edition) about Barbara Brooks Hamel, go to pages 249-50. Much of what is there comes from Chad's Feb. 18, 2010 letter to me. See also, EYE CONTACT, page 550 for Vanessa Mansson's observations of the Barbara-Chad relationship.
4. I've never heard of the TV show, "Lockup Raw," which makes for an interesting contrast. It's your favorite and I've never heard of it.
5. Christine Gagne has worked very hard on this case and has developed some very good questions about Cassidy's health and behavior. Christine doesn't deserve your hostility and sarcasm.
6. We agree that the State of New Hampshire spent a lot of time and money to prove that Chad and Amanda were seeing each other in 2001, in violation of Chad's bail condition. Those resources could have been much better utilized during the initial investigation.
7. I believe the "flashbacks" note by Amanda that Bruce Aube described, and which the police

wanted to obtain, is the one that I've presented on the website and in EYE CONTACT (page 258). If Bruce's description doesn't exactly fit what Amanda wrote, then Bruce's description was incorrect or Det. Marasco's summary of what Bruce said is incorrect. In any case, Amanda's note stands by itself. If there is another note, I know nothing about it.  
I'll ask Chad about his being in his car with Amanda in the police parking lot at the time the police and Bruce Aube were talking outside.

20 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison:

See: NHSP Det. John Marasco continuation report, 6 December 2000. Disc p. 1069.  
Police report made by State Police Trooper John Marasco:

"during a follow-up interview with (Bruce) Aube, Linscott and I learned that Amanda and Chad were living with Aube....Aube did advise there was a note at his residence that was written to him by Amanda. In this note, Amanda makes reference to the fact that Chad had picked Kassidy up by the face on a previous occasion. I asked Aube....to produce this note...Aube agreed.....I waited at the (Rochester) police dept (parking lot).....Aube returned to meet me at the police department after traveling to his house. When Aube returned, he was visibly upset. He stated that Chad had taken the note and given it to his attorney. Aube stated he told Chad and Amanda to leave his residence. AS I STOOD IN THE PARKING LOT SPEAKING WITH AUBE, I SAW A VEHICLE CIRCLE THE POLICE PARKING LOT. AUBE IDENTIFIED A MALE AND FEMALE SUBJECT INSIDE THE VEHICLE TO BE AMANDA AND CHAD. ...Aube began to cry. He also threw is vehicle keys..to the ground."

So if Chad is such a great guy, why is he following/spying on his best friend? This is another example of how Evans' manipulative behavior...he was "circling the wagons" best he could.

In addition, you've added a transcribed note (7 May 2001, "Transcribed WORD Copy of 3-page Notes" that you claim is the note that was referenced to by Aube. Nowhere in that note is there any mention of what Aube stated, which is obviously not the same note. Why did you state that this is the note that Aube mentioned?

You must choose your response very carefully Morrison, your losses are mounting in our battle of facts.....I only want to hear one thing, and that's why you've made yet another intentional distortion of facts to better support your claims of Chad's innocence.

19 November 2011 - Rochester

**Bob Arnold** | 

Continued:

May 2001-August 2001 "Assorted documents-see "NH State Police Cont. Report" by Sgt. White phone interview with Alan Noyes (regarding investigation into whereabouts of Chad Evans and Amanda Bortner)

"Noyes also told me that he believes and "eight ball" of cocaine was consumed over the weekend and he described Evans as a "cokehead.".....Some "family man."

Furthermore, the State Police had to SUBPOENA the Truells, Chad's mom and dad for their willfull assistance given to help Chad's intentional, willfull and illegal contact with Amanda. Unbelievable. The devised telephone codes to faciliate contact, all with the help of the before mentioned people who had to be served subpeonas to get info out of them.

At one point, the State Police had to assign 7 troopers to perform a surveillance in Keene to determine living arrangements of Chad and Amanda.....See NH State Police Cont. Rpt. filed under

the previous mentioned date..... Now, you want the state to pay for more investigation of the Chad Evans case, after he and Amanda already cost the state tens of thousands of dollars in manpower, police investigation and judicial proceedings? Give me a break.

19 November 2011 - Rochester

**Bob Arnold** | 

Christine:

Where are you? Are you hiding? You should be, because liars get special treatment from me here at this forum:

Your email to Jeff Strelzin: "After spending over 2500 hours researching this case, from the beginning to the end, with a clear, unbiased mind, in search of the truth, I have compiled a list of what/who killed Cassidy. Ironically Chad Evans did not make the list. In fact, I believe that we can scientifically exclude Chad....."

First off, and as Mark C. has pointed out, 2500 hours equals 104 straight days of study with no sleep and no breaks...or perhaps you split it up into 8 hour days: That equals 312 days....are we to believe that you actually spent "over 2500 hours" working on this case?

In addition, I find it impressive that your credentials include that of a scientist. So, what kind of scientist are you?

Your comment on 14 November in regards to Chad's efforts to take a polygraph:

"For the record, Chad DID ask at his questioning to be polygraph tested, his request was denied because he had asked for counsel. "

Now, how is it that a member of the CEWCC and representative who appeared at the meeting with Jeff Strelzin is making unbelievable claims, both here and all over the internet? Why isn't Morrison doing something about your behavior? Why are you making things up, and presenting them as fact?

Do us all a favor and educate yourself about the facts of this case, and stop spreading your lies.

19 November 2011 - Rochester

**Bob Arnold** | 

My favorite show Lockup Raw is on....I can't wait to see Lockup Raw New Hampshire, maybe they'll feature poor Chad....the narration will sound something like this: (deep scratchy voice) "We visit the state prison in New Hampshire....lockup crews are being exposed to the tools of a deadly trade (first scene, a shot of shanks, another of a jammy with ground up zippers as shrapnel) "correctional staff and officers are overwhelmed (scene of two inmates fighting) ...and for the first time the lockup crew comes face to face with an innocent man (scene of Chad Evans, tears in his eyes, saying "I didn't do it)...."

After a few commercial breaks...."TV concerns are the last thing on the minds of officers (scene of Chad and his boyfriend holding hands)...we have inmates who get very jealous of their property."

"Next, on Lockup RAAAW....we visit with Chad Evans, an innocent man wrongly convicted for a brutal crime."

We're back, (scene of Chad, tears in his eyes) "so tell us why you're here..." Chad: "I was wrongly convicted for killing a girl who I read the alphabet to, I loved and nurtured her, I was a good, wholesome family man, the next thing I knew, the baby sitter befriended the police and here I am..." Narrator: "lockup crews routinely confront individuals who claim their innocence, but as with this one, there is nothing to substantiate their claims. We were surprised by inmate Evans' convincing interview, so we asked some of the other prisoners what they thought " (scene of a guy covered

with tatoos) "oh yea, that sob is guilty as all hell. The only reason why he's lieing is so that he can stay alive in here because we kill child abusers."

What do you think?

19 November 2011 - Rochester

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,

Your portrayal of Evans as a mild-mannered, loving, nurturing family man is an outright lie....the next time you meet with Chad, look closely into his eyes and you'll be looking at pure evil....dark and sinister, a manipulator who blames others and never takes responsibility:

B. Hamel interview: "there is a dark side to Chad Evans which most people never see.....Evans, if he did do it (kill Kassidy) would not accept blame for his actions."

-This, coming from a prior girlfriend of six years. I'd have to say that she knew him better than you do Morrison.

B. Hamel concurred with the prosecution, that Evans was a "JEALOUS, VERY MANIPULATIVE" person. This correlates to the timeline as proven by the prosecution...beat Kassidy out of rage, then cover it up with lies (trampoline, baseball/wiffleball) beat her some more, control, tell more lies, decieve, manipulate...and at the police interview, just repeat all the above...then after the interview, throw a fit of rage in the Kittery PD parking lot, confront Jeff, raise hell, scare people, avoid further contact with the police, then within hours of the interview, influence Amanda, send your sister up to the hotel to snatch her away, manipulate her, lie to her, get her on his side....

You're defending a liar (fact...I've proven it) and a manipulator (fact, I've proven it) and a sexual deviant (yet another fact that I've proven)....there is so much proof of what I've been saying all along about Evans, and all you can do is claim "police coercion". You're using the Chad Evans playbook.

19 November 2011 - Rochester

**Bob Arnold** | 

NH State Police interview with Barbara Hamel (former girlfriend of Chad Evans) on 11/24/00:

"B. Hamel indicated that she was a freshman in high school when she first met Evans. They were both employed by McDonald's...she stated that during the six years they were together they broke up numerous times, but would eventually get back together after a short period of time. B Hamel described Evans as "very jealous", "controlling" and "smothering". She added that he would get upset if he felt she was having a better time with others than him. According to B. Hamel, she and Evans would often get into heated arguments....would usually reach a point where he would push her into a wall or physically assault (her). She said that Evans never took responsibility for (his) actions and always blamed someone else. B. Hamel was able to remember specific insidents where an argument with Evans turned into violence....she attended a party at a local residence where there were some individuals marijuana.....(when) Evans arrived and was convinced she had been smoking marijuana as well.....she and Evans began to argue, because he had accused her of doing something she had not done.....Evans physically threw her off the porch and (face down on the ground). She stated Evans was a bad drinker. Another incident....she had just moved into her new apartment and was having a house warming party....Evans was drunk and became enraged and punched a hole into one of her walls.....he purposely hit his head on the hood of his own vehicle (and) punched a hole into the dashboard. A third incident....(while at his apartment) she was upset....she stated Evans came back downstairs, grabbed her by the throat and said "I'm going to kill you fuckin' bitch.".....she had seen Evans become enraged at work, not only with her but with customers as well. She stated that she had often times seen him strike a piece of equipment in anger....I asked her what usually enraged Evans and she indicated that his anger was tied to his JEALOUS tendencies and his insecurities. She added that he was "VERY MANIPULATIVE."

Very interesting.....everything that I've said about Evans is corroborated with yet another police interview.

What say you?

19 November 2011 - Rochester

**Bob Arnold** | 

That interview with Sgt. White happened after Chad had the opportunity to taint her recollection of events.....Chad tried all means at his disposal to maintain close intimate contact with Amanda for one reason: To taint her testimony. It's a fact (see police efforts to determine Chad Evans whereabouts). He got friends and family to lie/cover for him and to make calls to Amanda on his behalf. He did everything he could to influence her.

As far as a reinvestigation, who's going to do it, Christine? You? On the other hand, it would be a lot cheaper if you arranged a bonafide POLYGRAPH examination, not a VSA, a polygraph....I might inclined to support a reinvestigation by law enforcement authorities if he passed one of those.

Christine, Christine, where art thou? We certainly could benefit from your vast, superior knowledge of this case.....maybe you're too busy making unsubstantiated claims and tweets on Twitter?

19 November 2011 - Rochester

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

In the comment below, I forgot to give Sgt. Jim White credit for presenting what Amanda said to him, even if critical of him and/or the police. He wrote that she said, "You twisted around everything I said... Well, the papers twisted it around. They said he threw her against the wall. He wouldn't do that." (EYE CONTACT, p. 332)

That was in Sgt. White's summary of his meeting with Amanda, and not from a transcript. On that visit to Pizza Hut, he was accompanied by NH State Police Sgt. Kelly McClure.

19 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Mark,

Thank you for your qualified support of a re-examination or retrial of this case. Let's not argue about who should pay.

You have noted that "whenever arguments are brought up, supporters twist things around." I prefer to think that we "supporters" of Chad are presenting facts and reasonable counter arguments. Your use of the word "twist" reminded me of what Amanda said to Sgt. White when he visited her, openly and publicly, at her place of work, a Pizza Hut, in Brattleboro, Vermont on May 21, 2001. She said to him, "You twisted around everything I said... Well, the papers twisted it around. They said he threw her against the wall. He wouldn't do that." (EYE CONTACT, p. 332)

While I don't agree that creative consensual sexual activity is relevant in this murder and child assault case, except to state my view that happy, sexually satisfied people are less likely to abuse people or children, you have raised again the subject of a "threesome." I mention the term twice in EYE CONTACT. The first was on page 259 for the Det. Linscott summary of the Emily Conley int. that was discussed recently. The second was on page 267, with Det. Linscott's Nov. 12 interview with Jeff Marshall where Jeff said, "I was always trying to get the scoop.... but he did say that there was another girlfriend [who] had spent the night over at their house...there was a threesome... and he said that him and his ex-wife used to do that, too...." (p. 1639)" The only threesome activity in Chad's and Amanda's relationship was initiated by Amanda in the spirit of fun, love and competition. Please see Chad's full discussion of this incident in his March 18, 2010 letter to me, which is online with his "Letters from NH Prison."

Let me close this comment by presenting an "online comment" made by Melissa on August 4, 2011 to a comment by Bob

"Bob ...I want to know what average guy in his mid 20's isn't horny all the time- I would love to meet

a man in his 20's that would pass on an offer to have a threesome. My husband would LOVE it if I offered that to him, the difference is, unlike Amanda I don't want to. Amanda voluntarily participated in threesomes ....- yet you continue to bring it up like he forced her...."

19 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

### Mark C

Morrison,

To answer your question...sure.

I don't object to a re-examination or re-trial of this case. As long as the State doesn't foot the bill. The cost to keep a convicted murder in jail is well worth it so I don't view it as a \$5,000 versus \$1M analysis.

It does seem like whenever arguments are brought up, supporters twist things around. Example...show me evidence of this or that. Bob presents that evidence (direct quotes of Amanda) and the explanation is that she was coerced into making those statements.

As far as being a loving, family man. He sure had the loving part down with all his skanky conquests, threesomes, etc.

By the way, think about this...what type of man who supposedly loves and cares deeply for a woman asks her to participate in threesomes? A guy that couldn't care less about that woman. Don't brush it off as some lifestyle BS either. Amanda was bullied into doing things she didn't want to do. Chad's deviant sexual preferences is most certainly relevant in this case. It supports the fact that he was controlling and viewed women as less than his equal.

18 November 2011

### Morrison Bonpasse |

Bob,

Your quote from Amanda, "Yea, I know he is," is a good example of how the police persuaded Amanda to believe that Chad was responsible for Cassidy's death. It was similar to how police in other interviews around the country have persuaded innocent people to confess to crimes they didn't commit. See the case of Marty Tankleff. Confronted with the awful reality of Cassidy's death, and not knowing what caused it, Amanda was ripe for the police to persuade her that Chad was responsible. As Amanda said later to Chad and me (separately), "If they had told me that the Pope killed Cassidy, I would have believed them."

On another subject, I wholeheartedly deny that I'm doing any of this work to sell books. The sole purpose of writing EYE CONTACT is to inform the people of New Hampshire and the world of what happened in this case, so that Chad and Amanda can achieve justice. So far, we have printed 40 copies and sold about 15. One hundred copies are now being printed of the Nov. 9 paperback edition, and Amazon has a different formatted edition for \$25.00 as well as a Kindle e-book edition for \$3.00. Chad's parents will never break even on the publication of the book. All the book revenue will go to reduce the net loss to them.

Regarding Amanda Donnell. Chad and Amanda and Chad's mother were at TJ Maxx on Wednesday, November 15, 2000, and Amanda Donnell called Chad and Amanda, "Baby Killers." Chad's response of showing his middle finger seems restrained to me, given the circumstances. He didn't yell back at her, did he? He didn't push her, did he? At the time, Amanda Donnell appeared to be on bail for an alleged assault on a woman on September 16, during which the other woman's tooth was broken. (See the website's "Chronology" entry for Wednesday, November 15, 2000) Please note that Amanda Donnell is the daughter of the man who counseled Jeff Marshall not to take the polygraph test, which was scheduled for the previous day, Tuesday, November 14, 2000.

17 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

### Bob Arnold |

Morrison,  
Negative Negative Negative...you're presenting conjecture about her statements.....

Blodgett: "Chad? Do you think he's responsible for her death?"

Amanda: "YEA. I KNOW HE IS."

Where do you get off twisting the obvious meaning of her statements to police? I can read too and what I see her saying is something totally different than your book peddling interpretation. Yes, there's something in it for you, you can't deny it.

It's nice that Chad helped pay for the funeral dress.....was that the day that he flipped his middle finger at Amanda Donnell:

Police interview:

"Ms. Donnell indicated she observed Chad Evans and Amanda Bortner at the T.J. Maxx store in Somersworth, NH just two days prior to Evan's arrest. Ms. Donnell indicated that she was taken back and aggravated at seeing these two individuals together.....Ms. Donnell indicated she was aggravated because she observed Bortner and Evans laughing and joking.....Ms. Donnell indicated.....she observed no remorse of any kind or to any degree To the contrary, they constantly laughed and joked. While at the T.J. Maxx check-out, Ms. Donnell realized that Evans and Bortner were right behind her in line. Again, Ms. Donnell described their behavior at this time as laughing and joking and not at all normal considering the recent death of (Kassidy) and infant.....Being aggravated by this, Donnell turned to Evans and Bortner and said, "Baby killer" as she stared at Evans. In response, Evans gave Donnell the middle finger and they both (Evans and Bortner) began to laugh."

What do you have to say about this Mr. "I have a twisted explanation for everything?"

*17 November 2011 - Rochester*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Responding to your two most recent posts.

1. Your sample of Blodgett's questioning of Amanda is a good example of how Amanda was led to say certain things that seem to confirm the police theories of the case, but much of what Amanda said was ambiguous. When she answered, "Chad," she appeared to be thinking that the question was, "Who was home with Kassidy last night?" To Blodgett's second question, Amanda said of Travis, "He knows." Well, Blodgett, and perhaps you, likely interpreted that statement as indicating that Amanda understood that Travis "knows" that Chad is at fault. However, it was an ambiguous response. It also simply could have meant that Travis is a good witness to what he saw and heard in the Evans/Bortner household. As Freud said, sometimes a cigar is just a cigar. Later, the police and prosecutors chose not to believe Travis's statements about the evening of November 8, because it didn't conform to their theory, but "He knows." Last year, Travis told me he was willing to take a lie detector test to support what he told the police.

2. Your second post is easier to answer. Chad didn't go to Kassidy's funeral because he was in jail, as he was arrested on Thursday, November 16, and was not released on bail until Wednesday, November 22. Before his arrest, he DID plan to go to the services. As you likely know, he and his mother helped Amanda purchase clothes for Kassidy's body. The police anticipated Chad's attendance and counseled Jeff on his possible reactions if Chad were to attend. We don't know whether Chad's arrest was intentionally timed to avoid Chad's attendance at the funeral. Chad's father, brother, sister and sister's husband did attend the funeral.

Finally, it's true. I believe, after a year of investigating this case and of talking with Chad and his family and friends, that he was, and is, a "nice, decent, loving and caring 'family man.'" The facts presented in EYE CONTACT support that conclusion. Please read some or all of the 52 pre-

sentencing letters sent to Judge Nadeau. He wasn't perfect, as none of us is, but he was as you said that I characterized him.

17 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,

Here we go again, "Bob, you're on the stand"..... You've pleaded with me to explain why I think I believe in Chad's guilt, well I've been pouring out my thoughts for the past several days. It isn't one particular thing that leads me to believe in his guilt, it's all the little things that add up to my conclusion. True, the sex was not part of the trial, however I've used this information to formulate my opinion about him. In addition, the reason why I'm persistent in pointing out all these sexual facts is because you're persistent in portraying him as a nice, decent, loving and caring "family man" which is so absurd that your book lost all credibility within the first few minutes of reading it.

I'd like to know why he didn't show up for Cassidy's funeral...you want to ask him about that? I'm sure he'll come up with something good, like why he didn't testify at his trial, why he intentionally violated bail conditions so he could have contact with the star witness.....the list goes on.

17 November 2011 - Rochester

**Bob Arnold** | 

Police interview with Amanda on the evening of Cassidy's death:

Det. Blodgett: "Um, if the only reason Cassidy died is because she had head injuries from being beaten, who would be responsible for that? Only Chad or anybody else?"

Amanda: "Chad."

Blodgett: "Um, what do you think, um, your roommate is going to have to say about what's been going on?"

Amanda: "He knows."

17 November 2011 - Rochester

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Please note that I've added a new feature to this page which is a link to the collected "comments" since the first comment on July 20, 2010. The document can be used to easily search for earlier comments on the same subject, or by the same person.

17 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Mark,

Interestingly (to me at least), you have once again made a general statement that I agree with: "You don't isolate one aspect of a person's life to come to a definitive conclusion about who they are as a person. However, the sum of their parts provides you with what you need to know about the individual." Amazingly, when you and I apply that wisdom to the same set of facts, we come out with diametrically opposed conclusions.

You listed six specifics.

1. That "Chad was controlling, as evidence by demands involving deviant sexual activities,..."  
What is your evidence for such "demands"? (Who doesn't make sexual requests?)
  2. What is your evidence for his being "stubborn" (Who isn't, at least sometimes?)
  3. What is your evidence that "he didn't like to lose?" (Who does?)
  4. What is your evidence that he did like to be "told what to do"? (Who does?)
  5. What is your evidence that he had a "bad temper"? (I know that Amanda used that word, but what examples? His friend Jeremy was asked that question and he cited an example where Chad lost his temper when an employee stole several thousand dollars from a store. So? Who doesn't show anger in such situations?)
  6. What is your evidence that Chad was "abusive to women."? (I know that he had two fights with Tristan and a generally physical relationship with her and, as a teenager, with a girlfriend. Witnesses have said that both women slapped him more often than he responded.)
- Even if you are right about ALL six of the above characteristics, which I strongly doubt, aren't there several other human characteristics which might be considered when assessing Chad as a person? Such as courage, public spiritedness, loyalty, love of family, intelligence, kindness....?
- I'll close with a general question for you: Do you support the request to the Attorney General to re-investigate this case? My guess is that after 100 hours of such a re-investigation, the participating detectives would see which way the evidence was going. Then, the decision could be made to continue or stop. One hundred hours would cost about \$5,000, which could be compared to the cost of keeping Chad Evans in prison for another 33 years for an estimated cost of \$1 million. Again, do you support such a preliminary re-investigation?

17 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

### Mark C

Bob,

Christine must be working on another e-mail to Strelzin. After all, it takes a ton of time to think up possible reasons for Cassidy's death...other than the most obvious and logical.

I still find the liver disease angle quite fascinating.

Sippy cups full of vodka all around. My treat!

17 November 2011

### Mark C

You don't isolate one aspect of a person's life to come to a definitive conclusion about who they are as a person. However, the sum of their parts provides you with what you need to know about the individual.

Chad was controlling, as evidence by demands involving deviant sexual activities, stubborn, didn't like to lose or be told what to do, had a bad temper and was abusive to women.

No doubt Cassidy was a victim of circumstances. She was a wedge between Chad and Amanda, didn't give him EYE CONTACT or otherwise fall into a nice straight line for him. A little push, pull, squeeze, face wash here and there would get her to abide by Lord Chad. Unfortunately, Mr. Tough Guy didn't know his own strength when applying his typical adult female level EYE CONTACT to this unrelated and defenseless toddler.

17 November 2011

### Morrison Bonpasse |

Bob,

Please note that Emily Conley's interview was summarized by a policeman, rather than being transcribed. Detective Linscott wrote that "Conley stated that Amanda asked her if she would take part in a threesome with Chad, which Conley said she declined. Conley said that Amanda took nude

photographs of ..... for Chad.... Conley said that Amanda asked her if she could take some nude photographs of her to share with Chad..." Nowhere did Emily Conley say that Amanda told her that Chad requested any of these activities. In fact, he didn't. Did Emily Conley say that Amanda felt coerced? Did she say that Amanda was not happy about their sexual activities? What is the problem here, and what is the relevance to an alleged murder and alleged child abuse?  
(continued below)

17 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

(continued from above)

Regarding the allegation about Chad having Tristan's clothing at his home after their separation, here is what Chad wrote in his January 7, 2011 letter to me, "Also, you mentioned that during Emily's statement to the police, she stated that Amanda had informed her that I kept former lovers bras in my dresser. This seems like another one of those things that started out with a grain of truth and by the time it gets through 2-3 different people it has changed drastically. The only thing that I can imagine Amanda may have told her is one of two things.

1. On occasion after Tristan moved out, KG would come spend the night. I know at one point, she left a complete change of clothing, which I kept in my dresser. Can't recall if Amanda ever knew this or not.

2. I was married to Tristan and lived with her for nearly 4 years. When Tristan moved out she left many things behind and would take them on occasion. Our lives were intertwined. I do remember at one point I found a few of Tristan's bras in my closet. Knowing it would upset Amanda I shoved them in my top dresser drawer with the intentions of giving them to Tristan at some point. Amanda found them and got very upset, demanding that I throw them out. I was a bit stubborn myself, and didn't do well with demands. I informed Amanda that I was going to return them to Tristan along with some other items that were hers, in the bureau drawer. After that, I deliberately left the items in the bureau for a while until Amanda stopped mentioning it. Then I returned them to Tristan as I recall. It was so important that I "win" that it caused Amanda to feel like shit and share who knows what with one of her girlfriends. Then this girlfriend shares a story with the police that makes me look like a first class pervert. Anyway, I think that is it."

17 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Mark,

My mistake. Angela Blodgett DID ask Amanda about her sexual relationship with Chad, in Amanda's third interview. That was at the Gray, Maine State Police barracks.

At page 243 of the paperback edition of EYE CONTACT, I wrote,

"Blodgett then spent a few minutes asking Amanda about Chad's sexual interests, and Amanda dismissed them as a 'guy thing,' and 'Well, he's definitely a pig. I'll give him that, but I think he knows his boundaries...' (p. 139) There was no discussion of Jeff's allegation of a 'strap on dildo' and no discussion of sexual deviance."

Again, their sexual relationship was mutually consensual and satisfying.

17 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Police interview with Emily Conley: "Conley stated that Amanda asked her if she would take part in a threesome with Chad, which Conley said she declined. Conley said that Amanda took nude photographs of Crystal Martin for Chad. Conley said that Amanda said Chad had his ex-wife's wedding cake still in his freezer and that Chad had a bag of bra's in a drawer of women he had slept with. Conley said that Amanda asked her if she could take some nude photographs of her to share with Chad and Conley said she declined."

That doesn't sound like a "healthy" sex life, but rather an unhealthy but fulfilling one for Chad.

Crystal Martin interview:

"Martin said that Amanda said that Chad was starting to demonstrate anger and Amanda was concerned. Martin said that Amanda told her that Chad gets angry easily and head-butted her once and they got into a small fistfight. Martin said on another occasion, Chad and his roommate Travis got high and were making fun of Kassidy. Martin said that Amanda took Kassidy upstairs to get away from them."

Sounds like Chad isn't the "loving, caring family man" that you portray him as in your book Eye Contact.

17 November 2011 - Rochester

Morrison Bonpasse | 

Mark,

My grandfather was 8 years older than my grandmother. John F. Kennedy was 12 years older than Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy.

Agreed. There is a lot of conjecture in your, and Bob's, allegations, about the sexual relationship between Amanda and Chad. My understanding, again, is that it was mutually consensual and satisfying. I don't recall that Chad was asked any questions about his sexual relationship with Amanda in his interrogation and don't recall that Amanda was asked any such questions in her four interviews or in her testimony at Chad's trial. It didn't seem relevant to the police or prosecutors. So why is their sexual relationship an issue for you? What relevance does it have to the charges against Chad?

You seem to give Amanda little credit. Yes, she was a teenage mother, but she had the gumption to get her GED, and even earned it before her former high school class's graduation. She signed up for the ASPIRE program. Instead of choosing immunity from prosecution by standing by her induced false statements to the police, she courageously chose to tell the truth. She paid the price by being indicted, convicted and sent to jail for more than a year.

I don't recall the reference to someone's observation that Kassidy showed fear of Chad. Do you recall? Who or when? I do know that Amanda wrote to Judge Nadeau, "It makes me cry when I think about how many times in a day Kassidy would ask, "Where's Chad?" He did so many good things with her. Every morning before I had a job she would come into our bedroom and Chad would put her on his back, And piggy back ride her downstairs to her high chair.

(continued below).

17 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

Morrison Bonpasse | 

(continued from above)

He fed her breakfast every morning if he was there when she woke up. Many days I would come around the corner and find him sitting there talking away to Kassidy, playing with her while she ate breakfast. Many days he would come home midmorning and bring her some munchkins or for lunch he'd bring her a happy meal. It was like he couldn't come home without bringing her or me something. He would sit with her for hours and color, play spin art, and do the alphabet and numbers with her. He'd always point out objects and she'd say what they were. That's something we both did with her. She loved it! She also loved getting involved with the boys wrestling on the bed. She loved to play with the boys. One of her favorite things to do with Chad was pony rides and superman. He would sit and read to her at bed time, and was always affectionate. She gave Chad kisses and hugs all the time. He taught Kassidy to say "ohhhhh," when you gave her a hug. He was always talking about saving money for her future. And he's always a softy. He could hardly ever say no to her when she asked for a cookie, or a piece of candy. When I had a survey job on the computer he spent hours with her playing, holding her, watching Disney movies with her, and etc. so that I could work on my surveys. He was always so patient with her then and if she was sick. As far as the bad things, I honestly think it broke his heart that after 2 or 3 months she started throwing temper tantrums if he'd kiss me again. (After Jeff started babysitting) He and I just couldn't understand how she would be all over him playing, etc. for 4 hours one night and then we'd all be sitting together and he'd kiss me and she'd freak out. He has punished himself over and over for grabbing her face but I can honestly say he did not do it with the intention of hurting her but to get

her attention, and to have her listen....” (See the entire letter on pages 560-64 of the Nov. 9 paperback edition of EYE CONTACT)

17 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

---

**Bob Arnold** | 

And kids don't cry while dreaming, and they don't get up at 2am and stand in the corner, facing the wall, in complete darkness for hours on end. I can only imagine the hellish torment this little girl endured.

I don't believe Chad intentionally killed Cassidy either, but he must have been aware of the lines he was crossing on a daily basis.

It's funny how the CEWCC refuse to acknowledge any of the important interview comments made by Jeff Marshall. If you read his statements you'll find that he was consistent and more importantly a lot of what he said was backed up by other witnesses.

Gee, I wish Christine was here to share her vast knowledge of this case.....maybe she's done another all nighter, reading and studying the case material? I doubt it.

Becky,  
Has Chad asked you to send any nude photos?

17 November 2011 - Rochester

---

**Mark C**

Morrison,

Crude is a much older man shacking up with a younger girl, forcing her to perform sexual acts she didn't enjoy, having threesomes, frequenting p0rn shops and whacking it to nude pictures of Amanda's friends. The last part is conjecture but what else would he be doing with the nude pictures?

Pretty easy for him to control Amanda given her age, situation, lack of money, etc.

I don't think Chad meant to kill Cassidy so I agree with the statement that he intended to have a life with her and Amanda. However, things came crashing in around him when the baby succumbed to her injuries. I take all of his statements after-the-fact with a grain of salt. It certainly wouldn't help his case if he admitted something that could be perceived as bad, mean, etc. with regard to Cassidy.

I definitely think he had an issue with her being a girl. He wasn't used to raising one and they are much different than boys. More clingy, emotional...stuff that could easily aggravate a hot head if the actions interfered with his plans.

Why would Cassidy have the look of fear and act as if she would get punished, hit, etc. when Chad came home (on at least one occasion based on documented facts)? Kids don't act fearful of loving parents who don't abuse them.

17 November 2011

---

**Bob Arnold** | 

To top it all off, Chad had no respect for women, this was evident when he brutally assaulted his ex as well as Amanda. He got Amanda to do things, like obtain nude photos of her girlfriends, get her to have threesomes with her girlfriends, demands for anal sex....pushing her, choking her, etc..

So it would come as no suprise that he treated Cassidy like dirt as well.

17 November 2011 - Rochester

Mark,

1. Whether you tried or not, your characterization of Chad's relationship to Amanda is crude. In an earlier email you said that Amanda was Chad's "sextoy." There is absolutely no evidence that Cassidy interfered with Chad's and Amanda's sexual relationship. As far as I know, that sexual relationship was healthy and satisfying. What evidence or statement do you have for your assessment that "Cassidy hampered Chad's ability to get a piece of ass whenever he demanded it and often times was a wedge between him and Amanda."?
2. About Chad's financial planning for Cassidy, there are two points. First, he was planning for a future with Cassidy. Doesn't that say something to you? Second, the jury had no idea and Chad's lawyers should have presented this kind of evidence to the jury. Also, he was encouraging Amanda to set up her own fund for Cassidy, and he paid for her three-session money management classes, which she attended with Nicole and two of Chad's other friends.
3. Regarding the alleged fractures, please remember that the judge dismissed one of the fracture charges for lack of evidence, and the jury found him Not Guilty on the other. There was never any evidence that the alleged fractures were related to Cassidy's death.
4. Agreed. Cassidy was a girl and Kyle and Brent are boys. Chad loved each of them. Have you read Chad's comments on the photographs of Cassidy in the Appendix to EYE CONTACT? Yes, I know they were written in 2010 or 2011 rather than 2000, but as we seemed to agree earlier, character matters. I think that character is usually consistent over time as well. Have you read Chad's recollections of Cassidy in the text of EYE CONTACT and/or in his "Letters from New Hampshire prison?" Why do you "believe" that Chad had a problem with Cassidy being a girl? And if such a belief is correct and based on evidence, how do you make the stretch to abusing or beating her? Evidence, please, not theory.

17 November 2011 - Morrison Bonpasse

**Mark C**

Morrison,

I do appreciate your honest and direct answers.

With regard to his son and stepson, they were not living with him full-time when Amanda and Cassidy were. New relationships often are filled with excitement and make most people a bit more selfish when it comes to their own needs. Therefore, the son and stepson weren't getting in his way when it came to his focus on Amanda (and her friends). Without trying to be crude, Cassidy hampered Chad's ability to get a piece of ass whenever he demanded it and often times was a wedge between him and Amanda.

Setting up a 529 plan or other educational fund(s) doesn't equate to love. That just tells me that Chad was thinking ahead and didn't want to be confronted with huge debt as the kids got older in the event they were going to further their education. To some, this can be construed as Chad thinking of himself more than the kids.

When it comes to a dispute about fractures, I put more stock into the ME's report since she did a comprehensive analysis of Cassidy than a radiologist reading film.

I'm also not sure how you can make the connection between Chad showing no violence toward his son and stepson (that is documented) and Cassidy. Cassidy wasn't his son or stepson and someone who was not blood related or a boy. I truly believe that Chad had problems with the fact that Cassidy was a girl - he didn't know how to deal with her. Little girls tend to be more emotional, whiny, etc. compared to little boys. Chad even admitted that he had to treat his son and Cassidy differently.

17 November 2011

**Bob Bad** | 

Morrison,

Wow, is that how you describe abuse, "playful activity?" I suppose then that all the bruising was a result of playful activity as well? Hey, maybe they were playing on the make-believe trampoline.

It's ironic that a guy who demanded "eye contact" from little Cassidy, sure avoided eye contact with those police officers. I will sum up Chad Evans like this:

My dad (retired Kansas City MO police officer, 27 years on the force, 12 actual shootings he was involved in, thousands of domestic violence calls, etc...) used to say that sometimes he'd take a call on a domestic, and he'd show up and there would be a male there, shirtless or wearing a wife beater shirt, loud and drunk, smacking his wife/kids/girlfriend around, yelling at the neighbor, but the funny thing was when the police showed up he'd become a scared little rabbit, avoiding eye contact, "yes sir, no sir," very typical of a wise ass punk and that's how I see Chad Evans...a tough guy until the police are in the room.

Chad's a liar....yes that's a fact (see police interview), Chad's a manipulator....yes that's a fact (see investigation into Chad intentionally breaking his bail conditions to spend time with Amanda). Chad's abusive (see Jeff Marshall interview, as well as prior domestic assault conviction). Chad is all these things, you can not dispute it.

So, where's Christine? I'm still waiting to hear more about her vast knowledge of this case....seems to me she may not have spent all those hours researching as she claims, which makes her a liar as well....yes that's a fact (see Christine's comments regarding Chad's request for a polygraph).

Mark,

I'm trying to set something up for a first meeting of the Chad Evans He Man Wife Beater Committee but the guy at Peter's Palace said that he has no room, besides it's crowded with horny perverts. Maybe we can have our first meeting in the parking lot of the Kittery PD....we can throw fits in the parking lot and yell and confront people, kinda like Chad did on the evening of Cassidy's death.

Regards,

Bob

17 November 2011 - Rochester

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Mark,

1. Chad's son and stepson were living with Chad full-time from the moment of Kyle's birth in July 1997 until Tristan moved out, for good, in December 1999. Chad regarded his stepson, Brent, like his son and set up an education fund for him, as well as for Kyle. Chad and Tristan consulted with an attorney about Chad adopting Brent. Chad loved children, and loves them still, when he gets the chance during prison visits. There is simply zero evidence of any parenting difficulty, frustration, etc. Zero.

2. Your recollection about an alleged "throwing" of Cassidy is correct. At page 234 of EYE CONTACT, I wrote about a part of Amanda's third interview, with Angela Blodgett and Jeff Linscott) "Later, Amanda said, '...one time... he threw her on the bed and I picked her up and I'm like, 'don't ever touch her again. I'm going to do the discipline.'" (p. 96) Chad recalls that the tossing of Cassidy and Kyle onto their bed was part of playful activity and that Amanda was confusing play with discipline. He recalls that she made the strong statement, 'I'm going to do the discipline,' to Jeff, Jennifer and to Chad, about her doing the disciplining when Cassidy came back from Jeff's with black and blue on her buttocks, on Sunday, October 22. In melded families, biological parents sometimes have to remind other adults that, 'I'll do the disciplining.' " At page 392 of EYE CONTACT, I relate Amanda's testimony about the same incident, and she said that Chad "just kind of plopped her [Cassidy] on the bed." Again, Chad denies "throwing" Cassidy. On page 385 of EYE CONTACT, I quote Amanda's "My Life Story," where she relates another "I'll do the disciplining," event. I recall that Bruce Aube said he had heard such a statement at his house once.

(continued below)

16 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

(continued from above)

3. I spent some time in EYE CONTACT regarding the alleged fractures. The York Hospital radiologist said there were no fractures. Dr. Greenwald said there were, and Dr. Baden disputed that categorization, but Dr. O'Connor supported Dr. Greenwald. In other words, it was not clear. Even if there were fractures, there was absolutely no evidence that any adult around Cassidy knew that she had any fractures. They saw no event that was likely to cause a fracture and she didn't show any pain from the alleged fractures. There have been a few recent legal cases where medical examiners have claimed they saw fractures, but other doctors have disputed those claims.

4. I don't know how much force it takes to knock a cap off a tooth, but we've already agreed that no domestic violence should be condoned. What I think about the propensity of a man who has two recorded fights with his wife to then abuse his children doesn't really matter. What matters is that Chad committed absolutely no violence toward his son and stepson. He didn't even like to use any corporal punishment, such as spanking, which the law entitled him to do. Nationally, and statistically, I don't know the strength of the connection between a man who fights with his wife and men who abuse children. If you can find some statistics or reports, that would be useful. I'm certain, however, that the two behaviors do not always go together.

*16 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

## Mark C

Morrison,

I can only speculate about Chad's feelings towards his son and stepson. Blood relation issues aside, they also weren't living in the house with him on a full-time basis, getting in his way, disrupting his plans, annoying him, not giving him eye contact, etc.

Didn't Amanda tell Chad that she would be responsible for disciplining Cassidy after an incident where Chad threw the baby on the bed? I'm pretty sure I read it somewhere on here.

As far as the number of bruises and "alleged" fractures, that just makes his case worse. Are you insinuating that Cassidy didn't have fractures by prefacing the reference with the word, alleged?

The number of injuries is astonishing and incredibly sad. However, this ridiculous theory about Cassidy having some disease that made her bruise easily and lead to her death is, well, ridiculous.

Do I think she sustained injuries while at Jeff's place? Sure. Absolutely. Like I said many pages ago, the 4 main people involved with this case couldn't be trusted to care for a hamster let alone a child.

My question about a guy who abuses women...I'm talking hypothetical. One could argue that Tristan did need medical attention and she just didn't seek it. Afterall, Chad bashed her badly enough to break her tooth cap, right? You didn't answer the second part of that question though regarding your thoughts about abusers of women and the possibility of the abuse extending to other susceptible targets...kids.

*16 November 2011*

Mark,

Thanks for reading what you have of EYE CONTACT, and your comments. Given your investment in time, I'd be happy to send you a paperback copy. No charge. Just send me your address.

Cassidy's death is not mysterious to you? Ok. What do you think are the sources of the 100 bruises + alleged fractures the Medical Examiner found? When do you think that Chad hit her enough to cause her death? In the head or abdomen or both? Do you assign any role to the fall from Jeff's truck, her colliding a coffee table, the falling to the driveway on the 8th, and being hit by a T-ball on the 8th?

You wrote that Chad abused Cassidy because "that's the only way he knew how do deal with her?"

Excuse me? He had a son and a stepson. He worshipped them both. He didn't and doesn't believe in corporal punishment. He is an excellent parent, and would be a lot better if the state hadn't wrongly prosecuted and convicted him. He loved Kassidy. Sure, he was sometimes frustrated with her, as was Amanda, as is every parent with every child from time to time. No, he didn't "forcibly" throw Kassidy onto a bed, except in play, and usually with Kyle, too. No, he didn't "force her into corners/against walls/doors against her will," any more seriously than you or I or any parent has ever guided a child to a time-out in a corner. The police, particularly Detective Angela Blodgett, led Amanda into agreeing to such police characterizations, but they were not true, and Amanda tried to retract them at Chad's trial.  
(continued below)

16 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

### Morrison Bonpasse |

(continued from above)

Why do you ask me about a man "who assaults a woman so badly she need medical attention?" Have you read somewhere that Tristan needed medical attention in March, 1999? The police report, which is posted on the "Chronology" section of the website says, "Apparent minor injury." To my knowledge, she didn't have the tooth cap replaced until later. The police seemed to have called for an ambulance to come to the police station to check on Tristan, but there was no medical emergency and no medical treatment. To answer your question, I don't condone any domestic violence, but I don't condone the wrongful convictions of innocent people for murder, either. Neither do you, right?

You speculate about Chad's possible frustration with Kassidy, but what is your evidence of such frustration on November 8 or 9th for that entire last week? Chad had a good day at work, and he OFFERED to pick up Kassidy from Jeff so Kassidy could be at home instead of staying at Jeff's. Otherwise, Amanda's plan was to have Kassidy spend the night. The last overnight at Jeff's and Jennifer's was October 24-26, and that was not a good experience for Kassidy. Chad had Kassidy all day on Sunday the 5th and his caring for her was noted by others at a family gathering.

You speculate about what could have happened "behind closed doors," but it's sheer speculation. New Hampshire cannot keep an innocent person in prison on speculation. The State of New Hampshire should re-investigate this case.

16 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

### Mark C

By the way...I have read alot of the book from this site. Not all of it. I won't be buying a copy but I do appreciate the honest parts contained therein...i.e., not totally skewed in favor of the convicted like some would imagine.

The title could have been better though. Nothing mysterious about Kassidy's death, in my opinion.

Did Chad mean to kill her? I would like to think he did not. Did he abuse her (mentally and physically) because that's the only way he knew how do deal with her? Absolutely.

16 November 2011

### Mark C

Morrison,

How can you be certain that Chad NEVER hit or spanked Kassidy? He did throw her onto a bed forcibly at least one time and force her into corners/against walls/doors against her will, right? He did grab her legs and arms during such moments, right? That ties back into my statement about his presumed actions behind closed doors. People who abuse others don't usually do so in front of witnesses. However, it wouldn't surprise me if he lost his cool in front of Amanda on occasion because of his lack of control over his temper. In those situations, however, I'm sure he showed as much restraint as he possibly could. Imagine if Amanda wasn't around though...

Grabbing someone's face, especially a toddler's face, to obtain eye contact is a blatant act of bullying by someone trying to be dominant/controlling. What kind of stupid ass doesn't realize that toddlers, as young as Cassidy, don't comprehend those actions the way they are intended? Was his point to get eye contact or to simply intimidate Cassidy to make it clear who was boss?

Let me ask you...what are your thoughts about a man who assaults a woman so badly she need medical attention? I imagine you do not condone the behavior. However, what does your gut tell you about that person having the capability to hurt a child? Is it more likely that the guy would stoop so low to hurt a child who he is frustrated with, less likely or about the same as any other guy...?

16 November 2011

Morrison Bonpasse | 

Mark,

Thanks for this continuing exchange.

Yes, we agree that Chad likely hurt Cassidy, apart from accidents during play, but differ widely on the extent and intent. The intent of Chad's holding of Cassidy's face was to secure eye contact and not to hurt her. I use the phrase "likely hurt" because I presume, without knowing, that when Chad's holding was strong enough to cause bruises, it likely hurt. Whether Chad or Amanda knew that it hurt Cassidy is another question. I wrote about Amanda's thinking, on page 291 of the Nov. 9 Edition of EYE CONTACT: "Asked about Cassidy's reaction to the 'eye contact' grabbing, Amanda said, 'She would scream, cry.... it didn't look like it hurt. I never thought it hurt her until I saw bruises.... I can remember two times I could see bruises.'" (p. 85)"

Please remember that in New Hampshire, parents and their delegates are permitted by law to use reasonable force with children, and some court-approved discipline has included spanking and hitting with a belt. The purpose of such corporal punishment is to inflict pain, as compared to holding a child's face to obtain eye contact. Chad never hit or spanked Cassidy and never intended to inflict pain.

Yes, we agree that Chad was once a teenage boy, and he held his own. He was on the football team. Once several boys attacked him and he successfully defended himself, as he explained during his police interrogation. He once came to the aid of a girl whose boyfriend was hitting her. Yes, he did escort a man out the door of his home at a party when he felt the man had insulted his (Chad's) sister. As Chad recalls, the man apologized later. These incidents do not necessarily describe a child abuser or murderer.

(continued below)

16 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

Morrison Bonpasse | 

(continued from above)

I like very much your statement, "People don't tend to do things that are radically different than their typical behavior." What's interesting is that we each believe the statement supports our position. I submit to you that abusing and murdering Cassidy Bortner is RADICALLY DIFFERENT FROM CHAD'S TYPICAL BEHAVIOR. People who love children don't usually beat them. Character does matter. I view his fights with Tristan as aberrations to his character, and you seem to view them as central. Have you read any of the 52 pre-sentencing letters that were sent to Judge Nadeau by Chad's family and supporters? What do you think of his Union Leader "Hero" award in 1997? We also seem to agree that Chad could have been categorized as a Type "A" personality. At that age, I could have been similarly categorized. It's a stretch, however, to say that Type "A" personalities are prone to child abuse and murder.

We don't know about Jeff's motivations for his early babysitting, through early October. Amanda has said that she gave him her food stamps, although Jeff has denied that. Amanda also did landscaping work for Jeff. Chad had no involvement in Jeff's babysitting for Cassidy. However, in mid-October, Chad told him that his landscaping contracts with McDonald's would not be renewed after the winter season. The effect of that communication on Jeff's motivations is not known, as the issue was not addressed at Chad's trial.

Yes, I agree there was not much eye contact during Chad's interrogation with two intimidating policemen. There are many possible explanations for that. As noted before, we agree that body

language can say SOMETHING about communication. We seem to disagree about how much body language can tell us.

Have you read EYE CONTACT? Or Chad's "Letters from New Hampshire Prison?"

16 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

### Mark C

(Continued)

The control freak comment - Do you mean to tell me that Chad wasn't a person that liked to be in control of everything in his life, more so than the average individual? Jeff loved kids so much that he jumped at the chance to watch Cassidy, right? You don't expect anyone to believe that Chad wasn't holding the landscaping contracts over his head, do you? Like...ah, Jeff. You need to watch The Kid because you owe me and we can't put her in daycare because of the multiple bruises and fractures she has resulting from my EYE CONTACT with her.

Like it or not, body language tells alot about a person. Much like polygraphs, it is a tool that assists in getting to the bottom of reality and lies. For someone who loved EYE CONTACT, Chad sure didn't live up to his own expectations during the police interview. Maybe one of the detectives should have grabbed and squeezed his face, and demanded EYE CONTACT.

16 November 2011

### Mark C

Morrison,

My comments following the reasons/facts which I stated were to provide additional information relative to the subject. Clearly, many of those comments are my opinion. However, I'm glad you are in agreement with my first two points that he hurt Cassidy and beat women.

Didn't Chad admit to being involved in many fights when growing up? In fact, he regarded himself as a good fighter, right? Not sure about you, but in my experience, guys who get off classifying themselves as good fighters have volatile and uncontrollable tempers. Also, wasn't there a situation where he "went off" on a guy at a party at his house? The fact that he couldn't control his temper and struck, abused or restrained (popular term used in lieu of abuse) women is all I need to know about his temper. I love how the Tristan situation is easily dismissed. People don't tend to do things that are radically different than their typical behavior. If he lost control with Tristan and was forced to take anger management classes, that's a great basis for my statement and opinion. How many people that don't have problems with controlling their temper are forced to take anger management classes?

Do McDonald's franchisees typically promote individuals with volatile tempers? Who knows? My guess is as good as yours. I would think, however, they look to promote anyone who considers the job to be more than some temporary low level stint in between better jobs and those who aren't teenagers. I'm pretty sure that owners of those franchises look for individuals with type "A" personalities.

16 November 2011

### Morrison Bonpasse |

Mark,

Ok, thanks for your reasonable response. Let's examine your five.

1. Agreed. Chad squeezed Cassidy's face in order obtain eye contact and on 3-4 occasions in October, 2000 and bruising resulted. He and Amanda noticed such bruising sometime in October and then on the second or third time they made the connection between the bruises and his holding. Subsequently, he stopped holding so hard. Unfortunately, neither he nor Amanda thought

the easy bruising was serious enough to take Kassidy to a doctor. Amanda told me that she bruises easily. Respectfully, to say "I'm sure the documented accounts are scratching the surface" is simply a statement of belief. Do you know of any other "documented accounts" besides Chad's own interrogation and Amanda's interview and testimony? Similarly, "He knows what went on behind closed doors," show nothing but your apparent belief that something negative happened behind those doors.

2. Agreed. He and Tristan fought. However, he did not fight with the woman he lived with prior to Tristan, and he didn't physically fight with Amanda. However, Chad acknowledges restraining Amanda on the evening of Friday, August 25, after she slapped him. On the night of November 8, they argued and he restrained her for a few moments, and then they went to bed. Then you said, "In my opinion," and "I'm positive," which did not introduce facts, just your beliefs. Chad changed Kassidy's diaper on Sunday, November 5, in the presence of others. He changed her diaper on Wednesday evening, November 8 after her bath. Amanda chose not to change Kassidy's diaper around midnight on the 8th, and wait until morning. From Amanda's testimony, we know that Chad helped teach Kassidy her ABC's and 123's. He played with her and Kyle and read books to her at night.

(continued below)

15 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

### Morrison Bonpasse |

(continued from above)

3. Aside from the March 28, 1999 fight with Tristan, and an argument in December, 1999, what is your evidence of his allegedly "volatile and unpredictable" temper? Who has stated that he had such a temper? Do you think that McDonald's franchisees typically promote such people to manage their employees?

4. You wrote, "By most accounts, he was a control freak." To what accounts do you refer? What incidents?

5. Like Bob Arnold, you seem to view "body language" as a clear science and indicator of truth. I've seen the same videotape as you and I saw a nervous man, whose actions and behavior are ambiguous. A Google search for "Body Language Expert" presents a lot of such experts, but, to my knowledge, no such expert has ever testified at a criminal trial with an interpretation of body language to show the veracity of a specific defendant. I agree that body language is often a useful indicator of SOMETHING, but what that something is may not be as clear as you and Bob seem to believe. If it were, every police department, prosecutor and defense attorney in the country would have experts testify about defendants' body language during interviews and interrogations.

Taken all together, your "top five" show a man that you don't appear to like. They show a man who MIGHT have abused Kassidy Bortner. The factual evidence is actually stronger that Jeff Marshall (by his own acknowledgement and Jennifer's statements) spanked Kassidy, which Chad never did. Do your "top five" show that Chad Evans abused and murdered Kassidy Bortner beyond a reasonable doubt? Respectfully, they don't come close.

15 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

### Mark C

Morrison,

The facts I find most important in leading me to reach my conclusion that Chad was correctly convicted beyond a reasonable doubt are as follows:

1. He bruised and physically harmed Kassidy. I'm sure the documented accounts are simply scratching the surface. He knows what went on behind closed doors.

2. He abused and battered women. In my opinion, men who beat women are dirtbags who have no concept of right or wrong. They resort to physical abuse because, much like toddlers, they don't know any better way to get what they want. In Chad's case, I'm positive that he pushed Kassidy around, hit her and mentally abused her because she created waves...crying, needing new diapers or attention, getting jealous of him with Amanda, etc.

3. His temper was volatile and unpredictable. Something he could not control and for which he was forced to seek counseling.

4. By most accounts, he was a control freak. Relationships, friendships, at work...he needed to be in charge.

5. His body language and reactions during the interview speak volumes. I recall when Susan Smith killed her kids and seeing an interview with her right after the story broke. I told people I was watching it with that she did it because you could see it in her eyes and body language.

That's just a few reasons.

15 November 2011

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

There is a difference between inaccurate presentation of facts and different interpretations of those facts. You obviously disagree with my assessment of Chad and my and Chad's presentation of "key events," but those are not examples of inaccurate facts. As Sergeant Friday used to say, "Just the facts, ma'am. Just the facts." Before that, John Adams said during his defense of the British soldiers after the 1770 Boston Massacre, "Facts are stubborn things."

Can you or Mark present for us any inaccurate presentation of facts in the book, EYE CONTACT, the website or Chad's "Letters from New Hampshire prison"? If not, then doesn't the presentation of those facts on several thousand pages make you wonder just a little about your conclusions in this case?

15 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,

I've already pointed out inaccuracies, mainly the embellished account of Chad and the type of person he is, as well as downplaying key events.

15 November 2011 - rochester

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Mark,

You are right in your implicit assumption that child abusers and murderers are often mistreated in prison. However, Chad has never been segregated from others at the prison. In the beginning, there were some inmates who didn't yet know him and who believed what they had heard about his case. Now, that's not a problem, as inmates can be remarkably good judges of character. Several of Chad's inmates friends asked that their names be posted as supporters of Chad in the "About Us" section of his website.

Regarding my clients, as I told Chad and his family at the very beginning, I only work for inmates I believe are innocent. If I come across ANY persuasive evidence that Chad hit or murdered Cassidy, I would stop working for him. I made the same commitment to my other client, Alfred Trenkler ([www.alfredtrenklerinnocent.org](http://www.alfredtrenklerinnocent.org).) Others have asked for my services, but I've declined some and others discontinued correspondence. If Mr. Sandusky is convicted of the current charges against him, and then he contacted me, I'd listen to what he has to say and read what documents he could provide, and then make a preliminary evaluation. If that evaluation was that he was likely innocent, I'd continue to review the evidence until convinced otherwise. If that evaluation was that a guilty verdict was very likely correct, I'd tell Mr. Sandusky, and ask him to present more evidence to the contrary.

Let me ask you a question I asked Bob Arnold some months ago. What facts do you find most important in leading you to reach your conclusion that Chad was correctly convicted beyond a reasonable doubt? Maybe you could start with three or five?

15 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine



and her girlfriends, making requests of her girlfriends for nude pics to give to Chad. You see, Chad had this power over people and he used that power to get what he wanted. And it was great, because now he had a sex toy who was there 24/7, who made sure she was home from work on time every night. Only one problem and that was Cassidy, because Cassidy created issues for Chad. Cassidy was a pain in the a\$\$\$. Cassidy would throw fits of jealousy, and would throw tantrums.....to Chad, this was BS and this is why he lost his cool. He lost his cool and abused her whenever he felt the urge. The abuse gradually got worse until the evening of Nov. 8th.

I hope that the "Free the Wife Beater" people don't ask me to back up everything I just stated, because it will indicate you've not done your research. Everything I've stated is fact, see Investigation and Related Documents.

14 November 2011 - Rochester

---

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,  
You make it sound like a polygraph requires a mortgage....please do some research and you'll find that a polygraph costs under \$1000.....

The average cost for a specific issue polygraph examination will be \$450-\$900 -  
[www.assuredpolygraph.com](http://www.assuredpolygraph.com)

The voice stress analysis that Chad took does not exclude him as the killer for two reasons: First, VSA is extremely controversial, so much so that the Pentagon has banned it's use.....furthermore, Chad exhibited an "elevated level of stress" throughout the interview.

It's funny how the CEWCC claims he "passed" a lie detector, when in fact he never took an actual polygraph examination, but merely a VSA.

Maybe his mom could foot the bill? Better yet, why don't you start a collection at your next meeting, I'm sure that you could get a lot of money from your board members...we can see just how much those people believe in his innocence by how much they cough up. We'll call it a leap of faith....

Regards,

Bob

14 November 2011 - Rochester

---

**Bob Arnold** | 

Christine,  
I certainly was suprised by your claim that Chad had volunteered for a polygraph during his police interview because I've watched that video at least 10 times in the past and I didn't ever recall such a statement by him, however considering your "vast knowledge" of this case I gave you benefit of the doubt.....this I will not do again.

I just finished reading the entire transcript of his police interview and you are incorrect, and he never volunteered to take a polygraph.

This is yet another example of how members of the Chad Evans Wrongly Convicted Committee make false claims based on fiction and bias. Furthermore, I've done a lot of research on the internet over the past year and I keep finding posts by you and Morrison, posts at forums and websites that have nothing to do with Chad Evans. These posts include mentions on Facebook, Twitter, various editorials and other websites. These posts are embellished with fictional falsehoods and statements such as "new evidence" and "new DNA evidence". They also paint a grossly inaccurate picture of Evans as a "loving, caring, family man who loved and nurtured Cassidy." The very mention of the term "DNA" attracts attention, however the "new evidence" is not new and does not exclude Evans as the killer. Your portrayal of Evans as a "family man" is extremely exaggerated and clearly a sham

lie.

I would expect more from someone who (claims) to have spent hundreds of hours "studing and researching" this case.....perhaps you either don't know what you're talking about, or you're full of sh\*t, or a little of both?

I'm anxiously waiting for your explanation of why you've spent so much time researching this case, yet you still don't know what you're talking about.

Regards,

Bob

*14 November 2011 - Rochester*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Christine,  
Please provide the time mark of Chad's request for a polygraph because either I've missed it or it was garbled.

Thanks,  
Bob

*14 November 2011 - Rochester*

**Mark C**

Christine...you can understand why Chad would call Cassidy, "the kid" or otherwise not refer to her by name? Just because he was only with her/Amanda for 5 months? Seriously? Your argument may have some validity if the three of them weren't living together and were casually dating. That wasn't the case though.

What about the term, "bitch"...? That's OK too because they weren't together for a minimum number of months?

Don't know about you, but I don't go around referring to those that I care for in generic terms. Much like his poor body language, its just another indication that Chad didn't care for Cassidy as much as he claims.

*14 November 2011*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,  
There are no photographs of Tristan on this website, at her request.

Regarding Jeff's statement about Chad's 1999 domestic violence with Tristan, I've pasted below what I wrote on page 111 of the recently released paperback edition of EYE CONTACT:  
"Linscott asked about Chad's abuse of his wife, and Jeff said,  
'... I know he went to court over the assault and stuff ...his name's in the newspaper, you know, he, they quote, unquote, called it "the worst beating in New Hampshire, in a domestic abuse beating in New Hampshire," that's what, you know, everyone at the stores had said, uh, but I never really, I guess this is where the stupid part from me comes out, because I never said, "I got these two together," ... She [Amanda] always thought it was probably because his wife cheated on him, you know, and well, what made his wife cheat on her, make her leave, you know, urn, but recently I had said that, I told that to Jen, you know, I said, "You know, he is kind of abusive." And Mandy talked

about going to a party or something for McDonald's. They went there and they got into a fight, you know, he grabbed her by the throat.... ' (p. 1311)

Regarding Jeff's understanding of the fight between Chad and Tristan on March 28, 1999, it's a tragic truth that the "worst beatings" suffered in domestic violence cases result in death. The basic source of Jeff's statement was apparently Amanda and she apparently based her statement upon what Tristan told her during a heart-to-heart conversation. However, Jeff embellished the story, as no newspaper had ever called the incident a "worst beating in New Hampshire." There were no separate articles in any newspaper about the incident, and Foster's Daily Democrat did not include the incident in its regular section, "Police Log" for Rochester. The "Police Log" in the April 6, 1999 Rochester Times did contain five entries for March 28, including this entry, '2:48 a.m. - Chad Evans, 27, of 191 Milton Road is charged with second degree assault, a weapon offense and criminal restraint.' "

14 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

### Mark C

3...2...1...for Becky's next quotable words of wisdom. When in doubt, or left with no response...just cut and paste quotes that make about as much sense as Chad's supporters.

Bob - you really have to stop detailing the exact reasons why baby killer is guilty. The Committee doesn't like clear and concise arguments.

I'm waiting for the theory that the type of chairs at the police station were not conducive to Chad's bad back (well documented appointments on this site) and he needed to keep a chair in front of him so that he could lean forward slightly to alleviate the pressure on his lumbar region.

Ha Ha!

Chad Bad!

14 November 2011

### Christine |

For the record, Chad DID ask at his questioning to be polygraph tested, his request was denied because he had asked for counsel. Jeff was asked by police to take a polygraph at which time he made an appointment. The day of his appointment, he drove there and then oddly refused to take it. The police never pressed Jeff about this. Wouldn't that be an indication that he has something to hide?? Also it keeps getting said that Chad referred to Cassidy as "the kid" etc during his interview. What people are forgetting is that Chad had only been a part of Cassidy's life for less than 5 months. Under the circumstances I can understand why he would call her "the kid" but can you explain why Jennifer, Cassidy's aunt of almost 2 yrs would refer to her niece as "the kid", "it", and even "him"???

14 November 2011 - NH

### Bob Arnold |

AND, back to the assault on Tristan, Jeff stated to the police detectives that to his knowledge, it was one of the worst domestic assaults in NH history. This is what he heard from the store managers who were under Evans. Now, I'm going to confirm this because I believe it's important. Eye Contact makes a very brief mention of the assault, but apparently it was reported in Fosters newspaper as a very serious assault.

I will request once again that Morrison publish the police photo of Tristan's battered, bloodied face, just so we can set the record straight.

13 November 2011 - Rochester

**Bob** | 

Mellissa,

Keep reading all of the Jeff Marshall interview, you'll get the same impression of him that the police got: He was a very honest, helpful, trusting guy.

One thing that jumps out, when Chad called Jeff on the evening of the 8th to arrange pickup for Kassidy, Chad wanted Jeff to meet him at Peters Palace (a p\*rn shop in Portsmouth) and Jeff refused, he told the detectives that he certainly not taking Kassidy to that parking lot, especially with his company truck with his company name on the side....think about that for a second....Chad Evans, the "family man" wants Jeff to bring Kassidy to the parking lot of a p0rn shop.

I don't care what Morrison says about Chad, so what if he was on the school board, we had a guy on the Somersworth School Board who went to prison for raping his 3 year old daughter. I don't care if he helped those people out of a burning car, it didn't sound that couragous to me and as a matter of fact I believe most guys would have done the same thing if they were in that situation....and I don't believe anything that is written in Eye Contact in regards to the events (from Chad's recollection) of November 9th.

It's all a sham.

*13 November 2011 - Rochester*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Hi Mellissa,

Go to the "Investigation and Related Documents" link on the left....then scroll all the way down to:

3. NEW HAMPSHIRE STATE POLICE.

9 November 2000. 4:12 p.m. MSP Detectives Scott Harakles and Jeff Linscott interview Jeff Marshall

You can find that in page 20 of 69, but start at page 19 of 69 and work your way down.

Regards,

Bob

*13 November 2011 - Rochester*

**Midwest Mellissa**

Bob,

Would you please direct me to where this infomation is located.....

"Jeff describes Chad's house as "party central." Something that Jeff had a big problem with because Chad had kids, and he didn't agree with having loud drinking parties with crazy behaviour with kids around. Jeff also described one night at one of Chad's parties, where someone drove by the house and said something and Chad completely freaked out and went crazy on the guy.

Thanks.

*13 November 2011 - Midwest Mellissa*

**Bob Bad** | 

Morrison,

Getting back to your concern about the quote I claimed Chad made, well here it is from Jeff Marshall:

A little background, Chad calls Jeff on the morning of the 9th (the day Kassidy died) and he's upset over the call from DHS, he's making calls and confronting people like the bully he is, and Jeff says Chad states: "I don't want to be putting up with this shit, you know, they're like asking me about child abuse over her, it's like I ought to have her and her mother out!"

Furthermore, Jeff describes Chad's house as "party central." Something that Jeff had a big problem with because Chad had kids, and he didn't agree with having loud drinking parties with crazy behaviour with kids around. Jeff also described one night at one of Chad's parties, where someone drove by the house and said something and Chad completely freaked out and went crazy on the guy.

Your "family man" is actually a party animal who wants to have sex parties with multiple partners which includes plenty of anal sex. What a sham.

Even Chad's ex wife repeatedly warned Amanda about Chad, to "watch out" for him.

*13 November 2011 - Rochester*

**Bob Bad** | 

Detective Leclair: "Let me ask you Chad, have you ever, um, have you ever caused bruises to Kassidy?"

Chad: "She, uh,,,,,was that your phone or mine? Um, she um, well I'm trying to think, no, ah, well I remember one time...."

Liar. Hiding behind a chair, little to no eye contact with the officers.....for a guy who demanded "eye contact" he sure avoided it through much of the interview.

See Robert Conely's interview: He stated that Chad avoided eye contact with him, something that seemed strange to a guy who was a US Marine NCO for over 10 years, he said he could see right through Evans and something wasn't right with the guy. He appeared to be playing a game. Mr. Conley states that Kassidy was always fine, a curious and active child until Evans came into the picture....after that, there was a huge difference in Kassidy. Huge. Not to mention one of the last things Kassidy said to Mrs. Conley: "Chad bad, Chad bad."

Now for the past several posts I've described some but not all the reasons I believe in Chad's guilt (there's so much more that I could write a book which would be more factual than "Eye Contact" aka "Squeeze the One Year Old's Face as Hard as You Can") Now I once again challenge the "Wife Beater" supporters to prove why they believe he is innocent. And I want facts, not hyped up fictional bias and make-believe events.

Everything I've pointed out is bonafide and documented.

*13 November 2011 - Rochester*

**Bob Bad** | 

And let's not forget Chad's efforts to distance himself from Kassidy, her mother and the assault: First thing out of his mouth during his police interview: "I drove over two hours to get here" as if to say he lives far away from the crime scene. His referral to Kassidy as "that girl", "kid", "that baby" as if he has no relationship with her. He consistently distanced himself during that interview. At no time did he seem genuinely upset, at no point did he demand to know what happened to Kassidy, what caused her death, what happened to her.....why is that? Why is it, this loving "family man" who "loved and nurtured Kassidy" never showed any shred of sadness, never showed any form of concern about her or where her body was. Why is it, when offered to see the pictures of her, he refused? Why is it that this "loving family man" showed no interest in knowing what the hell happened to Kassidy?

Chad's plans to wiggle his way out of what he did to Kassidy: Deny, lie, manipulate, deceive,

obstruct, distance and ultimately to work on Amanda, tell her he loved her (something he never did before) and that he wanted to spend the rest of his life with her, turn her and get her on his side.....then when all this blows over I can dump her. But until then, she's my useful idiot.

*13 November 2011 - Rochester*

**Bob Bad** | 

What makes me sick is the portrayal of Evans as a "family man" in Eye Contact and by the CEWCC. A loving, caring family man who loved and nurtured Cassidy. A good man. A gentle, loving family man couldn't be further from the truth.

This "loving, caring family man" let Cassidy sleep all night in a shitty diaper. This "family man" made repeated demands for unusual sexual acts with the "woman he loved" including anal sex, sex with her girl friends, nude pictures of her girl friends (see Melissa Chick and Chrystal Martin interviews). God knows what he was purchasing at Peters Palace (Moonlite Reader). Apparently he kept his ex wife's wedding cake in the freezer as a trophy, along with a pile of women's bras he kept in a drawer.

Chad was far from the family man that is portrayed in Eye Contact. Instances where he brutally assaulted his ex wife and Amanda are downplayed so that the reader misses them.

Everything is someone else's fault with Chad. The assault on his ex wife—that was her fault. Choking Amanda—that was her fault, she shouldn't say that she works harder than me. Holding Cassidy's head under a faucet—that was Cassidy's fault for screaming. Keeping Cassidy from seeing a doctor—that's Amanda's fault. Bruises to Cassidy—that's his 3 year old's fault. The call from Child Services—that was one of Amanda's friends that did that. Cassidy's death—that's Jeff Marshall's fault, he did that.

Chad's parents must be proud of their darling son who could never do wrong. Poor Chad.

*13 November 2011 - Rochester*

**Bob Bad** | 

Mark,

It's interesting you brought that up, I did some research on polygraph and voice stress, and both are susceptible to inaccuracy when interviewing an someone who's convinced themselves of their own lies, however the polygraph is much less susceptible. The voice stress is still a developing technology that's surrounded with controversy.

Chad never took a polygraph. He recently took a voice stress, which did indicate a higher level of stress throughout the interview, which I would characterize as inconclusive.

There are countless instances where Chad lied, deceived, misled and manipulated throughout the investigation. The video of his interview reeks of deceit, one statement after another. His explanation for talking to Tristan on the phone, his explanation for having her "call everybody" because he didn't want to "tie up the phones" at the police station. His reason for not sitting, his description of his relationship with Cassidy and her mother, the trampoline story, the wiffleball story, etc. etc....

When pointedly asked if he grabbed Cassidy on the previous evening, first he said no, then when pressured he said "ok let me think..." He was thinking of his next lie, his next move because the lies were some numerous throughout the interview that his comfort level with his story started to deteriorate.

*13 November 2011 - Rochester*

**Mark C**

Habitual liars and manipulators believe their own lies and many would pass lie detectors tests. Just

saying.

13 November 2011

**Bob Bad** | 

But getting back to the actual remark, whatever it was, it did fall along those lines of "they're out of my house." Please don't present anything that Chad says because Chad is unbelievable, the account he shared with his attorney of: ""Well Jeff, I don't know what they are calling about but if it is anything to do with the baby, she and Amanda are going to come stay with you until it blows over....". Do you realize how ridiculous this sounds? Chad was enraged that Child Services was calling him, this is why he called Jeff that morning (something he never did before). This is what Chad does, when things aren't going right he begins making calls, confronting people, questioning people. His recollection of the conversation is yet another example of how Chad downplays events so he can persuade his audience.

Chad downplayed the beating he gave to his ex wife. Downplayed assaults to Amanda. Downplayed the assaults on Kassidy, one in particular is the kitchen sink incident where he held her head under the faucet. Jeff stated to the police that he couldn't give Kassidy a bath after that, she was terrified of water, yet Chad downplayed it by saying it was her fault in the first place, and he only splashed water on her.

Chad is a manipulator. Manipulators lie. They lie so much that they sometimes forget the lies they told, and this is when they're caught. Like the wiffleball story.

There is no doubt in my mind that Chad Evans killed Kassidy Bortner. I can't stand the thought of a bully like Chad getting away with what he did to this little child, and this is why I keep coming here.

*12 November 2011 - Rochester*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,  
Point understood, I have to look at it again.

Mark,  
Yes I agree....when my girls were in diapers, I couldn't stand the thought of them being in in soiled diaper, let alone letting them sleep all night in one. I never had a problem changing diapers and changed most of them because my wife was working at the hospital nearly all the time.

There have been several suggestions by Chad Evans supports that the reason I keep revisiting this forum is because I have doubt. This couldn't be further from the truth. The fact is, I can't stand the thought of someone like Chad Evans exploiting people's weaknesses. Equally unnerving is how he claims he was a loving family man who cared for and nurtured Kassidy. This is an out right lie and work of fiction in order for him to gain support from people who don't know any better.

*11 November 2011 - Rochester*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,  
In your comment below you stated that Chad said, "Amanda and the little bitch are out of my house." In your website you stated that Chad said, "Amanda and the little bitch can get the fuck out of my house."  
In addition to being inconsistent with each other, those quotations are not accurate quotes from Jeff Marshall's testimony at Chad's trial. (page 172 for December 6, 2001.) I wrote in EYE CONTACT (at page 419 of the new paperback edition) that Jeff testified that Chad said, 'If this shit's going to... keep up, Mandy and the little bitch is going to have to get out of my house. I can't put up with this. I got two boys I have to watch out for.' (p. 172) If Jeff made a similar statement to the police in his interviews, I cannot find it.  
More important than your inaccurate representation of Jeff's testimony is that Chad denies saying

those words to Jeff. In his November 2000 letter to his attorneys, and only a few weeks after Cassidy's death, Chad wrote that he said to Jeff, "Well Jeff, I don't know what they are calling about but if it is anything to do with the baby, she and Amanda are going to come stay with you until it blows over...."  
(<http://www.chadevanswronglyconvicted.org/documents/001100rev110613Chadlettertohisattys.pdf>)  
The "it" was the DCYF call to Chad's home which call he returned on the morning of Nov. 9  
Can you ensure in the future that Chad is quoted accurately in what you write? Also, if you do quote Jeff Marshall as a source for what Chad allegedly said, can you please correctly cite the source as Jeff Marshall?

11 November 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

### Midwest Mellissa

Here's one for you to consider, Mr. Arnold and Mark C.....  
"Thou shalt not bear false witness."

I think Moses might have been on to something. Just saying.

11 November 2011 - Midwest USA

### Mark C

Bob...I also like how Chad discussed the whole situation involving changing Cassidy's dirty diaper. I found it extremely odd that he never changed her...waited until Amanda was around to take care of that. And, when he did at least one time, its was discussed like he was changing an alien's diaper. That kid could shit...the way he described the situation during the police interview was disturbing to me.

It smacks of an individual who couldn't care less about Cassidy. Of course, the Chad nuthuggers will claim that he was just being a guy and would leave it up to the woman to take care of that stuff.

He didn't want to change her because she wasn't his kid. It ties into the way he treated her worse than his own kids.

11 November 2011

### Bob Bad |

Since the Free the Wife Beater supports like to question those with differing opinions, I have a question for all of you:

Why is it that Chad claims that he loved and nurtured Cassidy, however prior to her death, Chad was abusive and mean to her. He said "Amanda and the little bitch are out of my house" when he learned that DHS was looking for him. And he showed little emotion during the initial police interview...he even went as far as telling jokes, telling lies, avoiding eye contact, changing the subject, fidgeting in his chair, taking a drink of water while the lid was still on, then dropping the lid not once but twice, hiding behind an empty chair, etc etc.

Explain to me why he arrogantly states that Amanda was in love with him, but he in so many words said he didn't love her. Tell me why he wasn't concerned about what happened to Cassidy. And when offered evidence of the bruising to her face, he refused to look at the pictures.

Explain to me why he constantly distanced himself from her, repeatedly referring to her as "the girl", "the kid", "that girl", "that baby".

Chad Evans inflicted fatal trauma injuries to "that girl" on the evening of Nov 8th, this was proven by the prosecution, which resulted in his conviction.

11 November 2011 - Rochester

**Bob Bad** | 

I'm probably one of the most dangerous men in the world if I want to be. But I never wanted to be anything but me.  
-Charles Manson

*11 November 2011 - Rochester*

**Bob Bad** | 

Mark,  
How bout a pink wife beater with little tinker bells on the sleeves.

My wife thinks this is nuts too.

It's ironic that you mentioned your youngest, because that's what Kassidy reminds me of as well. My girls are now in grade school, but I fondly remember when they were that age. Detective McCleish was right when he told Chad that kids can drive you crazy sometimes, it's true but more mature individuals are better equipped to handle those moments and navigate their way in a manner that is loving, understanding, intelligent and firm. Chad possessed none of these skills. When faced with a screaming baby, he became enraged. When he didn't get his way, he would throw fits. On many occasions, he his rage would get out of control and result in bodily harm to others. These are the instances that we are aware of, how many were there that we aren't aware of?

The "Jeff did it" defense does not pass muster. True, he was no saint, however on the afternoon of 11/9, Jeff was all the things that Chad wasn't.....Jeff was an emotional wreck. Jeff was angry, upset, on the verg of tears, shaken, emotionally and physically exhausted. Chad on the other hand was a cool, calculating liar whose attempts at misleading the investigators failed miserably. When this was realized, he declared miranda and refused and further questioning.

It was no coincidence that Chad was reported to Child Services just days prior to Kassidy's death.

*11 November 2011 - Rochester*

**Mark C**

Bob...I'll take a large wife beater shirt please. If you could order a few pink ones, we'll show the Committee that we're not judgmental or fags (as it was so eloquently put).

I liken this board and Committee to a cult. No matter what you say, you just can't get through. Maybe we can incorporate a reference to Jim Jones, David Koresh or Charlie Manson in the name of our newly formed Committee as a tribute.

I went to school with Ruoff and knew him well. If he believes Chad and Amanda got what they deserved, that only validates my thoughts on the case.

This Committee needs to come up with a canned response to every post remotely questioning Chad Bad's guilt. It would take some of the frustration out of responding to idiotic statements and ridiculous theories.

For those asking...my family finds this initiative ridiculous and a waste of time, effort and money. In certain pictures, Kassidy reminds me of my youngest. Maybe that is why I am passionate about keeping the baby killer with his new found butt buddies in the big house.

*11 November 2011*

**Becky B** | 

Oh just two more before I call it a day...

"What we think or what we know or what we believe is, in the end, of little consequence. The only consequence is what we do."

&

"You talk of the scythe of Time, and the tooth of Time: I tell you, Time is scytheless and toothless; it is we who gnaw like the worm — we who smite like the scythe. It is ourselves who abolish — ourselves who consume: we are the mildew, and the flame."

~~John Ruskin

English author, poet and artist, most famous for his work as an art critic and social critic

*11 November 2011 - Rochester, NH*

**Becky B** | 

Ahem, and WOMEN who have served for our country.  
My Bad!

*11 November 2011 - Rochester, NH*

**Becky** | 

Well Good Night Bob!!

I think I'm going to stay up a little longer and print out this forum so when I call my doctor for my annual exam I can have this added to my chart.

Thank you for avoiding answering my questions.

Clearly you have tired yourself out here for one day.

Thank you again so much for serving my country!

I truly hope from this comment forward we can get back to the real deal here and stick to the facts of the case.

Looking forward to more positive interactions with you and yours!

*11 November 2011 - Rochester, NH*

**Bob Bad** | 

Becky,

It's Bob Bad.....get it? Chad Bad....Bob Bad.

You're right, I'm so ashamed of myself for coming here. My family has no idea of this double life that I lead. It's scary, isn't it?

I see that you're writing in complete sentences. Good for you.

Sorry but I have to sign off, I've got to find some of those wife-beater shirts for the first meeting. I gotta get Mark's shirt size. Also, I have to find some fake hair for my chest, I want to look like a real wife-beater.

*11 November 2011 - Rochester*

**Becky** | 

Hey Bad Bob! it's after midnight...

Happy Veteran's Day Buddy =)

I see your up late tonight & working hard, do you sleep much?

I love your creativity on your new nickname, real cute ;)

I admire the fact that you were to quote O. J Simpson.

It's interesting because he was found not guilty by a jury of murder.

Clearly they got it right? A jury also found Casey Anthony not guilty of murder either. These two individuals both claimed their innocence, but yet no one else has ever been arrested for the murders of Nicole, Ron or Kaylee. Ironic?

Let me ask you a question if I could please.  
Mark this one is for you as well.

Where were you in 2000 when Cassidy died?

Bob you started coming here only after the WMUR broadcast in Feb 2011 correct?  
If you can throw such disrespectful & disgusting comments here on this forum day after day, how do you expect me to believe you don't act like this at home with your children, wife & father?  
Do you have a family Mark?  
Where state do you live in anyway? You have a tendency not to fill that part of the guestbook in. Two more questions, if I may, again for the both of you... do your families know this how you like to spend your time & do they support such behavior?

For the record, I am an excellent Co Chair for this committee. If you would like to see a resume of all the wonderful things I have succeeded in I would be more than happy to email you one. There's only ONE judge & I know his name is not Bob or Mark.

In closing on this date 11-11-11,  
don't forget to thank all the men who have or who are serving our country for our freedom.  
TGIF!

*11 November 2011 - Rochester, NH*

**Bob Bad** | 

Mark,  
We should start our own committee. Let's name it good. Something like "The Poor Chad He-Man Wife Beater Committee," We can wear wife-beater shirts and sit around Peter's Palace and tell all sorts of lies. We can make ice sculptures of poor Chad having anal sex with his cell mate. Maybe we can have some fun with the "Ask Chad!" link and ask him how we can be more like him, how to violently beat one year olds, and how to get multiple sex partners. He can teach us about telling lies and making eye contact with little kids, just to get their attention. Then we can go beat some people up. What say you?

*11 November 2011 - Rochester*

**Bob Bad** | 

The Chad Evans supporters tend to use smoke and mirrors to prove his innocence. They parade around with quotes to raise doubt about his conviction. Few, if any of them have spent any time studying the case, reading the police reports, witness statements, chronology of events, or the actual court documents related to his conviction. They can't debate any of the facts concerning the case, however they're extremely vocal concerning his innocence, and they demand to know why anyone would believe Evans is guilty. They demand detailed information from individuals who don't agree with them, then they create fictional reasons for the death of Cassidy. Ironic, isn't it, that they behave in the same manner as the wife-beater Evans....make up stories, explain things away, lie, cover up, blame....these are all things that Evans has done. He even went as far as to blame his own three year old son for bruising to Cassidy (see police video interrogation if you dare)

*11 November 2011 - Rochester*

**Bob Bad** | 

Chad Evans was an abusive individual with a quick temper. His marriage to Tristan Evans ended when he brutally beat her for coming home late one night. The assault caused her to have a bloody face and loss of dental work. He was arrested and charged with assault, which he later plead guilty to.

There have been many eye witness accounts regarding Chad's quick temper and violent outbursts, which have been documented by the New Hampshire State Police. Amanda Bortner, who was the mother of the little girl that Chad murdered, was physically assaulted by Chad on multiple

occasions. Chad's violent temper would climax with such physical action as head butts, choking, pushing and shoving. All of these acts had been committed against Amanda, including a choking incident that occurred on the evening of November 8th, 2000, the same evening that he inflicted fatal injuries to Kassidy Bortner.

11 November 2011 - Rochester

Bob Bad | 

Eye Contact attempts to paint Evans as a hard working, loving family man who at times seems a little geeky, who fell in love with Amanda Bortner and was planning to live happily ever after with her. Police interviews and witness testimony paint an entirely different picture of Evans. He routinely addressed Kassidy as "little bitch", "bitch", "retard" and other names. It was so prevalent that even his three year old son referred to her as "bitch" during his police interview. Furthermore, his relationship with Amanda was dictated on his terms. At one point, he decided he wanted her to move out and get her own place. This was the direction that things were going at the time of Kassidy's death. But suddenly, on the evening of November 9, 2000, the day that Kassidy died, he professes his love to Amanda, and tells her he wants to spend the rest of his life with her. This statement was made just hours after his police interview, where he down played their relationship, and he went as far as to tell the police, in so many words, that he was not in love with Amanda, that she didn't really live with him, and that he didn't want to get involved with anyone right now.

11 November 2011 - Rochester

Bob Bad | 

Evans knew that he needed to influence Amanda, because this was the only way he would have gotten away with murder. Evans became the drunk driver who just reaked his car....do I wait for the police and face DUI charges, or run and hide, and face a lesser charge later of leaving the scene. This was Evans line of thinking, all or nothing. Refuse to cooperate with the police, refuse to answer questions, work on Amanda, convince her that he did, in fact, love her...and watch the charges disappear. He knowingly and intentionally tried to obstruct justice by continuing contact with Amanda, even after a court order not to talk to her. He knowingly and intentionally lied to police, lied to his friends, lied to his family, and lied to Amanda.

10 November 2011 - Rochester

Mark C

I am as ignorant as you are intellectual. I bet you've ignored your own kids while masterbating over this ridiculous case over the last year. Nice job. You and Amanda should hook up and party it up. Make sure you get EYE CONTACT when your kids are tugging at you glaring at your monitor or sculpting molds of Kassidy's head. Freak. You know so much...huh?

Why hasn't this case been re-tried yet then? You fool.

Wondering why people that are convinced of Chad's guilt spend so much time on his website.....

...to convince fools like you that this dickweed is guilty of killing a toddler.

Maybe it will sink in to your thick head if it is repeated. Seems to be the modis operandi of most fools on here....show me his is guilty...blah...blah...effing blah. Suck it.

You dicks have wasted enough of my time. Circle jerk your way to another decade of nothing. Dickbags.

10 November 2011

Bob Bad | 

Michael and Alex, I love you. And we're going to have the biggest celebration when you get home.

-Susan Smith

It's a horrible thing to realize what you've done.

-Mark David Chapman

By the skillful and sustained use of propaganda, one can make a people see even heaven as hell or an extremely wretched life as paradise.

-Adolf Hitler

Just because you're convicted in a court room doesn't mean you're guilty of something.

-Charles Manson

I never, in all my life, had anything whatever to do with robbing any bank in the state of Missouri.

-Cole Younger

Larry, I spent probably most of my professional life helping to build Enron Corporation. I don't think there was anyone that was as shocked by the - by the collapse of the company as I was.

-Jeffrey Skilling

God, I hope she is found alive.

-Scott Peterson

It is a rather pleasant experience to be alone in a bank at night.

-Willie Sutton

I understand why so many Americans were angry when I was first discovered in Afghanistan. I realize many still are, but I hope in time that feeling will change.

-John Walker Lindh

I don't know why you are treating me like this. The only thing I have done is carry a pistol into a movie.

-Lee Harvey Oswald

Our hope, and it's a sad hope, is that... well, I mean we need a tip. That's why we have such a big reward. We just hope that someone is holding her for her child and that we can, you know, get her back with a tip.

-Scott Peterson

*10 November 2011 - Rochester*

**Christine** | 

Wondering why people that are convinced of Chad's guilt spend so much time on his website.....

*10 November 2011 - NH*

**Bob Bad** | 

Here are some great quotes:

I didn't beat her. I just pushed her out of bed.

O. J. Simpson

I don't know how often I can discuss one incident in my entire life, but I'll continue to do that.

O. J. Simpson

I

I have always wanted to be liked and respected.

O. J. Simpson

I really have reached a point where I can write a book about all of this.  
O. J. Simpson

I tend to watch a little TV... Court TV, once in a while. Some of the cases I get interested in.  
O. J. Simpson

I think I've been a great citizen.  
O. J. Simpson

I'm absolutely, 100 percent, not guilty.  
O. J. Simpson

*10 November 2011 - Rochester*

**Bob Bad** | 

Christine:

You and Chad searching for the truth about Cassidy is like OJ Simpson looking for the real killer of Nicole Brown Simpson.

*10 November 2011 - Rochester*

**Bob the Terrrrrible** | 

Mark,

I'm deeply hurt that you've not acknowledged my poltergeist theory. You cut me deep Shrek...

*10 November 2011 - Rochester*

**Christine** | 

Mark C: First of all, yes, I have spent that many hours in a week on this case in search for justice for Cassidy. It seems that people are so ignorant they have long forgotten her. I did not set out to "fight for Chad" I set out in search of the truth as a concerned citizen that our justice system is so flawed....before I learned about this injustice I was just as ignorant as you in believing that our justice system is perfect. Boy was I a fool! Maybe if you spent as much time as some of us have on this case then you too would see the truth. As my grandparents used to say "if you don't know what you are talking about then you best zip your lip". Just saying....

*10 November 2011 - NH*

**Becky** | 

And again, where is my like button??  
Thanks Dave, those are some gr8 quotes!

*10 November 2011 - Rochester*

**David G** | 

Becky,  
Here is a couple for ya.

Sarcasm is the refuge of a shallow mind.  
~~ Michael Weatherly~~

If you look for the bad in people  
expecting to find it, you surely will.  
~~ Abraham Lincoln~~

10 November 2011

**Mark C**

Christine,

Are you working on this case tomorrow or taking the day off? I mean, you're averaging 78 hours per week since February according to your estimate to Strelzin.

You must be a State employee to work so much yet accomplish so little.

So, since Jeff's apartment was so infested with mold and such, explain why neither he nor Jennifer have any documented afflictions consistent those you think Cassidy had. Don't suggest that their ages have anything to do with it either. Over a decade later and they are still alive and kicking. Huh. Crazy.

Just admit it to yourselves (you can still keep up with the dog and pony show with these Committee meetings) that Chad killed Cassidy. Denial is such a tough emotion to overcome.

10 November 2011

**Becky** | 

"If you don't understand my silence, you won't understand my words"  
~~ Author Unknown

Happy Early Veteran's Day!

10 November 2011 - Rochester, NH

**Christine** | 

So let me get this straight....Chad wears a "wife beater shirt" and has 1 prior conviction for assault and that makes him a baby killer??? Are you aware that Jeff had quite a criminal record with PENDING charges at the time of Cassidy's death. If a man wears a pink shirt does that make him a fag??? Sounds like we are stereo-typing people because of their clothing. Shows the mentality in which we are working with here and makes you sound very ignorant....just saying

10 November 2011 - NH

**Christine** | 

I've been through everything relating to this case, in fact I've spent most of my adult life on the case according to Bob Arnold and I have yet to come up with anything that show Chad was responsible for Cassidy's death. If you ACTUALLY researched the FACTS of this case you would know about things that COULD HAVE caused Cassidy's death. There were things that were going on in her little body that is NOT consistent with child abuse, such as petechia on the thymus. Jeff Marshall's home was infested with black mold, are you familiar with the damage that this can do to a person let alone a child? Are you also aware that Jeff Marshall's home was built in 1890 and it is possible there was lead paint in his home? I took on this case as an investigator SHOULD HAVE and gathered all the information BEFORE coming to a conclusion, as the investigators SHOULD HAVE done in this case. I guess it was easier to jump to conclusions than find the actual cause of death.....

10 November 2011 - NH

**David G** | 

Bob,

Regarding your comment.

“The sole purpose of that committee is to get the word out about why they believe in Chad's innocence”

I think you are incorrect with that comment, The purpose is about a wrongful conviction, The purpose is seeking truth and justice, whatever it is, the purpose is seeking a new trial. We have several purposes “not a sole purpose” Any board member or committee member can feel free to publicly correct me if my above statement is incorrect in any way shape or form.

Some people think our “sole purpose” is to be their personal punching bag and to attack Without cause because our views differ from theirs. Also it is my opinion, that this forum is not being used correctly. This forum was intended to be used for debates regarding facts, views, and opinions of the case, in an adult manner. it is apparent, some, simply cannot agree to disagree, “Respectfully and in an Adult manner” Not doing so is a COMPLETE waste of time and energy and serves no purpose whatsoever.

10 November 2011

David G | 

BOB,

I do not wear blinders. Just so I am clear, is what you are saying in regard to Morrison's question about “Can you state what evidence you believed was overwhelming” or is this what you are stating as “proof “of guilt? Or is this for both?

Lets also be clear, because you can read, You like to say, “I want you to “prove“. As I have explained many times, and recently stated to mark “You know exactly what I was asking“. SHOW ME WHY you believe he is guilty You aren't being asked to “prove it” (in the manner that you stated). Another thing to be clear on, you state to me, “You say he is innocent“. I'll assume you were talking to me as my name was stated. I do not believe That I ever once stated that Chad was “INNOCENT“. I have made it clear MANY times that I do not excuse some things he has done! I have also stated that I cannot see guilty of murder based on evidence. Show me where I said Chad was innocent and I'll retract it, otherwise you need to retract that inaccurate comment, if you are stating that I said that. Now my remarks about how you treated Becky, her name was mentioned this time however, I have said in my remarks several times how you treat people especially the women! This means I have remarked to you about your treatment of everyone especially the women. One more thing, you say “It's obvious why she feels the need to act out in such a way because she lacks the skills to effectively communicate/debate”

That is what I have been saying about you and the way you lash out at everyone, foul names, insults, profanity, etc.etc. It is not necessary, and it is not productive, and it is not wanted. That is what say I.

10 November 2011

Bob Arnold | 

David,

One other thing concerning your remarks about how I treat Becky...what comes around goes around. Becky has crossed the line by threatening me and my family personally. It's obvious why she feels the need to act out in such a way, because she lacks the skills to effectively communicate/debate, so logically she freaks out and throws tantrums. I would expect more from a chair of the CEWC Committee, maybe I expect too much? The sole pupose of that committee is to get the word out about why they believe in Chad's innocence, and to secure his release. I doubt you'll get anywhere with someone like that in your ranks and if I were a member, I'd make a motion to remove her, you'd be better off without an irrational person than you'd be with another number to your ranks. What say you?

Bob

**Bob Arnold** | 

Becky, I see you're at it again, posting quotes on here to make up for your lack of writing/thinking skills. And I see David is at it again, challenging me to "prove" Chad's guilt, as if he was never convicted. Unbelievable.

I will revisit a few points that I've made in the past, so take your blinders off and read.....

Chad had a history of being an abusive person. Prior assault charge against his ex-wife Tristan, prior physical assaults against Amanda, not to mention the assaults he made on Cassidy which he admitted to (see police video interview) only after he was pressured by the officers. Chad told lie after lie to cover up for the abuse he inflicted on Cassidy (trampoline, baseball/starter ball, wiffle ball etc....). Chad refused to seek medical treatment for Cassidy and kept Amanda from taking her to a doctor (see police interviews with Amanda). Chad lied to the police, lawyered up and refused to cooperate. He also showed up at the police station with a posse of friends, WTF??? His behaviour in the police interview showed obvious guilt.

I could go on but I'm tired of having to repeat myself. You say he is innocent, well you prove it to me. So far all I get from you people are stupid slogans, quotes and far-fetched theories, not to mention that Morrison really dropped the ball when he paraded around the local media this time last year, claiming new evidence (blood under the fingernails) but actually this evidence was already supplied to the defense during discovery. It really makes the Chad Evans Committee look like a bunch of idiots, to have the AG point that out to them.

Signing off,

Bob

9 November 2011 - Rochester

**Mark C**

You guys are blinded fools. Keep chasing that innocent verdict because its a pipe dream.

Asking people to prove to you this guy is guilty over and over is not making your case of innocence. The burden of proof is one you fools, not those who agree with the jury's verdict, can read people and call a spade a spade. Easily dismissing the jury's verdict saying it was a baseless conclusion is ludicrous. Almost as bad as the spelling and punctuation on this board.

Let's just end this with another theory...maybe Bad Chad pulled off a big ruse and are making you look like fools. We all know he liked lifting. We also know he liked anal sex. We probably can summarize that he'd rather not work than work. Prison gives him all of this and much, much more.

So long fools. Enough time wasted trying to convince this hapless crowd that the chump is a baby killer.

He'll rot in hell for what he has done.

RIP, Cassidy. Happy Death Day.

9 November 2011

**David G** | 

MARK ,  
You know exactly what I was asking. SHOW ME WHY you believe he is guilty. You aren't being asked to "prove it" (in the manner that you stated) I want to know why, you think he is guilty Based on facts of course. Yet you refuse? I never realized that a conversation was supposed to be one

sided and only you were allowed to ask questions? We have been over the jury and the state requirements previously so lets not dance around with nonsense. Based on your Midwest Melissa comment its obvious that you will come up with anything not to answer valid questions!

9 November 2011

### Midwest Mellissa

Mark,

Show me something definitive that would indicate Chad was guilty of this crime. Proof, tangible evidence...something to back up your claims of Chad being guilty. Prove to me that the verdict was not based upon "speculation and conjecture" on the part of the JURY, I'm listening. Convince me.

9 November 2011 - Midwest USA

### Mark C

Midwest...you're basing your arguments on Greenwald's testimony about possibilities. Conjecture, speculation based on her experience as a medical examiner.

Why don't you quote her testimony where she says that it is impossible for the fatal injuries to have been inflicted in a time frame that definitively ruled out Chad as the culprit? Oh wait...you can't because she never did.

9 November 2011

### Midwest Mellissa

Something else, folks...as found in the TESTIMONY of Margaret Greenwald, Maine Medical Examiner...upon cross examination by defense lawyers, the followin dialogue is noted:

"Now, the mechanism of death with regard to fat in the body, that can happen pretty quick, can't it?" Greenwald's response..."It can."

Sisti then asked Greenwald, "Could have taken an hour, two hours, right?" Her response, "Yes."

Greenwald was also asked, "That emboli found in her lungs, then, would have been entirely consistent with her receiving a substantial injury within a couple hours of her death?" Her response.."Yes, that's possible."

And finally, as stated by Sisti, "We know that a couple of hours prior to her injury, she was in the care of and custody of Jefferey Marshall, right?" Her answer, "Correct."

It goes on..."We know that Chad Evans wasn't in the caring, nor dealing with Kassidy in any way, shape, or form four hours before her death?" Again, Greenwald responded, "Correct."

Now, I have shown testimony to indicate even the Maine Medical Examiner could not cast blame on one person alone for Kassidy's death...So, now I challenge those who believe Chad killed Kassidy. Show me SOMETHING to prove Chad is guilty. Something viable, something in writing, something documented....something concrete....something that is not hearsay or opinion. Show me facts.. Can you do it?

9 November 2011 - Midwest USA

### Mark C

David,

Its easy to ask the question of me to prove his guilt. I don't have to...a competent jury already did.

The burden is on you to prove he is innocent and you cannot. Otherwise, the State would have already re-examined this case in the decade plus since the baby's murder.

Don't you guys think you need to pick up the pace a bit and present valid arguments to the State before Chad gets shanked in prison?

9 November 2011

David G | 

Since it likes to be pushed down the line I'll bring it up again....

"As Morrison asked you over 2 weeks ago, "Twice you wrote that the evidence against Chad was "overwhelming." "Can you state what evidence you believed was "overwhelming?" Perhaps you could name the most important three or five? "

MARK, MARK, MARK, sadly you missed the point about the cap, but I am not surprised. My point was and still is, "it does not take a "beating" to break one" I know you still don't get it. But that's ok. This trial is about the death of an innocent child Cassidy Bortner. Not a trial about Chad vs. his ex wife. You are aware that he pled guilty to that? Before you try to bring them together this does not prove who killed Cassidy You are back on your looks like a duck opinion.

So lets move on to my other comment because you like to avoid it. "What facts do you two have that prove his guilt? If you two are so concerned that we don't have it right then show us, so as you say we can get on with our life."

I mean is that not what your crusade is about? Making sure we get on with our life and dropping this?

Great post Melissa, thats what I have been saying !

9 November 2011

Midwest Mellissa

For those looking to seek the truth... please consider these facts:

Margaret Greenwald (Maine Medical Examiner) TESTIFIED "we cannot eliminate Jefferey Marshall as the perpetrator of this crime." She acknowledged that "the injuries could have been inflicted on November 9th, between 8:00 and 12:30." She also completed a supplemental death certificate that listed the date of Cassidy's injuries(leading up to her death) as UNKNOWN. On the same document, the medical examiner listed the "time of injury" as UNKNOWN. Greenwald testified in this court of law that she did "not know where (in reference to a town or city) the fatal injuries were inflicted." Among these statements, it was indicated that several people had influence and charge over Cassidy in the final hours of her life. Look at her testimony folks...the MEDICAL EXAMINER (an expert in her field), was unable to prove that one person, SPECIFICALLY, was responsible for Cassidy's death.

Truth will prevail, and we won't give up on seeing this man exonerated.

9 November 2011 - Midwest USA

Mark C

David,

Sorry, my bad. Chad broke his ex-wife's CAP while he assaulted her. I mean, some say assault/abuse, others say EYE CONTACT. Tomato vs. tomahhto.

This is a perfect example of misguided souls losing focus of the real issues. More concerned about the reference to tooth instead of cap, looking beyond the fact that he beat her.

And, Becky asking for a moment of silence for Cassidy. While touching, you go on to say that Chad never hurt her. How do you know? Were you around with him and her 100% of the time, especially when he was making EYE CONTACT with her?

9 November 2011

**Becky B** | 

Today is a sad day, a moment of silence please for Cassidy...  
May you RIP KCB for I will continue to fight for your Justice!!  
I know Chad never hurt you.

I hope your Mommy is doing ok, please watch over her & give her strength.

9 November 2011 - Rochester, NH

**David G** | 

Stick to facts of the case, stop the insults, act like an adult and everyone can get along just fine! So lets move on. What facts do you two have that prove his guilt? If you two are so concerned that we don't have it right then show us, so as you say we can get on with our life.

9 November 2011

**David G** | 

Mark I know EXACTLY how it sounds! The sound of it is. GET YOUR FACTS STRAIGHT call it a broken cap NOT A TOOTH. that's a fact!

"Give it up, accept the fact that Chad was the person who directly resulted in Cassidy's death and focus your efforts on other important causes..."

Mark until you can give me the proof to that opinion I shall remain a part of the committee.. I have asked you kindly many times to show me yet you cant!

You and your friend Bob are the ones splitting hairs.! And get off trying to be disruptive.

9 November 2011

**Mark C**

Becky...who is talking behind anyone's back?

Your quote is out of context and not appropriate...like many of the theories and "new evidence" referenced on this site.

9 November 2011

**Becky B** | 

"Pay no mind to those who talk behind your back, it simply means you are two steps ahead"  
~Author Unknown

9 November 2011 - Rochester, NH

**Mark C**

David,

Do you know how you sound with your justification of Chad breaking her tooth/cap? Seriously. The fact that the cap broke while they were engaged in a battle is disgusting.

Your splitting hairs over something that should never even be a topic of discussion when it comes to a man and a woman.

Next, I may read something about his ex-wife having a history of bruising easily, lead poisoning, mold or liver disease, etc.

Over decade and this Committee has yet to get the State to re-examine this case. It will never happen. Of course you'll get the occasional meeting because the Governor has to placate the constituents. Don't you realize that? The Governor isn't going to appoint someone who comes off as a person/office not willing to listen to its people.

Give it up, accept the fact that Chad was the person who directly resulted in Cassidy's death and focus your efforts on other important causes...

I suggest and Occupy Rochester group.

9 November 2011

David G | 

Bob,

Once again you have proven what I have stated to be true, You go out of your way to insult (another woman) and be disrespectful to her because her opinion differs from your's. Might I remind you again, This type behavior takes away from anything intelligent that you may one day post here. While I am at it, Chad's tank top/"wife beater shirt as you say" comments are also getting old. First a wife beater shirt is white, Chad's is not white (in case you are color blind). Women also wear these shirts, What do you call them? Remember the camo pants and shirt that you wore and perhaps still do, You are aware that thousands if not millions of Gay and Lesbian military personnel wore the same thing? wouldn't it be sad if you were labeled as a Homo Sexual Because of what you wear? A shirt is a shirt and has no basis for anything. So lets move on and stick to facts and not opinions as facts. Chad broke a cap not a tooth, (your words to the effect he beat her so badly That he broke her tooth) first you are wrong, second, My wife has broken two of her own caps While brushing and flossing her teeth. My wife must be beating her teeth pretty badly, Your embellishment to the fact goes without merit. No I do not excuse his action, just pointing out that it does not have to be a "beating" to break a cap.

As Morrison asked you over 2 weeks ago, "Twice you wrote that the evidence against Chad was "overwhelming." "Can you state what evidence you believed was "overwhelming?" Perhaps you could name the most important three or five?

When we don't stick to the facts, these important questions get lost or ignored.

Dave

9 November 2011

David G | 

Mark

regarding your comment.

"We all know assaulting anyone is wrong. However, there is a distinct line crossed when a man beats a woman. It calls into question the man's state of mind and willingness to do anything to get his point across or otherwise dominate the individual. Very unstable. "

This is exactly what I have been trying to explain to Bob about his actions. Perhaps since you both are on the same side of the fence you could explain it to him.

**Bob Arnold** | 

Hey, has anyone considered if Jeff's house was haunted? Maybe a poltergeist killed Kassidy. Hey Becky, did you see that movie? Add poltergeist to your list of theories. Or maybe it was a killer whale, did you see Free Willy? Maybe I should come to your next Free the Wife Beater meeting, I have a great imagination and I think I could really help you guys out.

*8 November 2011 - Rochester*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Well I'm back, looking for that illusive "new evidence" which has yet to materialize. As far as all of the "new evidence" that the "Free the Kid Killer Committee" claims to have, it amounts to fictional work crafted by the minds of lost souls, who sit around late at night, after their yoga experience, by light of their Yankee candles and smoke from their jasmine incense, and they write. And they sip their green tea and smoke their hash pipes, and they write some more. They come up with the most far-fetched explanations for the death of this child, all while the evidence is there to see.

How sad it is, that all of your efforts could not be put to better use. Obviously, you're blinded by your emotions. I, too, was blinded by emotion when I first came to this site. You see, deep down inside I really am a nice, decent person. And when I heard of your efforts, I felt the need to join in your efforts and rejoice. However, after reading everything that the good man Morrisson Bonpasse has presented, I could not rejoice. Sadness filled my heart, and anger filled my stomach as I read about the dastardly deeds of Chad Evans.

The saddest part of all of this is that Chad was an asset to the community. But his one weakness was his temper, which was his undoing.

And poor Kassidy. Her last visit to her grandmother's house in Buckfield, she told her "Chad bad". This little 21 month old was crying out for help, but nobody helped her.

*8 November 2011 - Rochester*

**Mark C**

David,

Surely you see a difference between a guy who has assaulted other men and a guy who has assaulted women. Right? If you are lumping these types of individuals together, that is absurd.

We all know assaulting anyone is wrong. However, there is a distinct line crossed when a man beats a woman. It calls into question the man's state of mind and willingness to do anything to get his point across or otherwise dominate the individual. Very unstable.

*8 November 2011*

**David G** | 

Mark,

Regarding "still not enough "new" evidence" We do have a lot and with our continued growth We get more on a regular basis. We do not necessarily run to this forum and elaborate about every little or big thing that is found and the reason for that is quite simple, we look at it , we research it, we make sure that we have it right. We do however discuss these new things openly at our meetings. May I suggest that the next time you are in the area that you attend one of the meetings. You may be surprised at what one could learn just from 1 meeting. Everything is a work in progress with constant updates. Now as far as, "still not enough "new" evidence" In some states we do have enough. New Hampshire on the other hand has set the requirements extremely high and in my

opinion they have a “we are never “Wrong attitude. So that is why it has taken 10 years, on a good note however, the state is at least listening And seeing what is presented to them which truly is great progress in New Hampshire.

8 November 2011

David G | 

Mark

Lets start with this, it makes no difference “how many times” fact it he now has a “history” of assaulting people period. ASSAULT is WRONG! Period . You are excusing Jeff because he assaulted people less?

He assaulted that baby when he hit her so hard that he left bruises. Give me a break! If that had been reported to the police, guess what it would have been another assault charge! If not other charges, Now the jury? They got some things RIGHT! They got some things WRONG! When you cross the line to “strike another human being” That is WRONG no matter who it is, man, woman, child!

7 November 2011

Mark C

I certainly have no interest in seeing them, but I'm sure the autopsy photos paint a different picture than some of you are dreaming up with these wild theories about lead poisoning, mold, liver disease, etc. Things that are being thrown against a wall to see if anything will stick.

Its been over a decade...and still not enough "new" evidence to get this looked at by the DA's office. Doesn't that tell you something?

7 November 2011

Mark C

For the record, I don't want Chad to be guilty any more than I want the responsible party to rot in hell and live a miserable existence for the rest of his, or her, life for what was done to Kassidy. Deep down, one individual knows exactly who is responsible and will meet his/her maker in the end.

That being said, any reasonable juror would take in all of the evidence, testimony (or lack thereof by Chad) and come to a conclusion of guilt or innocence. You can't tell me that all of the jurors were lemmings who were lead to the cliff. Give the jurors the benefit of the doubt that they took their jobs seriously given what was at stake.

They obviously ruled out Jeff and others. Why was that? Jeff would appear to the number one suspect since Kassidy died in his care, had some history of discipline and poor caregiving. Do you think the jury just ignored him because they were out to convict Chad?

Becky - how many kicks to the balls or punches to the face? Well, first of all, I wouldn't be associated with a woman like that. However, in your hypothetical...I would restrain the person in self defense and remove myself from the situation. I would not proceed to choke or bash the woman's face in. How much did Chad outweigh his wife and girlfriend? Chad was also a self-proclaimed fighter, a good one too, right? All of a sudden women could kick his ass pretty easily...? Pretty sad how you are defending his actions as it relates to beating women.

Question for you Becky and David...how many time was Jeff arrested for beating up women?

When a guy crosses the line to beat up a woman, would you agree that it it is not outrageous to believe that he would also stoop to the level of abusing kids?

7 November 2011

David G | 

Mark,

I would like to suggest that before Becky goes into the other “half of the untold story” perhaps Give me what I have requested of you.. “proof” of guilt. It is perfectly ok that you have a different point of view and personally I’d like to know what facts it is based on.?

You did say that it was only Greenwald’s estimate opinion, you didn’t comment on the Emt or the police officer opinions but as I stated they all support each other. Do you disregard everything that is in favor of Chad? Between the three of them it proves someone lied, It also shows that Chad did not beat Cassidy before she died. If you choose to ignore credible people then who do you believe? Comments Amanda makes?? NO she clearly lies, the babysitter? Under his care, so many things happen to Cassidy that require

Medical attention and neglects to get her?? The same babysitter who admits to hitting her so bad that he left marks? The same babysitter that also has a history of assault? Or shall we just go to the prosecutor who files motions to stop any testimony regarding Chad around children? If that was allowed, Don’t you think that would add credibility to his behavior around children? Lets go back to baby sitter just for a sec.. why would a babysitter tell you everything that happened? I mean tell that she fell out of a truck? Why couldn’t it really be, the goose egg from that was oh lets say anything but a fall out of a truck. How about “accidentally” tripped and stepped on her and that’s why she walks funny. Why do you choose to believe those “stories” as facts when it’s not out of the realm of possibilities that those are cover-up’s, just like a trampoline story that you “quickly” denounce. I really hate to think you disregard anything which helps him, Just because you “want him “to be the guilty one.

*7 November 2011*

**Becky B** | 

Let me ask you Mark, how many kicks to the balls/punches to the face would you take from a woman before you defend yourself? Why didn't the State of Maine test her for lead poisoning? You don't think mold is dangerous? Chad was arrested before Cassidy's lab results were even back... the entire theory he abused her came from one person, ironic don't you think? Yes you are correct Mark, I know Chad is innocent, I know he didn't/couldn't/wouldn't do this. I also know that the public's opinions of Chad are, as you say, ludicrous! May I suggest you keep reading Mark & keep asking your questions.

*7 November 2011 - Rochester, NH*

**Mark C**

Becky,

You are saying that, because Chad had mouse cubes in his house/trash, there is no way he could have lost control of his temper and hit/hurt Cassidy? He always showed such great restraint in situations involving his significant others, right?

Didn't he start using those cubes when his son was old enough to be mobile? He also didn't treat his son the same as he treated Cassidy who came into the picture after he first started using the mouse cubes.

Let's hear the other half of the untold story. I'd be willing to listen and weigh valid points or positions. However, hanging on things like hand tracings, molds, diseases that could have caused her death, etc. is ludicrous, in my opinion.

Enlighten me and others...

*7 November 2011*

**Becky B** | 

Mark, the jury only heard half the story. The jury only saw ONE picture of a happy, healthy Cassidy, had they seen & heard the entire story, this forum would not exist. I have read everything here, EVERYTHING. I have seen things the public has not. I know Chad is innocent. Chad couldn't kill a

mouse, physical evidence proves that. Chad loves Cassidy, there's NO WAY he could have hurt her to cause her death. Bad Chad eh? Funny that statement never came out 10yrs ago during the trial... Justice will prevail here!

7 November 2011 - Rochester, NH

**Mark C**

Blindfaith Becky...

Who am I?

Someone who doesn't forget how much pain, suffering and torture poor Cassidy had to endure in her final months on this Earth.

Go back and read some of my other posts where I have brought "something" to this forum.

Just because you keep saying he is innocent doesn't mean its true.

If it were that obvious to the jury, Chad wouldn't be in prison.

Chad Bad.

7 November 2011

**Becky** | 

Thx Dave :)

6 November 2011 - Rochester

**David G** | 

@ Miss Becky,  
welcome back ! Nice to see a smiling face from the Chad Evans Wrongly Convicted Committee!

6 November 2011

**Becky** | 

Mark seriously? Who are you?  
& more importantly why can't you bring something important to this forum than just your opinion of Chad bashing. Chad is innocent! I'm thankful he's a bigger man than most out there, the true will prevail & most of you will be eating your words.

6 November 2011 - Rochester, NH

**David G** | 

Mark,

"Leopards don't change their spots" Under your theory, I wouldn't have convicted any person on prior bad Acts because the evidence can't pin them to what they are accused of. IMO doing so is a crime in itself. that's like saying, convict because I don't like their looks, I don't like their shirt, I don't like their mullet, I don't like that They didn't do enough squats, or I watched a video and yup they are guilty, If you truly believe in that kind of theory then I feel sorry for the accused when you may one day sit in a jury box.

I just cant see the evidence to convict of murder. I have no bias in this case, if you can show me the "proof" I am willing to look at it with open eyes. I am asking you to show it to me.. Show me that you care about the truth and our system.

6 November 2011

**Mark C**

David,

If only you were on the jury...

Maybe you could have convinced the others that this was just a big mistake. I mean, I can see Chad and his mullet from behind running after a girl, but it not ending in an embrace...more like an ER visit for the poor girl. Leopards don't change their spots, man.

*5 November 2011*

**David G** | 

Mark,

Nothing to do with the case. Just something to think about. Have you ever seen someone from behind, their hair, walk, clothing, and thought it was a friend? And you yell to them, and they turn around and much to your surprise it was not them? Have you ever waved at a car driving down the road because you thought it was someone that you knew?

Only to realize you didn't know them? How about a guy and a girl running and the woman screaming and your impression was she running from the guy because she was afraid of him, only when he catches her, they are wrapped in an embrace?

These very things happen to me time and again. That is why in my life I do not subscribe to the theory, "if it walks like a duck and sounds like a duck, chances are."

My experiences have shown me that things are not always what they seen . Just saying.

Dave

*3 November 2011*

**David G** | 

Mark,

To your point "its not a coincidence that the focus of the investigation shifted to Chad"  
I agree with that comment, It was shifted because of other behavior, however, prior behavior does not "prove" guilt of murder.

Perhaps you are correct here "it did NOT resonate with the jury because, if it did, they would have concluded that it was impossible for Chad to have done it."

I also forgot to mention, even an EMT stated cool, clammy, and the presence of rigor setting in.. Rigor usually starts to take place at around 3 hours after someone is dead .

If none of these things resonate with the jury because they are so obvious. Then it makes me wonder if the jury actually even heard anything or it was because of the time of year  
Or because they were so ANGRY (and rightfully so) they didn't care who they convicted  
But someone was certainly going to pay for it. IMO

I am completely convinced that Kassidy was abused before she died. I am further convinced that it was impossible for Chad to have done this abuse, I base it only on  
Medical proof, police statement, and emergency personnel, NOT any he said/she said  
Testimony which is often "opinion" they all back up what I am saying as well as back up each other, that's some pretty hard facts or proof to disregard. A body through autopsy Tells a story, a body cannot lie, that's how timelines are made.

*3 November 2011*

**Mark C**

David,

Yes, I know Greenwald was the State's ME. However, it is the ME's estimate of when the fatal blows were inflicted. And, it did NOT resonate with the jury because, if it did, they would have concluded that it was impossible for Chad to have done it. They obviously didn't think that based on the evidence and testimonies they were presented with.

The most logical suspect would have been Jeff since she died in his care. However, its not a coincidence that the focus of the investigation shifted to Chad. I'm sure there are those that feel its some big conspiracy against the guy. However, if it walks like a duck and sounds like a duck, chances are...

3 November 2011

David G | 

Mark

You do realize that Greenwald is/was the Maine the medical examiner correct? You state, "Its one person's testimony and obviously didn't resonate with the jury." This certainly did resonate with the jury, it is my opinion That it is very compelling evidence, Much more factual than anyone with . He said/she said testimony. Forensics is powerful stuff. My point to bringing this up is simple, It shows, that Kassidy was abused Before she died, it also shows/proves that it would not be possible for Chad to have been the one to inflict this abuse. You do know where Chad was during this critical time don't you? This also shows Someone is lying during this time frame, to put it as bluntly as I can. Cold bodies do not make noise. I would rather doubt that a police officer would lie about the fact that the body was cold. My intent is not to point fingers at anyone else, My intent is to show reasonable doubt. Also do you realize, that there are signs of abuse To kassidy before Chad was ever involved with Amanda and kassidy?

As far as power lifting goes, it would seem to me 3 phases of it would mean you work on each phase 33.33 percent of the time, I mean why would anyone work on one thing 80 % Of the time and leaving 20% to the other phases? Perhaps the size of his legs were where he wanted? Which no longer required "a lot" ? I do not know as I am not a weight lifter, I would think, therefore it would be my opinion, you'd work on them equally until each goal was achieved?

Dave

2 November 2011

Mark C

Estimates are estimates. You could get 20 other experts to give different estimates. Its one person's testimony and obviously didn't resonate with the jury.

The powerlifting thing - you use, and work on, your legs 80% of the time. Having strong legs and core are fundamental components to the sport. Now, I know Chad wasn't competitive and probably just liked to claim he was a powerlifter so people would think he was some sort of tough guy. I mean, its not as cool saying you just like to go to your buddy's house and do bench and arms, right?

Just one thing that calls into question other things he has said/done in my mind. Gloss over stuff, make stuff up, etc.

2 November 2011

David G | 

Mark,

I'm sorry I need to correct my math ! In my below comment I state subtract 4 hrs from 1:30. In fact that should be "9:30" so please disregard 10:30 as the timeline.

Dave

2 November 2011

**David G** | 

Mark,

Maybe I am confused at the question? Since we agree that power lifting consists of 3 different phases and we choose not to do one of them (in this case squatting) the bench press and dead lift are still phases of power lifting. Example as to my thinking, If I were a carpenter and I built a house and put up sheetrock but I didn't do the finish trim, I would still be a carpenter. Give me more on your thought so I can better (accurately) answer you. Here is what I asked on the 17th

Greenwald testified "that she estimates other injuries would have been inflicted four hours before she died, which would have possibly put the toddler in Marshall's care".

If Greenwald is correct and TOD IS 1:30 and you subtract the four hrs for injuries inflicted before she Died this would be 10:30!

Remember now it was aprox 12:30 when Marshall called and said unresponsive baby making noises.

How could this even be possible? This is also backed up by the first Officer on the scene (he states) body was cold.

in general, it takes aprox 2 hrs to notice a difference in body temp. which again brings us back to 10:30

where would chad be at 10:30 when this Innocent baby was beaten one last time?

1 November 2011

**Mark C**

David...

I know what powerlifting is but Chad obviously does not. He should have said he liked doing bench and biceps, and skipped the comments about being into powerlifting. Powerlifters who don't work on their legs aren't powerlifters.

What was your question? Instead of scrolling back through to find it, it would be easier for you to restate it. thanks

1 November 2011

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Thank you for retracting the "slamming her into the wall" allegation. Don't you find it interesting that you have been stating that my 700 page book, EYE CONTACT, is fiction, but no one has yet called to my attention any statements which are untrue which relate to Chad's claim of innocence? On the other hand you made a claim which was definitely incriminating to Chad and it was false.

One would hope that you would be more careful in the future about your claims, as David G. has noted.

David G | 

Mark  
Regarding What sort of power lifting

Power lifting involves the squat, the bench press, and the deadlift.

hope this helps  
Dave

31 October 2011

David G | 

Mark c.

Good question, I do not have the answer to that, however I will get it. Unless someone else already knows. in the mean time, why not respond to the question I raised back on the 17th that you never responded to.. It is a good idea to focus, answer, resolve each and every question, one at a time so they don't get lost between the many many questions that we all have

Dave

31 October 2011

Mark C

Chad says he was into powerlifting, right?

What sort of powerlifting was he doing where he didn't work on legs for over a year?

It may seem like a "whatever" type of comment to most, but its things like that which make me question the truthfulness of what he said and continues to say.

31 October 2011

David G | 

Bob

For the record, I am a veteran! I'm glad you decided to retract your incorrect (fact)slamming Amanda against the wall. On the contrary, I did not miss what you said  
About reading the deposition. However you clearly missed what I said when I new for a fact that you were not there! Nowhere in that deposition (which I have not read) does it state that his lawyer dropped him because he didn't think he had a case, as you paraded as a fact. Would you like to retract that fact as well? You have paraded your opinions many times as facts would you like to retract them as well? Where do you get off presenting such nonsense as fact? "Chad Evans is not credible. He's a bully, a liar, a control freak and suffers from the "big man on campus" syndrom. Now he's got a new group of friends that are willing to do things for him."

FACT! that is your opinion, because it is your opinion does NOT make it FACT!

You identify as enemy? You can't stand it when people do not agree with your opinion that is why you call them names, use profanity, insult, try to intimidate, that is called being a bully!

Continued below

31 October 2011

David G | 

Continued from above

No one here agrees with your opinion, except for Mark, that's why you treat him decent, however, no one has treated you with such blatant disrespect, go back this past year, look at your comments, its ALWAYS when someone's opinion differs from yours (your enemy) then you go on your tirade, "big man on campus" (controlling) that makes you the angry one! You made comment that I am angry? You are correct, it makes me angry when someone like yourself, shows such disrespect, especially to the women in here just because they feel different than you Emotions do not know the difference between a chat forum and real world, Reactions will be EXACTLY the same! that is a fact! (psych 101) You say you treat your family differently? The books say otherwise!

You clearly missed sarcasm regarding a NY. rally too, let me spell it out, IT NEVER HAPPENED!, But boy were you ready with the insults and name calling. CLEARLY You have demonstrated your M.O.

If there is no doubt in your mind, then why are you here? Why do you find the need to spend so much of your valuable time here bashing everyone who has a different view than you? There is no need for you to be so obsessed with our belief.

Dave

31 October 2011

Bob Arnold | 

One other thing, about that picture at the top of the page, all the way to the left....I love that shirt that Chad is wearing....the wife beater shirt. It suits him well.

30 October 2011 - Rochester

Bob Arnold | 

David:

On the contrary, there is no doubt in my mind that Chad is guilty.

After careful consideration, I've decided to retract my statement that Chad "slammed Amanda against the wall" on the evening prior to Cassidy's death...I should have phrased it as: "Chad violently grabbed Amanda by the throat" and that "Chad also slammed Cassidy against the wall on one occasion." I get confused sometimes, especially after the wiffle ball story, or was it a starter ball? Or maybe a hard rubber ball? No no, it was a baseball.

I see that you're an angry individual, perhaps this is why you're able to identify with Chad Evans, as he too was an angry individual.

I'm impressed that you can speak on behalf of the Chad Evans Wrongly Convicted Committee....at least you can converse and debate, unlike your comrades (Morrison is of course the exception). Does it feel good to know that you're defending a convicted child killer?

I'm fully aware of where you're trying to go with your efforts, I can assure you that I treat my family much differently than people I've identified as an enemy, unlike Chad Evans, who inflicted emotional and physical trauma on those closest to him so do me a favor and save those types of remarks for your buddy behind bars.

I never claimed to be present at Chad's deposition, where did you come up with that? Did you miss the part where I stated that I've read the transcript of that deposition?

As far as your crusade against police officers, this is yet another example of someone I would consider a sewer rat with ultra-liberal beliefs trying their best to upset the system of law that we've put in place. I bet you got a problem with veterans too.

Regards,

Bob Arnold

30 October 2011 - Rochester

David G | 

Bob:

On behalf of the Chad Evans wrongly convicted Committee, Thank you for devoting the last year of your life to something that we feel strongly about, it warms our hearts  
To know that you question your own feelings about the case, If you were so sure,  
So convinced, you would not waste one second here.

As far as Jeff's lawsuit goes, Apparently I Do know more than you, as you were not present during any deposition regarding that lawsuit! ( I know this as a fact) There is no need for me to "read " what I already know!

Christine and myself did get together for a rally ,however we didn't smoke any organic hash. It took place in NY. It was for The charges against 13 police officers, two sergeants and one lieutenant, the latest in a spate of corruption allegations, We already know these SCUM are Guilty, Breaking laws that they swear to uphold! What hypocrites!

We here, are not your Wife or Children so stop treating us as such.  
It is not Chad who suffers from little man syndrome and every other thing(insult) that you have said fits you to a T. As far as (pun) "as you state" goes, there is no pun or ANYTHING funny about the death of a child! Coming from you though, I am not surprised!

As Morrison and myself have asked on three occasions and now four, we hoped that your next post would have an explanation of the source of your statement that Chad's argument with Amanda on the evening of November 8, 2000 included his "slamming her against a wall." Please provide the source for that claim. Instead you continue to IGNORE the request and have more of a desire to continually insult and attempt to change the subject. Answer the question and lets move on shall we?

30 October 2011

Bob Arnold | 

David G:

Your comment: "Basically Jeff didn't drop his suit, In a nutshell his Attorney quit him, he found Chad to be credible."-----This appears to be your opinion and not fact. The fact is this: Jeff's attorney dropped out because he didn't think they had a case, not because he found Chad Evans credible. Where do you get off presenting such nonsense as fact? Maybe you should go back and read the transcripts from the deposition?

Chad Evans is not credible. He's a bully, a liar, a control freak and suffers from the "big man on campus" syndrom. The guy literally beat Kassidy Bortner to death. He also smacked Amanda around, choked her, head butted her, etc... Not to mention the abuse he inflicted on his ex-wife Tristan. He smacked her so hard she lost a tooth.

Chad liked to control people. He had a way of getting people to do things for him. He got a large group of friends to meet him at the police station on the evening of Nov 9th. He got Amanda to do

orgies. He got Travis Hunt to lie about Cassidy's disposition on the night before her death. He got people to cover for him while out on bail, he got people to lie for him and provide their homes to him so he could have access to the prosecution's star witness. Now he's got a new group of friends that are willing to do things for him.

*29 October 2011 - Rochester*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Mark:

The chiropractor entries are another skillful attempt to mount the "poor Chad" defense. Everything coming out of the "free Chad" camp is meant to portray Evans as a sweet guy, a great father, a family man and a victim of the police, the AG, and even his own attorneys. Poor Chad was so good to Cassidy. Poor Chad's back. Poor Chad fell victim to Jeff Marshall's evil ways. Poor Chad.

Chad Evans blames everybody else, at no point has he ever taken responsibility for the brutal beatings he inflicted on this little girl. He blames Amanda, he blames Jeff, he blames the police....he even blamed his own son.

I only have one word to describe Chad Evans: Unbelievable.

Bob

*29 October 2011 - Rochester*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Apparently "David G." doesn't get the pun, maybe he should do some more research into the Evans murder case? "Eye Contact" aka "Grab the little Bitch by the Throat" is where he's likely gotten most of his information.....maybe Christine Gagne can share her vast amount of knowledge with him, since as she claims she's spent most of her adult life researching the case. May I suggest David and Christine get together and discuss their ideas over a bowl of organic chicken soup and sauted organic beets with tossed goat cheese salad? Afterwards, they can sip on a steaming cup of Vermont maple flavored sassy tea, while smoking some more of their organic hash. Of course, they might have to divide their time with the occupy Boston protests.

Mark, you hit the nail on the head. That police video speaks volumes, no matter what the "Free Chad Evans" crowd says, they can come up with as many excuses as they can dream up but the fact is this: Evans lied, hid behind that chair, tried to control the conversation, tried to distance himself from Amanda and Cassidy, etc. etc..... You know the jury got to watch that video as well, and they saw the same thing you and I see, that Evans acted guilty.

Regards,

Bob

*29 October 2011 - Rochester*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Welcome back. I was hoping that your next post would have an explanation of the source of your statement that Chad's argument with Amanda on the evening of November 8, 2000 included his "slamming her against a wall." Please provide the source for that claim.

Mark C.

Thanks for asking about the reason for the chiropractor entries in the "Chronology," and it's not as you guessed. A major reason for Chad's wrongful conviction was that the jury was given no timelines for the events of June-November 2000. Witnesses seldom were able to specify dates of their observations. One goal for the "Chronology" is to document what happened every day of the year from June 2 through November 9, so readers can better understand the charges and the context. By establishing the specific dates of events, people are more likely to be able to remember the timing of other events in relation, i.e. before or after, to such events. Chad, for example, remembered that one of the overnight babysitting stints for Cassidy with Jeff Marshall and Jennifer Bortner was the night of a party in Maine that he and Amanda attended with friends. With the date-stamped photographs of the party, we are then able to identify the date of that overnight babysitting. Explaining it another way, it would not have mattered at all if the chiropractor appointments were dentist appointments or optometrist appts. It was the certainty of the date that mattered. Regarding Chad's body language during his interrogation, we had many exchanges with Bob Arnold about this issue months ago. In summary, Chad was upset and nervous, especially when he realized that he was being wrongly accused of beating Cassidy to death.

Morrison

28 October 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

### Mark C

Does anyone know why there are so many entries relative to Chad's appointments with the chiropractor in the Chronology section of this site?

Trying to establish that he had a back back...for what reason?

Also, wouldn't it be the easier route for police to target Jeff as the killer since Cassidy was in his care when she died, he had some history of spanking her, etc.? For those suggesting that Chad was the easy target, I don't agree at all. There obviously was enough information the police had to focus on Chad as the primary suspect.

I also watched the video of his interview and do think he is guilty as hell. Body language speaks volumes.

28 October 2011

### Mark C

Bob...have you had a chance to review Christine's e-mail to Strelzin?

Some pretty crazy stuff, IMO.

Making molds of Cassidy's head, hand tracings from Chad, spending an average of 78 hours per week on this case since February. Suggesting that the medical examiner didn't perform certain tests. I mean, the medical examiner can pretty much rule out cirrhosis of the liver unless, of course, the wonder twins were filling her sippy cups with vodka...which wouldn't shock me.

28 October 2011

### Bob Arnold |

Becky we finally agree on something!

28 October 2011 - Rochester

### Becky B |

I don't know about any of you, but if I were to spend my hard earned money on anything it would be here:

http://www.girlscoutsgwm.org & not on building bogus & hateful websites!  
It doesn't take a MD to know that this  
Co-Chair loves her Thin Mints & supporting my local girl scout!  
FREE CHAD!!

23 October 2011 - Rochester, NH

David G | 

Mark c

The point is you said he should have had a second opinion I said he most likely did, has nothing to do with having 300 of them? As far as not fighting hard enough? You or I will never know how hard he fought, That would be between him and his attorney's we were not in that room with him/them and that would be purely speculation on our parts. So to even think he deserves what he got for "not fighting hard enough" is not what our legal system is about or supposed to be about, and does not justify a conviction.

Again the reason we are here is because we feel that the jury did not do the right thing, If you have read my timeline, explain to me how that alone can be brushed aside?

I am gone for the evening and look forward to your explanation to my question.

Regards  
Dave

20 October 2011 - Cold new England/ Southern Florida

Mark C

Dave...

Fact is the jury did find him guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

And, having two attorneys or 300 doesn't change the fact that he didn't push hard enough to defend himself on the stand.

Rightly or wrongly convicted, maybe he deserves what he got since he didn't fight for his freedom when he had the opportunity.

20 October 2011

David G | 

Mark c. Regarding Getting second opinion,  
Chad had 2 Attorney's so again for whatever reasons they chose to do the things they did, it's fair to say Chad had a second opinion.

Regards  
David

20 October 2011 - cold New England/Sunny florida

David G | 

Mark c.

Go back, if you would , to the 17th here. I posted About a timeline (that is in evidence) that cannot be refuted.

This is also reasonable doubt. and put this with everything else and there is no way to convict BEYOND a reasonable doubt

20 October 2011 - Cold new england/ Sunny Florida

## Mark C

Dave...under your scenario, if I did not agree with my doctor, I would get a second opinion. Blindly following the advice of anyone is dangerous and stupid, especially when your life hangs in the balance.

Chad seems to be questioning alot relative to his case. Too bad he didn't channel that passion when he was prepping for trial with his attorney.

But, then again, I guess I'd be questioning everything too if I were convicted of this crime, hoping that I may find freedom by raising enough suspicion over Cassidy's death that got me off the hook.

*20 October 2011*

## Mark C

No, I'm not suggesting that the damning evidence is the fact that the jury found him guilty. Its the evidence they weighed in arriving at that conclusion. Clearly, it convinced them that Chad was responsible for killing Cassidy and Jeff was not. That's the basis for my earlier comment.

*20 October 2011*

## Dave G |

@ mark c. A follow up.  
e If you go see your Dr. because you have a pain in your stomach  
And the Doc says, you have a hernia requiring surgery, do you argue with him or do you trust in him  
And follow his guidance?

That's pretty much the same thing . We are taught to trust in them and that they will help you, that's why we go to them.

Not making excuses because I do agree, just want you to see why people do what their Professionals recommend. They do not always make the right choice ( in hindsight)

Regards  
Dave

*20 October 2011 - cold New England / Sunny Florida*

## Dave G |

@ mark c. am I reading this correctly? Are you saying that because the jury made a decision. "that's the damning evidence"?

Agree with you on this , I certainly would hate to see anyone wrongly convicted, due to poor police work, bad legal advice, etc...

That is why we are here.

Regards  
Dave

*20 October 2011 - Cold New England / Sunny Florida*

## Mark C

@ Dave G

Damning evidence in the sense that the jury concluded, beyond reasonable doubt, that Chad killed Cassidy.

I certainly would hate to see anyone wrongly convicted, due to poor police work, bad legal advice, etc. However, Chad was a grown man capable of insisting on taking the stand. If his attorney felt it wouldn't have been a wise move, then maybe he should have replaced him. So, in effect, Chad's stupidity was brought into the case.

20 October 2011

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

It's wonderful to see so many thoughtful comments and questions. I can help with a few, but need not address all.

1. My understanding is that Jeff's attorney, Stephen C. Brown, of Rochester, withdrew from his representation. I don't know why. I've tried to talk with Mr. Brown, but even if I were to talk with him, he would likely not tell me why he withdrew from the case as it's a confidential lawyer and client matter.

2. Agreed. Even though the jury was instructed not to draw inferences from Chad's not testifying, it's still a natural inclination to draw such inferences. That's especially true in this case, because of several factors. First, the defense put all its eggs in one basket, which is that the babysitter killed Cassidy, but the babysitter testified, and he did so politely, even if forgetfully at times. Second, Chad's videotaped police interrogation was shown to the jury, and Chad should have been encouraged by his attorneys to explain to the jury some of his responses to the police. Third, the jury had heard several less than favorable things about Chad, and they needed to hear from him. Fourth, the defense chose, and I do not know the reasons for that choice, not to call any defense witnesses other than Dr. Baden. Soon after the trial, Chad knew that he should have testified, and if there is ever a new trial, he has definitely said that he will testify.

3. My concern about the role of a polygraph exam in this case goes beyond Jeff's decision not to take such an exam. Until that point, the police were sure he was going to pass, and even told Jeremy Hinton that Jeff had taken a polygraph exam, with the implication that he had passed. They asked why Chad wasn't taking a test. A polygraph was to be an important investigative tool. (See EYE CONTACT, page 244) Well, they never asked Chad to take a polygraph exam. After Jeff declined to take a test, there was no more discussion about such an exam with anyone. There was no recorded discussion with Jeff of why he declined. After that point, polygraphs were no longer important to the police. I don't know why the police didn't ask Amanda or Jennifer to take a polygraph, as was stated to be planned in a police Investigative Plan.

Morrison

19 October 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**David G** | 

I'm just throwing this out as well.

Chad has done some stupid inexcusable Things "by his own admissions" To which I agree.

However those things that he has done do not prove being guilty of murder.

Chad wasn't on trial for being dumb/stupid, He is however guilty of being dumb and stupid with some things. in my opinion there is not one spec of evidence so far that PROVES Chad is guilty of murder. If there was, I wouldn't be here and neither would anyone else.

Regards  
Dave.

19 October 2011 - Cold New England

**David G** | 

@ mark c. I think I just answered the first part of your question, see below.

Basically Jeff didn't drop his suit, In a nutshell his Attorney quit him, he found Chad to be credible. Morrison will fill this detail in more. As far as a lie detector test, Jeff agreed and then declined. You

Are correct, why would he not take it if he had nothing to hide? Wouldn't that plant a seed of doubt in our minds? Like, you stated about a jury's mind? You say Jeff is sketchy, well I'd agree, Because the timeline on her death and what the medical examiner states, puts her in Jeff's care when she was beaten one last time. What exactly are you calling damning evidence?

19 October 2011 - Cold New England / Sunny Florida

### Mark C

Regardless of any instruction to the jury, defendants who do not take the stand always plant that seed of doubt in jurors minds. Like, if he was not guilty, why isn't he defending himself?

Same goes for certain comments that are made and the judge immediately instructs jurors to disregard said comments. Jurors still heard them.

Anyone know why Jeff dropped his lawsuit against Chad? Lack of funds? Why did his attorney resign? Didn't think he'd get paid? Waste of his time?

Despite not having anything to prove, why wouldn't Jeff take the same lie detector test Chad took?

Jeff seems sketchy but there is more evidence damning Chad than Jeff, IMO.

19 October 2011

### Dave G |

"lawyering up" ? Chad Fully cooperated with police right up until they accused him! Any person with common sense would do exactly that. You have the right to remain Silent anything you say CAN AND WILL be used against you . Which really means we will twist everything you say to make you look bad .Sounds to me like a great time to say I want a lawyer. Damning video-taped police interview,? How so? Because you want it to be? Refusal to testify at his own trial.? Chad NEVER REFUSED!

His Attorneys had a plan which was a poor one , I agree. However that plan did not Include him on the stand .“Often people wonder why anyone would choose to do this, and It is common for criminal defendants to not take the stand and tell their story to the jury. Unfortunately, while taking the stand may seem like a great idea, especially to someone who is innocent, there are many reasons why it is often better not to take the stand at trial. Taking the stand can easily provide an opportunity for the defendant to appear much more culpable than he actually is. Additionally, the jury is not allowed to infer anything negative from the fact that the defendant does not testify, and the prosecution is not allowed to comment on it. In sum, there are very good reasons why an attorney may persuade a defendant not to take the stand and any defendant should carefully consider this advice. Even though not taking the stand may seem counter intuitive, it is often the best choice. “

“slamming her against a wall.” I too would like to know where this came from?

One last thing.. "Grab The Little Bitch by her Throat" as you like to call it. The childs name is Cassidy Bortner! That is highly INSULTING! Please Refrain from calling something what you like to call it.

19 October 2011 - cold New England/ Sunny Florida

### Melissa

Bob- what about the amount of calls that were made before calling 911 the day she passed? How about not seeking medical treatment when she fell out of a truck, drank Windex, or for the fact that they said later they thought she came to them that day beaten. I would call the police if a child truly showed up at my home looking like that!! Wouldn't any normal, educated, loving adult do that? No matter how short or long Cassidy's nails were- had she been bathed she wouldn't have traces of

blood under so many fingernails. As well why wouldn't his son who is said to be bright- why wouldn't he say hey mommy Cassidy was bloody? Nothing? Sorry if I missed it in my reading but were they not good about taking care of diapers? I must have missed it. I admire how much to look at and pick apart Chad's life and involvement with Cassidy. Maybe if investigators had that same tenacity with everyone a different outcome may have happened. I think regardless of who was charged, we are all here for the same thing- Cassidy. A beautiful little girl who was unjustly taken from the world. So how can we not look at everyone the same way you have with Chad. Doesn't Cassidy deserve that much?

19 October 2011 - NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

The FIRST reference to the argument between Chad and Amanda on the night of November 8, came in Amanda's fifth interview, which was on December 19, 2000. The interview was by NH State Police Sgt. James White, and not recorded electronically. His summary stated, "An argument developed after she told C.EVANS how tired she was from working so hard. He told her he worked hard to and she responded that at least he didn't have to go up and down ladders all day like she did. She told me they were seated on the couch and he became angrier as the argument developed. C. EVANS then grabbed her by the throat and pinned her down, on her back, on the couch. She pushed him away and then he apologized."

At Chad's trial, Amanda described the incident at pages 127-131 of the transcript, which I've presented at page 394 of EYE CONTACT. Amanda testified that Chad had his hand on her "...for about a second... Maybe two seconds." (T. p. 130)

You wrote in your comment below that the argument included "slamming her against a wall." Can you please tell me your source for that description of the argument?

Regarding the book, EYE CONTACT, you have often called it fiction, but to the best of my recollection you have never cited a single error of fact in the book. Does the book mis-quote anyone? Does it have an incorrect date for an event? Does it leave something important out? You've obviously read many of the source documents, so you are well qualified to cite errors in EYE CONTACT. Until you find such errors, or until others find such errors, can you please stop calling it a book of fiction? Draft Edition 2b is now on the website, and it has the correction for my error about the DNA testing report not being included in the discovery materials sent to Chad's lawyers. It WAS included.

Morrison

19 October 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison:

There you go again, see point #6 below....you're once again trying to down play an important, documented event...."after a brief argument they went to bed." You left out the part where Chad became enraged and choked Amanda, slamming her against a wall. You also left out the part about the soiled diaper, you know, the one that neither one of them ended up changing (evening of the 8th). It's reminiscent of the fight between Chad and Tristan that you tried to down play, you know the one where Chad beat the hell out of her and knocked out a tooth...and the police showed up and arrested him??? Do you see what you're doing Morrison? You want to win so badly that you've intentionally falsified previous events in order to persuade your audience.

I would like to say, to all the new members of this forum, to avoid the use of Morrison's book in your research of the case, for it is flawed and filled with bias and an incorrect interpretation of actual events. "Eye Contact", aka "Grab The Little Bitch by her Throat" as I like to call it, is mostly a work of fiction. I would suggest you read all of the police reports, court docs, and other available material

BEFORE you start reading "Grab the little Bitch by her Throat," to avoid having your judgement tampered with by a work of fictional accounts dreamed up by Chad Evans.

Regards,

Bob

18 October 2011 - Rochester

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison:

There you go again, see point #6 below....you're once again trying to down play an important, documented event...."after a brief argument they went to bed." You left out the part where Chad became enraged and choked Amanda, slamming her against a wall. You also left out the part about the soiled diaper, you know, the one that neither one of them ended up changing (evening of the 8th). It's reminiscent of the fight between Chad and Tristan that you tried to down play, you know the one where Chad beat the hell out of her and knocked out a tooth...and the police showed up and arrested him??? Do you see what you're doing Morrison? You want to win so badly that you've intentionally falsified previous events in order to persuade your audience.

I would like to say, to all the new members of this forum, to avoid the use of Morrison's book in your research of the case, for it is flawed and filled with bias and an incorrect interpretation of actual events. "Eye Contact", aka "Grab The Little Bitch by her Throat" as I like to call it, is mostly a work of fiction. I would suggest you read all of the police reports, court docs, and other available material BEFORE you start reading "Grab the little Bitch by her Throat," to avoid having your judgement tampered with by a work of fictional accounts dreamed up by Chad Evans.

Regards,

Bob

18 October 2011 - Rochester

**Bob Arnold** | 

Mark:

Jeff Marshall was no saint and had his own issues, however I don't believe he caused Cassidy's death. I believe the prosecution summarized this nicely in their closing statment. As far as Chad goes, I do find it amazing that he's able to remember all of these dates and conversations that took place over ten years ago. I can't believe a thing the guy says.

Morrison, I've given you many examples of why I think Chad is guilty, namely his behavior on the afternoon of the 9th, his "lawyering up" early on, his documented emotional disposition during early November, his short temper, his damning video-taped police interview, not to mention all the lies he told (wiffle ball/starter ball/baseball, trampoline story, "I can't sit at the moment I've been driving over two hours"...etc etc) as well as his willful and itentional efforts to tamper with witnesses, namely Amanda, contrary to his bail conditions....and his refusal to testify at his own trial.

Melissa:

Point well taken on the bathing...judging by the way they took care of her diapers, they probably didn't keep her nails trimmed either. I would suspect that there were traces of blood under her nails after the bath he gave her, and that's the only reason he gave her a bath, to clean blood off her body,

Becky:

I'm glad to see you've stopped parading around with your annoying quotes. Now if we can get you to converse in longer, more linear sentences, I believe you'll be on the road to earning your GED.

Regards,

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

David,  
 Agreed. Witness identifications and observations are notoriously inaccurate. The New Jersey Supreme Court recently required, in a unanimous 134 page decision, that NJ police and courts reform their procedures for witness identification. The U.S. Supreme Court will be hearing in November the case of Barion Perry vs. New Hampshire, which challenges the reliability of Perry's identification by a police witness. The unreliability of the observations of Cassidy are similarly suspect. There is no question that she did have some bruises during the fall of 2000, as children do, but the specifics of police interviews and courtroom testimony were unreliable, especially regarding the timing of the observations.

Mark C.,  
 Good questions. I'll try to answer.

1. Sorry about the photos. The scanned copies were often of copies of copies.
2. The photos destroyed in a fire in August 2001 were in a precious folder kept by Amanda. In the "Chronology" section of Chad's website for August, 2001 is Chad's list from memory of many of the missing photos. There were many bruiseless periods which surviving photos show, and are also proven by the bruiseless medical appointments of August 10 and Sept. 11, and the known babysitting times with Cassidy's grandmother.
3. The T-ball accident caused some bruising to Cassidy on the 8th, but it wasn't "deep" and the Medical Examiner testified that the bruises she saw were not likely caused by a ball. Nonetheless, the hit knocked Cassidy backwards and into some level of spaciness.
4. Yes, Chad knew what kind of ball it was. It was one of the last of the balls in the toy wheelbarrow and he made a split second, and unwise, decision to toss the T-ball rather than stop the play and pick up all the wiffle balls and start over. He had Cassidy on his lap, and it was just one of those stupid decisions that we all make sometimes - and usually avoid calamity.  
 (continued below)

17 October 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

(Continued from above)

5. The steroids usage was rumored, and Chad told the police about supplements during his interrogation, but steroids were not specifically addressed until his pre-sentencing report. (See page 544 of EYE CONTACT, or search for "steroids.") (Also, see page 298 of his "Letters" which are linked at the website Home Page, Key Documents, #11), where he wrote, "I have NEVER used steroids."
6. Chad was not angry on the night of the 8th. As he has noted in his "Letters," he was especially solicitous of Cassidy because she seemed ill. He tried to give her dinner, and later a popsicle. He gave her a bath, changed her diaper, rubbed J&J Baby Lotion on her, and read "Snappy Numbers" to her at bedtime. Later that night, he and Amanda argued briefly when she came home from work, and then they went to bed together.
7. Interesting question about photographs and life in prison. Chad lives his life as fully as he can, given his wrongful conviction. He enjoys seeing his family and friends and tries to make the best of what has happened, and is working every day for his exoneration. Laughter and love help him overcome his anger at what has happened. Please read his "Letters" to get a full measure of the man.
8. Yes, Chad has an incredible memory. Please remember that his recollections of 2000 have been frozen in time. In my research of the case, it's been rare that his memory has been proven incorrect.
9. Regarding Cassidy's death, there is considerable evidence, which was ignored in the investigation and at Chad's trial, that Cassidy was ill. Her death may have been caused by an accumulation of accidents, disease, chronic condition and toxins, or a combination of them. All we

know is that Chad didn't murder Cassidy. He loved her, and never hit or even spanked her. Chad's lawyers put all their eggs in one basket and said at Chad's trial that the babysitter killed Cassidy, but are other possibilities. That's why the book, EYE CONTACT, labels Cassidy's death as "Mysterious."  
Morrison

17 October 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

## Mark C

Few other (adult/border line 5-year old) questions...

Why are some photos really blurry? What really happened to the photos that were coincidentally lost in that fire? I'm sure some would have revealed bruises if Cassidy was "so clumsy."

Unless that plastic bat was made out of some kind super teflon, is anybody really supposed to believe that it generated enough force on a hardball to cause serious damage...to the point of deep bruising? Also, Chad holding Cassidy on his lap at the time...seems like it would take a professional baseball player to do what Kyle did...by accident. And, you can't tell me Chad didn't know the difference between a wiffle ball and, much heavier, t-ball. Too caught up in the game that he didn't realize what he was throwing to his son? Most people who picked up that ball would have realized and not thrown it to be batted back at them.

Anyone explore the possibility that Chad was on steroids and experienced bouts of roid rage? It sounds like he took supplements so a valid question.

Why does Chad look so happy in pictures of him in prison? If I were falsely imprisoned, I'd look like a miserable son of a bitch 24/7, especially mugging for the camera. Seems odd...and I'm sure I'll hear how happy he was to see family, etc. to justify the expressions.

Chad's recollection of photos (who, what, where) also seems very odd to me. 99.99% of individuals in this world couldn't recall a fraction of what he details. Christ, I get surprised every time when I scroll back through my camera to see what pics I've taken in the last month...let alone from years ago. Granted, different day and age with digital photography, but...seriously.

If Chad didn't do it, then who did? Can any supporter answer that question?

Or, is it just...we're not sure, Cassidy may have had some condition beyond the abuse she suffered that was the real cause. Or, Jeff did it.

If Chad really thought that Jeff did it, why didn't his defense focus on that?

17 October 2011

## David G |

Morrison, in regard to your #11 response (in part) photographs that can be dated within the period of the charges against Chad and Amanda do tend to show that "eye witness accounts were unreliable"

the late U.S. Supreme Court Justice William J. Brennan observed that "At least since United States v. Wade, 388 U. S. 218 (1967), the Court has recognized the inherently suspect qualities of eyewitness identification evidence, and described the evidence as "notoriously unreliable"

I completely agree with you if I am reading this correctly.

This question just jumps out because it's pretty obvious.

9: So what does Jeff Marshall's prior charges have anything to do with Chad Evans?

They both have assault charges and marshalls cannot be discounted!

You put this Persons Assault Charges along with admitting to hitting Kassidy so badly he left a bruise, Using makeup to cover bruises, Lack of medical attention for the many things that happened in his care that NEEDED medical attention and didn't get. Shows a more accurate picture of who he is.

Greenwald testified "that she estimates other injuries would have been inflicted four hours before she died, which would have possibly put the toddler in Marshall's care".

If Greenwald is correct and TOD IS 1:30 and you subtract the four hrs for injuries inflicted before she Died this would be 10:30!

Remember now it was aprox 12:30 when marshall called and said unresponsive baby making noises.

how could this even be possible? This is also backed up by the first Officer on the scene (he states) body was cold.

in general, it takes aprox 2 hrs to notice a difference in body temp. which again brings us back to 10:30

where would chad be at 10:30 when this Innocent baby was beaten one last time?

If one takes the time you can find alot of Reasonable Doubt.

*17 October 2011 - Cold New England/Sunny Florida*

**David G** | 

Melissa, I could not have said that better... EXCELLENT!

Mark C. Welcome to the forum.

@ Miss Becky, Now thats a welcoming thought!  
and do you have anything that says ding you got mail?

*17 October 2011 - COLD New England/Sunny Florida*

**Becky B** | 

@ Mark C  
Welcome to the CEWCC forum.  
Now lets hope we can ALL debate this topic like adults.

*17 October 2011 - Rochester, NH*

**Mark C (Former NH Resident)**

I'm curious about Bob's take on Jeff. I mean, he is no saint by most accounts and has admitted to hitting Kassidy so badly he left a horrific bruise.

Mark C

*17 October 2011*

## Melissa

For me, what leaves me in doubt is there are so many unanswered questions. I agree Bob its crazy he didn't take the stand. But I feel like there is so much more, like you said he bathed her to get the blood off- let's say that were true- why then was blood still under most of her fingernails(sorry I don't remember how many) When I bathe my children- their fingernails come clean from being in the water. Why wouldn't his son say anything about her being bloody if that were the case? He was old enough to observe so many things. Why was Cassidy not wearing pants if her diaper was never changed the day she passed? Why was so many calls made BEFORE 911? Bob you make great points, you truly do. You have even made me question things- not innocence- but why of things. Kudos to you. With that said, nothing we state, I stated, makes you question? Nothing makes you wonder- gee whiz why wouldn't he take care of that girl better? Why did he not take her to the hospital after falling out of a truck? Why would he beat her butt so bad? When looking at an innocent life, I feel like everyone should be looked at. I know, yes Chad is the only one who was convicted, but if your truly for Cassidy's justice than you can't ignore everything else simply because it didn't have to do with Chad. This was a beautiful young baby that deserves someone to look closely at everything and everyone. If everyone examined everything and we all put our heads together- I think answers could be found.

17 October 2011 - NH

## Becky B |

It's simple...

I've seen ALL the photos & physical evidence proves Chad's story & when you look into his trash you see that Chad couldn't even kill a mouse! & for the record you can learn a lot from a 5 year old.

16 October 2011 - Rochester, NH

## Morrison Bonpasse |

Bob,

A few comments on your comments.

1. Whether you call an appointment with an orthopedic surgeon a consultation or examination, Dr. James Timoney still saw Cassidy on September 11, 2000, and said she was "cranky," and he said nothing, absolutely nothing, about bruises.

11. Yes. photographs that can be dated within the period of the charges against Chad and Amanda do tend to show that eye witness accounts were unreliable. Although you have written before that you saw no connection between the October 1 photograph and the jury's finding of Not Guilty for the "grabbing and squeezing Cassidy's face" assault charge for the period October 1-7, I do see a direct connection. If the jury had seen the other photographs AND known about the medical appointments and known about the public places to which Cassidy had been taken, the jury would have been even more doubtful about the assault charges. Please note that most of the observations of bruises, such as a bruise on a forehead or neck, were not of bruises that could have been caused by "grabbing and squeezing Cassidy's face."

20. Chad told the police on November 9, that the ball that hit Cassidy was a "starter baseball," and a "hard rubber ball." He never said it was anything else to anyone. Others clearly misunderstood, because Chad's indoor ball hitting with Kyle was always with wiffle balls, except for that night.

Twice you wrote that the evidence against Chad was "overwhelming." If it was so overwhelming, why did the judge dismiss one of the bone fracture assault charges and the jury found Chad Not Guilty for the other? Why did the jury find Chad Not Guilty for the October 1-7 "grabbing and squeezing" assault charge?

Can you state what evidence you believed was "overwhelming?" Perhaps you could name the most important three or five?

Morrison

15 October 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Becky:

Your note, or statement, or whatever it was: "Forensics show Chad is innocent!!".....What forensics evidence are you talking about?

As a chair person of the free Chad committee, you should be prepared to back up what you say, so back it up. Or perhaps your 5 year old can do it for you?

Regards,

Bob

*15 October 2011 - Rochester*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,

There is nothing new in your letter to the AG's office:

- 1: The Sept 11th appointment appears to have been a consultation, not an examination.
- 2: Duly noted, but hardly enough to show reasonable doubt.
- 3: Perhaps he would have been not guilty of another assault charge, but not the murder charge.
- 4: I disagree. The assault on Amanda demonstrated Chad's demeanor on the evening of the 8th, the evening that Chad inflicted injuries to Cassidy.
- 5: I've pondered the blood found under Cassidy's fingernails and I've concluded this: That in all likely hood, the blood got under her nails on the evening of the 8th, while she was in Chad's care. Chad gave her a bath, possibly to wash blood off her body from his assault on her.
- 6: Again, it shows no reasonable doubt.
- 7: Merrill's alleged statement to Chad is just that, alleged. This, coming from Chad Evans, is hardly believable.
- 8: Are you sure it wasn't included in discovery? Did you look behind the
- 9: So what does Jeff Marshall's prior charges have anything to do with Chad Evans?
- 10: Please explain to me how this testimony was prejudicial to Chad. You're reaching.
- 11: None of those pictures are close ups of Cassidy, furthermore, there was overwhelming eye witness accounts of the bruises to Cassidy's face. Are you saying that those pictures would have made the eye witness accounts unreliable?
- 12: Mute point.
- 13: Unimportant.
- 14: I'm starting to fall asleep now Morrison.
- 15: I'm yawning.
- 16: Amanda's optometrist records? Are you serious Morrison?

*15 October 2011 - Rochester*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Continued:

17: Duly noted, however it does not help Chad's case in the least bit.

18: I really don't see how this helps Chad.

19: There were a lot of things Chad's lawyers failed to do, but it still wouldn't have helped because the evidence against Chad was overwhelming.

20: Here comes the wiffle ball again. Or was it a starter ball. Or a baseball. Who knows, because it wasn't Chad's attorneys who confused everybody, it was Chad. He couldn't keep his story straight.

21: I agree with this, because Kassidy did bruise easily. As a matter of fact, every time Chad grabbed her face with full force, she bruised. How is that possible?

22: I agree, the defense should have presented other possible causes of death, like radon gas, poison gas, nerve gas, and maybe laughing gas.

23: It's so sad that Chad lawfully assaulted Kassidy.

24: This is a complete fabrication on Chad's part....the conversation never happened.

I can't read anymore, I'm getting bored.

Regards,

Bob

*15 October 2011 - Rochester*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

I agree, softly, with Bob's request for open self-identification of contributors here with real names, but I'm more concerned with what people WRITE than with their names. Anonymity sometimes allows important ideas to be presented safely. One of the great written discussions in American history, "The Federalist Papers," was written in 1787-78 by "Publius." It wasn't until Alexander Hamilton's death in 1804 that the true authors became known, and they were Hamilton, James Madison and John Jay.

In response to Becky's note, I wish that the forensics (meaning the scientific evidence?) did show that Chad is innocent, but they don't. At least not clearly. However, it can be said that the forensics DON'T SHOW that he assaulted or murdered Kassidy either. Given all the recent cases where prosecutor allegations of terrible crimes against children have been shown to be instances of accidents, disease, or chronic conditions, Chad's case must be re-investigated. See the cases of Michael Hansen, Eric Hopkins, Elizabeth Torrey and Joseph McElheny on the website at "Related Websites," paragraph "2. Cases where defendants found innocent."

I wonder what visitors to this "Online Comments" section think of the 46 reasons for a re-investigation that were submitted to Sr. Asst. Atty. General Jeffery Strelzin last week. See "Latest News" for October 13. Any questions or challenges to any of the 46?

Morrison

*15 October 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Becky B** | 

It's not a matter of WHO killed Kassidy!

It's WHAT REALLY killed Cassidy????  
Forensics show Chad is innocent!!  
My 5 year old gets it... why don't you??  
FREE CHAD!!!

15 October 2011 - Rochester, NH

**Bob Arnold** | 

I'm sorry but I just have to say something to the "former NH resident." I'm glad that you're here and that you and I agree, however it would be nice if you at least used your first name, as I've addressed this with many of the Chad Evans supporters, I've got to be fair and address it with you as well.

Regards,

Bob

14 October 2011 - Rochester

**Bob Arnold** | 

Former NH Resident:

I don't think I would characterize any of the three main persons as "losers." As far as Chad goes, he was actually a hard working guy with a driving personality. Now, this is the problem I've had all along with him not taking the stand in his own defense. A guy like that, with all of his accomplishments in life, a guy who could navigate the in's and out's of a career with a lot of responsibility, and he doesn't take the stand. It does not add up at all, not to mention his excuse, "my attorney told me not to" is just out right silly. I believe, based on his personality, that if in fact he was innocent, then he certainly would have taken the stand despite what his legal counsel advised.

I agree with you that the reason Jeff baby sat was due to Chad's influence over him. Chad tended to surround himself with people he could influence (he had the "big man on campus" syndrom). Once he lost influence on someone, he found no further need for them. Ex-wife Tristan is an example, she started doing things against what the "big man on campus" wanted, so he beat her up pretty badly. Another example of his influence was demonstrated with his willful witness tampering of Amanda. His professed love for her materialized only after his initial police interview on the night of Cassidy's death. Yes, he tampered with her as well as Travis Hunt.

Morrison, is there a summary of the conversation between you and the assistant AG?

Regards,

Bob

14 October 2011 - Rochester

**Former NH Resident**

Morrison,

When I say "losers," I don't mean what they did for work, how much money they made, etc. In fact, I know several millionaires who are losers. Dirtbags...rednecks...white trash...whatever label you want give them.

Only one person knows for sure who killed this poor, helpless child.

Was Jeff wrong smacking her ass so badly that it left a horrible mark? Absofrickinlutely, man. In fact, I would love to see charges brought against him for that and other incidents that occurred while Cassidy was in his care. Drinking Windex? WTF? Peel yourself away from the TV for christsakes

and take care of the girl...who was not high maintenance by most accounts.

My guess is that Jeff took on the role as babysitter due to Chad's position and Jeff's contracts/livelihood. It certainly seems odd that a grown man acts as a babysitter, but whatever...I can see why he didn't refuse.

I just think the focus is skewed. Let the poor girl rest in peace and give up the crusade to free Chad. Seriously. New trial or whatever, he's still spending his life behind bars.

If I'm proven wrong, I'll be the first to eat crow.

Respectfully,  
FNHR

14 October 2011

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

To Bob,

The meeting with Sr. Asst. Attorney General Jeffery Strelzin took place yesterday, the 13th. It was cordial and helpful. I posted our letter, with appendices, to Jeff in the "Latest News" section of the website a few minutes ago.

To "Former NH Resident"

Chad was a successful manager and Jeff had his own landscaping business that was prospering. Amanda and Jennifer were younger, but had high school degrees and ambitions for their futures. Amanda became a teenage, single mother before she wanted to be a mother.

Chad and Amanda thought they understood the cause of each of the bruises they knew about, except Chad didn't know the source of the sore on Cassidy's lower lip. Amanda didn't think the bruising indicated a serious problem as both she and her mother bruised easily. No one knew of broken bones, as Cassidy showed no indications of pain to anyone. As too many parents of deceased children know, hindsight can be tragically 20/20. How many of us say, "Let's wait and see how she is in the morning, and then make a decision?"

At a new trial, Chad would testify. He would testify about how he held Cassidy's face in order to obtain eye contact, and NOT to punish or hurt her. There would be photographs of a healthy Cassidy at several times in the fall of 2000. There would be a timeline of observations, events and appointments. There would be many witnesses to present their observations of Cassidy during the weeks and months before she died.

Chad loved Cassidy, and was planning to raise her to adulthood, and he talked to his financial planner about setting up a IRA fund. He talked to the director of his sons' school a few days before Cassidy died about enrolling Cassidy. He gave money to Amanda to purchase new clothes on Sunday, November 5, four days before Cassidy died.

Yes, a lie detector test is not admissible in a trial, but the police use them and prosecutors often rely on them. Chad is the only person in the case to have taken such a test. I've never heard of a case where a person has passed a lie detector test because s/he has convinced her/himself that s/he is telling the truth, even if the statements are not true.

Morrison

14 October 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Former NH Resident**

Dear Morrison,

While I appreciate your efforts to find justice in situations where you feel people have been wrongly convicted, I don't see this one being added to the list of those who have been exonerated.

This case just reeks of a bunch of losers that should never have been in a position to care for any child. Yeah, I said it. I'll make it personal regarding those involved because I think they all should be

accountable for Cassidy's death, some alot more than others. To stand by and not do anything when you see bruises, broken limbs, etc. is unconscionable. Beyond disturbing. I hope the Fab 4 are haunted by it for the rest of their pathetic lives. They deserve it.

Let's say you get the case to be opened and new evidence considered. What exactly is it that you think would sway a jury to find him innocent? Procedural legal issues aside.

Taking a lie detector tells people that he is either telling the truth or he has convinced himself that he is telling the truth. Its not admissible for reasons you surely know.

14 October 2011

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison, have you met with Strelzin yet?

Regards,  
Bob

14 October 2011 - Rochester

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Please, can we get back to the facts of the case, and their possible interpretation? Let's avoid the name-calling and personal attacks. Presumably, we share the common ground of wanting justice in this case.

It was brought to my attention last week, that several of Cassidy's internal organs were "congested" which meant that she died of slow health failure, which is not an indicator of child abuse or sudden blows. I don't know what caused it.

14 October 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Dear "David G" aka Coward:

Child games? I expected your response to be weak, without an opening debate about the facts of the case, and overall unimpressive....you certainly didn't let me down.

Let's take a moment and review the facts of the case: Chad was a hot-headed abusive individual who cared nothing about Cassidy or her mother (he did threaten to kick their asses out of his house on 11/9). Chad covered his tracks with Travis Hunt, however the jury couldn't believe Travis (see trial transcript) and I couldn't believe him either. Chad's video taped interrogation speaks volumes, a clearly guilty individual being questioned by professional police detectives. Chad refused to cooperate with the police, and invoked his miranda rights early on. Chad also broke the terms of his bail by maintaining contact with Amanda. Chad refused to testify at his own trial, now he blames his attorney advice????

I can sum Chad's story in one word: Unbelievable.

Regards,

Bob

14 October 2011 - Rochester

**Dave G** | 

Bob you are correct you have nothing to prove.. so leave. ENOUGH OF YOUR CHILD GAMES! I wont waste this forum responding to any more of your IGNORANT comments NO MATTER WHO YOU COME IN HERE AS!

14 October 2011 - COLD New England/Sunny Florida

Dave G | 

@ Miss Becky :)  
We Need to talk to Morrison about that Like Button.

As Always FREE CHAD.

14 October 2011 - COLD New England/Sunny Florida

Bob Arnold | 

To "David G", another coward who posts here without giving their full name: The facts of the case were provided to a jury, and that jury found your beloved Chad Evans guilty of murder, not to mention multiple counts of assault. There is no need for any of us who believe in Chad's guilt to "prove" anything. You, like the other members of the cult to free Chad, have failed to provide anything of substance to either prove his innocence or to warrant a new trial.

To the former resident of NH:

I've been a follower of this matter for nearly a year now, I've read everything I could to better understand this case. I've also been ridiculed by mystery guests to this forum who refuse to use their real name, but at the same time they accuse me of "hiding" behind my keyboard. Regardless of the facts, these shit heads have blindly jumped on the free Chad Evans bandwagon. These are the same type of corny idiots who think 9/11 was an inside job, that Wallstreet should suffer at the hands of the likes of Obama (a true communist) and that JFK was a conspiracy. My best advise to you is to address your fact based questions and opening debate with Morrison. Most of the other people on here can't discuss this case on an intellectual level because they don't understand the case.

Regards,

Bob

14 October 2011 - Rochester, NH

Becky | 

@ Dave G  
where's my LIKE button??  
1st drink is still on me...  
FREE CHAD!!!

14 October 2011 - Rochester, NH

Dave G | 

@Former NH Resident, It Makes no difference to me if you take me seriously or not, Or that you Question who I am.  
This committee Knows Exactly Who I am. That is the Important thing in this forum. MY email is Correct as well.

I was going to mail you but then I saw you decided to hide that as well.

So let me see, no name, no email, Whats the point in trying to communicate?

please give us the "Facts" that "PROVE" Chad Is Guilty, Back up what you say.

13 October 2011 - COLD New England/Sunny Florida

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Dear Former NH Resident,

Your offer to consider your first posting as a public service announcement would be accepted if you provided specifics for your allegation that the efforts to exonerate Chad and Amanda are BS.

Please view the photographs of Kassidy in the "Amanda and Kassidy" subsection of the webpage, "Who IS Chad Evans?" at

[http://www.chadevanswronglyconvicted.org/who\\_amanda\\_and\\_kassidy.html](http://www.chadevanswronglyconvicted.org/who_amanda_and_kassidy.html).

The last ten photographs of Kassidy on that page were taken during the periods of charges against Chad and Amanda. Chad's jury saw only one of the photos, the October 1, 2000 photo of Kassidy with her toy bunny. I believe that photo was the reason the jury found Chad "not guilty" for the charge of assaulting Kassidy during the period of the photograph.

What would have happened if the jury had seen the other photos?

What do you think of the jury not being told that Amanda took Kassidy to two doctor appointments during the period of alleged child endangerment?

What do you think of the jury not being told that Chad took Kassidy to a family event on Sunday, November 5, 2000, which was four days before she died? At that event, five other adults saw Kassidy with Chad, and only one bruise on Kassidy's face.

What do you think of Chad's passing his 2010 lie detector test?

Do you agree that many people in this country have been wrongly convicted? Above and beyond the 273 exonerated by the nation's Innocence Projects?

Morrison

*13 October 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Former NH Resident**

You really told me, Dave G.

By any chance, are you related to Kenny G? I mean, "G" is such an uncommon last name.

Now, if you are telling me that your first name is not really "David" and that "G" is not really your last name, then you have lost credibility in my eyes. In fact, I'm not sure I'd be able to read any of your posts objectively if that were the case.

Consider my earlier post a public service announcement. Give up this futile crusade and take back your lives people!

RIP, Kassidy.

*13 October 2011*

**Dave G** | 

Wow @ Former NH Resident...

Thank You for wasting Your time and using up valuable Internet bandwidth.

Something for you to consider on your next visit, Feel free to use your Real Name. It helps in taking your Opinion or Facts seriously.

ALSO - Opinions are like A-holes Everyone has one but its counter productive when you act like an A-hole expressing your opinion.

Regards : Dave

*13 October 2011 - COLD New England/Sunny Florida*

**Former NH Resident**

This case makes me sick to my stomach...the fact that a poor, defenseless baby was abused, tortured and killed by people she looked up to for love and comfort.

Give up the BS plight to get this convicted child murderer released from prison. You're wasting your time and using up valuable Internet bandwidth.

Most of the parties involved in this case couldn't properly care for a damn hamster, let alone a toddler.

RIP, Cassidy.

12 October 2011

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

People DO die from mold poisoning, even if not every day in this country, at least. See the 2010 article in the Cleveland Leader about the deaths of Hollywood actors and husband and wife, Simon Monjack and Brittany Murphy, at <http://www.clevelandleader.com/node/14224>. And the article from the Center for Disease Control and Prevention at

<http://www.cdc.gov/nceh/publications/books/housing/cha05.htm>, For further info, see webpage, "Black Mold Symptoms in Children" at <http://www.buzzle.com/articles/black-mold-symptoms-in-children.html> and black mold website at <http://blackmold.awardspace.com>.

Speaking of infrequency.... I cannot find a single instance in literature or real life where a mother has watched her lover beat her child over weeks and months, resulting in the child's death, and the mother remains in love with her child's killer. If anyone knows of such a case ANYWHERE in this country since our beginnings, please let me know. It didn't happen in New Hampshire in 2000-2007 either. The best reasonable explanation is that Amanda didn't see Chad beating Cassidy and she doesn't believe that he was responsible for Cassidy's death.

If frequency is the answer, then Cassidy more likely died of mold poisoning than at Chad's hands, and that's only one type of possible poisoning for Cassidy. Others are arsenic, pesticide and the ammonia in the Windex she drank.

Morrison

9 October 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Oh yea Becky, people die from mold every day.

7 October 2011 - Rochester

**Becky B** | 

Hi Bob! Did you know that the "minute marks" on Cassidy's foot was actually petechia?? & knowing how you are a painter and are in construction/remodeling you must know the dangers of mold. Did you know Cassidy had exposure to mold while in Maine??

6 October 2011 - Rochester, NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Right. Thanks. Incredibly, the jury knew nothing of Cassidy's medical appointments on May 9 (pediatrician), August 10 (pediatrician) and September 11 (orthopedic surgeon). Those last two appointments were within the periods, beginning August 1st, that Chad and Amanda were convicted of Child Endangerment. In her first police interview, Amanda mentioned that her mother, Jacqueline, took Cassidy to a hospital with a fever. We don't yet have those records, but have identified the hospital as Goodall Hospital in Sanford. It was before the spring of 2000, because that's when Jacqueline moved to Auburn from Sanford. We do have Cassidy's birth records from Southern Maine Medical Center in Biddeford, but do not have the pediatrician records from that date, February 4, 1999 until May 9, 2000. The Maine Medical Examiner may have copies of those records, but she has declined to release them to me, even with Amanda's authorization.

Once the information from these records is combined with what we know about Cassidy's health

and behavior in October and November, 2000, and her death on November 9, we may be able to more clearly identify other possible causes for her death.

Morrison

3 October 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison her medical records would be helpful as well.

Regards,

Bob

1 October 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Thank you for your kind comments, your deep down feelings about the case, and your willingness to look at more evidence. This story is complicated and even with so many pages of information available, there is still much to learn and digest. This morning, it finally dawned on me that it would be useful to prepare a database of observations of Cassidy's behavior and health, including accidents, bruises and injuries. For 20 months I've struggled with ways to assemble the data with WORD documents and codes, but the data were too chaotic. The website is one way to collect the information, and the book, EYE CONTACT, is another, but a database system will also be useful. It will be a lot of work to collect the information into such a database, but it will be useful so the data can be sorted by the name of the observer, the date of the observation, the observed behavior, etc.

Morrison

24 September 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

To the coward "I Know Bob", I find your writing skills to be characteristic of a twelve year old. If your grasp of the english language is indicative of your intelligence, then any further notes addressing you would be unfair to you, you child.

I have been a faithful contributor to this forum, and not once have I made any threats to anyone. On occasion I have been perfectly blunt and combative. This serves it's purpose, because as I've pointed out before, these are the types of exchanges that you can expect to get into with less civilized persons than myself.

As far as being closed-minded, on the contrary, when I first began researching this case I really wanted to find Chad innocent. However, based upon all available information, I found that the verdict rendered was correct. I'm still willing to look at more evidence, because deep down inside I would like to find him innocent, as it would be a horrible injustice for an innocent man to be stripped of his rights and freedom for something he didn't do.

IF this were the case, then Morrison Bonpasse is the man for the job.

23 September 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Can we return to being a "forum for all those with opinions about the case"? i.e. the Cassidy Bortner/Amanda Bortner/Chad Evans case? There is still much to be asked and much to be learned, and common ground to be found. All of us, for example, view the death of Cassidy Bortner as an avoidable tragedy. All of us want to understand what happened to her, and if crimes were committed, we want justice. Further, none of us wants injustice for anyone.

20 September 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Mellissa**

Mr. Arnold,  
I hope that GOD has mercy on your soul when you one day pass away, yet judge you as harshly as you have judged Chad. Your concern about this case is noble and understandable, yet you have failed to see the whole picture. I will pray for you to see the truth one day, even though your heart is clearly filled with hatred and anger. Sincerely,  
Mellissa

20 September 2011 - Midwest

**I know bob | **

Colene would be very sad over this!

20 September 2011 - Rochester

**Bob Arnold | **

oh boy.

20 September 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**I know bob | **

I am sure that the only one doing any harrasing and threatening here is YOU! these people here have EVERY RIGHT! to know who is coming here and harrasing them ! When they decide to have you prosecuted for harrasment as well as copyright infringement i will give them your name, address and anything else they need to fully prosecute YOU! let me make that clear to YOU!! they are not bothering you! but you seem to get a kick out of coming here to their forum and harrasing them with your nonsense. for the record my name is BOB! So go ahead have me prosecuted for informing them as to who is harrasing them! now thats intelligent son!

20 September 2011 - Rochester

**Bob Arnold | **

Furthermore, I will have records and internet address info subpoenaed from Yahoo for your bob.arnold49 address to determine who originated it. You should carefully consider your next move.

20 September 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Bob Arnold | **

To the person who is hiding behind THEIR keyboard, I'm not afraid to use MY real name. If I begin getting calls, there is a proper procedure that I intend to follow and it does involve the police. After I have website records SUBPOENAED I will have you prosecuted for harrasment. I need to make this perfectly clear to you right now, I will release the hounds from hell on you.

The assistant AG agreed to give ONE of you a BRIEF meeting to discuss things that have not been brought up yet.

Regards,

Bob

20 September 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,  
Jeff Strelzin's letter to Chad was courteous and helpful, and he agreed to meet with four of Chad's supporters. Campaigns for justice for the wrongly convicted sometimes take a lot of time and thoughtful consideration. The recent release of the West Memphis 3 is a good example. As you consider "the matter to be closed in its entirety," can you please stop commenting on this website? The matter is definitely not closed. Paraphrasing John Paul Jones, we have barely begun the campaign for justice for Chad Evans.  
Morrison

*20 September 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**I know bob** | 

I just looked at some of these Bob Arnold comments  
I must say what arrogance! he acts as if he was there? some people get off hiding behind a keyboard.(cowards)  
while i do agree that he has made (some) valid points, he fails to look at the points that blow his points right out of the water!(close minded)  
none the less, this person needs to realize that he has NO LEGAL RIGHT to post pictures which he does not OWN of Mr Evans or others on his hate pages without his/their consent.  
He has already violated the terms of the webpage contract, He needs to be educated in copyright laws!  
if you need his home phone number or address email me.. he most likely has only given you his verizon cell#

you need to grow up Robert!

*20 September 2011 - Rochester*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Standing bridge watch on a ship which is rapidly sinking is serious business as well. At what point does the captain order his crew to abandon ship?

I know that the letter from the AG's office must have been a huge blow to you, but surely you're not suprised by it? I mean, really Morrison, everything that I've said all along was quickly summarized in that letter. Furthermore, the "book" (I love how the assistand AG used my quotation marks) had no business being sent to state police and justice personnel. Your previous assumption that the book is factual based upon the fact that nobody from police or justice has disputed it is a falacy of thinking and yet another example of how the Chad Evans supporters use smoke and mirrors to mimick the truth.

At this point I consider the matter to be closed in it's entirety. Unless of course you'd like to submit your client to a polygraph test, vs an unreliable and questionable VSA which has recently been banned by the DOD as well as the DOJ.

I will be watching for your next defendent, hopefully he/she will be a better subject of wrongful conviction that Mr. Evans. And as far as Mr. Trenkler goes, well you're beating a dead horse with him too.

Best Regards,

Bob

*20 September 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,  
As I wrote in EYE CONTACT, sarcasm is not helpful to finding truth or common ground or in fostering constructive dialogue.  
The question of whether an imprisoned man was wrongly convicted is serious business.  
*20 September 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob Arnold** | 

I suppose you're right Morrison, that picture of Tristen is too graphic for my website....very bloody, that lower lip is so swollen that it looks like he hit her with a baseball bat....hey wait, maybe it was a wiffle ball bat. A yellow one, like the one Travis Hunt described, but never appeared in the police search.....a mysterious yellow bat did it. Or maybe a brown bat. Better yet, a starter bat. That's it, it was a starter bat....or a plastic bat. Hmmm....I'm getting confused here. OK let's just say she fell off a trampoline. Or she bumped into it. Or.....

*19 September 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Bob Arnold** | 

My hats off to Senior Assistant Attorney General Jeffery Strelzin. I couldn't have said it any better. It's ironic that he used the same quotation marks that I used in describing Eye Contact....a "book".

I would like to volunteer to be the person to meet with him. I'm sure he and I would hit it off, unlike a meeting with one of you which I'm sure he'd find a total waste of time. I could sit and talk to him about all of the fiction that can be found in Eye Contact, maybe I can have a friendly contest with him, see who can point out the most lies, looser has to buy lunch. We'd eat a meal of prime rib and non-organic baked potato, versus free range chicken and organic sweet potatoes. Afterwards, we'd light up a cigar and tell war stories.

*19 September 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,  
Regarding your interpretation of Chad's mug shot photo, perception is often in the eyes of the beholder.  
Even if your perception of anger is correct, wouldn't you be angry if you were arrested for crimes you didn't commit?  
I recommend that you ask Tristan for her permission before you post a photograph of her.  
Morrison

*18 September 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob Arnold** | 

If that Facebook page is for his friends and family, then why the controversial title?

I would never do that to a child. The only photographs I intend to use are Chad's mug shot (a very good photo I might add, the angry, diabolicle look in his eyes are heart stopping) and the police photo of a bloody and battered Tristen (the night that Chad brutally assaulted her, )

*18 September 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,  
Chad's Facebook pages are for friends and supporters. Beyond that, I'm not familiar with Facebook's rules. This "online comments" section of Chad's website has been open from the beginning "as a forum for all those with opinions and facts about the case."  
Regarding your plan for another website about the case, you are welcome to copy materials from

this website, but please give credit where due. However, please do not use photos of Chad's son. Your opinions and facts are welcome in this section, but it would be helpful if we could avoid rehashing what's been written here before.

Regarding the two Channel 9 programs about Chad's case last winter, I agree that they did not conclude that Chad was innocent. That's not what news programs do. They did, however, correctly inform the people of New Hampshire that their government may have imprisoned an innocent man, and that he is requesting justice and a re-investigation.

Morrison

*18 September 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob Arnold** | 

I can't believe you guys took my Facebook page down, that's real good. I'd like to see if you can take this down:

[www.chadevansguilty.com](http://www.chadevansguilty.com)

It's still a work in progress.

Morrison,

I got your message, I barely have time to cut my grass besides meeting with you about Chad. Maybe someday? Yes I spend a lot of time here, mainly late in the evening, or if I have a sick little one home from school.

I'm really upset about my comments being deleted from Facebook. Sure, there were a lot of them, but why were they all deleted?

I'm also upset about some of the messages I received from Chad Evans supporters who claim that Channel 9 News stated he was innocent....what's up with that? I swear, some of the people on your side of the isle have no idea what they're talking about.

Regards,

Bob

*17 September 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Mellissa** | 

Mr. Arnold,

I respectfully ask you at this time, why have not yet answered my question? Why is Chad not entitled to another trial? Does it frighten or embarrass you that your peers might learn the truth and an innocent man may be set free? Please help me understand what harm there is in putting this before the courts again.

Furthermore, this isnt about stroking Morrison's ego. This is about, and always will be about, the exoneration of a wrongfully convicted man.

Sincerely, Mellissa

*16 September 2011 - Midwest*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Sometimes written communication doesn't work, whether it's in letters, emails or Internet postings. In the beginning of your postings at Chad's website, you seemed more open to evidence that Chad was wrongfully convicted, but lately you seem to have become less receptive. These exchanges have taken a lot of my time and your time and we each seem to continue to believe what we believed at the beginning.

That's why I wrote you an email this past Sunday to see if we could meet. As you appear to live in Rochester, it seems reasonable that we should meet to talk face to face, and even to make "eye contact." It's not like you are in Arizona. I called you yesterday and left a message with the same

goal.

I hope we can meet to discuss this case, and probably find common ground, just as the two sides of many issues have met in other fora. So far, we seem to agree that Chad is 100%, but you think he's 100% guilty and I am convinced that he's 100% innocent. Surely, as reasonable people, we can sit down and find ways to bridge these differences. I'm willing to invest in the time for such meetings, and hope that you are.

Sincerely,  
Morrison

*16 September 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Oops I did it again, I started a new group on Facebook, "Chad Evans Guilty". I'm going to be very busy with these new endeavors, so please don't be offended if I stop coming here.

*16 September 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Becky,

I just started my own Facebook page titled "Chad Evans Guilty Committee." Consider this the end result of deleting my comments on Facebook. By deleting my comments, which were factual, unbiased and to the point, you've proven that you're more than willing to shut people out who have a differing opinion than yours. I believe, as a chairperson of the Chad Evans Wrongfully Convicted Committee, you've acted in a rash and extremely childish manner. Furthermore, the title of your Facebook page was not "Chad Evans Family and Friends" or "We love Chad", it was controversial and addressed his so-called "wrongful conviction."

You're more than welcome to visit my Facebook page and feel free to write anything you wish. I, unlike you, will not shut people out who have a differing view than mine.

*16 September 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Becky B** | 

Dear Mr. Bob Arnold,

Facebook is a place for Chad's friend's and family... you have clearly stated your opinions here & that's fine, this is where it belongs, not on Facebook.

Thank you by the way for blowing up my phone while I was at work today, it made my day most interesting!

*16 September 2011 - Rochester, NH*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Wow, I just purchased chadevansguilty.com from Godaddy. You want to play around and delete my Facebook comments which were factual, well fine. I'm starting my own website devoted to ensuring that Chad Evans stays in prison, and your book is exposed for what it is: 60% fictional nonsense, 40% fact.

So whoever decided to delete/block me on Facebook, my hats off to you. You've given me motivation to proceed with what I've been thinking about doing for several months now.

*16 September 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Bob Arnold** | 

It's interesting that my recent comments on the Facebook page of the Chad Evans Wrongly Convicted Committee were all deleted.....you people are unbelievable. You're going to cause me to start my own web page, Facebook page and forum that supports his conviction.

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Regarding the effect on the jury of the October 1 photo:

- a. It was the only photo the jury saw of Kassidy alive.
- b. A photo is sometimes worth a lot of words.
- c. Jacqueline Conley testified about the circumstances and dating of the photo.
- d. There was very little evidence about the precise timing of observations of any of the bruises which were allegedly caused by Chad. Remember, the assault charges were all the same, except for the dates: "Evans caused bruising to Kassidy by grabbing and squeezing her face."

Therefore the deduction seems reasonable that the photo was the primary reason why the jury found Chad Not Guilty for the Second Degree Assault charge for the period October 1-7. If you have any other possible explanation, please let me know.

Agreed. Chad downplayed the level of his relationship to Amanda. I don't think that rises to the level of lying, but it's a matter of degree.

Chad explained to the police at pages 1494-95 in his interrogation that he had called Tristan to ask her to call his friends about his not being able to go to Bananas (a sports bar) on the night of November 9. That seems like a reasonable request, given the circumstances. What is the source of your claim that he lied about that explanation? It wasn't clearly stated, but I don't see lying. What is the lie?

What are the other claimed lies that you referenced when you said, "...lied about a lot of stuff."

Morrison

16 September 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Number 5: I suggest you strike it from your book. You've stated this several times both here at the website and in the book...there's no evidence that the jury threw out one of the assault charges based on a picture.

All of your other points are mute.

In reading the hard copy of his initial police interview, I'm convinced that Chad Evans is a habitual liar. He lied so much it's unbelievable. (downplayed his relationship with Amanda, lied about his call the Tristen about going to Bananas, lied about a lot of stuff.

15 September 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Well, Al Gore won a Nobel Peace Prize for his work to alert the world to global warming. If I could win Chad's release in return for my work, that would be fine.

1. FACT: Kassidy died in Maine. FACT: Chad was convicted in New Hampshire courts and is imprisoned in New Hampshire. The naming of the states in the subtitle shows the unusual dual-state work on this case and it was a significant cause of Chad's wrongful conviction. Some of the critical information about the case didn't get to the NH prosecutors, because it was in Maine with different rules about what could be released, and to whom. Amanda's residency in New Hampshire and eligibility for Maine welfare assistance was a problem in the case. That was one reason for Chad's efforts in his interrogation to minimize his relationship with Amanda. It is significant that the New Hampshire Medical Examiner never was asked to assist in the case. The Maine State Police concluded within a few hours that Chad murdered Kassidy and then handed the case to the New Hampshire State Police. There was zero physical evidence that Chad "beat the hell out of Kassidy," on November 8. What is your evidence for that claim? Do you believe that Travis Hunt saw Chad bathing Kassidy and that Travis held Kassidy afterwards? Travis has offered to take a MRI-brain scan lie detector test, but we don't have the money to pay for it.

(continued below)

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

(continued from above)

2. The account of what happened at Chad's home on the morning of the 9th comes from Chad and Amanda. Chad is the only person in this case who has taken and passed a lie detector test. I generally believe what people tell me unless I have sufficient evidence otherwise. In his police interview, he told the police that Kassidy ate half a banana the night before. When the police searched Chad's house, they found the other half.

3. Thanks for attributing eloquence to me, but it's undeserved.

4. Ok, so what is your explanation of the blood under Kassidy's fingernails? When and how did it get there? Whatever your theory, don't you think the jury should have known about that blood?

5. Regarding the jury's presumed use of the October 1 photo as a source of its Not Guilty verdict, it's just that, a presumption or deduction. The witnesses were very imprecise about then they saw bruises and where on Kassidy's face and body they saw those bruises. There was minimal evidence that Chad caused the bruises that each witness saw. Thus, it was likely the October 1 photograph, together with the knowledge that that photo was taken as grandmother Conley's home on that day, that let the jury to find Chad Not Guilty for that period. If you don't agree with that deduction, why do you think the jury found Chad Not Guilty on that charge, but guilty for the other five assault charges? What would the jury have done if they had the other photos of September and October?

Morrison

15 September 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Excerpts of Melissa Chick interview on November 13th:

Chick said when Bortner arrived at Chick's house, Bortner stated her boyfriend, Chad Evans, was having his parents over for dinner and if they saw the bruises on Kassidy they would be asking questions. Chick described to me that Kassidy's face was covered with black and blue bruises all over except around the sides of her nose which was white. Chick stated "We could barely see her face with all the bruises all over her face." Chick described in detail a mark coming from across Kassidy's face starting behind her left ear and coming down to her chin. The mark was very clear and in a straight line....Chick told me that later that night she bathed Kassidy and observed a bruise to Kassidy's stomach area, marks on her arms and legs.....Chick stated Amanda told her that Chad Evans is helping her discipline Kassidy and thinks Amanda is too lenient and does not discipline Kassidy enough.....

Chick told me she talked to Amanda three weeks ago on the telephone and Amands had told Chick that her relationship with Chad was shaky. Chad wanted her to move out and it was not working living together.....

Chick also told me she believes Chad Evans had too much influence over Amanda....

How do you explain all of this? This statement from Melissa Chick blows holes in your argument that Chad was a loving guy who was madly in love with Amanda. What say you?

15 September 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Bob Arnold** | 

Melissa, do us all a favor and stop stroking Morrison's ego...his book is filled with fabrication (fiction) to drum up emotion in order to add more people to the choir that he's preaching to. The book does have a lot of facts in it, however the fictional accounts are over the top. The account of the morning of the 9th, downplaying Chad's behavior on the afternoon of the 9th, at the police station, etc.... Downplaying Chad's assault on Tristen (he slapped the shit out her so hard that she lost dental work). Chad's multiple assaults on Amanda (head butting, choking, choking again, etc...) He liked to go for the throat, kinda like what he'd do to Kassidy, he'd go for her throat.

Chad Evans brutally assaulted Cassidy on the evening of the 8th. She died of her injuries the next day. He knew he was in trouble, so he began making calls to all his friends, he delayed his arrival at the police station. Then during the police interview, he outright lied, not to mention the fact that his behavior was completely unlike anything an innocent person would exhibit.

Chad lawyered up early on, avoided the police, used his influence to change Amanda's testimony, broke bail conditions, refused to cooperate with the investigation, etc etc etc.

Then he refused to take the stand, AT HIS OWN TRIAL. On sentencing day, he pretty much admitted guilt, right there in the court room. Now, go back and do some more research before you throw flowers to Morrison for writing "a good book."

*15 September 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Bob Arnold** | 

I beg to differ. I think my analogy worked great....Gore selling fiction, you selling fiction, sounds perfect to me.

Well let's start with the subtitle of your book. "Mysterious Death of Cassidy Bortner in MAINE and the Wrongful Conviction of Chad Evans in NEW HAMPSHIRE." Before the reader even gets a chance to start reading, you've already planted one of your fictional seeds by distancing Chad (New Hampshire) from her death (Maine). This is example numero uno of your biased approach to this case. The fact of the matter is this: That the crime (murder) took place in New Hampshire. She succumbed to her injuries about 12 hours later in Maine. Yes, Chad beat the hell out of her on the evening of the 8th, she died the next day. It so happened that she died in Maine. Now now, please don't play dumb with me anymore Morrison. You've proven to be a skillful writer who relies on using a reader's emotions to obtain what you're looking for: More members to add to your cult.

Example number two: The entire account of the morning of November 9th....you've portrayed Chad as a loving, caring guy who appears in the readers mind as a little geeky. This is a prime example of how you use a fictional account to drum up the reader's emotions as leverage to obtain the support you seek.

Another example is your eloquent manner of explaining away things that hurt Chad's defense. Your explanations may be plausible, however when coupled with all of the other pieces of evidence, testimony and fact, they become unbelievable.

Blood under the fingernails? I wish you'd cut that out, you're making yourself look foolish. This is another one of your lame attempts at creating controversy about something that has no weight.

As I've stated before, Cassidy's prior pediatric appointments happened months before she was killed by Chad. As far as photos, those don't prove a thing. And your statement that the October 1-8 photo was evidence not to convict him on one of the assault charges, I'd like to see evidence of this to back up what you're asserting.

*15 September 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Sorry. Analogies rarely work perfectly. Let's forget the comparison to the debate about global warming, which I introduced, and focus on the facts of the Chad Evans case.

Do you not want to accept my challenge to identify a page with the alleged "bias," "spin," or "of the emotionally charged b.s. that you've embellished." If a page is too much, please offer a paragraph, or even a sentence.

Whether yes or no, let me ask you about specific evidence which the jurors in Chad's case did not know:

1. What do you think of the fact that DNA tests were done on the blood underneath Cassidy's fingernails, and that the existence of those tests and their results were not given to Chad's attorneys?
  2. What do you think of the fact that the jury didn't even know about the blood underneath Cassidy's fingernails?
  3. What do you think of the medical appointments for Cassidy on August 10, and September 11, 2000, during the period that Chad was allegedly "endangering" her?
  4. What do you think of the 11 photographs in the Appendix of EYE CONTACT that were taken of Cassidy during the period August-November? The jury had seen one of those photos, taken on October 1, 2000, and due to that photo, Chad was found Not Guilty of assaulting Cassidy during the period of October 1-8.
  5. What do you think of the reddish brown stains on Cassidy's new parka?
  6. What do you think about Chad's bringing Cassidy to a family gathering on Sunday, November 5 where she was observed to have one, and only one, bruise in the middle of her right cheek?
- Morrison

*15 September 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob Arnold** | 

It's ironic that you use what Al Gore has to say about the nonsense he believes in as a comparison to this case. One could also point out how Obama blindly pushed funding for a solar company on the verge of bankruptcy. He was so narrow minded about his silly beliefs that it cost the taxpayers over \$5m. His stupid green initiatives are reminiscent of you and your silly endeavour to get Chad Evans out of prison. Very sad.

This was a good, rock solid conviction. I'm sure for the right price, you'd agree on just about anything??? As for myself, I'm not getting any money or a "committee chairperson" title, like all of you. Why am I the only person here who isn't getting any benefit out of spending time at this site (other than the satisfaction of seeing a guilty child murderer rot in prison).

*14 September 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Melissa,  
We agree. Probably the only difference remaining is a matter of degree, amidst shades of gray. I just talked with a juror at Chad's trial and that person said the jury made the right decision. S/he didn't want to look at the book or the website. Didn't want to know about the DNA tests that were performed before the trial. Didn't want to know about Cassidy's doctor appts. Didn't want to know what the jury wasn't told.

On the other hand, I talked with a retired State Police person who listened.

Today, on the radio, I heard Al Gore talk about the people who still do not believe that human activity is a primary cause of global warming, or even that global warming is occurring. He compared the non-believers to those who supported segregation in the South for a long time until they finally realized that it wasn't right or just. Not listening to the evidence of a claim of wrongful conviction is not right or just either.

I hope for the same change for people who still believe that Chad Evans abused and murdered Cassidy. At some point, the tide will turn. We want that point to be sooner rather than later. Ten years in prison for something you didn't do is enough.

Morrison

*14 September 2011 - Newcastle, ME (but in the Rochester, NH Public Library now)*

**Melissa**

Morrison, while I agree you can change some peoples' minds, I also believe some you just cant. :)

*14 September 2011 - NH*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Melissa, (New Hampshire)

Thanks for your kind words. However, I'm optimistic that people CAN read and listen to facts and other interpretations and change their minds about something, including this case. That's why we have this website and why I wrote the book. Several current supporters of Chad originally assumed that the legal system always works and that he abused and murdered Cassidy Bortner. Where opportunities are presented to improve the book and make it more accurate, I welcome those opportunities. That's why Bob's challenge is so important, and why I asked him to start with ONE PAGE of the book. He has alleged that the book is biased, contains "emotionally charged b.s" and is "spin." Well, let's examine those claims as carefully as possible, and start with one page of his choosing. After we resolve, hopefully, the claims about that one page, I hope we can move on to improve other specific pages.

Regarding Chad's domestic violence conviction, I would add that there was no excuse for either Chad or his wife to hit the other.

Morrison

*14 September 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

### Melissa

Morrison, unfortunately unless you change your book to say the emotionally charged BS that Bob is saying then it won't be good enough for him. The fact is, this is your book- a great book, and not everyone will be happy with it. It's never going to be enough for some people. It's just people sitting on two separate parts of the "debate" and no matter how hard either side tries one won't budge. Great job with your book Morrison. And Bob- there is absolutely no excuse for Chad hitting his wife, none what so ever. Yes, he broke off her cap- and that is unacceptable. With that said, I have learned that its gods way to forgive someone for their mistakes, no matter how monumental. It's not for you to decide if he truly is sorry- your ideas and biased on Chad is just that- ideas and biased. You don't know Chad- your making judgments and assumptions based solely on a website. Based on what some- no all- people had to say about him. I thank you again for coming back.

*14 September 2011 - NH*

### Morrison Bonpasse |

Bob,

1. Earlier, you wrote that after the domestic violence between Chad and his wife, Tristan was missing a tooth. Respectfully, I just made the point that a cap breaking off is different from dislodging a tooth, but making that distinction doesn't excuse Chad's actions on that night in March, 1999. He felt very badly about the incident and pled guilty to domestic violence. He underwent the required counseling and then voluntarily obtained more counseling to help him better understand his actions. The fighting with his wife had nothing to do with the death of Cassidy Bortner 20 months later. Similarly, the absence of fighting with his live-in woman friend before Tristan had nothing to do with Cassidy's death either.

2. Every person who reads "EYE CONTACT" is important. While you call the book "spin," it seems fair to me that I point out that no one has found factual errors which detract from the book's conclusions. I have received a letter from one Assistant Attorney General who said, generally, that s/he disagreed with some of the book's interpretations, but no facts were disputed. The book had been available for only two months. I'm not ignoring what you are saying, but your calling it "spin" or "fiction" doesn't make it so. If you, or anyone were to find factual errors, that's something else, and I will gladly correct errors which you or others identify.

3. Chad did love Amanda and Cassidy. At times, however, he thought that their moving to his home so quickly may have been too soon, and not good for Amanda's sense of independence. Also, he was very concerned that having Amanda living with him might cause his wife to attempt to thwart or renegotiate their divorce agreement. Aside from those moments, he and Amanda and Cassidy had wonderful times together. As he has said, it was the happiest time of his life.

4. I see your "RECOMMENDATION," and I have a request. Please pick ONE page from the book, "EYE CONTACT," that you believe has "emotionally charged b.s. that you've embellished" and tell me what is wrong with that page. Please give me the page number. If the page is wrong or flawed, I'll be pleased to fix it.

**Bob Arnold** | 

1: Yet another example of your bias account of what happened. The fact is this, that Chad assaulted his wife. "A cap broke off her tooth" you make it sound like caps break off teeth all the time.

2: Did it ever occur to you that nobody of importance is reading your "book"? Stating that nobody (of importance i.e. the prosecution, police, etc) has come forward to dispute what you've written is spin. The entire book is spin, and you've based much of it on Chad's statements which we all know are unreliable. I've pointed this out to you multiple times, yet you continue to ignore what I'm saying.

3: I stand by what I've said about this matter. Amanda's statements to the police during her first interviews sharply contrast with what she had to say later, after Chad influenced her. Here is a girl who loved Chad, but he didn't love her. She was an object to him. He wanted to kick her out. Then all the suddenly he falls in love with her on the evening of the 9th?? Give me a break.

4: You're right. You guys probably sit around eating free range chicken and organic tofu.

So here is a RECOMMENDATION for you: Rewrite the book, and remove all of the emotionally charged b.s. that you've embellished it so that you can sway your reader, stick with the facts and let people make up their own mind based on a work of non-fiction.

12 September 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

1. There are no photographs on the website of Tristan, at her request. On the night of March 28, 1999, she and Chad had a fight and the cap on a tooth broke off. There was no "missing tooth." Tristan's subsequent recollection of that night is posted in the "Chronology" section of the website for that date.

2. You label the book, EYE CONTACT, as fiction, but neither you nor anyone has identified errors of fact in the book. Nonetheless, there are surely some, and when they come to my attention, they will be corrected.

3. Agreed. In her interviews, Amanda did make incriminating statements, but they are either ambiguous, explainable or wrong, and she retracted what she could at Chad's trial. Her statements were in the nature of a false confession, as has occurred in many of the wrongful convictions in this country. This is what she wrote in a January 12, 2005 email, "They said that they had medical and physical evidence and that's how they 'knew' Chad had killed my daughter. That shows you how much investigating they did to come up with a conclusion that fast. They tried their very best to convince me that he killed her. Finally they weren't getting what they wanted out of me so they went one step further. They said, 'Well Amanda, if Chad didn't kill her, did you kill your baby?' So at that point I was scared to death. I thought to myself if I don't tell them what they want to hear, I'm going to get charged with the murder of my daughter! So I just said yes to everything they asked. They said, 'What did he just throw her into walls?' And I said yes. 'Did he do this?' Yes, yes, yes. Not only did these lies incriminate Chad, they also incriminated myself. I was so distraught, full of fear, and anxiety. All I wanted to do was get out of there. This is something that does not matter in court. It is something that most people do not understand unless it happens to them or they've seen it happen."

4. Your characterization of the meetings of the Chad Evans Wrongly Convicted Committee is unfair. As Margaret Mead said, "Never underestimate the power of a few committed individuals to change the world. Indeed, it's the only thing that ever has."

10 September 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Now, I want you to post the police photos of Tristen's face in your fictional account of Chad's conviction. The pictures of her bloody face, the night that he beat the crap out of her. The pictures of her split lip, missing tooth, and don't forget the bruises.

I believe Chad Evans got what was coming to him. He's guilty, beyond a reasonable doubt. So have your silly little meetings, light your incense and keep smoking your hash pipes.

*9 September 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Second interview with Amanda:

"yea, he, ah, well he just grabbed my throat and stuff."

"He told me, um, I was like, well, I'll bring her to the doctor's and he's like, well, 'you should wait until the bruises go away'...."because he was paranoid about this, about him getting into trouble with her."

"I don't know what he did but he probably hurt her"

"no, I think about it and I don't believe it" (Chad's wiffle ball story)

"(he said) He didn't want anything to do with her (Kassidy) anymore, on the phone."

"When he's mad he'd like, goes like this and does like this and chokes. When she was bad."

"He would try to (push on your throat and knock the air out)"

"He head butted me once."

"Yea, but last night he said 'you should take her to the doctor after she gets rid of the bruises."

"When I talked to Tristen, she told me that he hurt her and, um, she told me to go to the police station and look at pictures but I never did."

"DO YOU FEEL THAT HE IS RESPONSIBLE FOR HER DEATH?"....."YEA, I KNOW HE IS."

*9 September 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Mellissa** | 

Sorry, typing error....Kassidy (vs Kassicy).

*9 September 2011 - Midwest*

**Mellissa** | 

Okay, so I will ask again: If many of you are SO absolutely sure that Chad is guilty, then what is the harm in giving him another trial? If he is guilty, as you say, then it would be proven again. On the other hand, if he was given another (fair and unbiased) trial and he was finally proven innocent, it would mean Justice for Chad, Kassicy, Amanda and all of their loved ones.

*9 September 2011 - Midwest*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

1. As Detective Angela Blodgett said to Amanda, "I think everybody lies." We all do, but some lies are more important to others. The only lie that Chad stated to the police was the "trampoline story,"

which was about bruises on Cassidy's cheeks in October which had nothing to do with her death. As noted earlier, he did not proactively maintain contact with the police because he had retained counsel. Lawyers instruct clients not to contact the police without their involvement.

2. Regarding Chad's retention of counsel, he told the police on the 9th that he wanted to talk with an attorney. The mutual understanding at that point was that there would be no further Chad-police discussion without an attorney. Chad met with Alan Cronheim on Saturday, Nov. 11. I don't know where you obtained the Tuesday, Nov. 14 date. If I wrote that in EYE CONTACT, please tell me the page, and I'll correct it.

3. No, I'm not playing dumb. Yes, others were ASKED back for second and more interviews, but Chad was not asked. Also, the police never ASKED Chad to take a polygraph, even after Amanda told them that Chad agreed to take such a test. (Whether his lawyers would have later persuaded him otherwise is another question.) Chad requested a leave of absence from his job out of his loyalty to the company. He didn't want his company to be hurt by the bad publicity. In retrospect, he now understands that it would have been better for him to stay in his job, as was his right as an innocent, though accused, man. It also hurt him severely in the pocketbook.

(continued below)

8 September 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

(continued from above)

4. You can argue that Amanda was influenced by Chad because her post-interviews statements differed from what she said and agreed to in those interviews. However, the better explanation is that after those first few days, she was no longer in sudden shock, and was able to think things through. One factoid that surprised me was that Amanda never understood that the ball that hit Cassidy on the 8th was a T-ball and not a wiffle ball. Surely, if Chad was trying to influence her recollection, he would have ensured that she understood that important detail.

5. We have different views about the meaning of fairness. Do you think it's fair to prosecute someone and not tell the defendant that you (or the sister state government of Maine) have done DNA tests on the blood underneath the victim's fingernails? And not tell them that you have documentation of doctor visits which occurred during the period of your charges? I think that Chad's own lawyers helped deprive him of a fair trial because they declined to present an affirmative defense with more than one witness. They failed to affirmatively show the jury that the EYE CONTACT/cheek holding did not hurt Cassidy, and had no role in her death. Further, in a state which permits corporal punishment, it was perfectly legal for parents and their delegates to hold a child's face in order to gain his/her attention.

Morrison

8 September 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison:

Thanks for your response. Allow me to address each of your points:

1: I agree with you, we have guaranteed rights that one may exercise when they wish. The problem I have is this, that Chad has stated that he has the up most respect for law enforcement, however his actions speak otherwise. He intentionally lied to the investigators. There was no effort made to stay in contact with the police. This behavior speaks volumes about Chad's guilt in the matter.

2: As of November 14th (a Tuesday) Chad had not retained an attorney. What attorney are you

referring too?

3: Now you're playing dumb. And as far as Amanda, she was shown photographs of Kassidy during her second police interview. You see, everyone else came back for second, third and sometimes fourth interviews with the police. Jeff even called the police station on at least two times to offer more help. Chad on the other hand never did any of that. Chad immediately took a leave of absence from his job....why would an innocent man do something like that?

4. Incorrect. There is plenty of evidence that Chad influenced Amanda. The contrast in her statements between her first police interview and her fifth, as well as her testimony at trial is indicative of tampering.

5. Wrong. He received a fair trial. The "new" evidence you speak of does not conclude a thing.

*8 September 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Oh Becky you're doing it again.

*8 September 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Becky** | 

I keep telling you Mr. Arnold I don't personally know any murderers, sorry.

*8 September 2011 - Rochester, NH*

**Bob Arnold** | 

As a Midwesterner myself, I'm suprised that a fellow Midwesterner would fall victim to such fiction from a convicted murderer.

*7 September 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Becky** | 

Dear Mr. Arnold my parents raised me to NEVER to use the Lord's name in vain. It's disrepectful, period!!

As for reading over the 10,000 plus documents, they CLEARLY point to Chad's innocence. Your clouded opinion of what you think is guilt, is not in fact FACTS. Yes you are intitled to your opinion, but it is what it is, it's just your opinion!

*7 September 2011 - Rochester*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

First, the recently posting "Mellissa" is from the Midwest and is new to these Online Comments. She worked for Chad at McDonald's and only recently learned of his imprisonment through the Internet. She is not the same person as "Melissa" who posted comments earlier.

Regarding your comments about Chad's letter to the NH Attorney General.

1. There is nothing wrong with exercising one's Constitutional rights, including the request to consult with an attorney. Interestingly, if he had exercised his right not to talk with the police, he would have avoided the interrogation that hurt his case, especially when combined with his decision not to

testify.

2. Similarly, while you and I might have preferred that Chad go back to the police for a second interview on his own initiative, his lawyers advised otherwise. "Say nothing to anybody," was the message. Chad should not be faulted for taking their advice. They were the experts.

3. I don't know what you expected when you faulted Chad for "no display of concern about finding out what happened to Cassidy." What did others do to show that concern that you were looking for? By accusing Chad on Day 1 of murdering Cassidy, weren't the police foreclosing such concern? Didn't his arrest before Cassidy's funeral prevent his attendance? The police were not open about the information about what happened to Cassidy. They never permitted Amanda to see her daughter's body so SHE might find out "what happened to Cassidy."

4. There is zero evidence that Chad used his influence to alter Amanda's testimony. He always told her to tell the truth. Yes, he and Amanda were together during his bail period, despite the restriction, because they needed each other. They knew that they were both innocent, and they expected that Chad's trial would clear them both.

5. The trial was not fair in the sense that some important evidence not made available to the defense attorneys, e.g. the DNA tests and the dates of medical appointments. It was also not fair to him because his attorneys failed to present an affirmative defense, with witnesses, photographs and timelines.

Morrison

*7 September 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Becky if you can't present an intelligent argument based on documented fact then please restrain yourself the next time you feel the urge to attack me. What you label disrespect I label a spirited debate of the facts of this case. You can't claim that you've studied every document available in this case and still draw the conclusion that Evans is innocent.

*7 September 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Becky** | 

Excuse me Mr. Arnold but disrespect in any form, is not welcome here. I do not believe Jeff belongs in prison either. Funny how you keep straying so far from the truth. Keep searching though, it will find you!

*7 September 2011 - Rochester, NH*

**Bob Arnold** | 

My comments regarding Chad Evans letter to the NH Attorney General:

You state that the case "went off track", this coming from a man who invoked his Miranda rights.

The police investigation was on track, despite your repeated attempts to lie and deceive the police and your unwillingness to cooperate with them. Yes, the police only conducted one interview with you (on the 9th) which you abruptly ended and left of your own free will. When you invoked Miranda, it left the police with their hands tied. You were given business cards from the investigators (see video taped interview) but you never followed up with them. You never called them back, you avoided all contact with the police which I find unconscionable, considering the circumstances (a child under your care had died). There was no display of concern about finding out what happened to Cassidy.

Furthermore, you used your influence to alter the testimony of a key witness, Amanda Bortner. You received specific instructions to avoid contact with her, and this was one of your bail requirements. You willfully, repeatedly and intentionally violated this bail condition for your own purposes.

Finally, you were given a fair trial. At that trial, the court offered you the opportunity to testify, and you refused. This came as no surprise, because this is what you had done from day one: Hide. Avoid. Deceive. Hinder.

*7 September 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

---

**Bob Arnold** | 

Well Jesus Christ Becky, let's just throw Jeff in prison and let Chad go. Anyone who talks like that is clearly guilty. On the other hand, Jeff repeatedly came back to speak to the police. Chad did not. Jeff was consistent, truthful and honest with the police. Chad was not. It's documented, Chad lied to the police. Chad hid from the police. Chad avoided the police.

*7 September 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

---

**Becky** | 

Ahem, excuse me, but I have a copy of the letter to Alan from Chad where it states that Chad had given Jeff a head's up about his contract. Also I like to add Jeff said "ya know" a lot during his interviews. Count them up! There are more "ya know's" in those interviews than there are facts.

*6 September 2011 - Rochester, NH*

---

**Bob Arnold** | 

Mellissa:

You're heading off on the emotional reaction thing again. Let's talk facts about the case and save the cheer leading for Monday Night Football.

Morrison:

I told you what I thought about your book and you've not made any effort to neutralize the emotionally charged bias that you believe will help you in gaining support. You've just wasted a lot of paper and money by sending that book to the AG's office and other members of government. The book can not be taken seriously.

Regards,

Bob

*6 September 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

---

**Mellissa**

If Chad is guilty of all these charges..what's the harm in looking into the case again? Oh, I know... because the truth might be uncovered to prove that Chad is not responsible for Cassidy's death! Look at the facts folks. Chad has made mistakes in life, but he's no "baby killer" as the media has so labeled him.

*3 September 2011 - Midwest*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Oh boy? Meaning?

3 September 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Oh boy.

3 September 2011 - Rochester

**Chad Evans (via Morrison Bonpasse)** | 

Mr. Arnold,

First and foremost thank you for your continued interest in this case. Though we have views that differ, I respect your position and the thorough approach you take in digging for details.

At this point I have read all of your comments and agree with Morrison's responses, so I won't waste anyone's time repeating the answers that I would give. However, there are a few areas that I would like to specifically address. First, it seems that it was a surprise to you that I told Jeff in October, 2000 that his McDonald's contracts for landscaping were not going to be renewed. Until Morrison came along, I never knew the potential significance of this very issue. Luckily, there is some documentation to back up my claim. Not only were my trial attorneys aware of it, (apparently deciding it wasn't a big deal), the issue DID come up during the deposition where I was being deposed by Jeff's attorney, Stephen Brown. There was an exchange of questions and "verbal judo" going on between me and Mr. Brown for several pages and I indicated that Jeff knew (about losing his contracts) because I told him. I admit the answers are a bit convoluted because, as Morrison indicated, we were all "playing the legal game." I had very bitter feelings toward Jeff because of what I felt he did. I wasn't going to lie under oath, but I certainly wasn't going to be overly helpful either. The police and doctors said that Cassidy's death was a homicide and I knew that I didn't kill her, and never even hit her.

(continued below)

1 September 2011 - New Hampshire State Prison, Concord, NH

**Chad Evans (via Morrison Bonpasse)** | 

(continued from above)

Alternatively when Jeff was being deposed by my attorney, Mr. Fisher, he recalled in great detail that it was Larry Lane who notified him he was being let go. This did not ring true to me because in the version of events that Jeff shared, Larry Lane wasn't following McDonald's S.O.P. (Standard Operating procedure) I feel confident in sharing that any current or former employee under Larry Lane's supervision would indicate that he does EVERYTHING by the "book". Most people aren't aware that I was not Jeff's only target in civil court. He filed, or threatened to file, a \$500,000 lawsuit against McDonald's shortly after the claim against me. Most of the questions at my deposition were a "fishing expedition" to use in a case against McDonald's.

I don't think it is any secret that McDonald's has much deeper pockets than an incarcerated, former area supervisor. Unfortunately, that lawsuit stalled out as mine was being dismissed on Jeff's own initiative.

What stood out to me when I initially read the transcript of Jeff's deposition was how clear his memory was on all aspects of his life with the exception of any time he spent with Cassidy and her last hours alive on earth. (But this is another issue altogether).

The second item I want to address is your doubt of the responses I am giving to the questions asked in 2010/2011. I understand this being an issue for you. Ten years ago, if I were in your shoes, it would be an issue for me as well. God, do I wish someone had asked me these questions 10 years ago. It is disheartening to me that in at least four different investigating police agencies, not one person asked some of these questions. It boggles the mind that it took a 62 year old, non-practicing attorney to ask the questions that could have been so helpful. Luckily, many of the thoughts that I am sharing in the letters section of the website can be backed up and supported by another fact. So, for those with doubts, the reliance only on my word is minimal.

(continued below)

**Chad Evans (via Morrison Bonpasse)** | 

(continued from above)

Mr. Arnold, like most people I have made many mistakes and sometimes regret decisions that I made/did not make in life. I understand that claims of wrongful conviction are hard to swallow, but we have to at least agree from the evidence of those before me; they happen. Prior to being involved in this situation I heard such claims and shared your skepticism if not your tenacity. I also had unwavering faith in the police. I had an uncle who was a deputy sheriff and I had life long friends in law enforcement. I gave to the Police Benevolence Funds whenever called upon. I still would today. However, the one thing that this experience has taught me is that these men and women in uniform, in the prosecutors' offices, in the black robes, and sitting in the jury boxes are also human beings. They feel emotions like you or I. They bleed like you or I, and they are capable of making mistakes like you or I. They do not belong on this pedestal I have kept them on for so many years. As Peter Miller alluded in a quote I read several months ago, it isn't unpatriotic to question convictions because the possibility of error exists in any system devised by man. In closing, I invite you to write me directly if you are interested. Or, if you prefer, I could arrange a face to face visit so we can share some dialogue. I've always found that looking directly into a man's eyes can be quite telling. My mom has shared with me that she could always tell when I was telling a "fib" growing up because my eyes were a dead giveaway. I can't help but think that with the passion that you feel for this case, a visit would be mutually beneficial.

Thanks again for your interest,

Chad Evans

1 September 2011 - New Hampshire State Prison, Concord, NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Yes, Chad learned not to squeeze so hard. Period. Chad loved Cassidy and had zero desire to hurt her, and certainly no desire to cause bruises. As Daniel Webster said, "There is nothing so powerful as the truth, and often nothing so strange."

What is the "too much evidence" of Chad's alleged violence that you referenced? His never hitting his son and stepson? His purchases of candy for Cassidy? His wrestling with her and Kyle on the bed? His flying her through the air like "Superman"? His walking with Cassidy, Kyle and Amanda to Lone Oaks for ice cream? His reading to Cassidy on the night of November 8?

Regarding his fight with Tristan in March 1999, there was one fight. The police piled on four charges which is a common police practice. There were three charges of Simple Assault and one of False Imprisonment. The four were reduced to two, and Chad pled guilty. Regarding the weapons, it's routine to remove weapons from the home of every domestic assault case, regardless of the severity.

Yes, the lie detector test he took was a voice stress analysis lie detection test, and he passed it.

How many other people in this case have submitted themselves to ANY kind of lie detector test?

Yes, there was background stress, at least in part because a fellow inmate was nearly beaten to death on the morning of his exam.

Morrison

24 August 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

"Chad learned not to squeeze so hard?" Do you realise how ridiculous that sounds? There is too much evidence that proved Chad was physically violent. I stand by my title of your book.

Chad was arrested and charged with not one, but four counts of assault against Tristan. Again, your attempt to downplay this event is sickening. The domestic violence was so bad that the officers decided to remove all weapons from the house. That's serious. Furthermore, he was convicted on those charges. I would like to see you add the police photo of Tristan's face to your book so that people can see the effects of Chad's violent temper.

True, you never used the words "squeaky clean" but you imply it.

Voice stress test, not a polygraph. Voice stress. Furthermore, the results are, to me questionable because it was noted he had elevated indications of stress throughout the test.

24 August 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Yes, that's right. Chad held Cassidy's face to ensure eye contact, and 3-4 times he and Amanda noticed that bruises resulted. After the first time, he resolved not to squeeze so hard, but among the several subsequent times he held Cassidy's face, 2-3 of those times he again caused bruises. There were none in November, I understand, because Cassidy wasn't feeling well and Chad had learned not to squeeze so hard. We don't know exactly why, but Cassidy seemed to bruise easily, as did Amanda (as she told me in 2010).

Regarding his fight with Tristan in March, 1999, they both felt badly about it and it led to their divorce and Chad's pleading guilty. See Tristan's undated summary of the incident at the "Chronology" listing for 28 March 1999. That differs from the police report. He attended the required counseling sessions and when they didn't seem too useful, he retained his own private counselor. In 2000, when Amanda saw a note stuck to the bedroom wall with Chad's own handwritten hints to himself (e.g. "Take several deep breaths....") on how to avoid conflict, Amanda pulled it off the wall and said she no longer needed it. And he didn't.

In any case, he's in prison for his wrongful conviction for assaulting and murdering Cassidy, and not for a fight he had with his former wife a year before he met Amanda and Cassidy.

I never wrote that Chad was "squeaky clean." Those are your words. I like Chad very much, and believe he's a wonderful man and father, and that he tells me the truth. I've independently confirmed some of what he has told me, and he has passed a lie detector test.

Morrison

21 August 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

I love how you down play everything that makes Chad look bad....page 29 of Squeeze her Face as Hard as You Can (you call it Eye Contact):

All did not continue well at home, however. On the evening of March 27, Tristan went out for the evening and Chad had a few drinks at home. When Tristan came home in the early morning, which was several hours later than expected, Chad was very upset. According to Tristan's account, Chad accused her of having an affair and she slapped him. In the ensuing fight, a cap on one of Tristan's teeth was broken off. She called the police and Chad was arrested. (See the Rochester Police report.) After that, Tristan and Chad tried to recover their marriage. They stayed together, but in April, Tristan went to Chad's office and told him she wanted a separation.

Why don't you just tell it like it is Morrison, instead of blaming Tristan (she came home later than expected, like it was all her fault the fight started). Let's try this:

"On the night of March 27th, Chad got drunk and beat the shit out of his wife. He hit her so hard he knocked out one of her teeth. When the police came, they arrested him and seized an arsenal of weapons and ammunition."

Some father. Some loving husband. Yes, your book reeks of bias. Your squeaky-clean convicted killer isn't as sweet as he seems.

21 August 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

It's been a month since the posting on this website of the first Draft Edition of the ebook "EYE CONTACT." Copies were sent to many law enforcement people in Maine and New Hampshire and other stakeholders. I've made some corrections and additions since July 17, and have posted Draft Edition 2 on this website and several ebook sites. No corrections have been suggested by anyone that detract from the conclusions of the book, i.e. that Chad was wrongly convicted. Putting it another way, no one has called any substantial errors to my attention. Readers are welcome to post such errors here on this "Online Comments" page or send me an email to morrison AT Chad's website.

18 August 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

Becky | 

"All great questions must be raised by great voices, and the greatest voice is the voice of the people - speaking out - in prose, or painting or poetry or music; speaking out - in homes and halls, streets and farms, courts and cafes - let that voice speak and the stillness you hear will be the gratitude of mankind."

Robert F. Kennedy

16 August 2011 - Rochester, NH

Becky | 

How do they convict a man on a 2nd degree murder charge with out an ounce of PHYSICAL evidence?? If Chad was abusing Kassidy they surely would have found something to back that up inside his house. They spent HOURS & HOURS inside Chad's home & they found nothing!! Yet, an entire basement was overlooked when the search occured in the home where Kassidy died. How is that possible?? How do they not test Kassidy's blood for lead poisoning? By jumping to conclusions & ignoring the facts surely won't do anybody justice!

By the way, Mr. Arnold my drink of choice is Coke in a can, once again you were so far from the truth. Chad Evans is innocent!!

16 August 2011 - Rochester, NH

Bob Arnold | 

Eye Contact is not filled with facts, it's nearly 80% fiction and biased.

I want to know why an innocent man would take a sudden leave of absence from his job. That makes no sense to me.

The guy did not cooperate during police interview, he lied to the police and attempted to mislead them. Of course the police were on to his game and confronted him about it, which resulted in Chad refusing to answer any further questions. They gave him their contact info and encouraged him to contact them if he felt the need to talk further. He did not.

Chad Evans refused to take the stand at his trial, not due to attorney advice but because he knew he was guilty. He violated his probation conditions (prior conviction of wife-beating) and he violated his bail conditions.

How do you expect anyone to believe this guy is innocent?

16 August 2011 - Rocheser, NH

Morrison Bonpasse | 

It's hard to respond to sarcasm except with the facts, and the facts are presented on the website and in the book, EYE CONTACT. There is no suggestion in either place that the police manufactured any evidence. The only testimony about Chad's allegedly "violent behavior" was from Amanda, and she recanted most of what she had said earlier to the police. The prosecutors tried to

force her to stick to the false statements she made to the police. Chad did not confess at his sentencing. He said that he felt "shame and regret for the things that I've done.... And my heart feels most heavy for the way that I failed Kassidy. Amanda, I am so sorry for the emptiness and the hurt you have to deal with for the rest of your life." Yes, it was an ambiguous statement that was intended to achieve Chad's lawyers' goal of seeming to apologize and show remorse, and achieve Chad's goal of not admitting that he killed Kassidy. He felt badly, and still feels very badly that he was sometimes harsh, but not abusive, and that he didn't do more to help Kassidy. Hindsight can be 20/20. As happened so many times in the earlier proceedings in this case and in the civil lawsuit filed by Jeff Marshall, the statements Chad made were aimed at achieving particular goals, while being truthful, rather than achieving an unambiguous full understanding of the truth. He played the legal game as he was advised. He was told that if he angered the judge by telling the truth, he might get a longer sentence. So his lawyers helped him craft an ambiguous, while truthful, statement. Well, there has been no ambiguity from Chad since early 2010, and it should not be too late for the full truth. By remaining in prison for 10 years he has already paid far too high a price for his earlier mistakes, and for those by many others in this case. It's time for the truth and the correction of those mistakes with a re-investigation of the case, and, if still sought by the Attorney General, a new trial.

*15 August 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob Arnold** | 

You're absolutely right. It's a mystery why Kassidy died, maybe it was bigfoot that killed her, or the Loch Ness monster. And all of the evidence used to convince the jury of his guilt, well it was all manufactured by the police. Like the testimony about Chad's violent behavior, like the lies he told to the police. And the confession he made at his sentencing, well he did that because his attorneys told him to. It's unbelievable that a swell guy like Chad could be convicted of something like this.

*14 August 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

I hadn't heard that nickname for Ray Krone, but an "expert's" claim that the bite marks on the victim, whom Krone knew, were Krone's was what convicted him of murder. He was sentenced to death in 1992. He won a new trial, but was reconvicted in 1996. Finally, after 10 years in prison, he was exonerated in 2002. He was the 100th DNA exoneree by the Innocence Project, and the 12th to be exonerated from a death sentence. I remember this case well because the victim's mother was active in helping exonerate Krone. She was at the gate when Krone was released. In a cover story for Parade Magazine, she said, "I hated the man who killed my daughter, but not Ray." She is a good example of how family members of victims can help in the pursuit of justice AFTER a wrongful conviction. See the Innocence Project summary of his case at [www.innocenceproject.org/Content/Ray\\_Krone.php](http://www.innocenceproject.org/Content/Ray_Krone.php)

*12 August 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Becky Boudreau** | 

Or does anyone remember the Ray Krone's case aka "The Snaggle Tooth Killer"?? Convicted NOT once BUT 2ce for a crime he didn't commit. What a shame for his family but this story keeps me going for our innocent Chad.

[http://forejustice.org/wc/ray\\_krone\\_JD\\_vol2\\_i9.htm](http://forejustice.org/wc/ray_krone_JD_vol2_i9.htm)

*11 August 2011 - Rochester, NH*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

You asked the question, so I'll say again that I would not be working for Chad Evans and his family if I didn't believe that he is innocent. Not just wrongly convicted, but innocent. You asked another question about what the police should have done in the case of Cassidy Bortner. They should have gathered evidence for several days and weeks before making their arrest and recommendations for prosecution. Instead, they formed their theory of Chad's guilt within a few hours on the same day as Cassidy died, and implicitly or explicitly told everyone. This is a classic formula for wrongful conviction. Form a theory and then the evidence supporting that theory is pursued and found. Despite their desire to prove their theory, the police were finding evidence that contradicted that theory, such as Chad's Hero Award in 1997, and the absence of gambling debt. In the face of such evidence, the theory should have been questioned.

Regarding Kansas City, MO, are you familiar with the wrongful conviction of Ted White of Lee's Summit, a suburb of KC? He recently settled his claim for \$15.5 million. After his initial conviction, he fled the country. Looked guilty, right? But he wasn't. He was returned to the U.S. and imprisoned and he continued his fight for exoneration.

Are you familiar with the wrongful conviction claim of Byron Case, involving a 1997 murder? See the book, "The Skeptical Juror and The Trial of Byron Case."

Have you heard of the Kansas City lawyer, Richard Buchli, who was convicted in 2002 of murdering his law partner, but was freed in 2010 after the discovery of prosecutorial misconduct?

From the website of the Missouri Innocence project come the names of these wrongly convicted people: Joe Amrine, Darryl Burton, Dennis Fritz, Josh Kezer, Ellen Reasonover Ted White, and Johnny Lee Wilson.

As good a police officer as your father may have been, everyone makes mistakes, including the police and prosecutors of Kansas City, Mo., the state of Missouri and the states of Maine and New Hampshire.

Morrison

*11 August 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,

One other thing I want to address about your last comment concerning "lies".....

My dad was a Kansas City police officer, 27 years on the force. He worked the worse division of KC for all those years because he loved it there. I'm not an expert on police, however I do know this, that they are trained to detect deception. Being his son, I learned this painful lesson at an early age. Many police officers develop a "sixth sense". It's not something that is easy to describe, but most of it comes from careful collection of statements from other parties to the event. This is why they didn't want Amanda talking to Chad, because there was a high probability that he would use his influence to get her to change her testimony, and that's EXACTLY what happened. Follow me here....

The police determined, at an early stage, that Chad was their prime suspect, based upon other statements. However, they still wanted to talk to him. So here comes Chad, with all his friends....late....he tells lies. He shows deceit....he tells the trampoline story, he tells stories about balls, he down plays his relationship with Amanda, his physical behavior points to guilt, his statements point to guilt.....now what do you think the police should do?

In my opinion, the police did an excellent job and I'm glad that they put the effort into this investigation that it deserved. Undoubtedly, in my opinion, Chad Evans is guilty.

Regards,

*10 August 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Bob Arnold** | 

OK that's good that you have a second addition, it's not good that you've not heeded my advice that I think you're biased....maybe I should rephrase that Morrison, I think that there's a lot of

embellishment on both your's and Chad's behalf that lead the reader to conclude what I've pointed out in the past two weeks, that the book, in my opinion, doesn't paint an accurate picture of Chad.

I've missed the Chronology and Chad's Letters intentionally. I wanted to make an informed decision about this case, and the Chronology and his letters are, again in my opinion, a carefully orchestrated mixture of fiction, biased fact and heresy which results in an emotionally charged ambush for the reader who isn't familiar with the real facts of the case. This is why I believe you're "preaching to the choir". Can you see my point?

Eye Contact should be written with the other side in mind as well. All of your effort has gone down the drain by not addressing this, and I do believe it's important because that's who your trying to convince, isn't it? I feel like you're trying to convince the people who are already convinced, which does ME no good....

OK, back to the McDonald's contract... It was a suprise to me, after reading all of the factual information you've made available. Jeff's third interview, or actually I believe it was his second interview with Kittery PD, he was asked if he still had his contracts and he stated yes indeed he did.

You're right, if his attorneys knew about this, they most certainly have released the hounds from hell on Marshall during cross. Considering the wealth of other information Chad gave to his attorney's, I believe it's doubtful he would have overlooked this. Therefore, I don't believe it ever happened. Not for a second.

Morrison, I have to ask you this, man to man, what does your gut tell you about this guy?

Regards,

Bob

*10 August 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

I forgot to mention that Draft Edition 2 of EYE CONTACT was released today. It can be viewed and downloaded from Chad's website. See the "Latest News" and "Books about Chad and other wrongful convictions" sections.

The new edition contains photographs of Kassidy in an Appendix and several pages about the Pre-Sentencing Report, and a few other changes. No changes have been suggested or requested by any reader of Draft Edition 1 which might affect the book's assessment of Chad and his wrongful conviction.

*10 August 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

You're right. The conversation about the non-renewal of the landscaping contracts with Jeff Marshall was never mentioned publicly before last year. It wasn't even mentioned in the depositions in the lawsuit filed in 2003 by Jeff Marshall against Chad. It was first described to me by Chad during a prison visit last year. At first, Chad was surprised that I thought it was important.

Subsequently, he described it in the following "Letters" in 2010 (see Home Page, Key Document #11): February 21, March 14, March 20, July 14, July 19, July 27, July 28, and August 26.

It's been in the "Chronology" page of the website since last year. See the entry for October 23, 2000. "Key Document" #3 is about his Voice Stress Lie Detector test. Chad brought to that exam a list of proposed questions that he welcomed and question #5 was, "Did you inform Jeff in October of 2000 that his landscaping contracts with McDonald's would not be renewed the following year?" The examiner did not ask the question, but it was on Chad's list.

As we know, Chad did not testify at his trial, and this allegation is one of the many issues that should have been presented to the jury. As you noted, Jeff Marshall could have been asked about

the allegation during cross-examination. However, Chad hadn't told his attorneys about the conversation. Please understand that I've spent many more hours in this case with Chad than his attorneys were able to do. This is a classic example of oversight, and misunderstanding. Of course, there were only two parties to the conversation, so we will never know for sure what was said and how it was understood.

Regarding lying, I agree that the "trampoline story" was an intentional lie, but at the time, Chad didn't believe it had any relationship to Cassidy's death, and it didn't. His statements about his relationship with Amanda and the length of time it took him to get to the police station do not rise to the same level. In the book, I don't call a lie the police statements to Jeremy Hinton about Jeff's taking a polygraph exam and don't call a lie Det. McCleish's statement to Chad that he had talked to a doctor about Cassidy's death. Mis-statements, yes, but lies?

Morrison

10 August 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,

I've got a big issue with page 57, the content of which I can't believe you printed and I would like you to independently verify and site: Chad's late (2010) recollection of telling Jeff that his 2001 McDonald's contracts would not be renewed. In summary, Chad says that they normally wait until spring, but he gave Jeff a heads up as a favor for a friend.

Independently verify and site it Morrison, if you can't, then delete it. This conversation that Chad NOW states occurred came as a complete sup rise to me. It was not brought up at trial during cross examination, in his letters to his attorneys, nor did it come up in any of the police interviews. Chad is trying to show that Jeff had motive. If, in fact, this conversation did occur, it most certainly would have been brought up during the cross examination of Jeff Marshall.

This is another example of reckless fiction that you've allowed to happen in this book. As I read the book, I continue to find bias, and I continue to see comments from Chad 10 years after the fact which make the book less believable. Chad Evans is a liar. I can state that because it's a fact and I will now verify it:

Police interrogation, Nov 9th, 2000....Evans lied to the police with the trampoline story, he lied about his relationship with Amanda, he lied about driving 2.5 hours to get to the police station, he lied about a lot of things. All of this is fully documented. In light of this fact, how can anyone believe a thing that he says now, after 10 years, of something so tremendous in 2000?

I'm not done tearing your book up. More to come.

Regards,

Bob

10 August 2011 - Rocheser, NH

Bob,

You're right. Chad's attorneys charged at the trial that Jeff killed Cassidy and the jury obviously disagreed and convicted Chad. Hindsight can be 20/20, but what Chad's lawyers could have done was point out that the evidence about what happened to Cassidy while in Jeff's care was similar to the evidence about what happened at Chad's and Amanda's home. At Jeff's and Jennifer's home, Cassidy had accidents which caused bruises and probably her limping. Jeff spanked Cassidy, which was a disciplinary action never attributed to Chad. One important accident was the alleged fall from Jeff's truck during the three day/two night babysitting of October 26-28. She came home hungry and dehydrated from that babysitting. At Chad's trial, this incident was confused with a near-fall from Jeff's truck at his home a few days before Cassidy died.

As noted before, Chad's lawyers seemed to have accepted the view that Cassidy's death was a homicide. Instead, it may have been caused, or partially caused, by accidents, disease, chronic condition or toxins. At Jeff's she drank Windex and may have been exposed to mold, pesticides, and lead paint.

The point which could have been made to the jury was that if there is similar evidence apparently pointing to TWO people, AND there is evidence pointing to non-homicide causes of death, the jury could not convict ONE person of murder beyond a reasonable doubt.

Morrison

*10 August 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

#### Bob Arnold

Jeff Jeff Jeff. You sound like Obama laying blame on Bush. Very lame. Jeff was cleared by the police for reasons you're not able to understand.

*9 August 2011 - Rocgester*

#### Melissa

I guess what I mean is, it would be really nice to get answers from everyone else too. I just think that more than one person behaved differently than I, you, or someone may think they would. I think many people failed this poor child. And we can't truly be searching for HER justice if we aren't questioning everything- and everyone. Even Chad's supporters should be asking questions of him, but in my eyes he isn't the only one needing questioning.

*8 August 2011 - NH*

#### Melissa

Bob- here are some facts that you seem to continually miss:

Jeff made 12 phone calls before calling 911

Jeff says his cat alerted him to something being wrong with Cassidy- was his cat Lassie?

Jeff hit her bottom so hard he left bruises

Cassidy fell out of Jeff's truck and he didn't call 911 or even tell her mother until days later

Jeff "tripped over Cassidy and hurt her foot/leg!

Jeff never changed Cassidy the day she died, he never even touched her yet her clothes were removed.

Jeff is said to have referred to Cassidy as bitch, retard, and child of the corn.

I see your facts and points. I truly do! But what about these facts?!

As a mother, I can't overlook these huge things and not wonder if other people should be sitting in jail too, in addition, or in place of others.

*8 August 2011 - NH*

Melissa,

No I didn't know Chad personally, and I don't wish to have a hand-holding get together with him. All evidence paints a picture of the real Chad Evans, not the fictional Chad Evans that Eye Contact portrays him as. I believe that ultimately, the prosecution closing arguments speak volumes. So does the taped police interview of Chad.

I believe the most compelling evidence, which is factual and documented, is Chad's behavior on the 9th, beginning with the phone call from DCHS, and ending with his appearance at the Kittery PD with a posse of friends and supporters. He went as far as to have Tristan (estranged ex-wife who is not to have contact with) accompany him....he has her meet him at the Portsmouth traffic circle so she could "lead him" to the police station. Do you know how ridiculous that sounds? And then there's the taped interview.

There is one thing that is certain and it's this: No matter how many signatures you gather, no matter how many works of fiction are written about this case, it's doubtful that these endeavors will result in Chad's release.

Regards,

Bob

*7 August 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Melissa**

Bob you seem to speak as you knew Chad personally. That you know what kind of person he was and is. Did you ever meet Chad? Do you know someone personally who knows Chad? You're not reading all the interviews because Chad had plenty of people who thought he was a good guy. Did you read all the letters his friends and family sent in for his sentencing? Have you thought of debating with Chad and writing him?

I want to know what average guy in his mid 20's isn't horny all the time- I would love to meet a man in his 20's that would pass on an offer to have a threesome. My husband would LOVE it if I offered that to him, the difference is, unlike Amanda I don't want to. Amanda voluntarily participated in threesomes and anal sex- yet you continue to bring it up like he forced her. Anal sex may not be what you or I are into but that doesn't mean Amanda wasn't- or that its relevant to this case. Some of the things you point out are very much relevant.

*4 August 2011 - NH*

**Melissa**

(continued)

You say Chad referred to Cassidy as a bitch- so did Jeff. He said she was retarded and like a child of the corn. Those statements didn't come just from Chad either. I think it's awesome your analyzing everything about Chad- but what about everything in general? Analyze -where her pants when the day she died- why would he remove pants if he never touched her? Analyze if it took Chad too long to get to the station- not knowing what was wrong- Jeff knew what was wrong with Cassidy, so why did he make 12 phone calls before calling 911? Using common sense- anyone would call 911 first. Why did Jeff change his story about Cassidy falling out of his truck if he was so honest? Multiple people saw the bruising he left on her behind, why would a good person hit a child that hard? If he had nothing to hide and his story remained the same- why refuse a lie detector? You say he changed his story about the ball simply because he called the ball a new name. Why did his son tell

his mother that he had hit Cassidy with a ball if he hadn't? If I call a soccer ball a soccer ball, a beach ball, or simply a kick ball- doesn't mean I'm lying about my ball- it means I chose to call it a different kind of ball. It's not like he said oh it was a ball, then said I meant it was a toy, oh no wait- it was a fall. He simply called the ball two different words.

4 August 2011 - NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Thanks for your two comments. Responding to the first comment....

1. On Nov. 9, Chad was paged/called by the Kittery police. He was not told what had happened to Cassidy. He arrived two hours later for a trip which normally would take about an hour and a quarter. After he arrived, the police didn't interrogate him for three hours, which is a good indication of the lack of urgency which had previously been communicated.

2. I don't understand your point about right to counsel and going against common sense.

3. I did not point to the babysitter, but was trying to present the facts of the case, and they should speak for themselves. What is your evidence that Chad "changed his story?"

4. Chad clearly told the police about the ball hitting Cassidy on Nov. 8. Kyle told his mother that night during a phone call, though the type of ball was not stated. The misunderstandings by others doesn't mean that what Chad told the police was untrue.

Regarding my working for Chad and continued belief in his innocence, I said that there is no credible or reliable evidence that points to his murdering Cassidy. I see ambiguous facts, but nothing that credibly points to Chad. Regarding the charges of assaulting Cassidy by holding her face, he DID hold her face, but this was non-criminal parental communication and discipline.

(continued below)

4 August 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

(continued from above)

Responding to the more recent comment.....

1. A reasonable headline might have been, "Chad Evans Sells Land to Raise Funds for Legal Defense," or "Chad Evans Sells Land."

2. Your assessment of Chad Evans differs from mine. Can we just focus on the facts?

3. About Chad's actions on the 9th, we've gone over them several times. We disagree on the interpretation.

4. On several occasions, both Chad and Amanda let wishful thinking interfere with objective understanding of what might have been happening with Cassidy. You wrote, "Considering Chad's personality, he didn't give a damn about her." There is a lot of evidence in the book EYE CONTACT that Chad cared a lot about Cassidy. Even his holding her face to obtain eye contact when communicating important messages and disciplined shows that he cared about her.

5. Again about the ballhitting on the 8th. Chad told the police it was a "starter baseball" and a "hard rubber ball," which are the same thing. Other people made assumptions and misunderstood the ballhitting, but Chad never changed his story. This was a good example of where Chad's decision, not to testify, upon the advice of counsel, was devastating.

Regards,

Morrison

4 August 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

1: You try to vilify the press and lay blame on him for his conviction. Case in point, you complain about headlines, such as the one I've previously pointed out: "Convicted Child Killer Seeks to Sell Land." Well how would you suggest the editor of the paper reword that headline? "Chad Evans, a Swell Guy, Seeks to Sell Property"??

2: You paint a picture of a squeaky-clean, somewhat nerdy guy who has fallen in love with a girl and her daughter. He's a loving, family man who's planning to live happily ever-after with the woman of his dreams. HAVE YOU NOT READ AND UNDERSTOOD ALL OF THE POLICE INTERVIEWS OF PEOPLE WHO KNEW CHAD? He was not a nice guy. He was actually a self-absorbed, self centered horny guy who wanted to have threesomes and anal sex with his "dream girl" Amanda. He had a horrible, violent temper that resulted in injuries inflicted on others, including his ex-wife, Cassidy and Amanda.

3: You go to great lengths to down play his actions on the 9th, after being summoned to the Kittery PD. Did he go straight to the police station, as anyone would who had no guilt, and no idea what was going on, as he claims? No, he did everything that a guilty person would do.

4: Page 12..."(Cassidy)-was not at her best, but he was ever hopeful that she would improve, after the lethargic behavior of the previous day. THIS IS BIASED OPINIONED, NOT FACT. Considering Chad's personality, he didn't give a damn about her.

5: Page 12..... "(Cassidy) -had a bruise from the injury by a Tee-ball the previous night. ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF THE AMBIGUITY SURROUNDING THE BALL. Was it a Tee-ball, wiffle ball, starter ball, baseball, nobody knows because Chad could not keep his story straight.

Here are 5 examples, and I'm not even through page 12.

Regards,

*3 August 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

---

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison:

1: I absolutely disagree with you. Once again, I'm basing my argument on the fact that Chad Evans was not the type of person to let a homicide investigation focus on him, if in fact he was innocent. Chad Evans was a driven person, someone who had complete control over his life as well as his career. He was outspoken and had an aggressive personality. Consider this, if a guy like that was accused of something he didn't do, would he have behaved in the same fashion as the accused did?

2: Everyone has the right to legal council. It's guaranteed. However, when that advise goes against the grain of common sense (again, factoring in his personality), it simply makes no sense why he would hide, unless of course he was in fact guilty.

3: "The little bitch is acting weird" may not have been what Chad said, however the evidence of that statement was reinforced by multiple interviews with Marshall. You see, you point the finger at Jeff, but he was the only one of the two who was honest and truthful during the police investigation. His story never changed. Unlike Chad's.

4: A perfect example of Chad's inability to keep his story straight. There is so much ambiguity surrounding the ball story that nobody knows the truth.

5: See #4 above.

6: I gave you nearly 660 examples of bias. That's how many pages are in your book, however it appears you'd like some quotes so I'll show you the most blatant in the following days.

You state in your book that if you find any evidence that would point to guilt, you'd drop your client. I don't understand why you've not dropped Chad Evans. The evidence is so overwhelming. You're looking at things after sitting down and having a deep, meaningful, hand-holding, heart to heart get-together with him, and this has clouded your vision. You're not looking at him (or how he was) with objectivity.

Regards,

Bob

*3 August 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

1. You're right. After being accused by the police of Cassidy's murder, and being represented by lawyers, neither Chad nor his lawyers called the police proactively to request a meeting where he could affirmatively present his understanding of the facts. Of course, it's very rare that defense lawyers use such a strategy, but it can be done. On the other hand, the police didn't ask Chad or his lawyers for another interview, either. Also, the police never asked Chad for a polygraph even though Amanda told them that she had discussed the idea with Chad and he had agreed and even though he had offered to Sgt Stewart on the evening of November 9 to take a polygraph. The police seem to have assumed that Chad's lawyers would urge Chad to decline further interviews or a polygraph. Each side made assumptions about the other and played the legal game as it is usually scripted.

2. Please don't hold against Chad his choice to seek legal counsel. Isn't that what a reasonable person should do when accused of murder?

3. I don't believe that Chad said to Jeff Marshall when driving from Jeff's to pick up Kyle at day care, "The little bitch is acting weird." That was Jeff's recollection, so it's an unresolved "he said, he said" conflict between the two.

4. It's true that Amanda understood that the ball that hit Cassidy on the evening of November 8 was a wiffle ball. It was a reasonable assumption as most of the balls in the toy wheelbarrow were wiffle balls. Except for the two T-balls, and perhaps a tennis ball.

(continued in comment below)

*2 August 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

Morrison Bonpasse | 

(continued from above comment)

5. You wrote that Chad changed his story about the ball during his interrogation. Respectfully, I don't think so. On page 57 of Chad's interview, Rick LeClair asked him about bruises on Kassidy on the evening of the 8th, and Chad began with a description of the ballhitting incident. Here was the exchange:

CHAD: ".....She was sitting on the right hand side and you know I threw the ball and he hit it and but it was like, it was a hard rubber ball and he whacked her right on the side of the face, like right here."

MCCLEISH: "The ball with ..."

CHAD: "With the ball."

MCCLEISH: "You say a rubber ball ..."

CHAD: "Well it's like, you know one of those starter baseballs."

Do you really think that saying "starter baseballs" in that exchange over a few seconds was a change in his story? Both expressions, "hard rubber ball" and "starter baseballs" correctly describe the T-balls which the police seized during the search of Chad's home.

6. I'm still waiting for some examples of bias that you found in the book, "EYE CONTACT." I'm working on Version 2, and would like to make all necessary corrections.

Regards,

Morrison

*2 August 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

Bob Arnold | 

Morrison,

1. Nearly every page shows bias slanted towards Chad. There is very little objectivity, and where there is some, it's lost in the bias.

2. You're right, I'll try to play nice.

3. Absolutely negative. Chad did not cooperate. He told lies and half-truths during the initial interrogation. He also lawyered up. The police told him to call them anytime, he never called them back. Not once.

4. You got me there. I should rephrase it to: "Hey, the bitch is acting weird." Blodgett and the other investigators were putting the heat on Chad's friends. That's what happens during a homicide investigation. The wiffle ball/T ball/starter ball story is just that, it's a story. He told Amanda that it was a wiffle ball. He changed it to a "hard rubber ball" during his interview. The guy couldn't keep his story straight.

Regards,

Bob

*1 August 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

Bob Arnold | 

There you go again Becky. I would expect more from a chairperson of the Rochester Chad Evans

Wrongly Convicted Committee. Perhaps I expect too much? Do you not know that this is an area for debate/discussion, no matter how ugly it gets? You probably think the Kittery Police, NH State Police and the Attorney General should apologize too. If you can't handle what is being written, how can you handle a debate on the street or at one of your meetings? There are a lot of people who think he's guilty, so toughen up, take another sip of your machademia nut flavored organic green tea and finish your free-range chicken sandwich. When you're done, come back and post something else.

I think Chad is guilty. Morrison does not. He and I are in a debate (though I lack the civility that he does). Feel free to jump in anytime you wish.

Best Regards,

Bob

1 August 2011 - Rocheser, NH

---

**Becky Boudreau** | 

Once again Mr. Arnold, I think you need to apologize!!

1 August 2011 - Rochester, NH

---

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

1. In a previous comment, you stated that my book, "EYE CONTACT" was biased, and I asked you for a few examples which showed such bias. So far, you have provided none.
2. Your satirical mock "news" article about Chad's sale of land to help pay his legal expenses doesn't advance the search for truth. As is said at the top of this "online comments" page, this is a forum for "opinion and facts about the case." Let's try providing more facts and less opinion.
3. Except for telling the "trampoline story" lie, Chad cooperated fully with the police investigation. If you can cite any evidence showing a lack of cooperation, please say so.
4. In your satirical mock article, you attributed a quote to Chad, "Hey. Everybody lies." He never said that to anyone. However, as is noted in the book and website, Maine State Police Detective Angela Blodgett did say to Amanda, "I think everybody lies." (Nov. 9 interview, page 864) I think she was right. The police told Jeremy Hinton that Jeff Marshall had taken a lie detector test, when, in fact, he had not. Was that a lie? Calling something a lie is a question of intent, so I choose to call that police mis-statement simply that. The bruises which were the subject of the "trampoline story" had absolutely nothing to do with Cassidy's death, but the story did lead the police to question everything that Chad told them, and that was a major cause of his wrongful conviction. Much of what Chad told the police was corroborated by others or by physical evidence, such as the half-eaten banana in his kitchen trash, but the police continued to disbelieve him. Perhaps the most notable example of that disbelief was the prosecution's view that Cassidy was not hit by a batted ball on the evening of November 8, or, if she was, it was only by a wiffle ball. She WAS hit by a T-ball, i.e. a "hard rubber ball" or "starter baseball" as Chad told the police in his interrogation. Please, can you use this section to present facts and fact-based opinion?

Morrison

30 July 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

---

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,

You're absolutely right about how the media vilified poor Chad. You gave an example, front page news headline said "Convicted Child Killer Seeks to Sell Property." Why couldn't they rephrase that,

something more like "Chad Evans, A Swell Guy, Seeks to Sell Property" ...then the story could begin something like this:

Chad Evans, a swell guy, is seeking to sell a portion of his property in order to pay his outrageous attorney fees. Poor Chad must pay the fees, even though his attorneys did a lousy job of defending him. We spoke to poor Chad, as he fought back tears, he proclaimed "I'm a man of my word, and I pay everyone I owe, because the bible says 'let no man be owed money from you'"

Upon further investigation, it was revealed that poor Chad is actually innocent of the ridiculous charges against him. As Chad put it, "I didn't beat the little bitch."

Poor Chad has been incarcerated as a result of a police conspiracy to undo him. Even though Chad refused to cooperate with the police investigation, and went as far as lie to the investigating officers, poor Chad believes "hey, everyone lies."

Poor Chad is very well liked by everyone at the prison, including the guards. Many of the guards look up to poor Chad, as well as other prisoners who have been segregated from general population in order to protect their lives from evil pr editors. As poor Chad's girlfriend put it, "the guards really like him and respect him. So do the other prisoners."

Poor Chad would like to create a shrine to Bula Bula, the god of injustice, and dedicate it to Cassidy, who he says he misses very much. "I miss the little f\*cking bitch."

What do you think Morrison?

Bob

*30 July 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Bob Arnold** | 

P.S.

Now I know you're going to come back and ask me to give you some examples. The entire book is written as if the reader is either completely oblivious to the facts, or someone who is already a Chad Evans supporter.

In a nutshell, ou're preaching to the choir.

Bob

*29 July 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrion,

I agree with you, Judge Nadeau and the entire prosecution team should have sat down and talked with Chad, got to know him, have some coffee together and share their feelings. I'm sure he would never have been convicted if they set aside some of their time for him.

The United States should have done the same with Osama Bin Laden. We should have arranged a meeting, sat down with him and talked with him. Get to know him. Find out what we did and what we could do to make things better.

You need to rewrite this entire book and remove your bias. How can anyone take this thing seriously? What amazes me is this: You're obviously a well educated, smart guy. Why would you write something like that?

Start over. You can do better.

Regards,

Bob

*29 July 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,

I looked at the pics and there's nothing new there, just more information about each pic.

The book is well written, your writing skills should be used writing about something else, like the Battle of Gettysburg or the Battle of 73 Easting. Or maybe how the German Army killed millions of Russian jews during their march through the Ukraine, a fact that most people are unaware of. You seem to be an injustice type of guy, there's so much injustice that you could write about, like how Ward Bird was convicted and thrown in prison for something that should have resulted in a warning from the police.

I'm no closer to believing Chad is innocent than you are to believing he's guilty. I'm still patiently waiting for that one piece of overwhelming evidence, so far I've not seen it.

Best Regards,

Bob

*28 July 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Now that you mention it, your comment about Chad's shirt could have been taken as a joke. I had previously read several things you had said about Chad that seemed unfair, and I just assumed that the shirt comment was to be taken seriously . Beware of assumptions, right? Thanks for the lightening up.

In a few minutes, I'll be posting another "key document" on the Home Page of Chad's website. I call it, "Kassidy Photo Album - June-November, 2000" It has ten photos of Kassidy with descriptions, plus a list of many of the missing photos.

How is the book coming? Questions?

Morrison

*26 July 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Becky** | 

Whoa Bob, that was a low blow.  
I really think you need to apologize.

23 July 2011 - Rochester, NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Judging people by what they wear on a hot June day at the park doesn't seem fair. It's not my style either, but so what? You've made some thoughtful and helpful comments in these exchanges, but that wasn't one of them. The most helpful was pointing out the "Mice Cube" testimony. I hadn't noticed before, but it appears that the prosecution intentionally asked Sgt. Magee about the "Mice Cube" to try to further poison (pun intended) the jury against Chad. My guess is that the prosecution didn't know what a "Mice Cube" was, either. I wonder if anyone in the jury knew. Unfortunately, in the American jury system in most states, jurors are not permitted to ask questions, or they don't know that they can do so. In the Federal trial of "Scooter Libby," the jurors were permitted to ask questions, by submitting them to the judge for him to ask the question of the witness or attorneys. The photo you referenced is of Chad and Kyle, and is Pam Evans's favorite. She took the photo of her son and grandson on Saturday, June 10, 2000 where Chad's stepson, Brent, was playing Little League baseball.

The previous evening and night, Amanda had brought Kassidy to Chad's for the first time, and they all made a Greek salad for dinner. On the 10th, Amanda and Kassidy went back to Amanda's parents' in Auburn, Maine. Within three weeks, by early July, they had both moved to Chad's home. Any questions or observations about the book, "EYE CONTACT"?

Morrison

23 July 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,

you might consider changing the picture on the website, first one on the left of Chad wearing a wife beater shirt, although it does suit him.

Bob

23 July 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Bob Arnold** | 

Roger that.

Regards,

Bob

21 July 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

I have more information about the "mice cubes" that Sgt. Magee described when he said, "I'm not too certain. I guess it looks like it's to control mice, whether it's a poison or mouse poison." Chad called me today and I asked him about the "mice cubes." It turns out that it's a brand name for a humane mouse trap made in Manchester, NH, and marketed by Pied Piper International in New Castle, NH. "Mice Cubes" are available on Amazon.com and other outlets. The box states, "The only mousetrap you'll ever use! safe, clean, silent, re-usable, humane, easy-to-use AND IT

WORKS! Will not harm children or pets." The mechanics are that homeowners put bait (peanut butter is recommended) inside the "Mice Cube" box and the mouse walks in and is trapped, in a way that's similar to how a lobster trap works. To see photographs of a "Mice Cube" box and materials, see the entry in the "Chronology" at Chad's website for 8:20 p.m., Wednesday, November 8.

It's perhaps a small matter, but the message that Chad's jury received from Sgt. Magee was that Chad and Amanda has discarded poison in a regular trashbasket where Cassidy could have found it and eaten it. As with so many other mistakes in this case, it simply wasn't true.

Regards,  
Morrison

21 July 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Thanks for the reference to Sgt. Magee's testimony where he recalled seeing "mice cubes" which he understood to be a type of mouse poison. I'll ask Chad about that.

During his police interrogation on November 9, he said, "When we went inside, I sat her down on the counter and I opened up the mouse trap, I caught a mouse. She actually acknowledged it, [and] pointed [to] it. And Kyle is "Daddy you got another mouse." You know whatever."

In his May 31, 2011 "Letter" (See "Key Documents #11, on home page), he wrote that they were using a "Have a heart" trap. My understanding of "Have a heart" traps is that the animal survives and can then be released in the wild/backyard. Chad wrote, "Looking in the trashcan, they found the box for the mousetrap..." Again, I'll ask Chad.

Thanks again for the reference, which DID save me time. I would have looked in Sgt. Magee's search documents, and was about to ask members of the Chad Evans Wrongly Convicted Committee to help me find such a reference.

Regarding "Dirty Deeds Done Dirt Cheap" I initially thought it was a clever slogan for a landscaping company, and I still do. Later, somebody told me that it was the name of an AC/DC song, so I looked it up, and thought the lyrics were interesting. That's all. Interesting. Elsewhere, I noted that Chad shopped for healthy foods, and he worked at McDonald's. I thought that was interesting.

Regarding your perception of bias, please remember that the book cover says, "By Morrison Bonpasse with Chad Evans." I've presented what he said and what others said as best I can. The book is about Chad and his wrongful conviction. Where I've found evidence to contradict what someone said, that evidence is presented. I don't think that presenting Chad's words show a bias. If there were two or more versions of an event and I only presented his version, that would be an indication of bias; and if you find such bias, please let me know.

Regarding Chad's taking the Fifth during his deposition in Jeff's civil lawsuit against him, I was very disappointed when I read that. You and I interpret that differently. I see it as another example of how the legal system is often a high stakes game, instead of a process for gleaning truth.

Regards,  
Morrison

21 July 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,

12 Dec, redirect, page 78.

Regards,

Bob

20 July 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,

I've been able to pick out facts that I was not aware of, like the fact that Chad took the Fifth at his civil deposition.....this is really revealing to me. Chad took the Fifth when asked questions regarding Cassidy's death. However, I do have problems, and it's this: Your version of events reeks with bias, here are a few examples:

When Cassidy woke up early, Chad yelled to her: "Cassidy, go to sleep baby."

As Amanda rolled down her window I said, "I didn't kiss Cassidy yet." I quickly opened the backseat door and kissed Cassidy on the forehead. "I love you, have a good day baby." That is when I noticed she had somehow gotten hold of her Ziplock cereal baggie, had opened it and was eating some of her cereal. I was amazed that she could open it. I believe I said out loud. "You little shit. I didn't know you could open these." I said to Amanda, something like, "Baby, she opened her cereal bag. Did you know she could open them?"

These are example of attempts at portraying Chad Evans as a sweet guy. One only needs to look at actual police interviews as well as court testimony to see that Chad wasn't the sweet guy you're trying to picture him as.

You keep pointing the finger at Jeff Marshall, a good example is putting the lyrics to "dirty deeds" in the book, as if Jeff's landscaping company slogan was an omen of the evil that brewed in him. Entries such as this demonstrates an eagerness to seek the same failed defense that Chad's attorneys used, "Jeff Marshall did it" doesn't work.

I believe that if you're going to get freedom for Chad Evans, you're going to need to avoid the same lame explanations and accusations that were used at his trial....IF he is innocent, the evidence is somewhere in the vast amount of documents you've obtained and made available to visitors to this site. You've got to find it.

I expected "Eye Contact" to be a highly biased attempt to rewrite the record, and so far you've not disappointed me.

Best regards,

Bob

20 July 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

I didn't ask for anything about the summary of Crystal Martin's interview, which I read. I asked for help in identifying the potentially harmful substance you said that Sgt. Magee had found in the trash at Chad's. Again, can you tell me what that substance was, and in which wastebasket it was found? That would save me some time.

Regarding the Alfred Trenkler case, I believe he is "Perfectly Innocent" which is the name of the e-book I wrote about that case. We photocopied or printed about 150 copies. Incidentally, four of Alfred's jurors read that book and then wrote to the trial judge to disavow their votes on the jury and to ask for a new trial or other relief. However, this is Chad Evans's website. The only connection between Alfred's case and Chad's is that Chad read the front page November 22, 2009 Sunday Boston Herald article about Alfred's case and he asked his father to contact me in December 2009. That was how I began to work for Chad and his family.

If you would like to explore further the Alfred Trenkler case, please send me an email. Alfred's website has an "online comments" section, too, but I just checked and the content is missing, so I will contact the ISP to have it restored.

The ebook, "EYE CONTACT," is currently being distributed by email and by posting it on Chad's website. Our plan has been to edit the book from its current 422,000 words to about 120,000 words and self-publish it as a 400 page paperback. As many copies will likely be given away, the anticipated retail price of \$15.00 (less to bookstores) would hopefully pay for the costs of printing if we can sell about half of the anticipated printing of 1,000 copies. The primary goal of the book is to communicate the truth about the Chad Evans case.

Regards,  
Morrison

*20 July 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,

Crystal Martin, her interview with police, it's in the Investigation and Related Docs, have you not read that? I'm starting to wonder about you, and I'm starting to question what your real motives are.

I'm really shocked that you've taken up the Trenkler case, this one is really hard to swallow because Trenkler was clearly guilty, not to mention that the guy blew up two police officers, killing one and nearly killing the other. What kind of person are you Morrison? I give you a tip, and you want me to spell it out for you? You can find what I've described in the trial docs. You claim to be a private investigator, but your actions raise considerable doubt about what your intentions are.

Please provide a breakdown of the cost for each of your "Eye Contact" books. I'm curious about the \$20 charge for each book, as well as why you're recommending supporters of Chad Evans purchase 5 copies.

Also, please give me a brief explanation about why you're trying to free Trenkler, a cop killing, bomb making terrorist.

Regards,

Bob

*19 July 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Regarding Chad having liquor at his home while on probation, I'll ask him about Detective Linscott's summary of the interview with Crystal Martin. Linscott reported, "Martin stated they were having a couple of drinks and Chad put the drinks in cups because he was on probation." That seems odd to me, as I don't see what putting anything in cups will do, but I'll ask Chad. If he did serve alcohol to Crystal and Amanda, he was also serving alcohol to minors. However, it doesn't seem like a large

problem to me, given the home-setting and the apparently minimal drinking. To my knowledge no other interviewees mentioned drinking alcohol with Chad during the year of his probation. He certainly did not abuse alcohol during that period. He told me that his probation officer stopped at Chad's home several times during outdoor parties to be sure that there was no alcohol present - and there wasn't.

Thanks for reading EYE CONTACT, or, at least starting. To save me time, can you tell me what Sgt. Magee found in the trash that you referenced that could have been toxic to Cassidy? Magee mentioned several trash baskets, including the one in the kitchen, with the half-eaten banana, and Chad's bedroom, where two diapers were found.

Regarding the book generally, it can always be improved, and I appreciate your bringing any inaccuracies to my attention.

Regarding the conversations with Jeff Marshall, you will see what Jeff recalled in his interviews and trial testimony.

You wrote that "...back then, from what I've read, Chad wasn't such a nice guy." If that's true, and I understand that not everyone liked Chad, then what do you think of the 52 pre-sentencing letters written to Judge Nadeau? What do you think of his 1997 "Hero" award?

Regards,  
Morrison

19 July 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,

Read Crystal Martin's summary of interview in regards to drinking alcohol from paper cups because "Chad was on probation and isn't allowed to have liquor in the house."

I've started reading your book and I would like to point a few things out. First, as a private investigator, I believe you are not doing a thorough job. So far, you're just rehashing things over and over. You've not produced anything that would tend to shed light on the "mystery" of Cassidy's death. Example, per testimony of Sgt. William Magee, something was found in the trash at Evan's home during their search. I'm not going to mention what it was, just consider this a tip and I'll let you find it. If that certain something happened to have chemicals in it (if a child ate it) that would affect a child in ways that were agreeable with the findings of the medical examiner, well I believe you would stand a good chance of proving Evan's innocence. Do you see where I'm going with this? I don't think you've digging deep enough, you're just going by what Chad says and that's not going to get you anywhere.

Second, I believe your description of events, such as conversations, are not accurate, namely Chad's statements to Marshall when Chad had called him about the DCYF call. You're not giving an accurate description of that conversation (I believe Chad said something to the effect of: "Amanda and the little bitch can get the fuck out of my house", not "well they're going to need to stay with you until things blow over"). I like the time line of events that took place on the 9th, you've filled in some gaps that I've been looking for information on, but it really is frustrating when I read statements that Chad supposedly made that paint him as a nice, decent guy when in fact, he was a real jerk.

I'm sure that prison has humbled Chad, and he's turned into a nice guy now, but back then, from what I've read, Chad wasn't such a nice guy.

Regards,

Bob

19 July 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Responding to your two comments:

I don't recall seeing any report or reference that Chad broke his 1999 probation by having liquor or weapons at his home. During one of the November 2000 searches of his home, ammunition was found in a long-forgotten box. When Chad's probation officer was told of the box, he told the searching officers to leave it at the home, and that he would pick it up later. It didn't seem to be a big problem to him. The charge that the ammunition represented a violation of his probation was later dismissed by a Rochester District Court judge.

It is true that Chad violated the bail condition that he have no contact with Amanda, and he paid a heavy price for that violation by being sent to jail. That reduced his ability to work with his attorneys on his defense and reduced his ability to visit his son. That does not make him a child abuser and murderer. Incidentally, I've never said he was "squeaky clean." Most of us aren't.

The quotes from Jeff Marshall's testimony at Chad's trial are Jeff's recollections and interpretations. He also said in his police interviews that Chad was in debt because of gambling, which was not true. Jeff said that he and Jennifer were asked to babysit Cassidy when Chad and Amanda visited Chad's parents in Keene because they didn't want to take Cassidy and show her alleged bruises. As far as I know, Chad and Amanda went to Keene twice and both times they took Cassidy. However, as you requested in an earlier comment, let's not make this about Jeff.

Morrison

18 July 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Chad quotes:

Jeff Marshall testimony at trial...

-about call received from Chad on 11/9:

"I got a call from DHS, they were asking questions (about) Cassidy.....if this shits going to keep up, Manda and the little bitch (are) going to have to get the fuck out of my house"

-about confrontation with Chad outside police station on evening of 11/9:

"How can you do this to me, how can you tell them everything!"

-about the circus of friends that Chad arranged to rally support for him at the police station:

"Jeremy, Bruce, his ex-wife, Travis, he brought everyone there."

You see, this guy that you are trying to pass off as a squeaky-clean, honest, hard-working good father is nothing more than an angry, self centered control freak who only cared about himself.

17 July 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison, none of what you just wrote is convincing. And as far as his the call from the police goes, whom in their right mind would not show concern and sense of urgency in getting to the police station if one were summoned? I'm telling you, if he were innocent he would have high-tailed it down there ASAP. However, he knew that his life was about to take a turn for the worse, after the second call from DCYF and the police summons. This is a guy who had no respect for the law in the first place. Even while on probation, he broke probation by having liquor, weapons and ammunition in his home. Later, while out on bail, he broke his bail conditions.

*17 July 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

In my note below, I meant to refer to the Not Guilty verdict in the First Degree Assault charge of fracturing Cassidy's leg. The charge for the allegedly fractured arm was not sent to the jury, because Judge Nadeau believed it to be too lacking in substance to warrant its consideration by the jury.

*17 July 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,  
Respectfully, what you call "indisputable facts" are not facts and they are very disputable. Why do you insist that Chad show a great sense of urgency when he was paged by the Kittery Police? Did the police communicate that sense of urgency? Did the police show a sense of urgency? Did they tell Chad to come right away or as soon as possible? Did they tell him what the call was about? When Chad arrived, did the police want to talk with him right away, with any sense of urgency? The answer to all these questions is NO. In fact, he left his meeting with his supervisor immediately after getting the page and he made it to the police station two hours later.  
(continued below)

*17 July 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

(continued from above)

The only lie Chad told the police was the "trampoline story," which had absolutely nothing to do with Cassidy's death. He shouldn't have told the police that story, but he did. Period.

Chad and Amanda loved each other, and their love grew through this terrible double tragedy: Cassidy's death and the wrongful convictions of Chad and Amanda. They were even engaged to be married after Amanda was released from jail, but such a plan did not survive Chad's continued incarceration.

Regarding Chad's not testifying, he was advised that he would have a better chance of being found "Not Guilty" and returning to his beloved son if he didn't testify. He took that advice. The lawyers were the experts, and he was not. Is it cowardly to take the advice of one's lawyers? In hindsight, it was a terrible decision, and one that Chad regretted almost from that last day of his trial, but that was the decision and it wasn't cowardly.

Here are three indisputable facts, for starters:

1. The jury was not told about Cassidy's medical appointments of August 10 and September 11.
2. The jury was not told about the DNA tests of the blood under Cassidy's fingernails.
3. The jury was not shown other photographs if a bruise-free Cassidy during the period of the indicted charges.

The jury found Chad Not Guilty of one Second Degree Assault charge because, I believe, they saw ONE photograph of a bruise-free Cassidy and that was taken during the period of that "Not Guilty" charge. Why are you so sure that if the jury had been shown other photographs and been told about several other observations of bruise-free days, they would not have found Chad "Not Guilty" of other charges? They also found Chad not guilty of fracturing Cassidy's arm.

Morrison

**Melissa**

Bob thanks for the reasoning on why he brought her to the porch. But why were her pants removed? That still hasn't been answered. Why did Jeff call 12 people before calling 911? Hope you are enjoying this nice weekend!

17 July 2011 - NH

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,

It's no mystery to me. These are the facts and they are indisputable:

The only urgency shown by Chad on the 9th, after receiving a page from the Kittery PD, was making calls to Tristan, Marshall and at least two other friends, and stopped at the Portsmouth McDonald's to talk to Jeremy Hinton. All of these people that he spoke with were challenged by Evans, he was wanting to know who called DCYF and what was going on at the police station. There was no urgency to get to the police station. There was no urgency to call the police back. Why? Because of conscious guilt.

During the police interview, Chad's behavior was shameful. Chad lied repeatedly. This you can not dispute or explain away. He intentionally obstructed justice. He lied about the time it took him to get there, he lied about the relationship with Amanda, he lied about disciplining Cassidy, he repeatedly tried to control the interview. He hid behind that chair, cracked jokes, etc. Then he refused to cooperate and told the police he wanted a lawyer. The jury viewed this taped interview and drew the same conclusions that I did.

The only thing that Chad was honest about was that he didn't love Amanda. Your story of Chad being in love with Amanda is spin. Chad used Amanda's feelings for him as leverage to get her to recant her statements to police, to persuade her, to influence her to take sides with him.

The jury would have convicted, regardless of what lies/spin Chad came up with. True, the defense only called one witness. However, they had the opportunity to cross examine every one of the prosecution's witnesses, and Chad had the opportunity to testify on his own behalf, and like the guilty, cowardly person he is, he refused.

Regards,

Bob

17 July 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

I am confident that if Chad's jury had known more about Chad, Amanda and Cassidy during the fall of 2000, Chad would not have been found guilty of any crime. The jurors did not know about Cassidy's medical appointments on August 10 and September 11, and didn't see the available photographs of a bruise-free Cassidy, and didn't know about the November 5 gathering at Chad's sister's home to which Chad brought Cassidy. The list of what the jury didn't know is long. I wish I knew why Cassidy Bortner died. It remains a mystery. In the absence of that knowledge, it's wrong to keep an innocent man in prison without a thorough re-investigation of the case.  
Morrison

17 July 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

I'm sure Eye Contact will become a rallying cry for all the misled Chad Evans supporters, however I doubt there will be anything of material value in it. Similar to the spin that is generated by this website. Cases in point: The portrayal of Chad and Amanda, being "in love" and starting a new life together, when in fact this is a gross misrepresentation of the facts.

The pictures of Cassidy that are posted here, as well as comments regarding justice for her. The fact of that matter is this, that Chad abused this 18 month old child, and as the prosecution proved beyond a doubt, was responsible for her death.

The accusations against Jeff Marshall, which are outright ridiculous. Jeff cooperated with the police, Chad did not. Jeff was truthful with the police, Chad was not. Chad lied, misled, deceived and knowingly obstructed a police investigation. Jeff was the only one who sought medical attention for Cassidy, Chad on the other hand repeatedly kept Cassidy from seeing a doctor (see Amanda's first two police interviews, which she later recanted after Chad Evans committed witness tampering). So to point the finger at Marshall is simply lame, just ask the jury who convicted Chad.

The demands for an "independent and fair" investigation. There's already been an investigation, grand jury, and trial. It's a done deal, he's guilty. Besides, if he lied and obstructed justice the first time around, you better bet that he's going to do it again. He's already doing in and he's rounded up a network of people to believe the lies he tells. You say "he will testify this time." So why didn't he testify the first time around? I know why and deep down, so do you.

17 July 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,  
I believe that 51/53 is a duplex building which faces Rogers Road. The driveway is Johnson Court, along the northeast end of the building. Johnson Ct. also has two other homes on it. The 51 Rogers Road porch is at the southwest end of the duplex building, i.e. toward the river.  
The Kittery Police Station is at 200 Rogers Road, which is northeast and on the way to the Kittery Mall, where Amanda and Jennifer worked. Also at the Mall is the McDonald's where Chad took Amanda and Cassidy for a surprise lunch after Amanda started working at Old Navy. Two of the day care centers which Amanda called on November 3 and 8 are nearby on a state highway.  
Morrison

16 July 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison, well it's hard to tell from the street which is the front and which is the side of those two other houses which are situated behind 47 Rogers Road. Judging by the appearance, I would say

that the third house has no traditional "front side" and the main egress is on the side facing the shared drive/parking area.

16 July 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

It's always been my understanding that Jeff brought Kassidy to the side porch so that he and she would be more visible to the EMT's when they came down Rogers Road.

When the book "Eye Contact" is posted on the website later this week, I hope you will read it, and ask more questions.

Morrison

16 July 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

I have wondered why Jeff brought Kassidy to the porch while waiting for the EMT's. I drove by 51 Rogers Road today and discovered that the house does not abute Rogers Road, it's located behind a detached house on that road, this would explain why Jeff brought Kassidy to the front porch. I had to drive by twice before I realized it. So this would explain why Jeff brought her out on the porch, because there are what appear to be three different detached structures, one behind the other, with a shared gravel drive.

I'm still open to any compelling evidence, and I'm still looking at things with an open mind....However, I still think Chad Evans is guilty.

16 July 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Melissa**

Bob- I very much appreciate and can "hack" your questions. My question is can you not "hack" mine? Why are mine less important than yours? Again, Im so glad you keep coming back- you keep asking great questions. Some of which I too have asked at one time or another. But how can you not question the rest of it? How can you not question Jeff, Jenn, or anyone but Chad. This site isnt just for Chad, its for Kassidy. To bring truth and awareness to the entire thing- not just Chad. Thanks again =)

15 July 2011 - NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

I understand your question as we have covered this territory before. The police would not tell him what the problem was. He was not able to reach Amanda or Jennifer. When he reached Jeff, Jeff passed the phone to a Kittery policeman who asked him to come to the station. There was no mention of any difficulty for Kassidy. Chad had received the DCYF call in the morning. Chad was nervous because of Amanda's residency issue, and because he thought that his own divorce was not yet final, even though it was final on October 4. He was nervous because the police in Rochester treated him badly in March of 1999 after his fight with Tristan. Yes, he was a McDonald's manager with a good salary, and he had been an elected official in Keene, but he was still a high school graduate and was intimidated by policemen.

We know in 2011 that Kassidy had died at about 12:30 p.m., so it seems logical to us that anyone who loved Kassidy would rush to the police station if that would help in any way. But Chad simply didn't know. He was asked to go to a police station and not a hospital. What was it about? No one would say. Wouldn't that uncertainty be a little unnerving?

Given what you know of the case, when do you think that Chad delivered the blows to Kassidy that were said to kill her, and why? He had a good day at work on the 8th, and had his beloved son for a day or two. He was planning on going away for the weekend with Amanda on a business trip to Maine.

A critical part of any conviction for a crime is a motive and intent. What were they for your view of Chad's alleged actions?

Morrison

14 July 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Melissa,

I originally came to this site in Feb with an open mind because like you, I wanted to know the truth, and the fact of the matter is this: I wanted to believe that this guy was innocent. Yes, believe it or not, I really wanted to find something that would convince me that he was, in fact, innocent or even possibly innocent, but I could not. Now Melissa, Morrison appreciates my skepticism because hey, these are the same questions that most people have, not to mention the state. If you can't hack this level of questioning, how in the world do you think you're going to convince anyone about what you believe?

Morrison, you've got to put yourself in Chad's shoes on the 9th. You're a successful guy, you've got a great job and you make over \$70k a year, you've got a company car, you're in charge of eight restaurants, and you didn't get here by being a passive pansy. On the contrary, you're a go-getter, an aggressive type person with an aggressive personality. NOW THINK ABOUT IT Morrison.....you've received a message from the Kittery Police, requesting you to report to the police station. With all that said, what would YOU do if you were that person (and you're completely innocent of any wrong doing)..???? Morrison, this is important because you've got to really look deep inside and ask yourself this question: Would I immediately make way for the police station, and make every effort to call them and find out what's going on? Or do you start calling people like your ex wife, your friends, etc....???? Do you see where I'm going with this?

14 July 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Melissa**

Bob- I don't think we can solely talk about Chad if we are trying to discuss Cassidy. In fact Jeff is a key player in all this. Why is Chad questioned here and not Jeff, Jenn, Amanda, or anyone in her life? The sad reality of this case is Cassidy's life was unjustly cut short! The fact that Chad likes anal sex has nothing to do with Cassidy having on no pants and having enlarged genitals. You keep asking Morrison the same things over and over- do you feel his answers will change for you? I love that you're coming back and asking questions- but I feel it's not with an open mind. I could be wrong- please excuse me if I am. But I feel if your open than your open to every single aspect of this and not just to the subject of Chad. The honest truth is, most of the adults in this beautiful girl's life failed her. Even Jenn and Jeff!

14 July 2011 - NH

**Melissa**

Things clearly happened at that home, Jeff's, which are left unanswered. Why did it take so long to call 911? Why did he call so many people first? If he took her from his room and into the kitchen how did blood and his DNA end up on the same napkin on the bed where her pants were? He clearly removed her pants- why? If I don't change my son's diaper, clothes, or even touch him I have no reason to remove his pants. I know for sure if his eyes were rolling into the back of his head the last thing I would think to do is remove his pants.... I can't get past her lack of pants, as you can't get past Chad's interview.

If the VSA he took is not as good as a lie detector why does the military use it? Why can I find more positive information than negative? Unfortunately Chad took a VSA and not the LD like you want- maybe someday he will- here is a question- what will your response be if a LD says he is being honest? Will that too not be a good source? Why did no one else take one?

Thanks for coming back- I would love to hear your take on my questions- I feel your answer of- we are talking about Chad not Jeff is no different than you thinking we parade behind quotes.

14 July 2011 - NH

Bob,

I'm very cautious about saying that someone lied, and believe that Travis Hunt told the police the truth, to the best of his recollection, in his interviews and courtroom testimony at Chad's and Amanda's trials. Yes, the prosecutors thought he was not telling the truth because his statements regarding Cassidy in the bathtub on Wednesday, Nov. 8, didn't conform to the police/prosecutor theory of the crime. Yes, Travis and Irene Ricci had a slightly different recollection of what he felt or said when he arrived at Irene's that night, but I wouldn't accuse either of lying. Nonetheless, specifically, what alleged lie(s) are you referencing?

Regarding the jury's not knowing about the Nov. 5 gathering at Chad's sister's home, there are several important points. First, Chad was not hiding Cassidy. Second, he appeared to others to be caring for her in a loving way. Third, as you noted, the only bruise noted by Brandon and Nicole was the bruise on Cassidy's right cheek, which appeared to be the same bruise as observed by Tristan on the 30th. Fourth, Cassidy appeared to be tired and slept for some part of the day, which may have been an indication of a serious illness or condition that played some part in her death four days later.

Regarding Chad's activities on the way to the Kittery Police Station on the afternoon of Nov. 9, he was worried and nervous, but not for the reasons you imply. He called Jeff's number and tried to call Amanda and Jennifer. While on the way to Kittery, Jeremy called Chad, and then Chad's secretary called him about the upcoming labor audit. Jeremy called Chad again, and they talked and Chad also talked with Travis. Chad called Tristan for general advice and for help in finding the Kittery Police Station. Tristan called him back. He called one of his two best friends, Bruce Aube, and left a message. He brought a "soup cooker" to the Portsmouth McDonald's, which was only slightly out of the way to Kittery, and talked with Travis and Jeremy there.

Finally, I agree that the DNA tests did not solve the case, but they did provide important information which the jury and the defense attorneys did not know. If the attorneys had known, there would have been several different questions for several witnesses.

Morrison

*14 July 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

Bob Arnold | 

Morrison, Melissa brought up the "enlarged anus" findings of the ME Medical Examiner. I was just pointing out something to her that reminded me of something Chad demanded, that's all.

Hunt, well yes he lied. Read his second interview. Then read his girlfriend's interview. They actually called her to the witness stand to show that Hunt was not being truthful.

As far as how she looked at a family gathering on the 5th, you're saying that the new bruise on the right side of Cassidy's face cleared up? This was the new bruise reported by Tristan Evans to DCYF on 10/31 via phone call.

As far as the blood under fingernails thing, whenever someone brings up "DNA" it sounds powerful. It's a term that reminds us of convicted killers who were later determined to be innocent. I don't see how it is going to help in this case. You keep saying that, "DNA" just like you throw around the term "lie detector test" which you know will attract attention, because most people associate "lie detector" with "polygraph" and Chad did not take a "polygraph."

The family gathering on the 5th, blood under the fingernails, not convincing.

As I stated before, Chad had a driving personality and putting pressure on people came naturally for him. Why did he call Tristan on the 9th, just after he got the page from Kittery PD? He called her asking why Kittery PD wanted him. He asked her "why would Kittery PD be calling me about the baby, what happened to the baby?" You see Morrison, he was on the phone all afternoon with everyone within his spear of influence, questioning them, confronting them, "buttoning things up" because he knew, he knew he was in trouble. He tells Tristan "have everyone call me." He goes to see Jeremy Hinton, does the same thing with him. He's fishing around, calculating his next move. He's planning. He's shoring things up because he knows his ship is sinking. He has everyone he knows meet him at the Kittery PD. What kind of sick, twisted person does this? He knows what's about to happen, he's preparing himself. Now with that in mind, go watch the video taped interrogation. Control freak.

14 July 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,  
I don't see why you seem to believe that Chad's and Amanda's sexual relationship has anything to do with the alleged abuse of Cassidy or her death. The police didn't ask either Chad or Amanda about their sexual relationship. Others commented on this topic, but I don't recall any direct questions to Chad or Amanda during police interviews, and not to Amanda at Chad's trial. Your patience in watching re-runs of Chad's interrogation is impressive. We agree that Chad was nervous. You call his nervousness evidence of guilt. I call it evidence of nervousness. What is your evidence of witness tampering? Amanda testified that Chad advised her to tell the truth. What is your evidence that Travis Hunt lied? And to whom? He has recently offered to take a lie detector test regarding his interviews and trial testimony. The jury was not told of Cassidy's doctor appointments on August 10 and September 11, and not told of the photographs of Cassidy on September 1 and October 20, and not told of the November 5 family gathering to which Chad brought Cassidy, and not told of the DNA tests on the blood underneath Cassidy's fingernails. Shouldn't the jury have been given this exculpatory information?  
Best,  
Morrison

13 July 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Oh, one other thing Melissa: Speaking of enlarged anus, perhaps you should use the "Ask Chad" link and ask him about that, since he's the one who demanded anal sex from Amanda. It's interesting you've brought this up. This tells me you've been reading documents in the Investigation section. The only question I have for you is this: After reading what you've read so far, why aren't you convinced of Chad Evans' guilt? And to paraphrase the police, "I don't want to talk about Jeff Marshall. I want to talk about Chad."

13 July 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Bob Arnold** | 

Melissa,  
I was hoping you'd pick up on that. Have you watched the police interrogation? Try watching it. Study Chad's every movement. Watch Chad not make eye contact as he walks into the room. Watch as he refuses to sit. See Chad lie about driving 2.5 hours. See Chad take a sip of water from a water bottle with the cap on. See Chad drop cap. See cap roll under table. See Chad sit. See Chad avoid eye contact. See Chad pull empty chair towards him. Now see Chad hide behind empty chair. See Chad hesitate, then look at his ??? Pager? Day planner? When the police ask him to tell them what's been going on with Cassidy. See Chad crack jokes. See Chad smile. When the police ask Chad about Amanda, see Chad act like they just met. See how he minimizes his relationship with Amanda. See Chad stop telling jokes and smiling, when the police tell him he is a suspect. See Chad get angry. See the heat being turned up a notch, starting with the police telling him to move the chair, "I feel like it's Tool Time, you know the neighbor behind the fence." See Chad studder, as

he is slowly beat into submission. Chad not used to this. Chad used to doing all the talking. Chad used to telling people what to do. See Chad raise his voice. See Chad studder. See Chad pee his pants.

13 July 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison,

Yes they did bring that up in the interview and I thought that the police were a little aggressive about the debt. Never the less, I've now watched the interview about 10 times, and lately I've been watching it with the sound off. I suggest you do the same. Evans acted extremely guilty.

Evans couldn't wait to get out of that interview so he could "button things up." He demanded the police tell him who was saying things about him, so he could attack them later. His first target was Jeff Marshall, in the parking lot of the police station. Second target: Amanda. He spent all night on the phone with her, while she was staying at the hotel with Jen and Jeff. Here is a guy who didn't love Amanda, and actually wanted her to move out. Why, all of the sudden, did he love her? He was trying to influence her, as evidenced by the contrast in her statements during the first three police interviews and later during his trial. Third target: Travis Hunt. Look at his statements to the police, he lied for Chad, this is why the prosecution called in his date on the night of the 8th: What she had to say completely differed from his later statements.

Witness tampering. That's what he was doing. Tampering with witnesses, tampering with people within his spear of influence.

13 July 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Can we return to your previous view which is that incriminating statements were made to the police about Chad and corroborated before Chad's interview?

If you'd like to explore that thread, can you give me some examples? One I can think of is that Jeff Marshall told the police that Chad was in debt from his gambling. That led the police to think that Chad may have been abusing Cassidy because he was under financial stress from gambling debts. Lance McCleish said to Chad in his interrogation, "...we were told you have some gambling debts." However, it was completely untrue as Jeremy and Chad told the police later. If the police wanted to corroborate the denials, they could have contacted the bookie or asked Chad if they could examine his bank statements. To my knowledge, there was no effort to corroborate this allegation.

Morrison

12 July 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Melissa,

I don't want to talk about Jeff. I want to talk about Chad.

12 July 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Melissa**

I have another question- if I read this correctly- why was it that Jeff made not 1, 2, or even 3 calls before calling 911- but from shortly after noon where he noticed she was lifeless he made what, 11 or 12 calls? 6 of those calls were to Chad- the person he immediatly pointed to. If we are focused so much on the time it took Chad to get to the station(Bob I agree it could have been more quickly had he known or taken the situation more serious) but why did Jeff make so many calls before calling 911 and why so many to Chad? Why not to Amanda? he made less calls to Amanda than he did Chad and Jen- who aren't the parents. I also as a mother just cant move past the lack of clothing she had on and the blood in her vagina or her swollen genitals. Why was it this way? Was that even

answered? Morrison I cant seem to find another question you may know- I have heard or seen somewhere that at some point Cassidy spit up blood- was this in the bedroom, kitchen or on the porch? After he splashed water on her face was she brought back into the bedroom for more calls or out onto the porch? Oh and I also noticed when reviewing the timeline- that Chad also stopped for gas before going to the station, which can account for another 5-10 minutes.  
Thanks guys!! Hope everyone is enjoying the nice weather

12 July 2011 - NH

### Morrison Bonpasse |

Bob,

Mapquest says that the driving time from Chad's Hudson meeting to Kittery is about an hour and a quarter, without the detour to Portsmouth. He received the Kittery Police page at 2:22 p.m. and arrived at the police station at about 4:10 p.m.

Here's the exchange at the beginning of his interrogation.

LM: "CHAD just have a seat right here if you would."

CE: "Actually do I need to sit right at the moment? I've been sitting for two straight hours."

LM: "Do you want to stand for a little bit?"

CE: "Yeah."

LM: "Yeah we can do that, that's no problem."

CE: "Drove two and a half hours to get here."

Thus, he underestimated his wait time at the police station by an hour, and over-estimated his driving time by an hour. Do you really want to call Chad a liar for such estimates? As we have agreed, he was nervous.

You wrote that "these officers were talking to people all day, taking notes and corroborating their stories," before Chad's interview. However, the only interviews before Chad's were with Jeff, Jennifer and Amanda. There was also a discussion with Will Peirce and with Dr. Bock. There was little corroboration of anything said by Jeff, Jennifer and Amanda. Can you give specifics? Sorry to make that request, but a LOT was said and assumed about Chad on that day.

Morrison

12 July 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

### Bob Arnold |

Morrison,

Thanks and you're right, I should have been more specific and will address now:

I've studied every word out of Chad's mouth at that police interview and these are the facts: Chad repeatedly tried to deceive the state police. When offered to sit down, Chad lied and said he'd been driving two hours to get there, when in fact his time was spent gathering a support group to meet him at the Kittery PD. Chad found time to stop at the Portsmouth McDonalds at approximately 3:30 to talk to Jeremy Hinton (see police interview of Jeremy Hinton). Chad made numerous calls to Trisha and others (see report of phone calls made).

The lies continued when asked about his relationship with Amanda. He made every effort to down play their relationship, he made it sound as if they weren't a serious couple and thus made an attempt to distance himself from Cassidy. Upon further questioning, he realized the police already knew what the status was, so he backed off on his efforts.

He repeatedly lied to the police in regards to his physical contact with Cassidy as well as Amanda. Case in point: His

description of events sharply contrasted with those of Amanda, Tracy Foley, Melissa Chick, Jen Conley, Robert Conley, etc etc.

Now these officers were talking to people all day, taking notes and corroborating their stories, and here comes Chad Evans, and what he has to say doesn't match anything that they've heard all day. What say you?

I have more coming and will be getting back to Melissa's comments soon. I will also write a description of the Chad Evans that I see.

Regards,

Bob

11 July 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Yes, I'm very serious. You referred in a comment to "all of the statements given to police by people who knew Chad and Amanda." I simply asked you for specifics on any of those statements that you were referencing. I'm prepared to respond to any specific testimony or statement in a police interview you wish to identify.

Chad told the police the "trampoline story" which was a lie, and he minimized his relationship to Amanda. There were no other lies.

The burn on Cassidy's foot was probably caused by Crystal Martin's curling iron. I've talked with her. That's Chad's understanding now and during his police interview. Interestingly, Crystal was interviewed by the police and/or prosecutors in 2001, prior to Chad's trial, but no police record of that interview, and the prosecutors chose not to have her testify.

I do not understand your allegation that Chad lied about his request that Jeff meet him somewhere closer to Route 4, so he could get to Kyle's daycare sooner. What was the lie?

Chad did not lie about the reason Cassidy was not in daycare. The reason was that Amanda was hired by Old Navy sooner than she expected and before she had made day care arrangements. She called 17 day care facilities during two days of calls: on Friday, November 3, and Wednesday November 8, but was not able to find a satisfactory opening. Jeff and Jennifer volunteered to help with the babysitting until Amanda could find day care for Cassidy.

Chad was not lying about keeping Cassidy away from friends and family. He took Cassidy to his sister's on Sunday, November 5, where Cassidy was seen by several people, including an elementary school nurse, who was his sister's mother-in-law. Chad's jury was not told about that family gathering.

I don't know why you say that he no longer has an influence on his son, Kyle, whom he sees when Chad's parents or siblings bring him to the prison. Kyle's most recent visit was Father's Day. Chad is an excellent father, and would have been a better father if he hadn't been wrongfully convicted and imprisoned. Have you seen the entry for June 20, 2009 in the "Chronology" on Chad's website: "KYLES MERIT BADGE TO MANHOOD?" It's an extraordinary document.

Finally, I thought Melissa made several good points in her comments. What did you think?

Morrison

11 July 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison:

Are you serious? Let's start with Amanda, Jeff Marshall, Jen, Crystal Martin, Heather Hamilton, Emily Conley, Melissa Chick, Tracey Foley...Need

I go further?

Besides the fact that Chad acted completely guilty and nervous in his initial police interview, he also lied. He told the trampoline story. He lied about the manner in which he handled Cassidy. He lied about the curling iron burn (the police were never able to confirm this story with Crystal Martin). He lied about his request to have Jeff Marshall meet him at Peter's Palace so that he could pick up Cassidy (on Nov 8th). He lied about the reason Cassidy was not in daycare. He lied about hiding Cassidy from friends and family due to her bruises. At one point, he actually confirmed this, but tried to blame it on Amanda.

He lied so much to the police that it's unbelievable. To top it all off, he laughed, told little jokes, acted arrogant and kept hiding behind that chair. The police actually had to request that he stop using the chair as a shield.

This is the bottom line: Chad Evans is not the squeaky clean guy you try to portray him as. He was not a good father. He was an abusive, self centered, arrogant person. There is one good thing to come from Chad's conviction, he no longer has an influence on Kyle.

11 July 2011 - Rocheser, NH

## Melissa

Bob- I would say with someone like Casey Anthony, its safe to say that people make mistakes- her jury did! Its amazing to me that with the evidence they had on her that she wasnt found guilty of something more. They found hairs in the trunk of her car, a nasty smell- like a dead body it was said, stickers and tape on her mouth- web searches that her mother couldn't have done- they searched for hours upon hours in Chads house, his car- where they alleged he beat her- and nothing. Not one hair from her- I also have many questions. I agree he should have taken the stand- no doubt! Why didnt he? Great question. The answer may never satisfy some. I want to know if her diaper was never changed the day she died- why did she not have on pants? Why was there blood present in her vagina? Why was that and her anus enlarged? Why was it said she didnt eat that morning when the contents of her stomach showed she did? Why were other people called before 911? You focus a lot on the length of time it took Chad to get to the police station- what about the length of time it took her care taker to call 911? Why did he call so many differnt people? When my daughter got hurt at her sitters house, I was called after 911 was called and an ambulance was on its way. If she looked as bad as she did when she arrived, why werent the police called? I would have called the police if a child showed up to me looking like that! Her care takers would have seen it, her pants were removed! Why is it that to this day, Chad was the only one to take any type of lie dector test? Some refused, some alleged to, cops at one point even lied and said ppl had taken and passed. Im not point a finger, merely questioning things that were never answered. Im glad your open and keep asking questions!!! :) Hope you had a nice 4th!

11 July 2011 - NH

## Morrison Bonpasse |

Bob,  
The 2000 grand jury issued indictments with allegations, and nothing more. One of the Assault

charges, regarding a fractured leg, was so weak that it was removed by Judge Nadeau before even giving the case to the jury. The jury found Chad not guilty of the other Assault charge, which involved an arm fracture. The jury also found Chad not guilty of one of the Second Degree Assault charges for the period of October 1-8. I believe that is because the only photograph which the jury saw of a healthy Kassidy, without bruises was taken on October 1. The book, "Eye Contact," lists 17 observations of No Bruises on Kassidy during the fall of 2000. The jury knew about two of those occasions.

Regarding the inmate informants, they are a major source of wrongful convictions across the country. They talk with defendants and they read the newspapers and they give the police stories that defendants have admitted crimes to them. Of the inmate informants for whom we have reports of interviews, Cook, Gautreau, LaCroix, and Merrill, Merrill was chosen by the prosecutors to testify, but he perjured himself in the courtroom. Chad actually did talk with Merrill quite a bit in the Strafford County jail and, in characteristic Chad fashion, tried to help him after Chad was released on bail on November 22, 2000. After Chad was convicted and saw Merrill in the State Prison, Merrill apologized to Chad for what he had said and done. Please read what Chad said about Merrill in his 2010 letters of Feb. 18, April 14, May 11 and May 20.

The police also interviewed another inmate, Adam Tuttle, who was with Merrill, Gautreau and LaCroix at the same time in 2000. Tuttle told the police that he knew Chad before his arrest and that thought Chad was innocent. The report of that interview was not provided to the defense which would be a constitutional violation if the interview actually occurred. See Tuttle's April 21, 2010 letter to me, in the "Chronology" section of Chad's website.

Regarding your last point about "all the statements given to the police by people who knew Chad and Amanda," it would help if you were more specific. Can you give some examples of allegations or testimony?

Morrison

*9 July 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob Arnold** | 

It's interesting that everyone from the grand jury to the jury that convicted believed he was guilty. Even his cell mates at the Strafford County Jail believed he was guilty, and these guys have street smarts unlike any of us. I just can't get past all of the statements given to police by people who knew Chad and Amanda. At this time, there is no doubt in my mind of his guilt.

Regards,

Bob

*8 July 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Thanks very much for your continued interest.

Version 1 of the book, "Eye Contact" will be posted next Friday on this website. The full book contains 625 pages, over 13 chapters. The first five chapters are done, but still with some need for proofreading. Coincidentally, the subtitle is, "The mysterious death of Kassidy Bortner in Maine in 2000 and the wrongful conviction of Chad Evans in New Hampshire." Would you like me to send you those five chapters in a .pdf file? I hope that you will be interested. We will be sending copies to as many stakeholders and others, including the police, prosecutors, witnesses and interviewees. We will be asking for comments and criticisms and will incorporate that feedback into the book, so that Version 2 is more accurate than Version 1, and so on. We are considering publishing an abridged version as a 400 page paperback.

Morrison

*8 July 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Becky,  
Sorry but I was in Kansas City last week.

I must admit I'm thoroughly intrigued with this case, not so much the case itself (I find the sum total of all evidence against Chad Evans to be overwhelming), I believe it's a fascination with the people who are defending him, despite the insurmountable amount of evidence that eventually led to his indictment by a grand jury, as well as a unanimous guilty verdict which was decided by 12 out of 12 jurors.

Thanks for the invitation but I really don't believe I would fit in with you guys...I'm a hard ass conservative Midwesterner, gun owner, war vet, outdoors man, etc....I, as well as you, have questions, however our questions differ in that I would like to know why he didn't take the stand, you wish to know why blood under Cassidy's nails wasn't disclosed, I wonder why he lied and showed intentional deceit in his police interview (yes, he lied, tried to control the interview, hid behind a chair, showed extreme nervousness, all signs of guilt/deceit) and you wish to know why Cassidy bruised so easily....Chad's defense is essentially: "Gee, it's a mystery why she died." However, I do like to chat with everyone and I think that we can all agree that this site is a good place to do that. I hope that the Chad Evans supporters do not take offense to any of my past comments concerning this case.

With all that said, I still have an open mind about this guy. Maybe I'm intrigued by the fact that there may be a guy rotting in prison for a crime he didn't commit, while there are guilty people walking free???? Casey Anthony comes to mind.

Regards,

Bob Arnold

*8 July 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Becky B** | 

Hi Bob! I highly recommend you make time in your busy schedule to attend the meeting tomorrow night @6pm. Contact one of us if you interested!! Please please think about it...  
Hope to see you there!!

*28 June 2011 - Rochester, NH*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

1. The brief conversations between Amanda and Chad about her getting her own apartment or place to live were primarily a result of the delayed effective date of Chad's divorce. Amanda and Cassidy were living with him, but he was very concerned about doing anything which would upset that divorce agreement. Like other lovers, they were sometimes unsure about the relationship. Chad was wary of rushing completely into his new relationship. His heart was saying, "GO," and his head was saying, "SLOW DOWN."
2. Yes, in his interrogation, Chad downplayed the relationship in his effort to protect her claim to Maine residency and her eligibility for aid from the ASPIRE program.
3. Chad and Amanda were on the phone for several hours during the night/early morning of Nov. 9/10 because they needed to talk with each other about the terrible loss they, and especially Amanda, had suffered.
4. The "support group" that you referenced were friends, and former wife, of Chad who came to the Kittery Police Station to see what they could do to help Chad and the investigation. Chad didn't ask

anyone to come to the Police Station, except Tristan, who provided him help with directions.

5. It's interesting that you wrote that Chad was trying to establish a rapport with the officers. To me, it looked like a classic interrogation technique by the officers to establish friendly rapport with the subject. Sure, Chad was at ease talking about football and weightlifting, but it was the officers who kept the conversation on those subjects.

6. The threesome that you mentioned was initiated by Amanda, and there was no evidence of any pressure by Chad on Amanda for any type of sexual activity, except for one friend of Amanda. Who knows why Amanda said what she said to friends and her sister about her relationship to Chad? The motivations were complicated.

Finally, Chad did not get what he wanted in life many times. He wanted his marriage and Tristan to survive and it didn't. About this point of Chad's alleged persuasiveness and manipulation, Tristan was asked at Chad's trial, "Is the defendant a persuasive person?" and she answered simply, "No."

Regards,  
Morrison

*28 June 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison:

Yes I do, just prior to November 9th, he was trying to persuade Amanda to move out and get an apartment. During the police interview on the 9th, he down plays his relationship with Amanda, and makes it sound like he didn't love her. Then, hours after the interview he is on the phone with her all night. I can only imagine what he said, but this much is certain: He knew he was in trouble and he knew, without Amanda on his side that he'd be charged, so he tells her that he loves her. This is only one example. Another example is how he managed to get a support group to appear at the police station on the evening of the 9th. In the video taped interview, he can be seen trying to control the outcome of the conversation, trying to establish a rapport with the investigating officers (which would be the last thing I'd be interested in if I were in that situation and innocent). Chad was a guy who always got what he wanted no matter what. Case in point: The threesome he pressured Amanda into. Anal sex he pressured her into.

*26 June 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

You see a nervous guilty suspect, and I see a nervous man who is intimidated by police. Later, I see a nervous man who is angered that he is wrongly suspected of abusing and killing Cassidy. It's true that Chad has had ten years to think about what happened in 2000, but what he has written is consistent with what I've discovered independently. For example, he told me about Cassidy's wart on her right index finger and how he recommended that Amanda have a doctor remove it. Months later, I discovered the record of Cassidy's August 10, 2000 pediatrician visit where Dr. Glass mentions that the wart should be removed.

No one, of course, including me, likes to be misled by anyone, so I hope you are wrong that I've "fallen victim to his ways." Do you have any examples in mind when you described Chad as "manipulative?"

Regards,  
Morrison

*26 June 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob Arnold** | 

I've read some of his letters from prison, as well as his remarks in the hard copy police interview. As far as what he has to say now, it's after the fact and has no relevance. He's had plenty of time to figure out where he made mistakes and what he can do to explain himself, now after the fact.

I've read the police interview at least three times, and I've watched the video of the interview at least 7 times, and every time I watch it I see the same thing: A guilty suspect. I believe Chad is extremely

manipulative, and you've fallen victim to his ways.

Regards,

Bob

26 June 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Chad's first call from the Kittery Police Dept. was a "page" at 2:22 p.m. on Thursday, November 9. He arrived at the station at 4:10 p.m., or less than two hours later. Mapquest gives an estimated time of an hour and a quarter for the 60 miles from Hudson, NH to Kittery. Given that the police would tell Chad the reason for the request, taking less than two hours doesn't seem to prove much. What kind of emergency could there be at a police station? Now, a request to get to a hospital to visit someone is different.

One indication that the police were not in a hurry for Chad to arrive is that they did not interview him until 7:15 p.m., three hours after he arrived. Have you read any of Chad's "Letters from NH Prison?" Chad describes the afternoon of November 9 in his letters of January 28 and September 21, 2010. (See "Key Documents" at bottom of Home Page) I'd be interested in your comments about any of his letters.

Regarding his reluctance to see a photo of Cassidy's dead body, there are many people who are similarly reluctant to see photographs of the bodies of their loved ones, or of any dead body, especially a child's body. A few seconds later, Chad said, "I don't know that I want to see a dead baby." Sure, Chad's language was inelegant, but that, too, doesn't say anything about his alleged responsibility for her death. He agonized about the shock of Cassidy's death in that interrogation, saying "I did her alphabet with her before she went to bed and now I get a phone call today telling me she's dead, you know what I mean." He was confused, as he wasn't told that Cassidy was dead until he arrived at the police station, but the quote reflects his shock at the events of the day.

Morrison

26 June 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

11/9/00 interview-Chad quotes: Open to debate

(In reference to Jeremy Hinton)

"So I called him about that and then he - We were supposed to meet at Banana's tonight, but I couldn't get a hold of him so I had TRISTEN call everybody and have everybody just call me. Left a message on (inaudible)." So this is what appears to have happened on the 9th: After Chad is summoned to the Kittery PD, does he stop what he's doing and go there? Is there any sense of urgency to get to the police station? Negative. He begins making frantic calls to his ex wife, friends, etc. He asks Trisen who DHS was (in reference to the two unreturned messages on his home answering machine, one of which he denies ever getting but it's clearly notated in their case contact log). He then calls DHS and leaves a message that "he was going out of town for the weekend and he'd get back to them". He then calls Tristen back, he needs a support rally upon his arrival at the police station. He has her call all of their friends. Obviously most of them showed up at the station. Support rally for a guilty man, facing murder charges.

"I don't want to see a dead kid, Jesus." That's what I'm thinking: "Jesus." A dead "kid?" Like it's an object, not a person.

"I think I've been more than decent trying to answer every little question you guys have." Gee Chad, that's very decent of you to come down here to the police station (the last person to show up) and help us out with the death of this "kid."

Viewing messages 1 to 5.

Morrison Bonpasse | 

Bob,

In response to your comments about "Summary of the Chad Evans Case"...

1. To learn more about Chad's love for Amanda, please read the relevant parts of his "Letters from NH prison," which is linked as a "Key Document" on the home page.
2. Yes, in his interrogation, he did downplay his relationship with Amanda, because he didn't want to jeopardize her ASPIRE program eligibility, which required Maine residency. She was using Jeff's and Jennifer's address for her Maine address. Up until July of 2000, Amanda had lived in Maine for the past several years.
3. I believe that the threesome was Amanda's idea, as something that Chad would enjoy, and it happened only once. It was a playful experience. People with happy sexual lives are less likely, in my humble opinion and backed by Freud, to abuse people and children.
4. Yes, it's true that both Amanda and Chad were not sure about their relationship and it had its ups and downs. Sounds normal to me.
5. Your quote from McCleish, came after his question to Chad about putting Cassidy's face underwater. Chad responded, "No I did not hold her head under water. No I did not. That's ridiculous, I can't even believe that shit." McCleish thought he knew several answers to questions because Jeff and Jennifer had been interviewed before Chad. Jeff told the police several things about Chad that were not true.
6. Yes, Chad was nervous. You're a better judge of character than me if you can tell the difference between "nervous" and "guilty nervous."
7. Chad's lawyers didn't TELL him not to testify. They gave their advice, based on their experience.
8. Chad showed plenty of remorse to a lot of people for Cassidy's death, and especially to the one person for whom it counted, who was Amanda, but not for Cassidy's murder or even abuse, neither of which he committed. It was for failing to see what was happening and stop it - whatever it was.

Morrison

21 June 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

Morrison Bonpasse | 

Bob,

Below are your comments of June 17 to the "key document" at the Home Page of Chad's website, "Why the conviction of Chad Evans for the death of Cassidy Bortner was a Wrongful Conviction (rev 2/11)."

My comments are preceded by a triple asterisk, \*\*\*. Sorry, but this took many panels to complete. I began by forgetting to load the document from the bottom.

I see that you made comments today about another document, which is appreciated. Please continue to address specific documents from the website. I'll respond to those recent comments in a few minutes.

1. The jury didn't make their decision based upon what was reported in the press. The jury received specific instructions to weigh the evidence presented. Chad Evans had the opportunity to take the stand in his own defense, and he refused.

\*\*\* Agreed, but the sensational publicity was everywhere. The famous Sam Sheppard conviction was reversed by the U.S. Supreme Court in the early 1960's because of extensive and bad publicity.

2. The fact that blood was found under Cassidy's fingernails was her own blood, and the fact that male DNA was found on a napkin does not prove his innocence.

\*\*\* Agreed, but the jury knew nothing about the blood and nothing about the DNA tests. The jurors heard Dr. Greenwald say that there were no open wounds, so where did the blood come from?

21 June 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

Morrison Bonpasse | 

(continued from above)

3. Chad. A voice stress test. Not a polygraph. Big difference. Besides, after several years in prison he's probably convinced himself of his innocence.

\*\*\* Agreed. A voice stress test is not a polygraph, but I've never heard that one way to defeat the test results is to convince oneself of one's innocence.

4. The prosecution proved this point: He did love Kassidy. He loved to inflict injury to her.

\*\*\* Chad disliked corporal punishment. He never spanked nor hit Kassidy, and he never spanked his son, Kyle, nor his stepson, Brent. Chad preferred "eye contact" with messages, and time-outs.

5. Chad Evans was not a successful loving father. The only thing he loved was himself. He came first, before anybody else in his life.

\*\*\* Respectfully, several interviewees said that Chad was a good father. Second, he received a "hero" award from Governor Shaheen and Nackey Loeb for saving three men's lives, in disregard for his own life.

6. Now, how in the world can you explain this away? This kid had bruising on her face after Chad came into her life.

\*\*\* The first confirmed bruises appeared in mid-October, when Amanda brought Kassidy to her mother's home in Buckfield, and then to Sanford where friends saw her. There were other observations before that, but they were inconsistent and not confirmed by others. Amanda moved to Rochester in July and Kassidy by late July.

7. (bruises not kill Kassidy) That's not what the prosecution tried to prove. They used this as evidence that Chad was abusive to Kassidy. What's your point?

\*\*\* The point about the "eye contact" bruises is that they only show that Chad squeezed too hard on Kassidy's face on two or three occasions. Those occasions do not make him a murderer.

*21 June 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

---

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

(continued from above)

8. Well sure they were, both Chad and Amanda would fabricate stories to explain away her injuries. Apparently these stories weren't convincing enough when Chad's ex wife decided enough is enough and made a phone call to child welfare services.

\*\*\* The only fabricated story that Chad used to explain ANY bruises was the "trampoline story" to explain his eye-contact face-palming bruises. Bruising occurred two or three times in October. The original white lie was harmless enough, but it was a major mistake for Chad to tell the "trampoline story" to the police. It made them legitimately suspicious. The police had reason for their theory that Chad killed Kassidy, but they didn't look for all the evidence, and they ignored or discounted evidence contrary to their theory.

9. Are you serious? On the evening of the 8th, Chad calls Jeff Marshall while on his way home with Kassidy (which he never did before) and, well go read the conversation yourself and draw your own conclusion, but for me, it was obvious that Chad was trying to cover his tracks because something happened in the car just before he got to the Dover Tolls. Something like a back-handed slap to Kassidy's head? That's what I think happened. He lost it. He slapped the shit out of her, for whatever reason, and that's why he made the phone call to Jeff. Then he gets home and he claims she fell out of the truck? WTF? Are we to believe that this little kid tried to get out by herself? Nonsense. And then there's the wiffle ball story.

\*\*\* Yes, I'm serious. Jeff said that Chad didn't call him often, but that was incorrect. Chad called Jeff often about business, and when Kassidy was at Jeff's during those calls, Chad asked about Kassidy. No, Chad did not strike Kassidy on the way to pick up his son at day care. There was no wiffle ball story. Chad told the police that the ball that his Kassidy on the 8th was a "starter baseball" or "hard rubber ball," and it DID hit her. Others misunderstood the type of ball, and it was a major problem for him that the details of that ball accident were not clarified for the jury.

*21 June 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

---

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

(continued from above)

10. Wrong. Amanda threw a fit when she called the house on the evening of the 8th and was told by Chad that Kassidy got hit with a wiffle ball. She was so upset that she stormed out of the store

where her sister was working late that night. You see, she was getting to the point where she knew something wasn't right, with all the injuries that Cassidy was experiencing. She was getting tired of having to make up stories to allude questioning by friends and family. But look, she had nothing and Chad had everything. She had no money, he did. She had no house, he did. She had no career, he did. So she stayed because she saw a future and security for her and Cassidy. But, she was near the breaking point....case in point, the morning of the 9th. While leaving Cassidy with Jeff and her sister, she said "look at her, she looks like shit."

\*\*\* Yes, Amanda was upset about the accident on the 8th AND she was upset about Cassidy's problems that afternoon. You are right that she saw advantages to living with Chad, but she never would have tolerated any abuse, if she saw any, and she didn't.

21 June 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

Morrison Bonpasse | 

(continued from above)

11. Oh well hell, in that case let's set him free. Cassidy saw a doctor two months before her death. But before we set a convicted child murderer free, let's stop for a moment and look at the evidence: The trauma that killed Cassidy occurred approximately 12 to 18 hours before her death, not 59 days. Nice try Morrison, but you need to put the hash pipe down and come up with something better than this.

\*\*\* We have never asked that the State of New Hampshire set Chad free immediately. We are asking for a re-investigation. The testimony was unclear about exactly when the blows (or accidents?) occurred that killed Cassidy.

12 Oh really? The police exaggerated things? Are you serious? Maybe you're suggesting that the police, who did an outstanding job in their investigation, actually did a horrible job? Or maybe they didn't like Chad and decided to go after him. Maybe Chad had a threesome with one of their wives and the officers were pissed at him? I can't believe how you try to paint a picture of a squeaky clean guy, when in fact Chad Evans was an arrogant, dirty self-centered asshole.

\*\*\* Yes, again, we are serious. As with every wrongful conviction case, mistakes in the investigation and the trial were made. Everyone makes mistakes This case was like a "perfect storm" of mistakes.

13. Are you suggesting that the jury knowingly disregarded their jury instructions which were very specific? I can see maybe one or two people doing something like that, but all twelve? Well hell, maybe the jury had it out for Chad as well. Or maybe the police paid the jury off. I find #13 to be the most insulting statement coming from you Mr. Morrison. To suggest that a hand-picked jury would do something so ridiculous is absurd.

\*\*\* I never have suggested that the jury disregarded their instructions. The jurors heard and saw a limited set of facts, and ONE theory, i.e that a homicide had occurred and that one of two men were responsible. It was a highly emotional case, and someone had to be found responsible. The jury never saw other Fall, 2000 photographs of a healthy Cassidy, and never new about the August and September doctor appts., and didn't know about the family gathering on November 5.

Morrison

21 June 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

Morrison Bonpasse | 

Bob,

Below are your comments of June 17 to the "key document" at the Home Page of Chad's website, "Why the conviction of Chad Evans for the death of Cassidy Bortner was a Wrongful Conviction (rev 2/11)."

My comments are preceded by a triple asterisk, \*\*\*. Sorry, but this will likely take several "panels."

I see that you made comments today about another document, which is appreciated. Please continue to address specific documents from the website. I'll respond to those recent comments in a few minutes.

1. The jury didn't make their decision based upon what was reported in the press. The jury received specific instructions to weigh the evidence presented. Chad Evans had the opportunity to take the stand in his own defense, and he refused.

\*\*\* Agreed, but the sensational publicity was everywhere. The famous Sam Sheppard conviction was reversed by the U.S. Supreme Court in the early 1960's because of extensive and bad publicity.

2. The fact that blood was found under Cassidy's fingernails was her own blood, and the fact that male DNA was found on a napkin does not prove his innocence.

\*\*\* Agreed, but the jury knew nothing about the blood and nothing about the DNA tests. The jurors heard Dr. Greenwald say that there were no open wounds, so where did the blood come from?

3. Chad. A voice stress test. Not a polygraph. Big difference. Besides, after several years in prison he's probably convinced himself of his innocence.

\*\*\* Agreed. A voice stress test is not a polygraph, but I've never heard that one way to defeat the test results is to convince oneself of one's innocence.

4. The prosecution proved this point: He did love Cassidy. He loved to inflict injury to her.

\*\*\* Chad disliked corporal punishment. He never spanked nor hit Cassidy, and he never spanked his son, Kyle, nor his stepson, Brent. Chad preferred "eye contact" with messages, and time-outs.

5. Chad Evans was not a successful loving father. The only thing he loved was himself. He came first, before anybody else in his life.

\*\*\* Respectfully, several interviewees said that Chad was a good father. Second, he received a "hero" award from Governor Shaheen and Nackey Loeb for saving three men's lives, in disregard for his own life.

(continued)

21 June 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

I'd like to comment on the "Summary of the Chad Evans case" that's posted on the home page of this site. I have a couple of issues with what you've stated. First off, the characterization of Chad and Amanda's relationship. In other documents that you've written in support of Chad, you've painted a picture of a young couple in love and planning a family together. I've read enough about Chad to know one thing, that I really don't believe he had any love for Amanda. Case in point, during his initial police interview, he down played their relationship and tried to distance himself from her and Cassidy. He also convinced Amanda to arrange a threesome with one of her girlfriends. Another example is the fact that he wanted Amanda to move out of his house (sometime before the homicide) as stated by Amanda's uncle Robert Conley. I could go on with other examples but the point I'm trying to make here is this: It hurts your case when you portray them as a young couple in love and planning a family.

\*\*Continued\*\*

21 June 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Bob Arnold** | 

\*\*Continued\*\*

Second, it is true that the police had a number of suspects, namely those closest to Cassidy. The fact that they focused entirely on Chad by 7pm on the 9th is exaggerated. The police do typically develop a list of suspects, then they try to eliminate each one. Unfortunately for Chad, he was deceptive during the initial police interview. Case in point: He claimed he drove two hours to get to the police station, he downplayed his relationship with Amanda and Cassidy, he was evasive during much of the questioning. At one point, one of the officers (Lance McCleish) came right out and told Chad "look, when I ask you a question, I already know the answer and you're not being truthful with me." On top of it all, Chad was acting extremely nervous in that interview, not uncomfortable nervous but rather guilty nervous.

As far as Chad not taking the stand in his own defense, it is a weak argument to say that his attorney told him not to. This is something that I've brought up multiple times and I can not believe that a guy of Chad's nature would sit back and not take the stand if he were in fact innocent.

One thing that I do agree with is that he didn't show any remorse, as pointed out by the judge on his sentencing day.

Regards,

Bob

*21 June 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Hi Bob and "Just Me,"

Like Bob, I prefer that people use their real names here, but Becky did give her name in her email address.

Bob, Thanks for the thorough comments on one of the website document - WHY THE CONVICTION OF CHAD WAS A WRONGFUL CONVICTION.

I'm working on a deadline for more chapters of the book, "Eye Contact." I'll get back to commenting on your comments later, in a few days.

I appreciate your civility as well, and continue to look forward to further comments and exchanges.

*18 June 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Hiding behind a keyboard? Excuse me but I am using my real name, so who's hiding?

Comments are for debate, stating facts and discussing the case. Obviously you don't wish to do that. You parade around with your b.s. quotes just like some of the other people who come to this site. I doubt if you've even given any of your time investigating the facts of the case.

I have a great deal of respect for Morrison. He and I have communicated with one another through this site for many months. True, we don't agree about this case. As far as the hash pipe comment, that was not meant to be insulting.

*17 June 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Just Me** | 

2 EASY 2 hide BEHIND a keyboard...  
BUT won't face THE TRUTH in public...

Dear Mr. Arnold:

You are so far OFF it's NOT even funny!

You are barking up a tree of TRUTH & INTEGRITY!!!

You really need to apologize to Morrison & Chad for the lack of respect you are showing.

Seriously.

*17 June 2011 - Rochester, NH*

**Bob Arnold** | 

My rebuttal to:

Why the conviction of Chad Evans for the death of Cassidy Bortner was a Wrongful Conviction (rev 2/11)

1. The man portrayed to the judge, jury and the public was not Chad Evans. Interesting point, but mute none the less. The jury didn't make their decision based upon what was reported in the press. The jury received specific instructions to weigh the evidence presented. Chad Evans had the opportunity to take the stand in his own defense, and he refused.
2. DNA tests done in 2001, but not revealed to Chad or his attorneys. This doesn't prove a thing. The fact that blood was found under Cassidy's fingernails was her own blood, and the fact that male DNA was found on a napkin does not prove his innocence.
3. Chad Evans passed a lie detector test. A voice stress test. Not a polygraph. Big difference. Besides, after several years in prison he's probably convinced himself of his innocence.
4. Chad Evans loved children, including Cassidy Bortner. The prosecution proved this point: He did love Cassidy. He loved to inflict injury to her.
5. Chad Evans was a successful, loving father and not an abuser of children. Chad Evans was not a successful loving father. The only thing he loved was himself. He came first, before anybody else in his life.
6. Bruises caused by Chad when obtaining eye contact. Now, how in the world can you explain this away? This kid had bruising on her face after Chad came into her life.
7. These "eye-contact" bruises did not cause Cassidy's death. That's not what the prosecution tried to prove. They used this as evidence that Chad was abusive to Cassidy. What's your point?
8. All other bruises explained. Well sure they were, both Chad and Amanda would fabricate stories to explain away her injuries. Apparently these stories weren't convincing enough when Chad's ex wife decided enough is enough and made a phone call to child welfare services.

*17 June 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Bob Arnold** | 

9. Missed signals of distress on 8 November. Are you serious? On the evening of the 8th, Chad calls Jeff Marshall while on his way home with Cassidy (which he never did before) and, well go read the conversation yourself and draw your own conclusion, but for me, it was obvious that Chad was trying to cover his tracks because something happened in the car just before he got to the Dover Tolls. Something like a back-handed slap to Cassidy's head? That's what I think happened. He lost it. He slapped the shit out of her, for whatever reason, and that's why he made the phone call to Jeff. Then he gets home and he claims she fell out of the truck? WTF? Are we to believe that this little kid tried to get out by herself? Nonsense. And then there's the wiffle ball story.

There were no "Missed signals" on the evening of the 8th. On the contrary, Chad Evans inflicted injuries to Cassidy which took over 18 hours to slowly kill her. The prosecution proved this with their expert medical testimony.

10. Chad Evans and Amanda Bortner were unaware of Cassidy's plight on the day she died.. Wrong. Amanda threw a fit when she called the house on the evening of the 8th and was told by Chad that Cassidy got hit with a wiffle ball. She was so upset that she stormed out of the store where her sister was working late that night. You see, she was getting to the point where she knew something wasn't right, with all the injuries that Cassidy was experiencing. She was getting tired of having to make up stories to allude questioning by friends and family. But look, she had nothing and Chad had everything. She had no money, he did. She had no house, he did. She had no career, he did. So she stayed because she saw a future and security for her and Cassidy. But, she was near the breaking point....case in point, the morning of the 9th. While leaving Cassidy with Jeff and her

**Bob Arnold** | 

11. Chad Evans and Amanda Bortner did not withhold medical attention for any reason other than the belief that it wasn't necessary. Cassidy did see a doctor 59 days before she died.. Oh well hell, in that case let's set him free. Cassidy saw a doctor two months before her death. But before we set a convicted child murderer free, lets stop for a moment and look at the evidence: The trauma that killed Cassidy occurred approximately 12 to 18 hours before her death, not 59 days. Nice try Morrison, but you need to put the hash pipe down and come up with something better than this.

12. The police and interviewees exaggerated the facts or statements which pointed to Chad Evans, and they avoided, ignored or minimized those which pointed to other possible causes. Oh really? The police exaggerated things? Are you serious? Maybe you're suggesting that the police, who did an outstanding job in their investigation, actually did a horrible job? Or maybe they didn't like Chad and decided to go after him. Maybe Chad had a threesome with one of their wives and the officers were pissed at him? I can't believe how you try to paint a picture of a squeaky clean guy, when in fact Chad Evans was an arrogant, dirty self-centered asshole.

13. The jury felt it had a choice of convicting Chad Evans or holding no one responsible.. Oh really? Are you suggesting that the jury knowingly disregarded their jury instructions which were very specific? I can see maybe one or two people doing something like that, but all twelve? Well hell, maybe the jury had it out for Chad as well. Or maybe the police paid the jury off. I find #13 to be the most insulting statement coming from you Mr. Morrison. To suggest that a hand-picked jury would do something so ridiculous is absurd.

17 June 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

I received the anonymous letter below last week, in an envelope postmarked in Manchester. We are going to find truth and justice in this case by serious dialogue and inquiry and not by anonymous letters. I hope the writer of the letter acknowledges his/her identity or writes me/us again about the case, and includes contact information.

Dear Mr. Bonpasse,

First of all, I do not know how you sleep at night trying to defend an animal like Chad Evans. Wrongly convicted? Are you serious? You obviously don't know this man or the case. Chad took the life of a beautiful little girl who didn't have a chance at life. Her mother and he should both have been hung. Jail is too good for them. I hope Cassidy haunts your dreams and Chad's as he rots in jail. I could only wish for the rest of his life.

You must be hard up or have a severely warped mind to go around handing out cards to support Chad Evans. You make me sick and I in turn took your cards, copied them, posted them, and did my own handing out telling everyone to totally ignore your evil pleas for this animal. He needs to stay behind bars where he belongs and you should be sitting right with him. I am speaking for Cassidy and all the other little kids that have their lives snuffed out by adults that are suppose to protect them. Morrison, you are a vile person and I hope you are able to go no where with this.

From a sickened parent who followed this case back when they were convicted.

11 June 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Becky B** | 

Hi Bob, if you ever change your mind the offer stands. I just wanted to let you know that I am a mother of 4, all under the age of 10, I've known Chad since I was a teenager & I KNOW that Chad is innocent. I can't thank you enough Bob for each time you come back to this website, but I am

fighting the good fight & forensics will prove Chad's innocence! When you get thirsty... let me know.  
9 June 2011 - Rochester, NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Responding to your comments.

1. The Innocence-Guilt chart that you referenced is simply a tool for people to see that we should not convict people of crimes because we think they MIGHT have committed them, or even because they PROBABLY committed them. The standard must be, "beyond a reasonable doubt."

2. For several reasons, the jury in Chad's case did not have sufficient relevant information about Chad and Cassidy and the situation. Respectfully, if the jury in 2000 had seen the evidence now available, Chad would not have been found guilty. The jury: did not know that there was blood underneath Cassidy's fingernails, and did not know that Cassidy had seen doctors in August and September, and did not know that there were many photographs available showing a healthy, bruise-less Cassidy during the periods of the charges against Chad. I find this evidence compelling enough to warrant a retrial and/or a re-investigation of the case. Persuading the State of New Hampshire that it is compelling and is enough to take either of those steps is a challenge, but we must achieve that goal. The "Live Free or Die" state should not tolerate even the probability that it has wrongly convicted people in its prisons.

3. It's interesting that you mention Ward Bird, as he was recognized as a Union Leader hero for saving a person's life. Chad was similarly recognized by the Union Leader's Nackey Loeb and Governor Shaheen in 1997.

4. The legal process you described: Grand Jury, Jury, and Guilty verdict is the same process that was followed for every wrongful conviction in this country. Fortunately, 266 wrongly convicted people have been exonerated by DNA alone since 1989, and many others have been exonerated through other means. In Chad's case, the jury did not even know that there was DNA testing. Please continue to watch this case, as Chad Evans must be exonerated because he did not kill Cassidy Bortner. There were many, many errors made in this case by many participants, and it's time to correct those errors.

Morrison

7 June 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Becky, Thank you for the offer but I must decline. I spent countless hours researching this case (while recovering from an ACL injury in March). I've read just about everything there is to read about the entire case, most of which is provided by this website. I'm sorry, but I'm convinced that Chad Evans is responsible for the death of this little girl. I'm a father of two girls myself, and I can't possibly imagine how someone could inflict the harm that this person inflicted on Cassidy. One can't say that I'm closed-minded, on the contrary, I really wanted to believe that he's innocent, but I just couldn't.

I find the "percent of innocence" scale that's used on this site totally ridiculous. When a jury receives instructions from the judge, no court ever uses such nonsense. The bottom line is this: Chad Evans was INDICTED by a GRAND JURY based on information supplied by the police and DA. A grand jury found enough evidence to send him to trial. A jury of his peers found him GUILTY for the death of Cassidy. A jury. Think about that for a minute. Also think about this: The State will not reopen this case unless new, COMPELLING evidence is introduced. To date, no compelling evidence has materialized. Furthermore, the governor is not going to issue a pardon. New Hampshire governors very seldom issue pardons, even to someone who deserves it like Mr. Ward Bird. If the governor won't pardon a guy like Bird, what makes Chad Evans, a convicted child killer, is going to get one?

I admire you for fighting the good fight. But Becky, this is not one of them.

6 June 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Becky B** | 

Bob may I then invite you & your wife to a local monthly meeting where coffee would be served?  
(see the coming events for details)  
FREE CHAD EVANS!!

6 June 2011 - Rochester, NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,  
Chad was in a meeting with his boss in Hudson, NH, when he received a page and then a cell phone message from the Kittery Police at 2:24. That office is 60 miles from Kittery, and about an hour and a quarter drive, which would have brought him to Kittery at about 3:45 p.m. He stopped to get gas and he went to the Portsmouth McDonald's to deliver a cooking appliance. He met his wife, Tristan, at the Portsmouth traffic rotary as he needed help with directions to the Kittery PD. He arrived at the station at about 4:10 p.m. He wasn't told to go to a hospital, where he might be of some comfort to someone. He was asked to come to a police station, and there was little communication of a sense of urgency. After he arrived, the police didn't tell him that Kassidy had died until about 4:30 p.m., and didn't interview Chad until 7:15 p.m.  
Regarding the calls from DCYF, the first call was allegedly made to Chad's home on Monday afternoon, November 6, or three days before Kassidy died, and seven days after Chad's wife had called DCYF. Chad did not receive that Monday afternoon message. The next DCYF call was on November 9, the day that Kassidy died.  
Regarding the decision not to testify, what Chad wanted was his freedom, and to return to his son. Chad's lawyers advised that his best shot was not to testify. He took their advice, as they were the experts. They told him that the prosecution's case was weak.  
I hope that you will read the book, "Eye Contact" when it becomes available in July.  
Morrison

3 June 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison: Your response to his delay in getting to to the police station is weak. Seriously, he's summoned to the PD, he knows about the messages from child services over the prior two weeks(which he ignored), he's making calls to all his friends to garner a support rally upon his arrival at the police station, etc etc. True, circumstantial but it's enough to paint a picture of a guilty individual. As far as blaming his defence team at trial, well that's weak too. Look, the guy refused to take the stand. He can say that his lawyer advised him not to, but as I've pointed out before, considering everything about his nature, (successful businessman/manager, motivated, outspoken, driven) it's highly doubtfull that if he indeed was innocent, he would refuse to take the stand and be cross examined.

As far as the video of the police interview, actually that was one of the last documents I examined. I was already convinced of his guilt, based on court transcripts, witness statements, police interviews, etc. From my prospective, the video of his initial interview was the final nail in his coffin.

Thanks for the offer Becky but I must pass....besides, I'm a happily married man and would prefer to avoid meeting mystery women for coffee.

3 June 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Becky B** | 

Hi Bob... I was thinking do you like coffee?? & would you be open to meeting me for one someday?? I'll buy.

29 May 2011 - Rochester, NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Dear Heather,

Can you say more about why you believe Chad murdered Cassidy? When he last saw her, she was in the backseat of Amanda's car, on the way to the babysitter's, and reaching into her baggie of Reese Puffs. The previous night, after the accident when Cassidy was hit in the head with a Tee-ball, he gave her a bath, and then a popsicle and read to her, and worked with her on her ABC's, when putting her to bed.

Have you read any of his letters to me, which are in the "Key Documents" section of the Home Page? Have you read about his taking Cassidy to a family gathering on Sunday, November 5, which was four days before she died?

Have you seen the photographs taken of Cassidy in September and October in the "Amanda and Cassidy" sub-section of the "Who IS Chad Evans?" section of the website?

Do you have ANY questions for Chad? I'll be visiting him this Thursday and will ask him directly.

Sincerely,

Morrison

*22 May 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Heather**

You all can go right ahead and spend the rest of your lives trying to convince people that sick fuck is innocent while I will spend mine knowing a murderer is in jail and will stay there until he's in his 70's or dead.

*21 May 2011*

**Becky Boudreau** | 

Dear Mr. Bob Arnold, Heather & Are you Serious,  
Your opinions are very welcome here, but let me tell you, they are just that, OPINIONS! Chad's committee is filled w/ honest, hard working citizens that treat people they way they would want to be treated. There is only ONE judge in this world & may HE, THE LORD, have mercy on your souls. It is so easy for you to throw your hatred around... why not put YOUR MONEY where your mouths are. FREE CHAD!!

*18 May 2011 - Rochester, NH*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

To "Are you serious?" and Bob,

For "Are you serious?" the same question could be posed to you: are you serious? Everyone agrees that Cassidy Bortner's death was a tragedy, but how she died is a mystery. What do you think of the observation, in a social setting, of Chad and Cassidy by an elementary school nurse on Sunday, November 5, four days before Cassidy died? She wrote to Judge Nadeau after Chad's trial, and before his sentencing, "I have seen how children behave around adults who have hurt them either physically or emotionally; the guarding and the reluctance to be close to them or be touched by them. Several days before Cassidy Bortner died, I saw Chad with her. She climbed onto his lap and lay her head against him. This was within an informal family context, as Chad is the brother of my daughter-in-law. I have also seen Chad with his own son on more than one occasion and saw nothing except a loving and comfortable relationship."

For Bob,

You've argued well your views of Chad's interrogation. You seem very sure of your interpretation of ambiguous incidents, such as Chad's use of a chair. As Freud was reputed to have said,

"Sometimes a cigar is just a cigar."

Regarding Chad's conviction, there was only one defense witness, and that was a doctor from New York who testified only about why Cassidy might have died. What little the jury knew about Chad Evans came from cross-examination of prosecution witnesses. Even if some were his friends, and his lover, cross-examination is not the same as presenting a defense.

Chad didn't delay his travel to the Kittery Police Dept. on November 9, 2000. He had work to do, and accomplished a task while on his way to Kittery. He did not know what had happened to Cassidy, and didn't know why he was asked to go to the police station. His calls to Jeremy, Travis and his wife, Tristan, were not frantic.

Morrison

18 May 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison: Please refrain from posting a long message in order to push my post to the second page:

Anyone who has doubts about Chad Evans guilt needs to watch his initial police interview which is on video:

[http://chadevanswronglyconvicted.org/chad\\_evans\\_interrogation.html](http://chadevanswronglyconvicted.org/chad_evans_interrogation.html)

For those of you who prefer to parade around with quotes and do so without using your full name, I suggest you watch that video and watch it good.

Here is a guy who shows up at the police station, knowing he was responsible for the death of this little girl. He DELAYED his appearance at the Kittery PD all afternoon (while making frantic calls on his cell phone to determine who DHS was, as well influence possible witnesses and rally support, and to get a group of close friends to meet him at the Kittery Police station).

Watch the video and you'll see a nervous, guilt ridden, controlling person who actually positions a chair between himself and the police officers (this is called a buffer device and it's common with individuals who are not being truthful) and later, after thinking he has won favor and established rapport with one of the police officers, becomes blindly arrogant. Near the end of the interview, he becomes agitated and angry, however it is not sincere because he's doing this in order to change the minds of the investigators. Notice he never gets up and leaves? He is given multiple opportunities to end the interview, but he refuses, because he is trying to control the outcome of the interview.

Watch the video.

18 May 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison: I can you say more about why I think Chad was responsible for Cassidy's death: First off, he was found guilty by a jury of his peers. Second, based upon all of the witness testimony, police interviews and that damning video of his initial police interview. Third, all of the interviews, testimony and witness statements have painted a picture of Chad Evans as a selfish, aggressive, short tempered, jealous man who was abusive to Cassidy. And finally, a voice stress test does is not a reliable method of determining guilt or innocence. Now, if you want to get a full blown polygraph, go ahead. Maybe all of the people who show up at your meetings can buck up a few bucks each and make it happen. But they won't. I have to wonder what type of person shows up to one of these "committee" meetings: People who believe in UFO's, ghosts, ESP?? Or maybe they tree-hugging liberals who live in a world of make believe, their view of the world distorted by their rosey glasses? One thing is certain, they seldom if ever post their full name on this site. Interesting.

The most compelling piece of evidence is the video of Chad Evans initial police interview. Watch the interview. He is guilty beyond belief.

17 May 2011 - Rocheser, NH

### Are you serious?

Chad Evans is as innocent as a fox caught red handed in a chicken coop with a chicken in it's mouth. And the so-called mother is just as guilty. Both of these bastards are responsible for Cassidy's death. Both knew she had severe injuries. If he "loved" Cassidy so much he would have done something to protect her. If it was Amanda who did the actual damage he was more than capable of physically stopping and there was nothing wrong with his mouth to tell the authorities of what he witnessed. That child had visible bruising and damage. So, do not try to come off and say he is innocent. And Amanda should be in prison because if she saw Chad harming her child she had a duty of care to protect her child. She is as much of a scumbag as Chad. But, this free Chad, scumbag, Evans is disgusting. All of you are forgetting a child died of abuse. Fuck Chad and may he rot. If messages are passed to him then tell him I hope he gets beaten in prison and becomes someone's girlfriend. As for Amanda, I hope her supporters tell her I think she is a fucking bitch, as well. She needs to have her uterus ripped out because she is not capable of taking care of a flea.

15 May 2011

### Morrison Bonpasse |

Hello Heather,  
Can you say more about why you think Chad was responsible for Cassidy's death? Does his passing a lie detector test last July make a difference to you?  
Morrison

11 May 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

### Heather

CHAD IS EXACTLY WHERE HES SUPPOSED TO BE AND I HOPE HE ROTS THERE!!!

8 May 2011

### Becky |

"Justice delayed, is justice denied."  
~~William Gladstone

5 April 2011 - Rochester, NH

### Just Me |

Amanda!! Where are you??  
Are you aware that support for you is here?  
I will not judge you  
or make you feel any less of the great mother you are!  
PLEASE PLEASE contact me!  
We love Cassidy!  
We are here for YOU!  
I'm not going to stop until Justice for Cassidy is served!!  
Please consider my invitation of full support for you & your family.

2 March 2011 - Rochester, NH

### Melissa

Bob welcome back, I did in fact respond to you.. Scroll down you will find it. No, I'm not in some classroom as I am well out of college. Thanks though. You seem to be an expert on what tests are

better than others, if your so persistent about Chad taking a polygraph you can pay for it and he will, otherwise he took one that's is sufficient for the military and FBI. We quote because Chad loves them, not to please you. Truly thanks for coming back.....

2 March 2011 - NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

I forgot to mention in the earlier note about the jury not knowing about Cassidy's medical appointments, that Chad didn't remember and his attorneys didn't know the dates of those two doctor appointments either. This was another example of how "date-challenged" the investigation and trial of Chad was. At Chad's trial, Amanda testified, "She always walked pigeon-toed, and ... actually Chad was the one that pointed that out to me... and maybe I should bring her to the doctor's. And his mother said something to me also. So I brought her in July to check her feet, because she did -- she was pigeon-toed, and the doctor said that she was pigeon-toed, but she might grow out of it. If she doesn't, then they do something later on, just to see." (Transcript, Dec. 5, 2001, page 72) No one knew at the trial realized that the appointment she was referencing was on September 11, 32 days into the "Child Endangering" indictment, instead of "July." The defense lawyers should have known, and the prosecutors should have known, too. It was Chad Evans and his mother, Pam, who urged Amanda to take Cassidy to see a doctor, and not Amanda's mother, or her sister, or her friends, or anyone else.

2 March 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Becky** | 

Welcome Back Bob! =)  
Nice job, as always, Morrison!!  
FREE CHAD!!

2 March 2011 - Rochester, NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Let's move on, or away, from the lie detection issue. It's only one of many parts of the truth in this case. Other sources of truth include documents and photographs, some of which were not presented to the jury. For example, the jury didn't know that Amanda had taken Cassidy to the pediatrician for her 18-month checkup on August 10, 2000, and to an orthopedic surgeon on September 11, 2000, for the "toe-in" problem with her feet. Of course, neither doctor mentioned bruises or other signs of abuse in the medical reports. At the trial, the jury was shown only one photo of Cassidy, alive, and the jury was told that the photo was taken by Cassidy's grandmother, Jacqueline Conley, on Sunday, October 1. She said there were no bruises on Cassidy at that time, and not during the two overnight babysitting visits during September. Chad was convicted of Endangering the Welfare of a child, for the period beginning on August 1 to November 9. Does a verdict of Guilty, beyond a reasonable doubt, for Endangering Cassidy's Welfare between August 1 and October 1, i.e. most of the period of the indictment, seem just? Does a verdict of Guilty, beyond a reasonable doubt, of Second Degree Assault for the period of September 1 through September 30 seem just? There were other charges, but let's focus on these, first.

1 March 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Hello Mr. Bonpasse, I'm back. I'm still wondering about POLYGRAPH results. Not Voice Stress results. Polygraph. I would be less skeptical of his innocence if he passed one. I'm getting tired of hearing people state that he passed a "lie detector" when in fact he did not. I find the quotes that are paraded around in this comment section to be quite boring and annoying. I

would rather see these individual's remarks about the vast amount of information that is supplied by this website.

I see that Melissa (refused to give her last name) has yet to reply to my original response about her attack of our handling of Iraqi prisoners. Maybe she's hiding in her classroom again, preparing another "presentation" about things she knows nothing about.

I'm still convinced that Chad Evans is guilty of murdering Kassidy. I can't see Jeff Marshall doing harm to this little girl, and you people who are pointing fingers at him should spend more time exploring the evidence as well as the police interviews. Morrison, you should take more aggressive action against individuals who make accusations against him.

*1 March 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Rather than delete the comment below by a person purporting to be Chad's brother, Jason, it's left there as an example of what's not helpful in this campaign for justice and truth in the Chad Evans case. In the best comments here are comments, ideas, questions and facts about the case.

*26 February 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Jay**

I can't take the lies any longer. I know my brother did it.

*26 February 2011*

**Melissa**

I dont want to overload with quotes but I like this one!

"It is much easier to be critical than to be correct" Benjamin Disraeli

*24 February 2011 - NH*

**Melissa**

"The greatest pleasure in life is doing what people say you cannot do." Walter Bagehot

*22 February 2011 - NH*

**Becky** | 

"The person who spends his/her time finding fault seldom finds anything else."

~~ D. Steed

*21 February 2011 - Rochester, NH*

**Melissa**

The last post should have said my name... It was to Bob. And Bob I was not and am not sitting here saying you did anything wrong, however we can't begin to compare Chads case or what not to the war.

*20 February 2011 - NH*

**Bob**

How do you know I haven't served in the military? And I was specifically speaking about Abu Gharib Scandal, nothing specifically about what you did while you may have served. However you keep asking ppl if they are walking lie detectors or experts yet you seem to know he was guilty based on your assumptions! It's funny how you speak about Chad temper, yet you obv have one, and no one

on here is assuming anything about you. It's easy to sit where you are not knowing Chad to judge his mistakes because his are under a microscope. Chad is guilty of many mistakes in his life but killing Cassidy was not one regardless of what you feel. Chad will be free someday, you'll see!

20 February 2011 - NH

---

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

The war in Iraq was surely important, but let's stay focused on the tragic death of Cassidy Bortner and the conviction, I believe wrongful, of Chad Evans. Recently, while writing the chapter about Chad's trial, for the book, "Eye Contact," I noted that Chad was the only person whom the police didn't ask back for a second interview. Perhaps they assumed, and assumptions are often the sources of errors, that Chad's attorney would turn down such a second interview; but that was perhaps a lost opportunity. With a second interview, the police could have asked several followup questions. In the search for truth, followup questions are often the most productive.

20 February 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

---

**Bob Arnold** | 

Melissa,  
Are you joking? You did a presentation in college about how we handled Iraqi prisoners? Are you on F\*&KNG drugs? Who are you to give a presentation about events that took place in a war zone? And what have you done to make you an expert on how certain body language suggests deception? You child. We were looking for the officers so we could find out where the fu&kng mine fields were, you know the mine fields that those SOB's built in OCCUPIED Kuwait. FYI, we planned on clearing those so some Kuwaiti 10 year old wouldn't get blown up later..... I sleep good at night knowing that I performed my duty in an honorable manner and I never saw anything, I repeat anything happen that was in violation of the Geneva Convention. I'm just curious what kind of pansy presentation you gave. If you wanna join the Peace Corps, I can respect that. You wanna join the military, I can respect that. You wanna hide in a class room and give presentations about things you know nothing about, well I can't respect that.

Look at the evidence. Chad Evans is a guilty, manipulative, self-serving liar. You watch that video of his interrogation and watch it good.

I also sleep good at night knowing, without a doubt, that Chad Evans is guilty of murder, and that he will NEVER get out of prison. Never.

20 February 2011 - Rocheser, NH

---

**Melissa**

Morrison- I think its pretty sketchy that someone would agree then decline once they get there. Funny how only the guy convicted has taken one... and passed.. regardless of negatives out there for the VSA there are more positives. Even the MILITARY and FBI uses it.

18 February 2011 - NH

---

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Melissa,  
On the afternoon of November 9, during his interview which began at 4:15 p.m., the police proposed

to Jeff that he take a lie detector test, using a polygraph and he agreed. It was later scheduled for November 14.

At 7:15 p.m. on the 9th, Chad's interrogation began and he was not asked to take a lie detector test. Afterwards, and outside in the parking lot, Chad offered to Sergeant Matthew Stewart to take a lie detector test, and Stewart said that it was too late as Chad had asked to speak with an attorney. Certainly, having a lawyer posed zero obstacles to a police request to a witness or accused person to take a lie detector test. Also, having a lawyer is no obstacle to seeking a second interview with a witness or suspect. However, the police never asked Chad to take a lie detector test and never asked for a second interview.

(continued below)

18 February 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

Morrison Bonpasse | 

(continued from above)

During Amanda's interview on November 12, Detective Blodgett asked Amanda, at page 48, "... I have serious concerns about Chad. Do you think that it's reasonable for us to ask him to take a Polygraph test?" and Amanda responded, "I think it's a good idea." She said she would feel better if both Chad AND Jeff are asked to take lie detector tests. Blodgett didn't tell her that Jeff had already agreed to take a test. Later, at page 64, Blodgett asked Amanda, "When we ask if Jeff and Chad would take a Polygraph, you wouldn't have a problem taking one either?" Amanda said, "No." She had no objection to taking a lie detector test.

Jennifer Conley was not asked, to my knowledge, to take a lie detector test.

Sometime before November 14, New Hampshire State Police Sergeant James White prepared the investigation plan, now posted at

<http://www.chadevanswronglyconvicted.org/documents/001100TimeLineandInvestigativePlanprobablybySgtJamesWhite.pdf>

In that four-page document he listed three planned polygraph tests: one for Jeff Marshall, scheduled for November 14 and tests for Amanda and Jennifer, listed as "pending."

On Nov. 14, Jeff Marshall went to the Alfred, Maine State Police barracks to take the test but he declined. On November 16, he was interviewed by police and he was videotaped doing a voluntary demonstration of the CPR that he used on Cassidy. On the transcript, there is no discussion of Jeff's previous decision not to take the lie detector test.

There is no written explanation, to my knowledge of why a lie detector test was never offered to Jennifer and never administered for her or for Amanda, and there is no written explanation of why such a test was never offered to Chad. Also, Chad was the only one of the four people closest to Cassidy who was not invited to come for a second interview. Yes, the police could have guessed that Chad's attorneys would have advised him not to accept such an invitation, but the fact remains that he was never asked.

When a re-investigation of this case begins, perhaps such lie detector/polygraph tests could again be offered to all four.

Recently Amanda has reaffirmed to me her willingness to take a lie detector test. However, cost and logistics are an obstacle, but we are working on it.

18 February 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

Meliss

Bob- here is a question for you- if Chad is guilty why then did no one else take a poylgraph test- why in fact did some people end up refusing to take it? Got something to hide?

18 February 2011 -

Melissa

Bob- wasn't there a HUGE scandal over the treatment of some Iraq prisoners from US military? I did an entire presentation on it while in college. I don't think we can even begin to compare the two. His interview can be interpreted by you that he was nervous and at guilt- would you say the same thing about everyone else? We never saw Jen, Amanda's or Jeff's and who knows maybe they seemed just as nervous. I mean a baby died, to be frank with you- I would have been nervous also! How do you know he lied about his travels? His job required him in the car for a large portion of his days. He

could have been in one location- got the call- driven to another- and then driven to Kittery. But he sat in another room for hours waiting to be interviewed. If he had something to hide he wouldn't have been there! He wouldn't have sat in that room for 2+ hours while he was interviewed. And I have to tell you, if I was accused of a crime I didn't commit by someone in authority I would have "layered up" more quickly than he did. MC- the DNA is Cassidy's. The reason it's significant is that they allege she was already almost dead when she arrived at the sitters. If that were true how did blood end up under her fingernails? How did she remove her own pants?

17 February 2011 - NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

One of the themes in this case is how the police repeatedly interpreted ambiguous signals as being definitive answers. For example, during Chad's interview, he was asked about a "McDonald's party" where he allegedly choked Amanda. He was so nervous, he couldn't remember such a "party." What the police were referencing was a McDonald's dinner at the Exeter Inn on Friday, August 25. Note that this was almost two months into Chad's and Amanda's relationship. He didn't consider it a "party," though he had several drinks. At that dinner, Amanda became jealous of Chad's former loves, at least one of whom was at the dinner; and on the way home, the discussion was heated and she hit him. He reached out with his arm and pushed her against the back of the seat and said to stop it. He didn't choke her. The argument did stop and they continued home. To the police, Chad's failure to click on the "party" was "minimizing" or "denial." In that police interview, Chad also called his male dog, Kato, a "she." His nervousness was not a certain indication of guilt. Guilt was one of the possibilities, but not the only one. In about 40 of the 266 exonerations by the Innocence Project, the defendant confessed to the crime during their police interviews, and they were innocent. Chad's nervousness was a far cry from a confession, and he's innocent, too.

Also, he WAS deceptive about two issues. He minimized his relationship to Amanda and he told the police the "trampoline story," which had some basis of truth, but was essentially false. Out of loyalty to Amanda, he thought that it was best to be consistent with what she was likely telling the police. It was stupid to tell the police that story, but that doesn't indicate that he assaulted or murdered Cassidy. The bruises on Cassidy's face, which were caused by Chad's holding her chin or face to obtain eye contact had absolutely nothing to do with Cassidy's death, but the issue obscured the police view of the case. Can we move beyond the police interview?

Sincerely,

17 February 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**mc**

if he's so guilty why not use the finger nail clippings dna of a " FEMALE' THAT alone says mommy or aunty did.. i think mommy did and sister and b/f helped cover it. i think thats why he made all those calls to amanda, jen. i know if i found a child unresponsive,barely breathing,my first call would be 911.. not my g/f and her sister..

16 February 2011

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison, I don't care what he has to say about that interview. He can write all of the commentary he wants, it doesn't change what happened in that video. I can't believe you don't see what I'm seeing in that video. Am I the only person who can see what's going on? You have to look at it several times, watch every movement, watch what he does when he first comes in the room (first refuses to stand, then takes a drink from a water bottle with the lid on, then drops the lid, then says that he's been driving for two hours which was a lie). His deception started before he even sat down. He used must have taken 100 swigs from that 12oz water bottle. He kept trying to control the interview, pointing fingers, used a chair to hide behind.

When we questioned Iraqi prisoners, most of them had ditched their uniforms before being taken. We had to figure out who the officers were. We were taught what to look for (body language) because we were communicating through interpreters so verbal was out. I got to tell you, the Chad Evans video taped interview should be used as an example for military intel personnel to teach examples of deception.

As far as the polygraph, yes it's something that needs to be done. It's the only way that his claims are going to be taken seriously.

16 February 2011 - Rocheser, NH

Morrison Bonpasse | 

MR,  
Chad arrived at the police station about 4:10 and was taken to a room, mostly to wait by himself. Around 4:30, in Detective Ron Avery's office, Maine State Police Sergeant Matthew Stewart told Chad that Cassidy was dead. After going to the men's room and puking, Chad was able to make one call, which was to his mother to give her the news. After that, he was alone until his interview at 7:15. It was about 9:40 when Det. Lance McCleish told Chad, "our investigation clearly indicates that you are the cause of these injuries." Chad responded, "Ah, no way."

Bob,  
Given your interest in the video of Chad's interview, have you seen Chad's comments with a transcript of his interview? It's on the website, together with the interview, at <http://www.chadevanswronglyconvicted.org/documents/001109MSPintAnnttd100714ChadEvansbyMcCleishLeClairStewart110208.pdf> Chad is exploring taking a polygraph, but that costs money. We may be able to find a pro-bono examiner. The VSA exam was done at no charge. Are there some questions that you would want to see on that polygraph exam?  
Sincerely,

15 February 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

MR

So I am watching this viedo and will continue to it. But what I see is this scatter brained guy- who is really upset- keeps putting his head down on the chair- i dont see irt as using it to put in between but to lean on. He crys and seems upset. He reffers to his male dog as a she- this video just makes me even more think he didnt do it.

15 February 2011 - NH

MR

Hey... I am watching the video now.. how long did Chad sit before his interview? I mean this to me is big, if he went in there minutes of finding out I can see why Bob could be concerned with his interview, but I also can see if at this point its been a few hours and he is numb..

15 February 2011 - NH

MR

Bob- I have yet to watch his video though I did read that interview, I will have to watch it! Out of curiosity why is it that you think a polygraph is more substancial than the one he took. If I am correct he took the one he did due to the fact that its more widely accepted as unable to decieve. The CIA and the FBI use the VSA. I found that: Many intelligence agencies as well as private forensic psychophysilogists worldwide utilise VSA in preference to polygraph technology. I'm not sure if you saw it but did you know that more than 1 person did their own analysis of Chad's VSA and each had the same results of not deceptive?  
I will watch that video!

15 February 2011 - NH

**Bob Arnold** | 

I'm sorry folks but I just can't get the video out of my mind...the video of Evan's first police interview. Add to that, all of the interviews, including the first interview of Amanda Bortner and it adds up to a guilty Evans. Like I said before, I really would like to find the guy innocent, but I just can't.

Morrison, is there any way that you can get a polygraph examination done on him? I know it won't be cheap, but if he passed a polygraph with no deception detected, then I would find his story much more convincing.

*15 February 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

To "mel":

You are right that Amanda was rushing to get to work. From the various statements, I recall that she was at Jeff and Jen's for less than 10 minutes. Amanda testified at Chad's trial, "I brought her into the bedroom. My sister was there, and he was there, and I said her eye, or her face looks like shit. I said something of that. And I was only in there for a second, and then I left, because I was running late. And my work was like five minutes from their house." She punched in at work at 8:31 a.m. The blood underneath Cassidy's fingernails was quite clearly hers. The previously undisclosed March 22, 2001 Maine State Police Crime Lab report says that the blood matched the source of a blood sample at the Lab, and the only blood sample came from Cassidy. In the copy given to me, the name of the source of the blood is redacted, but it can be deduced to be Cassidy's. To my knowledge, neither Amanda nor Jennifer were ever asked to provide a blood sample. We'll be absolutely sure about the identity when Chad is given an unredacted copy of that report, as should have been done before his trial.

(continued below)

*15 February 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

(continued from above)

Please know that the existence of blood was in the March 12 Crime Lab report which the defense lawyers had been given. I don't know why they didn't bring up this issue at the trial. Perhaps they simply didn't see it, amidst the 3,000-plus pages of "discovery" materials. What they didn't have, however, was the March 22 DNA report. If they had possessed that report, it certainly would have highlighted the issue for them.

The Maine Medical Examiner, Dr. Margaret Greenwald, testified that the blood on the Wendy's napkin, which was also Cassidy's, came from a "purging" of fluids from her lungs as she was dying. Jeff had testified that he used the napkin to open Cassidy's mouth and see if anything was blocking her breathing. Dr. Greenwald also said that there were no open cuts from which the blood on that napkin/wrapper could have come. So the question arises: How did Cassidy's blood get underneath all ten of her fingernails? I don't know, but it would have been a good question for the jury to hear asked of several witnesses. It's doubtful that she put all ten fingers into her mouth as she was dying. The night before, Chad gave Cassidy a bath and he didn't see any red stain or blood under her fingernails. Travis Hunt didn't notice any blood. The next morning, Amanda didn't notice any blood, and neither did Chad. How, and when, did that blood get underneath her fingernails? Going further from your point, if the jury had known about the blood underneath Cassidy's fingernails, this information would surely have introduced more doubt about the charges against Chad.

*15 February 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**mel**

amanda drove her to jeffe's house where both jen and jeffe were home. supposedly amanda was running late ffor work but she stayed an extra 20 minutes.. if cassidy had female dna under her finger nails its either the mom or the aunt. i think jeffe and jen r protecting amanda... and so quick to

throw their fingers at chad. they say with out a reasonable doubt..but there r so much doubt .....

14 February 2011

MR

Becky- so true! Thank you Bob for serving for our country!

14 February 2011 - NH

Becky Boudreau | 

Bob, has anyone here yet Thanked you for serving our country??

Well THANK YOU!!

As far as this topic goes, please just keep reading, asking questions, and trying to make sense of this story.

Chad will respond to your letter.

I hope you continue to keep talking about this case... just keep talking.

I appreciate all the time you've invested so far.

14 February 2011 - Rochester, NH

MR

Kelly- I agree with you- they should learn. I think the thing with this case is- it was so emmotional- I mean a baby died- it was awful! But I also believe that they just weren't given enough of the facts either. I always wondered why she wa son the porch- or why he made numerous calls before calling 911- or why she had on no pants?! things just don;t add up for me with the day of her death. I'm glad your questioning it too. I would love to see all the "key" people take a lie detector too. Interesting how the one person who was convicted is the only one who willingly took one and passed.

14 February 2011 - NH

Kelly Thompson | 

I think that the babysitter, Jeff needs to take a lie detector test now. No one was with the child before she died except him. Why did he bring Kassidy out on the porch for the ambulance? I read where Jeff didn't like people coming inside and would often meet Chad outside when it was time to pick up Kassidy. Was Jeff trying to hide something? The jury is wrong, there was not enough evidence to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that Chad was guilty. Jury's need to be taught about the law before they are allowed to sit in a courtroom and decide a persons fate.

14 February 2011 - Springfield, IL

MR

As well if evidence ever supported that Chad did this, no money in world would get Morrison to help him! If you think he is making bank on this your wrong.

14 February 2011 - NH

MR

Bob- are you saying if I ever refer to my child as a "bitch" or "retard" it means I dont care for them? In that same theory than- I guess Jeff didn't love her either becasue he is quoted saying it too. If my child ever has unexplained bruises does that mean I did them? What if when I go to the ER and the

dr finds a bruise I didnt know of and he starts questioning me, my heart starts racing- am I guilty of child abuse? If Kassidy was abused by Chad as you say why is it that days before she dies she was seen with him by a nurse who saw he climb into his lap and cuddle? I know as a parent that my child wouldn't do that- in fact most children would shy away. If the ball never hit Kassidy the night before why would his son tell his mom he did that? I don't know many 3 year olds that can keep a lie going and keep it straight, I know fir sure if my 3 year old saw me hit an 18 month old mine would tell someoe! Anyone! If Chad was the one who abused her why did he INSIST that she didn't spend the night with her sitter that night and go get her? Do you really think somoene making 70K a year is so rich and powerful? I don't. I make more than that and I cant influence other people beacuse of it. And I'm certainly not rich!

14 February 2011 - NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,  
Sometimes Chad's vocabulary was not the most elegant, but that's true for many people. President Obama's recently departed Chief of Staff, Rahm Emanuel, comes to mind, as does General George Patton, and President Richard Nixon. At Chad's trial, Amanda testified that Chad said, "She is being a little bitch today. Said that a couple of times." Also, she testified that he said, "...she's kind of slow, retarded. He said that once, I can remember." (p. 97) Like many people, he used the word "retard" as a joking reference to people, as in "He's such a retard." Yes, despite the vocabulary, he loved Kassidy Bortner. He helped teach her the ABC's and numbers. He and Amanda took Kassidy to York's Wild Animal Kingdom in June, 2000. For Amanda's day of shopping with her mother and sister, on Sunday, November 5, Chad gave her money to buy clothes for Kassidy. He fed her. He carried her on his shoulders outside and around the house (once causing her to hit her head on the ceiling in the stairwell). He read to her at bed time. He played with her, and taught her to wrestle. He recalls one time when he held her chin to get eye contact with her, he was teaching her not to go near his dog, Kato, when Kato was eating his food, as the dog might bark at her, or worse. The jury knew nothing about the good that Chad did for Kassidy.

Regarding the question of Amanda getting her own apartment at one point in their relationship, it wasn't his idea. As in any new relationship, there were times when Amanda or Chad was not sure that it would work. Chad was sometimes concerned that they were moving too fast, and his divorce was not yet final; and he didn't want to do anything that would interfere with the agreements that he and Tristan had reached, especially about the joint custody for their son. Incidentally, the divorce was final on October 4, but he didn't know that until the paperwork was mailed to him after Kassidy's death. That's one reason why Amanda still felt like an outsider during Chad's October 15 birthday celebration, which Tristan attended, and Amanda did not. Life and relationships can be complicated. Sincerely,

14 February 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Is that why he called her "bitch"? Because he loved her? Is that why he wanted Amanda to move out, because he loved both of them?

Common Morrison, you're starting to sound like a public relations officer of an oil company.

14 February 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob and Mel,  
First, to Mel's point, Chad and Amanda did not seek medical attention for Kassidy after bruises began appearing in mid-October because they didn't think that there was a serious medical problem. On November 8th, Chad and his former wife, Tristan, discussed taking Kassidy to the

hospital but they agreed, as so many of us have in uncertain circumstances, to "wait-and-see" if she gets better. Also, Cassidy wasn't their child, so it was, ultimately, in the absence of an obvious emergency, Amanda's decision. Aside from the apparent accidents, she and Chad thought that Cassidy was sick with flu-like symptoms. Tristan called DCYF because she was given different stories to explain the bruising she saw, and she thought that Chad and Amanda were protecting someone else. She didn't think that Chad was abusing Cassidy. Incidentally, she told Chad on the night of the 9th that she was the one that called DCYF anonymously and Chad told her it was the right thing to do.

I forgot to mention, in a previous comment, another "substantial" aspect of this case which supports the need for a reinvestigation, which is that Chad is now the only person in the case to have taken a lie detector test. Yes, there is controversy about the validity of lie detector tests in general, and, in particular, Voice Stress Analysis.(VSA) However, many police departments, and the CIA and FBI use VSA tests. At the website, with the "Latest News" section about his test, at "15 November 2010," I've linked an article about VSA. Also linked there are questions that he brought to the test that he hoped might be included in the test. They weren't, but the offer was made.

(continued below)

14 February 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

(continued from above)

Regarding Chad's police interrogation, he was nervous and in shock and disbelief. As he said, he saw Cassidy in the morning and gave her the cereal of her choice in a baggie and off they went for the day. And now she was dead. He felt responsible for her death as he knew he could have done more to help her. Hindsight can be painfully 20/20, but that doesn't make him a batterer or murderer.

As for motives in this case, the most important motivation issue is that Chad had zero motive to harm Cassidy. He loved her and cared for her and looked forward to helping Amanda raise her to adulthood.

Sincerely,

14 February 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Mel I got to agree with you about the four adults. However, I do think that they were influenced by Evans position of power. Namely Evans financial position, he provided money and care to Amanda, he provided work contracts to Jeff, and as far as Amanda's sister, I think she felt like she didn't want to endanger Amanda's custody of Cassidy. You got to admit, he made a lot of money and did have the power to make things difficult for the three of them. Never the less, I do have to agree with you because they all knew something was up with Cassidy, and everyone within Chad's sphere of influence suspected that he was abusing her. The ex wife was the only one that made a call to DHS, even though she was also within his influence, this is why she made the call anonymously.

I would recommend to anyone who has questions of Evans guilt, go to the video of his initial questioning by the police on 11/9/00, it can be found in the Investigation and Related Docs section. Watch what he does when he enters the room, pay close attention to his body language, his failure to keep and maintain eye contact, his repeated efforts to control the conversation and change the topic, repeated efforts to drive the conversation in directions of his choosing, his nervousness, his phony explanation for calling his friends on his way to the station. Positioning an empty chair between himself and the investigators. Unbelievable. As a prior OS in the US Navy and experience handling foreign nationals during Desert Storm, I gained knowledge about people and how they act during interrogations, and I got to tell you, this guy showed extreme guilt during this questioning.

13 February 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**mel**

u have to admit there's reasonable doubt... i dont think any one thing killed her.. i believe the

cassidy hitting the glass table started the unfortunate term oil that helped end her life... but the most disturbing about all this is that not one of the 4 adults cared enough to get her help...thats where the crime is... think about it ..they all hurt cassidy one way or another..

13 February 2011

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison, I've already considered all of the points you already mentioned, it still does not outweigh the evidence against him. Some of the new "evidence" such as "blood under all of her fingernails" does not conclude that Chad wasn't responsible. Furthermore, I've read her statements to police, all of them. There was no evidence that they "lead" her, nor is there any apparent reason for it.

Part of me wants to see him get a second trial, but I must admit it would be a total waste of time. Let's say that this new evidence is explored and introduced, let's say that he does testify "this time," I don't see a not-guilty verdict being returned.

True, our prosecutors are paid, as well as state medical examiners and pathologists. So are our police officers. They have a job to do and they do it well. As far as your argument that you're paid just like them, well that's not a valid argument because you stand to financially gain substantially if he does get a second trial, or if he does a pardon. The state and local police, prosecutors, etc...they aren't paid in that fasion. They don't get paid on commission like you do.

I didn't mean to you attack you personally, that's not what I wanted. I;m merely pointing out that you're motivated for reasons other that seeing justice, namely financial. Am I wrong?

Respectfully,

13 February 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

I, too, am confident about our justice system, but mistakes happen. The Innocence Project has exonerated through DNA testing, 266 wrongfully convicted people since 1989. All those people were convicted by juries, or sometimes, judges, "beyond a reasonable doubt." Showing the power of police interrogations, about 25% of 266 confessed to the crimes they didn't commit. Even if Amanda didn't confess, she told the police what they wanted to hear about Chad. Chad reacted to his interrogation in a different way. In 20% of the exonerations, "snitches" or inmate informants were involved as happened in Chad's case with Cory Merrill.

Regarding my work for Chad, weren't the police and prosecutors and Medical Examiner paid for their work?

Respectfully, I think that the jury's not knowing about the blood underneath all ten of Cassidy's fingers is "substantial." Not knowing that there were DNA tests done on that blood and on the unknown fluid on a napkin is "substantial." Not knowing that Amanda took Cassidy to see doctors on August 10 and September 11, with Chad's support, during the period that Chad was charged (and convicted) of child endangerment, is "substantial." Not knowing that four days before Cassidy died, Chad took her to a family event where a school nurse observed Cassidy, and saw her crawl into Chad's lap is "substantial." Not knowing that Chad talked with a day care provider about getting Cassidy into professional day care is "substantial." Not knowing that the ball that hit Cassidy on the evening of the 8th was a Tee-ball and not a wiffle ball was "substantial."

Sincerely,

13 February 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

I, too, am confident about our justice system, but mistakes happen. The Innocence Project has exonerated through DNA testing, 266 wrongfully convicted people since 1989. All those people were convicted by juries, or sometimes, judges, "beyond a reasonable doubt." Showing the power of police interrogations, about 25% of 266 confessed to the crimes they didn't commit. Even if Amanda didn't confess, she told the police what they wanted to hear about Chad. Chad reacted to his interrogation in a different way. In 20% of the exonerations, "snitches" or inmate informants were involved as happened in Chad's case with Cory Merrill.

Regarding my work for Chad, weren't the police and prosecutors and Medical Examiner paid for their work?

Respectfully, I think that the jury's not knowing about the blood underneath all ten of Cassidy's fingers is "substantial." Not knowing that there were DNA tests done on that blood and on the unknown fluid on a napkin is "substantial." Not knowing that Amanda took Cassidy to see doctors on August 10 and September 11, with Chad's support, during the period that Chad was charged (and convicted) of child endangerment, is "substantial." Not knowing that four days before Cassidy died, Chad took her to a family event where a school nurse observed Cassidy, and saw her crawl into Chad's lap is "substantial." Not knowing that Chad talked with a day care provider about getting Cassidy into professional day care is "substantial." Not knowing that the ball that hit Cassidy on the evening of the 8th was a Tee-ball and not a wiffle ball was "substantial."

Sincerely,

*13 February 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison, I must strongly disagree with you, Cassidy's death is not a mystery. As the police have demonstrated, by use of testimony from various people close to Chad and Amanda, as well as expert testimony from a state pathologist, her death was the result of a brutal attack by the defendant/convicted, Chad Evans. Chad has a history of monopolizing opportunity, whenever he could gain from it. This includes but is not limited to the friends he convinced to rally around him, the persuasive manner in which he influenced Amanda's testimony, the unexplained phone calls made to Jeff Marshall and his ex wife on the evening of 11/8/00, etc...I could go on and on. Anyone reading this who doesn't understand what I'm talking about, you really need to go back and read the initial police interviews. Look at what everyone was saying at the time. The most damning evidence is two fold: One, the video taped police interview of Evans on the evening of 11/9/00, second is he refused, I repeat, he refused to testify at his own trial. He hid behind his attorneys, much the same way he hid behind that empty chair during his initial video taped police interview.

Watch the video.

*13 February 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Bob Arnold** | 

I've read everything there is to read about this entire case. I'm confident in our justice system, and I'm confident in the agencies that conducted the investigation. The investigation was thorough, professional and highly unbiased. Based upon all available information, I'm confident that Chad Evans is guilty. The evidence is there, all you have to do is remove your rose colored glasses and examine it. I'm also confident that he will never get a second trial, we will never be pardoned, and he will never leave prison alive. He is lucky this didn't occur in Oklahoma or Texas, where they would put him on death row for this horrible crime.

It's ok to have an opinion one way or the other concerning this case. However, I repeatedly pointed this out, that the Chad Evans supporters do not offer any valuable evidence that supports their beliefs other than stealing quotes here and there. Mr. Bonpasse is working very hard on this case, but he does have something financially to gain from this, which sullies his reputation regarding the Chad Evans case.

Watching the interrogation video a fourth time, I'm 100% convinced that he is guilty, There is no doubt in my military mind.

I will be a critic (with an open mind of course) of Chad Evans, until one of you can offer me something substantial in the way of evidence that is contrary to the opinion of our court system.

13 February 2011 - Rocheser, NH

---

**MR**

The pure and simple truth is rarely pure and never simple-- Oscar Wilde

13 February 2011 - NH

---

**Becky Boudreau** | 

"Better to remain silent and be thought a fool than to speak out and remove all doubt."

~Abraham Lincoln

13 February 2011 - Rochester, NH

---

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Kassidy's death is still a mystery. Yes, the Maine Medical Examiner testified about fractures, but Dr. Michael Baden said there were no fractures, and certainly not recently. Amanda took Kassidy to an orthopedic surgeon on September 11, 2000 to check on her "pigeon-toe" problem and the doctor said that there was a slight problem, but that was no need for surgery. There was no mention in his report of fractures or bruises. The jury did not know about the date of this appointment, nor other details about it. Amanda vaguely mentioned it at the trial and thought it occurred in July. The Maine ME referred to "pediatrician" reports, when asked about the "bruising easily" problem, but no pediatrician records were ever provided to Chad's lawyers. Independently, I've obtained records of Kassidy's last two pediatrician appointments, on May 8 and August 9. And Chad was convicted of abuse beginning on August 1st? The photo taken by Kassidy's grandmother, and shown to the jury was taken on Sunday, October 1, but the date of the photo was not emphasized to the jury. Neither were the dates of the observations of injuries.

The theory that Chad lost his temper on the evening of November 8 is pure fiction. He had a productive day at work. Amanda had planned to have Kassidy stay at Jeff and Jen's overnight on the 8th, but Chad offered to bring her home and picked her up on the way to pick up his son at his day care. He talked with his ex-wife, Tristan, that evening. His son was at home. Travis Hunt was there for a short time. Chad talked briefly with Travis's girlfriend on the phone and he talked with Amanda. There is simply no evidence that he lost his temper. He gave Kassidy a bath and applied J&J body lotion to her and read a book to her in bed. He's taken a voice-stress lie detector test, and passed.

Sincerely,

13 February 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

---

**stef**

check out jeffe marshalls police record...3/2/98 slapped with a restraining ordeer by nicholl mitchelll ,5/11/94 harassment charges, u should check it out he is a violent man.

12 February 2011

mel

jeffe couldnt have done it. 1st of the bruises on her stomach could of came from jeffe pushing on her stomach to do cpr ... then 4 calls later then decides ohh i should call 911... his and his aunt and mom should all be charged in this they all had a piece of her.....jeffe says its weird chad called to ask whats wrong with baby after he picked up....FROM JEFFE'S house who watched her ... amanda says chad only babysat alone twice but jeffe and jen always.....hmmm

12 February 2011

mel

i think all 4 adults had a piece of this little girl and the mom is a sick lady,. even after finding out her b/f murdered her 18 month she was banging him and having fun.... jeff didnt like that little girl and the aunt could of caredless..report these ppl's staements they contradict themselves and change their story left and right. the mom knew some thing was wrong that morning but she didnt care and left her with jeffe then before the end of the day she is dead but only chad gets it.. the other 3 threw him under the bus...

12 February 2011 - MAINE

Bob Arnold | 

Yes Becky, the truth hurts sometimes. No matter how many quotes you parade around with, the facts are facts. There is no way that Chad Evans is the sweet guy that this website portrays him as. I'm now convinced that he slowly killed this little girl, the final blow happened during the evening of 11/8/00. He lost control of his temper and brutally beat her, fracturing bone and causing the injuries that resulted in her death 12 hours later. A state pathologist with 25 years experience summarized this in her post mortum findings. Facts are facts.

Watch the video, 11/9/00 Chad Evans First Interview.

12 February 2011 - Rocheser, NH

Becky Boudreau | 

" The truth that makes men free is for the most part the truth which men prefer not to hear." ~ Herbert Agar

12 February 2011 - Rochester, NH

Bob Arnold | 

Morrison, thanks for discussing this further with me. I've reviewed statements made by those close to Chad, which paints a picture of someone with a mean streak and a very short temper which was uncontrollable. Eyewitnesses stated that he regularly called Kassidy "little bitch" and "f\*ckng retard". Is that something that comes out of the mouth of a caring adult? Other accounts of abuse of other people, objects, and one child in particular: Kassidy. Accounts of his aggressiveness with women (see statements made by Amanda about his sex life, about how he had complete control over her, he could get her to do anything he wanted including anal sex, threesomes, etc). He managed to influence her testimony at trial, evidence of this can be found by comparing her initial statement to police and friend to her actual testimony later on. You know, I have read all of the info I can find about this guy and the truth of the matter is this: He wasn't a caring person. The only thing he seems to care about in this world is himself. He was the last to show up at the Kittery PD on 11/9/00, because it looks to me like he was on the phone with people in order to rally support for himself. He showed up at the PD that night with a group of supporters. How can that be explained?

If Chad didn't kill this child, someone did and for the life of me, I can't see Jeff Marshall doing something like that.

12 February 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

People react in different ways to stress and tragedy and success, too. Chad felt shocked by Cassidy's death and knew he could have done more which, in retrospect, could have saved her life. He was very concerned for Amanda. Let's look at what he said in the police interview, rather than trying to interpret his body language. For example, he told them about the "hard rubber ball"/"starter baseball" hitting Cassidy on the 8th. It appears that the police and the prosecutors never believed him, but it's true. I believe that the ball's impact had some role in her death, but the jury seems to have thought that if there was an accident at all, it was with a wiffle ball. He was confused about many things during the interview. For example he called his male dog, Kato, a "she." He didn't complete sentences. For example, he said, at page 17, that "I get her into one," meaning "day care," but what he meant was that he had talked to the director of Kyle's day care about admitting Cassidy, and it couldn't be done until she was toilet trained. I talked with that school director and she confirmed the conversation, which occurred only a few days before Cassidy died.

Regarding Chad's treatment by other prisoners, I've visited him many times at Concord State Prison and understand how the prison subculture works. Please know that most inmates respect Chad and don't believe that he belongs there. Inmates are very good at spotting phonies, and Chad is the real thing, just like the other wrongfully convicted men I've known and supported.

Sure, I'm being paid a minimal amount by Chad's parents, with Chad agreeing to pay the balance when he's exonerated; but my reputation and desire for justice are far more important than the money.

What do you think could possibly have been a motive for Chad harming Cassidy? He brought her to a family gathering on Sunday, November 5 for the day and a school nurse, the mother-in-law of Chad's sister, saw them together. That nurse wrote to Judge Nadeau at Chad's sentencing, saying that Cassidy, "climbed onto his lap and lay her head against him." Does that sound like an abusive relationship to you?

Sincerely,

12 February 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison, watch the video again. Watch it three times. Watch it along with the transcript side by side. This is what I did.

I understand you may be a biased party to all this because you're a hired gun. You've been hired by the defendant's parents. That's fine. But you really need to look at this and go with your intuition. Go with your gut. You're a smart guy. Look at the video again. You have to ask yourself this question: Do I want to risk my reputation on this case?

12 February 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Bob Arnold** | 

Becky, please save the quotes. They do nothing to support your belief that this guy is innocent. This is one of the reasons I find it so frustrating with the Chad Evans supporters. You can't show any real evidence. Nothing. All you do is parade around with quotes and silly statements about this case.

I really would like to find this guy innocent, I really would. But so far I can't.

When I said I believed he is near the top of the pecking order in that prison, you really have no idea what that means, do you?

12 February 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

You are correct that in his police interview, Chad understated the degree of his relationship with Amanda. He was concerned about her status with the Maine Dept. of Health and Humans Services ASPIRE program which provides assistance to single mothers. It was that program that was assisting her to re-enter the workforce as a step toward higher education. Amanda's job at Old Navy, which began on Monday, November 6, was part of her ASPIRE plan. She hadn't yet told her ASPIRE counselor that she had moved to New Hampshire. I agree, too, that Chad seemed nervous, but I would be nervous, too, in those circumstances. He felt substantially responsible for Cassidy's death not because he did anything to her to cause it, but because he didn't take her to the hospital or to a doctor, or urge Amanda to take her to the hospital or to a doctor. Hindsight can be tragically 20/20. He also told the police the "trampoline story," instead of telling them how he had caused bruises on Cassidy's lower chin to obtain eye contact, which bruises, had absolutely nothing to do with Cassidy's death. He and Amanda had told that story for about three weeks to several people and he stuck with it. The police correctly didn't believe it, and began to believe that other parts of Chad's statements during the interview were lies, too, such as the accidental hitting of Cassidy with the Tee-ball on Wednesday evening, Nov. 8. You saw a lack of sadness. I saw sadness, shock and disbelief, and, yes, some anger and frustration, when he realized that the police were accusing him, wrongly.

Regarding Jeff Marshall, there are no accusations of him on the website to my knowledge. If you believe otherwise, please let me know where you think that line may have been crossed. I've talked with him on the phone once, and have invited him by email to meet with me, in the interest of gathering information about Cassidy's life and death. The Campaign for Justice for Chad Evans is interested in the truth.

Sincerely,

*12 February 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Becky Boudreau** | 

"The truth is incontrovertible, malice may attack it, ignorance may deride it, but in the end; there it is."

~ Winston Churchill

*11 February 2011 - Rochester, NH*

**Bob Arnold** | 

I've watched the entire 2 1/2 hour video taped police interview of the defendant on the night of the victims death. Defendant was deceitful within the first 60 seconds. (Watch the interview and his explanation for a call to his ex wife, also note his desire of distancing himself from Amanda and Cassidy when asked if they lived with him. Also note his description of his relationship with Amanda). Defendant was very nervous, and tried to change the subject every chance he got. He tried to control the interview, and during several moments became heated and argumentive with the police officers. Defendant placed a chair between himself and the officers and used the chair as a security blanket for nearly the entire interview. Defendant clearly showed guilt, and was calculating his answers. Had an arrogant attitude at times. No sadness over the loss of this little girl. None.

I'm telling you Morrison, you need to be careful with this guy. He is a dangerous SOB. I bet he's at the top of the pecking order in that prison. You also need to be careful about making accusations towards Jeff Marshall, you're going to open yourself up to a lawsuit.

Watch the video.

*11 February 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

Breaks are good, but your interest in this case is welcome and I hope it resumes later.

The "uncontrollable anger" theory was one that was pursued by the police. They asked everyone - Did he have gambling debts? (NO) Other financial problems? (NO) Problems at work? (NO) As he has described to me, he was the happiest in the summer and fall of any other period in his life. Yes, he did fight with his former wife, and twice under the influence of alcohol, he hurt her. That behavior scared him and he voluntarily sought additional counseling (additional to what was court-ordered). He had a list of "To Do's" at home on the wall to use if he became angry. After a few weeks of living with Amanda, she took it off the wall and told him he didn't need the list anymore, and she was right. Chad and Amanda had a very physical relationship, which was not abusive. The prosecutors argued that a man who could assault his wife could also assault his children, but that doesn't always follow. As his former wife has said, she had to do much of the disciplining of the children in their home when they were still together.

I think that you are right that something happened on Wednesday evening, November 8th, and that was that Cassidy was hit by a line drive "Tee-ball." Chad told the police that it was a "starter baseball" or a "hard rubber ball," and that was a "Tee-ball." Witnesses at the trial, who weren't there, sometimes called it a wiffle ball and the prosecution seems to have persuaded the jury that Chad was lying about that accident, and that it was only a wiffle ball. It wasn't, and the defense didn't work on that issue. That may have been the straw that broke the camel's back.

(continued below)

*11 February 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

(continued from above)

The original severe injury was around October 28th when Cassidy came home from three days and two nights of babysitting with Jeff, and what was intended to be a one-night babysitting job, beginning on Thursday the 26th. Jeff told Amanda that the bumps on the back of Cassidy's head were caused by a fall from a truck. At the trial, he seems to have denied that such a fall took place. But however it happened, Cassidy came home with bumps on the back of her head, and that may have been the time of the first brain injury that led to her death.

I look forward to your return to this exchange.

Sincerely,

*11 February 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Morrison, I have to take a break from this for a while because I'm becoming obsessed with this case. If I read anymore witness statements/testimony/court minutes I'm going to get a headache...

I have considered your response and weighed it against what I already know, and I'm still convinced he is guilty. There was evidence of abuse in the form of harsh excessive and illegal disciplining (assaults) by the defendant which predates the 24 hour period prior to her death, however that abuse was turned up several notches within 24 hours of her death. That abuse would have occurred after Chad picked Cassidy up from Jeff's. Something happened that night, Chad was there with no other adults present. I believe what the police and prosecution believed, that Chad inflicted those injuries in a moment of uncontrollable anger. The same uncontrollable anger that he had a history of releasing. It was proven that Chad had a major anger issue as well as a control issue. He is a manipulator, a compulsive, controlling person. I think he's controlling you, though you don't realize it.

I respect your opinion and the work you're putting into this Mr. Bonpasse, but I believe there's another case out there that warrants your attention more than this one. It's a losing fight with this case. I believe that Chad Evans is guilty. I believe that Jeff Marshall had nothing to do with her injuries.

Continue to fight the good fight. They're hard to find, but I don't believe you've found it with this

case.

Best Regards,

11 February 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

We agree on at least one issue, which is that it was a mistake for Chad not to testify. Also, though you have not mentioned it, it was a mistake not to take Cassidy to see a doctor at the time that the bruising began, consistently, in mid-October. Also, it was mistake to make up the "white lie" about the "trampoline story" instead of simply explaining that palming Cassidy chin to obtain eye contact caused some bruising. However, those mistakes don't make him an abuser or murderer.

Body language, i.e. Chad's during the police interview, can usually be interpreted differently. How about that he was experiencing some degree of shock at the death of Cassidy and that he was perplexed? Gradually, it dawned on him that he was being suspected. He didn't "lawyer up" right away. He tried to help the police by providing what information he could. After his interview, he offered, to Maine State Police Sergeant Matthew Stewart, to take a polygraph, but Stewart said he couldn't because Chad had asked for a lawyer. The police never followed up with a request to Chad to take such a test. Sure, they assumed that Chad's lawyer would say "no," but they never asked. As you are now more familiar with the case than most people, and as you wrote that all the information on the website is "damning," what do you think of the following?

(continued in comment below)

11 February 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

(continued from previous comment)

1. Amanda took Cassidy to Dr. James Twomey on Sept. 11, 2000, while the indictment against Chad says that his abuse began on August 1st.
  2. A school nurse saw Chad with Cassidy in a social setting on Sunday, November 5, four days before her death, and saw a loving, caring relationship, and did not see any bruises.
  3. Blood was found under all ten of Cassidy's fingernails though she had a bath the night before. Travis Hunt witnessed that bath, as did Chad's three year old son. At Chad's trial, the Medical Examiner said that was no bleeding from any of Cassidy's injuries. The only blood mentioned at the trial was from "purging" when Cassidy was dying, and by then it was too late for her to move her hands.
  4. The State did DNA testing on that blood and found that it belonged to Cassidy, but the defense was never told about those tests. Also, male DNA from saliva was found on a napkin on the bed at the babysitter's. That DNA doesn't prove much, but it certainly could have led to some interesting questions at Chad's trial. Where did that saliva come from?
  5. The photo on the website with Amanda and Cassidy, at arms length, was taken on Friday, October 20. Cassidy looks healthy and happy.
  6. Chad has acknowledged holding Cassidy's chin when obtaining eye contact, and which may have caused two of the 80 bruises found in the autopsy. He also acknowledged the accident with the Tee-Ball which was his fault. He also observed, but was not responsible for, about four other bruises on Cassidy on the 8th and 9th. Where did the other 73 bruises come from?
  7. A few days before Cassidy died, Chad talked with the director of his son's day care school about placing Cassidy in that school. He talked with his financial advisor about setting up an education fund for Cassidy, as he had for his son and step son. He shared in the teaching of Cassidy her ABC's and numerals, and read to her on the night of the 8th.
- Sincerely,

11 February 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

To Diane,

Thanks very much for the suggestion that there may be another medical explanation for some of Cassidy's symptoms. Your story is remarkable. There may have been different medical problems appearing simultaneously. The consistent bruising to Cassidy seems to have started around October 13, 2000, although there was one report of bruises in mid-September, but they disappeared by the 24th, when Cassidy was being babysit by her grandmother for several days. At the time bruises were appearing, Chad and Amanda thought that the explanations were reasonable and that Cassidy bruised easily, so they didn't think there was a serious problem. The alleged fall from Jeff Marshall's truck that caused a head injury occurred around October 27th, but Jeff denied at Chad's trial that such an accident occurred. There was another fall from his truck a few days before Cassidy died, and the trial did not clearly distinguish the two.

To Bob,

You asked how Chad's supporters respond to the evidence at Amanda's trial. She did not testify at her own trial, and thus did not tell the jury what she told a national audience on the John Walsh Show, which was that Chad Evans didn't abuse Cassidy. Yes, the police persuaded Amanda, early on, that Chad killed Cassidy, and grief-stricken Amanda was trying to make sense of what she was being told. Later, she realized that the police were wrong. Because she was no longer supporting the police version of Cassidy's death, the State withdrew its offer of immunity to Amanda and she was prosecuted and convicted. Both she and Chad paid a terrible price for not testifying. The juries at both trials heard only part of the story of Cassidy's life between June and November of 2000.

*11 February 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Diane M. Starkey** | 

February 10, 2011.

Dear advocates for Mr. Chad Evans: Has the possibility that Ms. Bortner had an infected spleen been covered?

I was told I had one at age 2, in 1958, and my parents only rushed me to the hospital in Dover to be treated like child molesters by the nurses; at first. My mother related to me that she saw how fast and large a bruise on my chest formed after I tripped and fell facedown over a door sill of 1 ½ inches.

I was found to have an infection of the spleen and shipped to the Children's Hospital in Boston. Thankfully, medicine worked, and I did not have to undergo surgery.

My condition caused a lot of internal bleeding at the slightest touch. This is just a possibility that should have been eliminated in the autopsy.

My question is, if the babysitter was last with the child before her death, why was he/she not the highest suspect?

Yours sincerely,  
Diane M. Starkey

*10 February 2011 - Rochester, NH, 03867*

**Bob Arnold** | 

Taken from the quotes section of this website:

"I want to answer every question you have. I want to be as helpful as

I can... I'm not trying to be a pecker head. I want to help you in any

way I can. I want to answer any question....I know when I went

through that last questioning, ... I got too many things going through

my head. I'd rather. There's two of you. There's one of me. I just feel comfortable answering any question with him [my attorney] sitting beside me..."

Are you shitting me? This guy started hiding behind his attorney before he was even indicted. He hid behind his attorney during trial. He hid behind his attorney when it was his turn to testify. Now he's hiding behind a smoke screen so he can get out of jail.

10 February 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Bob Arnold** | 

MR: I see you don't want to leave your name, fine. As far as pointing fingers, are you serious? Have you even looked at the content in this website? This website repeatedly makes reference to Mr. Marshall in a subtle manner as if to suggest that he is the guilty party...I've spent alot of time reading information about this case at the NH Supreme Court website and other state court websites. Just FYI, here is some information about the trial of Amanda: (Defendant would be Amanda)

Following Kassidy's death, the defendant was interviewed on four separate occasions by Detective Angela Blodgett of the Maine State Police. During the interviews, the defendant told Detective Blodgett that Evans threw Kassidy into a corner, banged her head on the closet door, pinched her face hard enough to leave bruises and called her a "bitch." The defendant admitted that she did not bring Kassidy to the doctor on the day before her death because she and Evans agreed to wait until Kassidy's bruises went away.

On December 19, 2000, the defendant was interviewed by New Hampshire State Police Sergeant James White. At this interview, the defendant described her observations of Kassidy on the day before her death and the day of her death. In addition, she described Evans as "out of control" when he was disciplining Kassidy. The information she provided to Sergeant White was, for the most part, consistent with the information she previously provided to Detective Blodgett.

How do you respond to this?

The more I read about this, the more certain I am that Chad Evans belongs behind bars.

10 February 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**MR**

As well Bob- you can find many things online to support for deny any theory..While there are many ways to 'beat' a traditional polygraph, including many methods promoted and sold on the Internet, there is nothing that can fool or beat voice lie-detection Found on Wikopedia- I could easily shoot down everything you say and be rude. In stead I was merely stating that I cant wait to see his reply to you and that I think its great you asked him instead of us. But to say we know the reason is very assumptive. You can say whtvere you want and spew any hatred you have- we know what we know and you cant change that. I didnt know Chad. I have and had NOTHING to gain by believing in his innocence. But I read things with unbaised eyes- listened with unbiased ears and thought things through with a clear and level head. And my decision is mine. You can be angry with people for their beliefs but you cant change them. Good luck to you on your path for YOUR ANSWERS.

10 February 2011 - NH

**MR**

Bob- maybe you should be honest with everyone and just say- unless he admits guilt you dont

believe a thing he says. Your not going to be satisfied unless you hear what you want. We can all say what we want- words that have come from Chad- and you'll get the same answer from him. One that won't satisfy you.

I never once claimed she was abused by anyone specific. I stated merely facts. Like I said, I don't know who hurt her, I just know the facts that I read. Think what you want about his supporters or random people who come to this site and believe what they want.

You can say he hated her and called her whatever name you want- and some people testified others called her those same names. People testified under oath that they never saw him hurt her- people testified under oath that he loved and cared for her. But since this theory doesn't fit what you want your not going to care. Had he failed that voice analysis test you would have believed its results, in fact you would have found facts online to support why its so great- but it doesn't fit your theory so its wrong.

*10 February 2011 - NH*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Bob,

You are correct that Jeff Marshall suggested to Chad that Cassidy be taken to the hospital. However, Cassidy seemed to recover that evening, even after being hit with a Tee-ball. Chad also talked by phone with his wife, from whom he was separated, and they discussed taking Cassidy to the hospital, if she wasn't better in the morning. The next morning, she seemed tired, but otherwise ok.

Chad did suggest to Amanda that she take Cassidy to a doctor to have a wart removed from a finger, and he did join his mother in recommending that Amanda take Cassidy to see a doctor about her "pigeon-toed" feet. The jury was never told that the orthopedic surgeon appointment was on September 11, 2000, which was six weeks after the abuse allegedly began for which Chad was convicted beyond a reasonable doubt. Amanda mentioned that appointment during her testimony, but she was vague about the date, and recalled that it was in July. Unfortunately, Chad's defense team was apparently not aware of the true date of that appointment, nor of the August 10 appointment with a pediatrician.

On October 1, Cassidy was with her loving grandmother, Jacqueline Conley, who saw no bruises on Cassidy. On that day, the trial's only photograph of a happy, healthy Cassidy was taken, with her holding her bunny rabbit. On October 14, Jacqueline called Chad's home, and talked with Chad because her son had seen bruises on Cassidy's face on October 13. If she had seen anything on October 1, she would have said something.

On Sunday, November 5, Chad brought Cassidy to a family gathering, as Amanda was with her mother and sister for the day. Chad's sister, a school teacher, cared for Cassidy for a good part of the day, and saw only one bruise, and asked Chad about it. His sister's mother-in-law, a school nurse, saw Cassidy with Chad and observed a loving relationship. Four days later, Cassidy was dead.

Chad's supporters are not trying to pin responsibility for Cassidy's death on anyone. What we are trying to do is show that, whatever the causes of Cassidy's mysterious death, it was not from abuse or assaults from Chad Evans. Chad never spanked nor hit Cassidy.

*10 February 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Bob Arnold** | 

MR: Who am I communicating with here? I'd like your name please. In response to your earlier statement, that you asked Chad a lot of "hard" questions and you got "honest" answers: What are you, a walking lie detector? How do you know he was telling you the truth? This guy is a convicted murderer, he's very much like an NFL team who is down by 20 points in the fourth quarter, he has nothing to lose, so why not go for it? I don't mean to be rude, but I am getting very frustrated with

the people here who are Chad Evans supporters. I came here to get some information on this conviction, and I keep getting unsubstantiated answers and silly statements from people. As far as the new evidence, there's nothing new there.

The more I read the "Case Chronology" the more I'm convinced that Chad Evans was responsible for the death of this little girl. You say he didn't kill her, the jurors and police believe he killed her over time. He was the responsible adult who had care, custody and control over her. It looks to me like he hated her, he hated her so much that he refused to seek medical help for her on multiple occasions. The only guy who did seek medical help was Jeff Marshall. Yep, the same guy you're trying to pin this on. I'm not saying Marshall was a saint, but you know what? He was the guy who suggested medical help for her the night BEFORE she died.

Getting back to your boy Chad, yes I believe he hated this little girl. He called her "little b\*tch", "f\*cking retard", etc....this came out in the trial, people testified to this UNDER OATH mind you. So I ask once again, WHY DID HE REFUSE TO TESTIFY?? Why didn't he refute what was being said about him? Do you know how that looks to a juror?

Non of you get it, do you? You think I'm beating a dead horse here but I'm not, this question I have is significant. Of course, I already know the answer to this question and you do too, but you want want to see a fairy tale come true here in NH, where someone wrongly convicted is set free. That's not going to happen. If he were innocent, he would have testified.

*10 February 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

**Mr**

Bob I think you did the right thing by writing Chad. Believe it or not you will get a reply from him. I hope you mailed it in, it's the quickest direct way to him. I'm sure his answer will very much be sincere. It may not satisfy you. Unfortunately like I said before it's all too easy to say how you would behave in the situation you weren't really in. I asked Chad tons of hard questions and I got real honest answers. I can't wait to see his reply. I hope it helps you understand. And regardless if you agree thanks for even taking your time to comment and especially for wanting to know more! I bop you continue to question things and dig deeper.

*9 February 2011 - NH*

**Bob Arnold** | 

I got tired of getting the run around, so I sent Chad a message, and here is a copy of it:

Chad,

I've been commenting in the blog on your website and the one issue that has not been properly addressed is this: Why didn't you take the stand? I hope you understand how significant this question is. All I want to know is why you didn't get up there and testify. I don't want to hear the same lame excuses I've gotten from other people, "my lawyer told me not to." That isn't going to work, and you should know better. Don't hold back, because if you think I'm expecting a short answer, then you're wrong.

Regards,

Bob Arnold

I hope anyone who visits this site can understand how important my question is. If he was innocent, why didn't he testify in his own defense? It's a very simple question, which should be answered with

a very long, sincere answer. I intend to post his reply. Then you can decide.

9 February 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Bob Arnold** | 

Continued:

As far as the voice stress analyzer test, it's not a polygraph test...it's unproven science.....

"This device (VSA) is nothing more than a prop," said John Palmatier, who earned a doctorate in psychology and who studied the machine for the Michigan State Police Department, where he worked. He said his study along with others found no scientific basis for Humble's claims, the inventor of the VSA.

One evaluation critic of the VSA said, "The VSA has no better chance of determining if someone is lying as hooking someone up to a sewing machine."-taken from

<http://www.eatstress.com/voicestress.htm>

I would like to see Chad take an actual polygraph test. Polygraph is used by CIA, FBI, State Police, and just about every police department in the country.

Do us all a favor and stop saying that Chad passed a lie detector test because most people associate "lie detector" with "polygraph test." Big difference.

9 February 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Bob Arnold** | 

OK Sandy, I look at it like this: Nearly all of those people who were convicted for a crime they didn't commit, well they probably belonged in prison anyway. Look at those cases, nearly all of those convicts were career criminals, which means they had no job, no evidence of where they got their money, they made of living committing crimes...burglary, robbery, forgery, etc...in most instances there was an armed robbery or rape, or some other type of violent crime and it just so happened a murder took place. So you have three defendants, one of them is going to get the murder conviction. So the poor bastard who didn't pull the trigger gets it, you know, the SOB who kicked the door in and beat the hell out of the victim. Oh, but he didn't pull the trigger.....Do some research on these souls who have been proven innocent of murder/rape/armed robbery, whatever. Most of them were criminals to begin with. So don't pull that BS with me because it's not going to work. I am a combat vet and eldest son of a police officer. Not just a small town cop, my dad was a Kansas City Missouri Police officer, 27 years baby, over 12 real shoot outs, SWAT team commander, the whole nine yards, On average 117+ homicides per year in that city, thousands of assaults/rapes/armed robberies. I grew up around that, so don't try to pull your touchy-feely bs because there is one fact here that you can't deny: You're boy didn't take the stand. So when are you going to present some serious evidence that there needs to be a second trial? I don't want to hear about "blood under Cassidy's fingernails were hers" This "new evidence" you have doesn't change my mind and it's not going to warrant another trial. Once you've exhausted your appeals, you're done unless you can provide new evidence, and that hasn't happened.

9 February 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Sandy G** | 

Bob,

Are you really basing his guilt or innocence on his not testifying at his trial? His lawyers advised him not to testify. His lawyers advised him not to speak to the press. The press and the jury did not have ALL the facts. Our justice system works in theory, but it is not fool proof. There have been over 200 innocent people set free in the last 20 years thanks to DNA evidence and a lot of hard work by people like Morrison. Those are only the ones that have been proven innocent after being imprisoned. How many died proclaiming their innocence?

I do not think everyone in prison is innocent, but I do believe there are innocent people in prison.

**Bob Arnold** | 

Sandy: "his lawyers wouldn't LET him testify", well that's just plain nonsense. You won't convince anyone with such a silly argument. Lawyers don't make you do anything, they are there to advise, not to force you to do things against your will. As a defendant, you're entitled to testify. You're also entitled to take the 5th Amendment whenever you want, and your lawyer will be ready to object to any questions from the prosecution which are unreasonable in order to preserve your rights and enforce the court rules.

"They also advised him not to talk to the press, which led to biased stories, because they didn't have Chad's side of the story", that's silly too. The jurors get both sides of the "story" during trial, not from the tv. They're also advised not to consider any information they've heard in the media. This is the duty of the juror.

I have faith in our justice system. Though it has flaws, it's the best in the world. I've been all over the world and can bear witness to this. I believe in our constitution. As a war veteran, I hold these things sacred. If Chad Evans is in fact innocent, then I am certain he will get a second trial. To date, this has not happened.

There remains one blarring issue with this conviction: He refused to testify in his own defense. There is nothing you can say that will change this ugly fact.

9 February 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

To respond to Bob's point, "I have yet to see any additional information that would warrant another trial, or for that matter another investigation," the following is presented.

1. DNA tests were performed by the Maine State Police in March 2001, on the blood underneath Cassidy's ten fingernails. Also tests were done on the saliva on a napkin found on the bed where Cassidy lay during her last hours. The results of those tests were never given to Chad's lawyers.
  2. Medical records show that Amanda took Cassidy to a doctor for her regular checkup on August 10, 2000 and to an orthopedic surgeon on September 11, 2000 and neither doctor saw any evidence of abuse. The records were not made available to the defense, and it's not even clear that the prosecution had them. Both sides should have had them. One of Chad's charges said that he began abusing Cassidy on August 1, and he was found guilty "beyond a reasonable doubt."
  3. Chad passed a lie detector test. Granted, they are not perfectly reliable, but he volunteered to take it and he passed. That should count for something, as the police PLANNED lie detector tests for Jeff Marshall, Jennifer Bortner Conley and Amanda Bortner. None of those tests was ever conducted.
  4. The jury did not know of a social gathering on Sunday, November 5, when a school nurse observed Cassidy and Chad together lovingly. Chad's sister, Nicole, cared for Cassidy for much of that day. Aside from being tired, and having one bruise, Cassidy seemed ok.
  5. The photo on the top of each page of Chad's website showing Amanda and Cassidy, at arms length, was taken on Friday, October 20. Does this look like an abused child? That was 20 days before she died, allegedly from months of abuse.
- There should be a reinvestigation of this case.

9 February 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

Thank you MR, very well said.

9 February 2011 - NH

MR

-- CONTINUE-- Had I been presented information that on this site- information they were not privy too... no way! Read the first police interviews- see how they guide people to the answers they want. See how they decided from their first interaction with Cassidy and the babysitter who was at fault. Read the medical report- there is more than one and they differ- one was used in court and one wasn't. Read what she was wearing when she arrived at the sitters and how she looked- then what she was wearing and how she looked when she was picked up. There is so much to this case. I wasn't there, I don't know for sure what happened but I do know that this case should at least be re-investigated. Bob thanks for being a little open minded to even ask your questions and not just sit there and judge and be rude.

It takes courage to stand up for what you believe in, all we ask is for you to just read everything for yourself. People are only human and they make mistakes, police, judges, Attorney General, mothers and fathers, and even juries are just as human as you and I.

9 February 2011 - NH

MR

Bob-Thanks for your comments. The thing is, Chad didn't yell from the rooftops that he didn't do this. He should have. But his lawyers believed that with the lack of evidence that he didn't need to. In fact Assistant Attorney General N. William Delker is quoted as saying "the case was circumstantial, with no eyewitnesses, confessions or incriminating statements" His lawyers and supporters KNEW he didn't do it so they believe there was no need. It's very easy to sit back and say how you think someone should have behaved and in hindsight you may be right- but in the moment no one knows how they would react to being accused of harming a child. Chad did have an anger problem, clearly. In fact one that he is very open to discuss and has owned up to it the best he can. However Chad has a son, who also was once 18 months old, 2 years, 3 years and so on. He never used any form of abuse as discipline for him or his step child either. If you read his ex-wife's police interviews she states that she was the disciplinarian because he didn't like to do it. Innocent of negligence, maybe not. As the "step parent" role he was playing- no way. Should he have done more, yes. And he has great regret for not doing more. But should he spend 40+ years in jail for that, I don't think so. The person who abused her should. It's not my place to speculate on how or where she got the bruises. I have gone extensively through this site and to be honest had I been given the information that the jury was, I probably would have found him guilty- I mean come on a little girl was abused and died as a result of a senseless act- someone had to pay- and he was the only one on the chopping block.

9 February 2011 - NH

Sandy Gelinas | 

Bob,

Chad's lawyers didn't LET him testify. They also advised him not to talk to the press, which led to biased stories, because they didn't have Chad's side of the story. The grand jury was presented with pictures of a battered dead baby, an autopsy report that pointed fingers at nobody, and they were told Chad was responsible for what they saw. They were not offered any other suspects or explanations. I would have voted to have a trial also. I think Chad had some anger issues, but I also know he took responsibility for his issues and sought help. I do not think he neglected Cassidy. I think it was a horrible set of circumstances that nobody foresaw. I think they had no clue how sick she was. I think they would not have brought Cassidy to the babysitters if they had known she was going to die. Seriously. I also know Chad was fully aware of the trials of toddlers. He was raising a son of his own and a step-son. Answer this question...why would he abuse Cassidy, but not his first step-child? Or his own child? I think he had issues with relationships, not with children. I've seen him with children. He would never hurt one.

**Bob Arnold** | 

Sandy, I'm not disputing what his lawyer told him, I'm questioning why he would take this lying down? I'm trying to look deep into this and that's the issue I have: He refused to testify. Plain and simple, he refused his right to get up there and take on his accusers. I also have to wonder why a defense attorney would advise their client to avoid taking the stand... I've just looked at "Chad's Checklist" which is posted on here, and I'm convinced he had a major anger management issue. Major. This paints a picture of someone who couldn't handle the frustrations that come with parenting a 21 month old. Yes, it can be frustrating at times. I've raised two children myself so I know, but I also know that I was mature enough to handle those difficult moments when a child is upset or screaming, etc..and I can visualize what would happen if someone with an anger issue had to respond to one of those moments. Not a pretty picture. So you think he's innocent of murder, fine. Do you believe he's innocent of negligence? Someone inflicted those injuries on this little girl. By my count, there were at least 30 police officers from NH and ME working on this case. 30 professional detectives/police officers and investigators, and they all drew the same conclusion. They presented their evidence to a grand jury. A grand jury for crying out loud. They handed up the indictments based on a ton of information supplied by the police. The case was tried in a court of law, and a jury convicted. What else is there? I have yet to see any additional information that would warrant another trial, or for that matter another investigation.

9 February 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Sandy Gelinis** | 

Bob,  
Chad was a manager, not a professional murder defendant. He trusted his lawyers to represent him adequately. They told him it was not in his best interest to testify, that is what he went with. It's important not to judge how he should have reacted and what he should have said and done. Nobody knows how they are going to react until they are in the situation themselves. I know Chad personally. He is innocent.

9 February 2011 - NH

**Bob Arnold** | 

OK, point well taken. I'm not saying he's a bad guy. What I'm saying here is, for a guy like him, who had worked his way up to an area manager position at MD's, that shows he was motivated. After looking at his past, and his career accomplishments, I have to ask myself this question: Why didn't he get up there and testify? This is a guy who had no stage fright, he appears to be an outgoing person with a talent for organizing and managing multiple tasks. An over achiever. A guy with natural management skills (as you point out, he had not college education), a guy who got things done no matter what. If he was innocent, why didn't he look at his attorney straight in the eye and say, "no, it's my life, and it's my right to testify, give me some advice here." Did that happen? No. It makes no sense other than the fact that maybe he was guilty, or felt guilty all along. He was concerned that the prosecution would anger him??? Are you serious? This guy couldn't maintain his composure during questioning? Is that it? I would like to say that I don't think Chad was the only person responsible for her death, I think all of the other adults around her were responsible to some degree, for not doing something to protect her. But he appears to be the primary person responsible for her injuries. She was obviously a battered and abused little girl who was in a horrible situation.

9 February 2011 - Rocheser, NH

**Sandy Gelinis** | 

I get so frustrated, do you people not understand if it was you or someone you loved, you would want the facts re-examined. Even if there's the tiniest chance of innocence, the case needs to be looked at. We are talking about a man spending the rest of his life in prison for a crime he did not commit. Chad is innocent!

9 February 2011 - NH

**Becky Boudreau** | 

I agree with you Chad!  
"Simon" can call you guilty and a liar,  
but where is his credibility posting things under a partial name??  
To "State Supreme Court Ruling" you said it right when you stated read the "opinion". That piece of paper was nothing but an OPINION!  
Chad Evans is NOT a murderer and has always portrayed him self true to the loving individual he in fact is.  
He's an amazing father, son, brother, uncle, friend!!  
To "You're Guilty" a jury is a group of humans, it is FACT humans make mistakes. You have a lot of your facts wrong, you are completely oblivious to what really goes on inside a prison.  
To "Vito" nice try buddy... I don't know who you are, but if you're brave enough to be serious enough on this matter, maybe we can help you.  
To "A Loving Mother" you really shouldn't judge. I am a mother of 4, and through trial and error we all make mistakes!! No one is perfect! Amanda was a kid herself when she had Cassidy, how dare anyone judge her for doing what she felt at the time was best.  
She loves Cassidy and misses her everyday!  
I hope all of you can reconsider the seriousness of this matter. Why not try seeking the truth, put your real name behind it and stop spreading negativity. Once again, Chad is NOT a murderer and the truth will prove that!!!

9 February 2011 - Rochester, NH

**Chad Evans** | 

I appreciate all of you for taking the time to comment. It shows either way you care about justice and Cassidy.  
I see many of the comments are strong opinions of my guilt, but your not signing your name to it. If you care to share your REAL name I'd be happy to discuss anything or answer any questions.

9 February 2011 - Concord, NH

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Mr. Arnold, Thanks for the good question. You are right that there is a longer answer to the question of why Chad didn't testify, but it's not because he intentionally harmed Cassidy. He was an excellent manager of people at McDonald's, and inspired many employees to be better people and better employees. However, he was also a high school graduate and the legal system seemed intimidating to him. He was afraid that the prosecutors would twist what he said into knots and trap him. He had already seen what the police had done to him and to Amanda in their interviews. He's told me that his lawyers were a little concerned that he might become visibly angry at the prosecutors during questioning, and that could have reinforced the prosecutor's message about him, i.e. being an angry, violent man. Of course, anger is also a very normal response from a wrongfully accused man. I agree that people expect that innocent people will scream at the top of their lungs, "I DIDN'T DO THIS!" but he was told by the legal experts not to talk with the media. Now, after nine years, he IS speaking out.

9 February 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

**Bob Arnold** | 

OK Mr. Bonpasse, explain to me why Chad didn't testify at his own trial? Please don't try to explain this away with "advice from his attorney" because that's lame. The innocent will take the stand in their own defense, the guilty hide behind their lawyers. An innocent man will get up there, in front of all those jurors and the courtroom, and tell their side of the story. They seize the opportunity to defend themselves. A guilty man will avoid the stand, because he knows he's going to be cross examined by the prosecution. I've read enough about this case to draw the following conclusion: Chad Evans is guilty.

*9 February 2011 - Rocheser, NH*

### Molrrison Bonpasse |

"State Supreme Court Ruling "State Supreme Court Ruling" could have noted that his/her extensive quotes from the NH Supreme Court's denial in 2003 of Chad's appeal began with "The jury could have found the following facts..." and the first two facts are correct: "Amanda and the defendant began dating in June 2000. A month later, she and Kassidy moved into the defendant's Rochester home." After that, what the jury "could have" found was substantially not true. "Could have found" is not the same as "did find." The Supreme Court could also have upheld Chad's appeal because of legal mistakes by the judge and begun an opinion this way, "The jury could have found that there was zero evidence that the injuries which caused Kassidy Bortner's death were intentionally inflicted by Chad Evans." The Tee-ball accident on the evening of November 8, 2000 was not intentional. Unfortunately, Chad did not testify, and there was only one defense witness called. If there is a retrial, Chad WILL testify, as will people who saw Kassidy lovingly with him only days before she died.

*9 February 2011 - Newcastle, Maine*

### State Supreme Court Ruling |

Again, if you have doubts, read the NH State Supreme Court Opinion concerning this case: <http://www.courts.state.nh.us/supreme/opinions/2003/evans183.htm>

Read the FACTS section, and you will be convinced that Chad Evans is a child murderer. He MURDERED this little girl, and now he is trying to portray himself as a loving individual. BS!!! This guy should have gotten the death penalty.

*8 February 2011 - New Hampshire*

### State Supreme Court Ruling |

Continued from below State Supreme Court "FACTS" On November 8, 2000, the day before Kassidy died, Amanda dropped her off at her sister's and Marshall's home in Kittery, Maine, at around 1:30 or 2:30 p.m. When she dropped Kassidy off, Kassidy was fine, although a bit sleepy. She had a couple of scratches and a faded bruise on her face, but nothing more. Her behavior was normal. She spent the afternoon watching cartoons.

The defendant picked up Kassidy at around 5:00 p.m. Shortly thereafter, he called from his car to tell Marshall that "[t]he little bitch is acting weird again." He said that Kassidy was "kind of bobbin' around" in the car. An hour or so later, he again called Marshall and said that she fell on her face on the ground when he took her out of the car. Later that evening, the defendant called Marshall again and told him that while playing ball with his three-year-old son, Kassidy was hit by his son with a ball. During the conversation, the defendant became frantic, telling Marshall that Kassidy's eyes were in the back of her head, and yelling at her to wake up. He told Marshall that Kassidy was out cold. When Marshall suggested that the defendant take her to the hospital, the defendant said that she had "come out of it" and was fine.

### State Supreme Court Ruling | 🗨️

If anyone has doubts, go to <http://www.courts.state.nh.us/supreme/opinions/2003/evans183.htm> "the defendant grabbed Cassidy's face hard as often as twice a week. He called her names such as "little bitch" and "f---ing retard." As frequently as three times a week, the defendant disciplined Cassidy by picking her up by the armpits and roughly placing her in front of a wall or in a corner. Once, he grabbed her by the back of the neck and tossed her against a closet door, banging her head against the door. Another time, when Cassidy resisted, he picked her up by the armpits and threw her on the bed. When Amanda intervened, he grabbed Cassidy's leg and then walked away, muttering that he wished Cassidy had never been born."

8 February 2011 - New Hampshire

### You're guilty | 🗨️

A GRAND JURY handed up MULTIPLE INDICTMENTS against you. Do you have any idea what that means? A jury of YOUR PEERS found you 100% guilty. There is no reason to open a "new investigation." As taxpayers, we're already footing the bill to feed you everyday, not to mention the cost of your medical care, clothing, etc. As a convicted MURDERER you should just shut your mouth and make the best of your prison sentence. Why don't you get a degree or something instead of wasting all this time on trying to get your sentence overturned? FYI, you will never get out of prison...you will live the rest of your worthless life there and yes, you will eventually die there, hopefully sooner than later. Scum bag.

8 February 2011 - NH

### The inmate in cell 443 | 🗨️

Hey Chad, I've been watching you....It's me, Vito, three cells down. I've been checking you out boy, and you're lookin real good to me right now. I've been lookin for a new boy, and although I'm selective, I gotta admit I hate guys who beat on little kids, and I can't decide if I wanna beat you or make ya my boy...what do ya think? You know you a guilty bastad, cumon quite lyin about it. I'll make my decision tonight.

8 February 2011 - Three cells down

### Bob Arnold | 🗨️

I don't understand how this little girl could accumulate these kinds of injuries over time, unless there was a parent who didn't care, or who was responsible for the injuries. That parent would be you Chad. Yes, you had "care, custody and control" over this little girl. It was your responsibility to protect her, to take care of her and make sure she was same. I myself, am a parent and there's no way I would ever let any harm come to my kids. I'd take a bullet for them. You, on the other hand, didn't care about this little girl and you beat her until she died. A jury of YOUR peers convicted you of her death. A jury. And it was based on a ton of evidence. You're where you belong, you're in prison, you'll always be in prison, and there's nothing that will change that. May god have mercy on your soul.

8 February 2011 - Rocheser, NH

### The truth

If you too have money to pay him, Morrisson BonPasse will gladly tell people you are innocent as well.

8 February 2011



Please consider writing to me with any questions about the case, or posting them here.

18 January 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

JJ 

I have read just about everything on this site and I believe that Chad is without a doubt 100% guilty. The excuses just keep getting deeper and deeper. It is sickening all the effort that is being made to free Chad. Depending on how you see this case it still boils down to the fact that either his actions or inaction caused this child's death. Chad is right where he needs to be and I hope he lives a long and healthy life, in prison.

15 January 2011 - Mass

Morrison Bonpasse | 

Carol,

In this case there was a rush to judgment, within hours of Kassidy's death. Because of this case of wrongful conviction, and others, I try to withhold judgment of other people until I'm quite sure of the evidence.

You may not have liked Amanda in jail, but she didn't deserve to be there in the first place. She did NOT watch Chad Evans abuse Kassidy, because he didn't abuse her, didn't hit her, and didn't even spank her. We don't know why Kassidy died, but we do know that Chad didn't kill her, and Amanda didn't stand by while observing harm inflicted upon her daughter. Sure, in hindsight, both Chad and Amanda could have done more to protect Kassidy, including taking her to a doctor. However, they had no idea that her life was in any danger whatsoever.

Please consider emailing me.

8 January 2011 - Newcastle, Maine

Carol Mackell | 

In reference to the last message I posted, didn't spell check and it should read Amanda Bortner as if everyone doesn't already know the sick persons name. You should never be able to have a child again, Still running after everything that moves?

2 January 2011 - Somersworth NH

Carol Mackell | 

In reference to the last message I posted, didn't spell check and it should read Amanda Bortner as if everyone doesn't already know the sick persons name. You should never be able to have a child again, Still running after everything that moves?

2 January 2011 - Somersworth NH

Carol Mackell | 

I spent time with Amanda Birtner in jail at Strafford County. I truly believe she would have been the one that would have done harm to Kassidy. Anyone that spent time with her would realize all she cares about is the men in her life. She tried to form relationships with men in jail and actually hooked up with one on the CO's from Strafford County jail. I believe that Kassidy held her back from her relationship with Chad and that she is a sick messed up person. I even had an assault on a prisoner charge against me from her. She will do anything for attention.

2 January 2011 - Somersworth NH

Sandy | 

I honestly do not know how anyone can spend time on this site, and not come away with the feeling that a grave injustice has been done. I believe with all that I am that Chad is innocent. And I have been a victim of domestic violence myself, so I do not take this case lightly. Spend some time reading his letters to Morrison. Write to Chad himself. An innocent man sits in prison, and I will never stop fighting to get him out.

2 January 2011 - NH

Ann Marie | 

One doesn't know what another is capable of. One also doesn't know what happens behind closed doors. My daughter's father was the greatest on the face of it. However, once he was away from his friends and family things were very different. I witnessed the evil he did to her, and the "COURTS" ignored everything I had to say, and when actual medical documents were brought to the courts attention, I was reprimanded. People don't walk into walls hard enough to do the kind of damage that was done, let alone children. There is a history of DV on this man's life, and statistically speaking wife beaters also beat children. There is no doubt in my mind that this son-of-a-B beat that little girl to death. It is a shame that "NOONE" did anything to stop it. When I went through it I almost ended up in jail more than once to protect my daughter.

1 January 2011 - Derry, NH

Stacey | 

I have been reading the interviews and other information. What stands out right now to me is the fact that it seems they only focused on Chad. Jeff had just as much if not more circumstantial evidence and it seems they went right for his explanation. Also Jen emphatically stated that the bruises and marks were not there when she left. If this was true when did her story change? I do not know who is guilty here, if anyone is? I do believe this should be looked at again, a new trial should be granted for many reasons. I am not a lawyer, but I love the law and this case is one that just seems to have gone off the rails. Not a shred of concrete evidence. I know Chad passed a lie detector test, did anyone else take one? And if so what were the results? I will not say I believe Chad is innocent, but I have enough doubts to believe he should be granted a new trial. Police should have kept open minds, and according to what I have read they were focused from day one on only Chad, that is a big mistake. One last thing I noticed, in Jennifer's statement she refers to Cassidy as "it" several times. I found that odd and it bothers me. If Chad is innocent I hope he find justice, if he is guilty he deserves to be in jail. Whomever is responsible should not be free. I know one thing, I cannot tell by what I have read so far.

31 December 2010 - NH

Randoulf Moon | 

Roses are red, violets are blue, killers end up dead, how about you? How dare try to get off. Saw the sappy poem before this and I feel you deserve worse than what you did to the innocent baby. If I was evil like you...I am pissed!

31 December 2010 - NH

Becky | 

Seacoast Chapter Committee Meeting  
was a success tonight!  
Thanks to all that appeared =)

15 December 2010 - Rochester

MR

I wrote Chad a poem and he asked me to add it online for him! :)

What's it like, sitting there?  
Waiting, hoping, someone will answer your prayer.  
Locked behind bars on hot nights,  
Dripping with sweat done with the fight.  
How do you not lose faith living in that place?  
Your freedom taken from you and confined in that space.  
Convicted for a crime they say you committed  
Wondering who will help you be acquitted?  
Supports come from places you least expect  
But become people you would hand select.  
People you once loved lost along the way  
Where are they, will they think of you today?  
Do they believe the lies they once were told  
Do they believe in you, could they be so bold?  
Hate mail written with such detail  
Telling you how to kill yourself while in jail  
A baby is gone and someone must pay  
But is it fair this way?  
Crying out to the world, listen to me!  
This isn't right; it's not how it should be.  
I'm innocent of the crime you depict  
Those awful things I did not afflict.

*29 November 2010 - NH*

## MR

All truths are easy to understand once they are discovered; the point is to discover them.-- Galileo Galilei

*8 November 2010 - NH*

## Morrison Bonpasse |

Recently, Chad received from a supporter, a poem by Angelina Merrill, entitled, "Wrongly Convicted." It reads:

Some people are wrongfully convicted.  
Putting in Appeals, hoping the charges will be lifted.  
A prison cell, now their new home.  
Entrapped, inside razor barb fences.  
With no more freedom to roam.  
A lot of precious years, will be lost.  
At somebody else's cost.  
Taking everything day by day.  
The only thing left to do is hope and pray.  
Maybe someday, the real criminal will meet their fate.  
Wrongfully convicted, and having a lot of hate.  
Pushed through the system, so they can close the case.  
Not able to accept what has happened.  
Sooner or later, it will have to be faced.  
Innocent as hell, we shouldn't be here.  
Living a life of constant fear.  
Maybe, they'll realize they made a mistake.  
Hopefully some day, when I awake.  
I will hear I'm a free man.  
And a journey home, I'll take.

We are working to bring Chad home as soon as we can, by persuading the people of New Hampshire that he was wrongly convicted for the mysterious death of Cassidy Bortner almost 10 years ago on 9 November 2000.

*4 November 2010 - Newcastle, Maine*

### Just Me |

"We can't solve problems by using the same kind of thinking we used when we created them."  
Albert Einstein

*7 August 2010 - Rochester*

### Morrison Bonpasse |

Shawn, thanks for your continued interest, and thanks for the information about bruising, after head injuries. I'm impressed by your research. Regarding the issue of an injury caused by a ball, Dr. Margaret Greenwald, the Maine Medical Examiner was asked by Asst. A.G. Delker at page 210 of her testimony if the shape of a ball was consistent or inconsistent with any injury she may have detected. Dr. Greenwald said that one injury "could be associated with the ball," but that "it was not completely consistent with those injuries."

She continued on page 212 to say that one set of injuries were more consistent with a something concave, such as "you might see it with a cup, or the edge of a spoon, if it's a large enough spoon, or something of that nature which would have kind of a rounded edge." The defense did not address the issue, so the jury was left with the brutal impression that Cassidy was struck with a spoon or a cup.

The police and prosecutors were interested in finding prosecuting crimes, and not interested in other explanations of injuries or death.

The police and the prosecutors never took seriously Chad's statement during his 9 November interrogation that the ball that hit Cassidy was a "hard rubber ball" or "starter baseball." Such a ball is commonly called a Tee-Ball. Similarly, the defense did not seek to ensure that the jury understood that such a ball had hit Cassidy and nearly knocked her out. One of the "key documents" (#7) on the Home Page is an analysis of what people said in police interviews and at the trial about whether a ball struck Cassidy, and if so, what type of ball. Most references were to wiffle balls, which are far less likely to cause serious injury than a Tee-Ball, which weighs nearly the same as a hardball baseball.

Yes, Chad should be granted a new trial, but he doesn't yet have a lawyer who can present the legal grounds to present to a judge. In the meantime, we are assembling as many relevant facts in this case as possible, and presenting them for the people of New Hampshire and the U.S. and the world to see.

*4 August 2010 - Newcastle, Maine*

### Shawn

Okay... You have my attention... the coroners report says that the bruising on her eye was inconsistent with injuries caused by a ball. I will say in favor of your theory that I have read that facial bruising can appear more significant after severe head trauma due to increased pressure on sensitive blood vessels...much the same way as broken blood vessels in the eyes caused by pressure when someone cries hysterically. A similar thing can happen to the face after head trauma. So, what your saying is that at the very least, Chad should get a new trial because of our ability to better analyze the evidence, better or more experts? I'm not convinced at all that he's innocent.. I am intrigued by the fact that even I, having no real background in law, can tell that Chad's attorneys missed some key points. Things that should have been presented. Again, that's not to say I think he's innocent.. for every point there's should be a counter..but the one you brought up about Cassidy's prior injury and the unknown severity does raise a question that I can't find a logical "Chad did it" answer to... I actually can only find information to support your "reasonable doubt". I will be watching closely with an open mind.

*4 August 2010 - Rochester NH*



(continued from last comment)

Regarding the timing of the bruises, they didn't start appearing until October, which was three months after Amanda and Cassidy moved to Chad's home in late June/early July. A reliable witness was Cassidy's grandmother, Jacqueline Conley, who testified at Chad's trial that she saw no bruises in September. The last time she saw Cassidy was Sunday, October 1st. Photos were taken on that day, and one of them appears in the "Chronology" in this website, and there are no observable bruises. Also, as is stated in the "Chronology," "Thomas McNeil, a friend of Jeff Marshall, held Cassidy Bortner in his arms, approximately 4-6 weeks before her death, and saw no bruises." and "Crystal Martin babysat Cassidy for an overnight, '3 weeks to a month before her death,' and bathed Cassidy and saw no bruises."

It was during October that Amanda began doing at-home computer entry survey work for Chad's friend, Bruce Aube, and she began to regularly take Cassidy to be babysat at the home of her sister, Jennifer Bortner Conley and her boyfriend, Jeff Marshall. The first significant injury to Cassidy was a "spanking" by Jeff on 21 October which caused significant black and blue bruises on her buttocks. The next significant injury was said to be a fall to the pavement from Jeff's truck on 28-29 October, which caused two large bumps on the back of Cassidy's head. (Why two bumps?) This fall alone could have injured significantly Cassidy's brain and increased her susceptibility to further head injuries, including hitting her head on the coffee table at Chad's home. Finally, on the night of Wednesday, 8 November, Chad was holding Cassidy in his lap and tossing some balls to his son to hit with a plastic Fisher-Price bat. Among the balls was a heavy Tee-Ball, which Chad unwisely tossed to his son, who then hit that ball into Cassidy's face and she was stunned.

Were all these accidents partly responsible for Cassidy's death? The issue was not raised at Chad's trial, but it should have been. We know much more now about head injuries to children than we knew in 2000. Even superficially insignificant head injuries to adults can be shockingly deadly, as happened to actress Natasha Richardson in 2009.

*4 August 2010 - Newcastle, Maine*

Shawn, thank you for your continued interest in this case, and for your good questions. Eighteen year old Amanda Bortner was interviewed by the police on the day her daughter, Cassidy, died. That morning, she had left Cassidy with the babysitter in apparently good health, except for facial bruises, the reasons for which Amanda thought she understood. Also, Cassidy appeared to be tired. Five hours later she was dead. You can imagine the stress, vulnerability and guilt Amanda was feeling, and the police told her their answer, which was that her boyfriend, Chad, had been abusing and hurting her daughter. As she said later, "If the police had told me that the Pope killed Cassidy, I would have believed them." The false statements Amanda made to the police were akin to "false confessions" made by wrongly convicted people. Of the 255 Innocence Project ([www.innocenceproject.org](http://www.innocenceproject.org)) cases mentioned earlier, there were false confessions in 63 of them. Amanda felt tremendous guilt for somehow letting her child die, and she was susceptible to police persuasion.

Yes, Chad occasionally called Cassidy a "retard" and a "little shit," but he called other people "retards," and "little shits," too. Most of the time, he spoke lovingly to "Kass" and "Baby." Speaking with impolite words should not be confused with hurting or killing a 20-21 month old child. Today in 2010, we are more sensitive to the word, "retard."

It's very good that you saw Chad playing with children, and that he was "great with kids," but I respectfully suggest that it DOES mean something. It also means something that Chad was elected to the Board of Education in Keene in 1991. It is true that sometimes, people can appear to be good people, and they can subsequently do terrible things; but generally, people are consistent. People who love children don't usually intentionally hurt them, and people who dislike children are more likely to hurt them. School Committee members are surely less likely to harm children.

(continued in next comment)

*4 August 2010 - Newcastle, Maine*

## Shawn

I understand why Chad wouldn't want these statements allowed..but how can you discount the content for yourself? Amanda clearly accused him on more than one account of harming or killing Cassidy.. Chad attacked Amanda showing his disregard for her, he was over heard on more than account calling Cassidy names... I understand that Chad was great with kids, I've seen him myself playing with kids including Cassidy... But that doesn't mean anything... Charles Manson was a boyscout.. does that mean he was nice guy? C. Berkowits was a prominent member of society well known and respected... The list is very long of wonderful men that did horrific things to innocent people.. Chad saying he didn't do it because he loved children is a pretty weak defense. As for Marshall.. I don't dispute that he got off easy.. but, he had been watching Cassidy off and on most of her life with out incident... The bruises didn't start until Chad came into the picture. It's not a coincidence.. So far I can't find anything to support him.. I wish I could find that piece of something for reasonable doubt.. I really do..

*3 August 2010 - Rochester NH*

## Morrison Bonpasse |

That's the link to Chad's direct appeal to the Supreme Court of New Hampshire, which he lost in 2003. That appellate case and all the others in this multiple tragedy appear on this website in the "Transcripts, Briefs and Documents" section.

Many of the facts stated in that opinion were incorrect because they came from a flawed trial. The trial was flawed because Chad was advised not to talk to media reporters before the trial, and not to testify at the trial. The evidence provided to the jury was restricted excessively. For example, the judge approved, in part, the State of New Hampshire's "Motion to exclude evidence relating to the defendant's good character and/or allegedly good treatment of children other than the victim." The defense compounded that loss by failing to present defense witnesses who were available and ready to testify about Chad's parenting of Cassidy. Thus, the jury heard nothing about Chad's love of children, whether they were his own, or not, and nothing about his parenting of Cassidy.

His attorneys chose to call only one defense witness, Dr. Michael Baden, a well-known forensic pathologist, but his analysis and opinion were not enough to carry the whole defense case. The defense chose to accuse Cassidy's babysitter, Jeff Marshall, of killing Cassidy, but Marshall testified under oath - and Chad did not. Chad's attorneys were well-known criminal defense attorneys, and at the time their tactics may have seemed the best that could be advised; but they led to disaster for Chad Evans and, later, for Amanda Bortner. Amanda was convicted of doing nothing to stop Chad from abusing and killing Cassidy, but, Amanda too, was wrongly convicted because Chad wasn't abusing and killing Cassidy at all.

Nationally, the Innocence Project has exonerated through DNA testing 255 wrongfully convicted people since 1989. In Massachusetts, 38 people, nine of whom were included in the 255, have been exonerated from wrongful convictions since 1976. In every one of those cases, a jury or judge found guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, and in many of them the appellate courts supported those verdicts, just as was done in New Hampshire for Chad Evans and for Amanda Bortner. Appellate courts uphold verdicts if there are no legal errors, but they do not re-examine the evidence or lack of it.

*3 August 2010 - Newcastle, Maine*

## Shawn

<http://www.courts.state.nh.us/supreme/opinions/2003/evans183.htm>

Did I miss this on this page?

*3 August 2010*

## Morrison Bonpasse |

In response to Shawn, thank you for your input. Please be assured that the website, and the Campaign for Justice for Chad, are dedicated to the truth about the death of Cassidy Bortner. If you have any facts which you think should be posted on the website, please present them here on this

"Online Comments" section, or send them to me by email or by hard copy mail, either anonymously or with your name included. My address is P.O. Box 390, Newcastle, ME 04553.

It was Mrs. William Loeb and Governor Jeanne Shaheen who gave Chad and Mrs. Marie Altobelli an award at a "Hero Awards Dinner" in 1997 for rescuing three men in 1996. See the entries in the "Chronology" in this website for 1 November 1996 and 23 April 1997. The 1996 accident rescue was two-plus years before Chad's domestic violence of March 1999.

The only bruises which Chad Evans caused to Cassidy were to her lower cheeks, when palming her face to get her attention, and eye contact. It is not known why Cassidy appeared to bruise easily, but those bruises did appear, as Chad readily acknowledges. In the fall of 2000, those particular bruises on her lower cheeks would appear after an "eye contact" incident, and then dissipate. Then, Chad would forget how easily they were caused and he would palm Cassidy's face to get her attention and cause them again. This happened several times. Again, the intent was not to hurt Cassidy or punish her, but to secure her attention. Those bruises had absolutely no role in causing Cassidy's death.

Regarding the book, the goal is to present the facts in a comprehensive way, and not to sell books.

*3 August 2010 - Newcastle, Maine*

### Shawn

There is so much I want to say... I'm not sure what your true motivation is Mr. Bunpasse, but it's not the truth. Remember sir, some of us actually knew him.. How about presenting the time line that includes the nights that POS grabbed that baby hard enough to Bruise her, or the nights he fought with Amanda.. you know the nights that made her afraid to leave him to protect her daughter. How about the time line truth of when he beat Tristan... right around the time you made him sound like a hero for "helping" put out that fire after the accident. If it was really the truth you want people to decide on then you should at the very least give them ALL THE FACTS.. not just the one's you chose to help paint your picture to cause a little controversy... makes for a better platform for selling your book doesn't it Mr. Bunpasse.. Your a joke and Chad is guilty..

*3 August 2010*

### Sandy |

I didn't know Chad all that well, and I knew him even before he met his first wife. I do know, my first reaction to this tragedy was, "not Chad". When he was convicted by a jury of his peers, I assumed the justice system worked, and pretty much put the whole thing out of my mind. Then a friend of mine convinced me to look at this website. I can now comfortably go back to my original thought, "Not Chad". You have my support. The right thing is not always the popular thing.

*3 August 2010 - New Hampshire*

### Morrison Bonpasse |

As a grandfather, it's hard for me to contemplate the loss of a grandchild. On the other hand, no loss can justify the conviction of an innocent person.

As Mrs. Conley has noted below, Chad Evans did hit his wife, and that led to their separation and divorce, and a restraining order. It's never been a secret, and is described and documented in the entry for 28 March 1999 in the "Chronology" section of this website. He has forever regretted that violence and was determined to avoid it in the future, including in his relationship with Amanda Bortner. However, he has never been violent toward children. He has always loved children, and was a very good father to his son, and step-father to his stepson, and father figure to Cassidy. Unfortunately, he was advised not to testify in court and not to speak with the media, so a very inaccurate picture of him was painted for the jury and the people of New Hampshire.

In this Campaign for Justice for Chad, we continue to seek the truth, and it will take several more months before his 2010 letters to me are assembled, (see "key documents" on the "Home Page") and the book, "Eye Contact," is written. In the meantime, and afterwards, facts and opinions are welcomed here, and by email, from all who are interested in this multiple tragedy case, including from those who believe that Chad killed Cassidy.

Regarding this "Online Comments" section it's open to everyone, including me.

*3 August 2010 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Jacqueline Conley = her grandma** | 

Isn't this to be messages from others....not from Mr Bonapasse...? In reference to my comment and yours, I must say the only true person who knew Kassidy was me. She was in my care most of her life. She started talking way before Mr Evans had any contact with her. I did not see her the last few months of her life..which I would of changed had I known the character of that horrid man. When I tell you she told me Chad Bad. She meant it. She hugged my leg, looked up at me with tears in her eyes and kept crying "Chad Bad, Chad Bad, Na Na.. I had her sit with me on the couch and she held me like she never wanted to let me go. I know it was not babble. She meant it. Chad is bad and belongs where he is. I have also heard from sources he was not the nice caring father figure. Look into the restraining order about his ex-wife...I could go on. I do not understand why people will try to get murderous criminals off....I think Mr Bonopasse that you picked the wrong case. He killed my Grand-daughter. No doubt. I have said all I need to say. So do not bother to e-mail me on this response.

*3 August 2010 - Maine*

**Morrison Bonpasse** | 

Chad Evans loved and nurtured Kassidy Bortner from the day he met her on June 9, 2000 until her tragic death on November 9th. Together with Amanda, Chad delighted in teaching Kassidy her ABC's and 123's and new words and new activities. At the age of 19 months in September, which was when Mrs. Conley last saw her, Kassidy was experimenting with words and sounds and activities, as she continued to do for six more weeks. On the morning of November 9th, when Amanda, Kyle and Kassidy were in the car about to leave for the day, Chad kissed Kassidy, and said "Love you," and he noticed that she had learned yet another skill - to open her Ziploc baggie of Reese's Peanut Butter Puffs.

This website seeks to present all the facts about the lives of Kassidy Bortner, Amanda Bortner and Chad Evans during those five months from June to November. Unfortunately, Chad was advised not to testify at his trial, where he could have told the jury of his love of Kassidy. He could have told the jury of other words Kassidy was learning, including "drink," "kitty, kitty, kitty," and "Bye-Bye." If he had heard Kassidy say, "Chad Bad," he would have laughed heartily, and hugged and kissed her, and nurtured her continued learning.

*3 August 2010 - Newcastle, Maine*

**Jacqueline Conley = her grandma**

I remember one day during the month of Sept before she died when she came up to me and said "CHAD BAD". I know in my heart that he is.

*31 July 2010*

**Just me!** | 

I'm so thankful for this website, it really sheds light on your life, Chad! I'm sending you nothing but positive thoughts! Talk to you soon, I'm sure! ~~~ Morrison, can't thank you enough for your time & energy you have put into this case!! Thank you for all that you've done!

*20 July 2010 - NH*