1 STATE OF MINNESOTA DISTRICT COURT 2 COUNTY OF POLK NINTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT 3 4 State of Minnesota,) File No. 60-CR-11-2640 5 Plaintiff,) VS. 6 Timothy Charles Holmseth,) TRANSCRIPT OF 7 PROCEEDINGS . Defendant.) 8 9 The above entitled matter came on for hearing 10 before the Honorable Tamara L. Yon, one of the judges of 11 12 the within court, in the courtroom at the Polk County 13 Justice Center, Crookston, Minnesota, on August 30, 14 2018. Mr. Ronald Galstad, City Attorney in and for 15 said City of East Grand Forks, appeared on behalf of the 16 State of Minnesota. 17 18 Ms. Gretchen Handy, Assistant Public Defender for the Ninth Judicial District, appeared on 19 behalf of the defendant, who was also present in court. 20 21 22 23 24 25

MS. HANDY: Timothy Holmseth.

THE COURT: Let's call those files and they are CR-18-343, CR-18-439, CR-18-441. Mr. Holmseth is present together with his attorney, Ms. Handy. We also have Mr. Galstad present on behalf of the State. We are here for pretrials in all three of these files.

Ms. Handy, do you have any pretrial matters to discuss?

MS. HANDY: Your Honor, the last time that we were before the Court I had informed the Court that Mr. Holmseth had indicated he was going to be filing a federal lawsuit against myself, Mr. Fontaine, and Ms. Kolar in our office and so at that time it was my understanding that that was going to have been done prior to today's hearing. Having not heard anything on that, I reached out to Mr. Holmseth yesterday via e-mail. He indicated that he has filed an ethics complaint against me and apparently he was informed by the Lawyers Office of Professional Responsibility that that should be his first step. Once that's completed, he then intends on filing the lawsuit. So I'm not sure how the Court would like to proceed today.

THE COURT: Well, I suppose it would be hard for the Public Defender's office to represent

Mr. Holmseth if he's got these pending actions.

MS. HANDY: Correct.

. 7

THE COURT: So, Mr. Holmseth, would it be fair to say that if this is your plan, are you wanting to represent yourself or hire private counsel?

MR. HOLMSETH: May I speak for a moment?
THE COURT: You may.

MR. HOLMSETH: The reason I'm filing a federal lawsuit, Your Honor, is because I've been charged on this order out of Florida on two different occasions and I've been assigned three different attorneys from the Minnesota Public Defender's office and none of those attorneys, all three of them, they all refused to challenge this order based on the First Amendment, yet I have a trial attorney out of the Washington, D.C. area who told me that this order violates the Constitution on its face. So I've got three attorneys and the latest one is Ms. Handy refused to make this challenge. I deserve to have an attorney but that attorney should be challenging this. Any attorney that's not in the Minnesota Public Defender's office says it's not constitutional.

THE COURT: Okay.

 $$\operatorname{MR}$.$ HOLMSETH: The only option I had was a depravation of rights lawsuit.

MR. GALSTAD: Your Honor, maybe I can --

THE COURT: Mr. Galstad.

MR. GALSTAD: I would just like to weigh in. I am, at this time, based upon all of the things that have happened, I am going to request a motion for a Rule 20.01. I believe Mr. -- I question his competency. To verify my reasons, after the last hearing, on the way to the last hearing, Mr. Holmseth was actually picked up on a routine traffic stop. During that routine traffic stop he's claiming that the police in East Grand Forks are trying to plant drugs on him. He feared for his safety. Afterwards he posts on his website the fact that he didn't think that he was ever going to see his children again. That the police are shooting people and that based upon that I don't believe that he's competent.

The other thing of it is, and you're seeing it right now, is that anybody that disagrees with him becomes a part of this larger conspiracy. He's blamed -- I'm a part of the conspiracy, the Public Defender's office is a part of a conspiracy. He's implicated ex-President Barack Obama in the conspiracy. He's implicated the entire East Grand Forks Police office in the conspiracy. Depending upon which case you're talking about, he implicates the FBI in the conspiracy --

.5

. 6

..7

MR. HOLMSETH: May I object for a moment? 1 MR. GALSTAD: Half the state --2 MR. HOLMSETH: Should my attorney be 3 objecting to what he's doing? 4 MR. GALSTAD: No, but half the state of 5 Florida is in the conspiracy. 6 MR. HOLMSETH: Should my attorney be 7 objecting to what he's doing right now? 8 9 THE COURT: Let me just stop both sides. 10 MR. GALSTAD: That's why I'm asking for a 11 20.01 motion. 12 THE COURT: All right. Procedurally Mr. Galstad is requesting what's called a Rule 20.01 13 evaluation. Under that rule, if it's either side that 14 requests it, the Court has to grant the request for this 15 evaluation and so there is no discretion there. 16 whether the defense asks for it, whether the State asks 17 for it, the Court must grant that request. What that 18 19 means is we put these criminal proceedings on hold. 20 And so, Mr. Holmseth, I will put together what's called an order for a Rule 20.01 evaluation. 21 There are a number of different doctors. I know one 22 that we have used from the Twin Cities area, his name is 23 Dr. Charles Chmielewski. He can usually turn these 24

reports around fairly quickly. So I will put an order

that Dr. Chmielewski have this evaluation with you and then we'll schedule a review hearing and we'll put it out a little ways so he has time to get that report done.

And I'm not comfortable saying you're on your own right now because I want to see what this report says and then we'll go from there. So I am not discharging the Public Defender's office, but basically for the criminal proceedings everything is on hold. I will put that order together and then, Mr. Holmseth, is there a telephone number that Mr. -- or that Dr. Chmielewski could use to try to reach you to set up a time to meet with you?

MR. HOLMSETH: Sure.

THE COURT: Do you want to give that to your attorney and then we'll -- I'll put it in the order so he knows how to reach you. Okay. And then it's going to take a little time for him to come up, meet with you, turn that report around. So what I'm wondering is, we could go a little ways. Maybe, it's the end of August now, how about if we set this either August 1st -excuse me, November 1st or November 22nd. Does that work for both sides?

MR. HOLMSETH: November 26th?

THE COURT: 22nd.

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. HOLMSETH: 22nd.

THE COURT: Okay. Let's do that. Thursday, November 22nd, and I got to double check. That's not -- is that Thanksgiving? Okay. The courthouse is closed. So I am going to scratch that out on this form. How about November 1st. Does that work?

MR. HOLMSETH: Yeah, it should.

THE COURT: Okay. So let's set the next hearing and it will be a review hearing, but we'll keep it on the Thursday afternoon calendar. Thursday, November 1st, we'll set them at one o'clock. Hopefully we have that report by then. Okay. Thank you to both sides and we will go ahead and adjourn.