

Commented version of Saldate's police report



[Translate this page into Spanish](#)
[Translate this page into French](#)
[Translate this page into German](#)
 using [FreeTranslation.com](#)



Translate Text!
FreeTranslation

Here we offer you a version of former DETECTIVE ARMANDO SALDATE'S police report with some comments added which are supposed to help you evaluate whether the account of the former detective is credible or not. As you read the details added here please ask yourself: if you were the judge at Debra Milke's trial, would you allow this document into evidence, considering the fact that it's the ONLY incriminating item in a death-penalty case and a person's life clings on it? Considering all the facts addressed herein, how likely is it that this report isn't credible and large parts of it had been fabricated? Please participate in [the survey at the bottom of this page](#) and tell us your opinion! Thank you!

TYPE OF REPORT HOMICIDE		SUPPLEMENT DATE 12-5-89	DR # 89-179406.A10
VICTIM'S NAME MILKE, CHRISTOPHER		LOCATION OF OCCURRENCE 99 AVENUE AND HAPPY VALLEY	
OFFICER WRITING REPORT'S # DET. SALDATE #1875		SUPPLEMENT # 89-179406.A10	
DATE & TIME TYPED DECEMBER 6, 1989 8:40 AM	BUREAU GIB	CLERK A1724	

Interview MILKE, DEBRA JEAN
 W/F, 3-10-64, 5'8", 145#, bln, haz
 526-67-1656
 7734 N. 12 Street #5
 John Alden Life Insurance
 8222 S. 48 Street, 438-7694
 BOOKED #1390389
 Miranda rights : 12-3-89, 1954 hrs "Yes"

Comment : Something no one ever addressed at Debra's trial is the fact that the time this report was typed is already suspicious. Here it lists December 6, 8.40 a.m. As we know SALDATE elected to interrogate Debra himself, alone in a dispensary room at the Pinal County jail facility subsequent to sending her acquaintance JANET FROEBE out of the room. Earlier that day, at approximately 1 p.m. until 6.35 p.m. SALDATE, together with his fellow detective ROBERT MILLS and suspect ROGER SCOTT conversed, drove to the murder-scene and to the Metro Center mall. Incredibly, the report about the interrogation of SCOTT was only typed shortly prior to 2 p.m. that day ... six hours after this report about the interrogation of Debra was composed and therefore chronologically twisted! How comprehensible is the fact of these twisted activities? And on top of that - again almost ten hours later - at 11.50 p.m. on that December 6th, 1989 - SALDATE composed his 'Case Synopsis' and concluded 'Investigation cleared by arrest'. This synopsis is headlined: support personnel NOEL LEVY - Maricopa County Attorney. M.F.B. Could it be the county attorney indeed 'supported' SALDATE in concocting these unbelievable - and in huge parts contradictory - claims pertaining to Debra Milke? The joint appearance of SALDATE and LEVY at the Grand Jury Hearing suggested exactly this suspicion. Additionally - but not of major importance - the reader should be informed that SALDATE'S listing 'bln, hazel' is incorrect. Debra Milke doesn't have brown or hazel-color eyes, but deep blue ones.

On 12-3-89 at approximately 1953 hrs, I contacted DEBRA JEAN MILKE inside an interview room at the Pinal County Sheriff's Office in Florence, Arizona. The purpose of my contact was to interview her in regards to this death investigation. The following is a paraphrased account of her interview.

On 12-3-89 at approximately 1945 hrs, the Phoenix Police helicopter landed at Pinal County Hospital with me as a passenger. I was then transported by Pinal County Sheriffs to the County Jail where DEBRA had been taken to be interviewed. Upon my arrival, I contacted jail personnel who directed me to an office where DEBRA and her aunt were sitting. I asked her aunt to step out and speak to DET. HAMRICK while I introduced myself to DEBRA. DEBRA immediately wanted to know who I was and what I wanted and I then identified myself and told her I was investigating her son's disappearance.

Comment: This paragraph largely matches the statements of DET. HAMRICK and JANET FROEBE at Debra's trial. Upon arriving at the jail facility SALDATE had not spoken to one of his fellow detectives. When DET. HAMRICK commenced his interview with JANET he instantly informed her that Debra 'was going to be charged as one of the three people involved in the death of CHRISTOPHER.' Here it becomes clear that SALDATE'S attempt to give a reason for arresting Debra with the purported happenings throughout the interrogation behind the closed door are nothing but an outrageous scam. It puts large portions of this report into a questionable light.

At approximately 1953 hrs, I explained to DEBRA that her son CHRIS had been found in a desert area and that he had been found shot to death. DEBRA immediately began to yell "what, what". She then started to scream and make noises as if she was crying but no tears were visible. I explained to her that I would not tolerate her crying and that she was also under arrest for her son's death. Again she became very excited and asked why I was doing this and I told her that she had been implicated in the murder by JIM and ROGER. I then told her to be quiet while I removed a Miranda rights card from my identification badge case and read her her Miranda rights verbatim from the card. I asked DEBRA if she understood her rights and she moved her head in an up and down motion indicating yes but I again asked her if she understood her rights, which she responded yes.

Comment: At trial SALDATE excused the fact that he didn't tape-record this interrogation with the claim that Debra told him she didn't want it tape-recorded. Debra on the other hand rebutted that SALDATE inquired about tape-recording, but that she demanded "No, I want a lawyer" which SALDATE disregarded completely. Debra denies that she was told to be arrested for murder, but only that she was arrested. That's why she gave that response. We will never know with complete certainty what was really said between the two individuals. SALDATE actually refers to that with the footnote to this report, but it would've been chronologically correct to reproduce what was said at this point. Well, maybe he had forgotten about it and thought the added remark at the end couldn't hurt. It's pathetic!

Again DEBRA began to appear to cry and was yelling but again I saw no tears. I again told her that I would not tolerate that type of activity from her and that I was going to question her about her involvement in this murder. I explained to her that it was very important for her to tell me the truth and that the only reason I was there was to get the truth and that I would not tolerate any lies. DEBRA immediately settled down and was shaking somewhat but kept asking me what I needed to know I then told her that I wanted her to tell me the truth about her involvement as she saw it and I did not want her to minimize her involvement. DEBRA at this point kept moving her head in an up and down motion as if she was agreeing with me. I then asked her if she was going to tell me what occurred and she said she was.

Comment: SALDATE enjoys to boast with his purported authority. He only needs to put on a serious face and the suspect will change his mind and tell him 'God's honest truth'. As we've seen with the analysis of the [report about the interrogation of ROGER SCOTT](#) SALDATE hid the true happenings during the conversation with SCOTT and only disclosed the parts that were convenient to him. The sudden change of song at this point of the narration sounds very odd.

DEBRA first told me that she had been feeling sorry for her son because of what he has to go through and that she had told JIM her roommate that CHRIS was probably growing to grow up just like his father and not be any good. She said she may have told JIM this several times but she didn't think that he would ever do anything to her son to hurt him. DEBRA then began to cry but again no tears were visible. I then told DEBRA that she was not telling me the truth and that I would not tolerate that because I was not here talking to her by accident. I told her that I already knew what had happened but that this was her opportunity to tell me the truth from her standpoint. DEBRA then told me "look I just didn't want him to grow up like his father, I'm not a crazy person, I'm not an animal, I just didn't want him to grow up like that."

DEBRA then continued and said that while she was in high school, she was a very popular person and considered herself to be a very likeable and friendly person. She said her self-esteem was very high, she was positive and was in love with life. She then met her ex-husband MARK who she said was involved with drugs and was an alcoholic. After their marriage, she said that MARK was constantly putting her down, telling her that she was no good and would never amount to anything. She said MARK continued to drink constantly during their marriage and to use drugs. MARK was also incarcerated several times during their marriage.

DEBRA also said that because of MARK, she has a very difficult time having sex and feels that it is a dirty thing to do. She believes it was because MARK was into a lot of kinky stuff and was heavily into pornographic material. During this period of time, she said she was taking birth control pills because she did not want to have any children. She said she knew before she had CHRIS that she would not make a good mother and because of that, she never wanted children. CHRIS she said was a mistake and while she was pregnant she had several tests to ensure he was not deformed in any way. At one point during her pregnancy, DEBRA had decided to have an abortion and made an appointment. She, however, failed to show up for the appointment because she felt the pain would be too much.

Comment : Of course, when it comes to a denunciation SALDATE needs to slip in some sexual remark! As the [Separation Notice from his personnel file](#) has shown he has a history of sexual misconduct, cheating, asking for erotic favors, etc. and even ruthlessly covered this by repeated lying to his superior. Here SALDATE narrated that Debra supposedly 'felt it was a dirty thing to do'. Towards Debra's sister SANDY PICKINPAUGH the detective later alleged that [Debra had flashed her breasts to him](#), and [the transcript of the tape-recording](#) discloses: "So me and her talking and I'm telling her I'm not going to tolerate that. She's not going to do it. She - dress looked very nice. She wraps the front of her blouse and she pulls it up to her eyes, she didn't have no tears, to wipe her tears away but she didn't have any." Therefore it must have been at this point in the conversation that this alleged stunt of Debra took place. Interestingly SALDATE doesn't mention this incident in this report. Good stuff! Could it be his dirty fantasy was instrumental in inventing this incident only when he talked to SANDY? Could it be it was solely a means to manipulate Debra's sister and trigger her envy?

After CHRIS' birth, she said she realized she was not going to be a good mother but that the alternative of having CHRIS stay with his father was not any better. She finally got a divorce from MARK and then MARK did end up with visitation rights. For the most part, MARK was always in jail and he could not take advantage of those visitation rights. Recently MARK had been having CHRIS for visitation and she noticed that CHRIS was acting just like her ex-husband MARK. She described CHRIS as being very mischievous and at times malicious. She said this really bothered her because she did not want her child to grow up and be like MARK, spending his time in and out of jails.

DEBRA then told me that she felt very bad about this and said she had a very empty feeling. She then said "I'm not a malicious person, I just wanted God to take care of him." DEBRA then told me that she was scared about what was going to happen.

Approximately one month ago, DEBRA said that she had contemplated suicide. DEBRA said the more she thought about it, she thought that it would not solve her problems about her son. She said if she committed suicide, MARK would have sole custody of CHRIS and he would definitely grow up like MARK. Because of that, she then spoke to her friend JIM about helping her figure out a way for her child CHRIS to die. DEBRA said at first, she could not tell JIM that she wanted her son CHRIS killed because it was very hard for her. Finally she told him that it would be better for her son to die than to grow up like her husband, his father. She said JIM agreed to help her and that the only agreement they made was that he would not tell her the specifics about the killing.

Comment: If Debra indeed instigated JIM to kill her son CHRISTOPHER, why would JIM STYERS repeatedly and coherently claim that Debra is innocent of what she was convicted of and had nothing to do with the killing? In the face of a death sentence a mutual cover-up doesn't make much sense.

I then asked DEBRA if she had killed her son because of some insurance she may have had on him and she told me she did not. She then said she did not have any life insurance on him but she believed that her father who lives in Florence did. She also believes that her father was the beneficiary of that policy. I then told DEBRA that it had been my understanding that JIM and ROGER were to receive a partial payment of the \$5000 policy which she had on her child's life. DEBRA denied having a policy but said she may have told JIM about her father's policy and said that that may have been JIM and ROGER'S motivation for the killing but that it was definitely not her's.

Comment : As the [analysis of the insurance issue](#) has shown the claim of a 'policy' was brought up by SCOTT because he confused Debra's social benefits booklet as an insurance 'policy'. Up to the sentencing order of the judge the talk was about a supposed 'policy', when in fact, Debra was never in possession of a policy. But what's even more interesting is that the insurance issue served the judge as a reason to assume 'pecuniary gain' [eventually leading to the death sentence] from an insurance payment. Here SALDATE gets caught with his fingers in the cookie jar: How in the world - if that was truly the intention - should JIM and ROGER receive payments from the insurance Debra's father's had on CHRISTOPHER??? RICHARD 'SAM' SADEIK would have been the beneficiary [in fact: he was the beneficiary!], not JIM and ROGER, or even Debra! And if her intention was to hide the fact that Debra had insurance on CHRISTOPHER, why would she on the other hand disclose her knowledge about her father's policy? Where is the logic in these assertions?

I then asked DEBRA if she, JIM and ROGER had spoken about how they were going to kill CHRIS and she told me that they had. She said that she and JIM spoke about it several times and she believes that she, JIM and ROGER only spoke about it on one occasion. DEBRA said that she did go out with JIM on one occasion with her son and that JIM was going to "do it" but that something happened and they decided not to do it. I asked DEBRA if do it meant to kill him and she responded yes. DEBRA said the plan was for JIM to do it and that he and ROGER would then go to Metro Center and claim that CHRIS had been lost. She said she never knew what method JIM was going to use to do it.

Comment : Unfortunately for the ex-cop his own fellow detectives often damaged his fabricated claims and divulged his bold-faced inventions. While the interrogation of Debra was still taking place at the Pinal County Sheriff's Office in Florence, DET. ROBERT MILLS interrogated [ROGER SCOTT at the Phoenix police main station and this conversation was tape-recorded](#). Herein SCOTT stated:

(...)

Det. Mills : Did she say how she wanted it done?

Roger Scott: She just said that she wanted Jim and me to handle it after Jim had purchased the one gun, uh, later on I believe it was 3, 4 days later he purchased another two guns.

(...)

ROGER SCOTT - who told police all this hell-or-blue about the alleged involvement of JIM STYERS and Debra Milke - confirmed the complete opposite of what SALDATE wrote in this report, namely that Debra purportedly didn't know the method how the murder was going to take place. And even worse, SCOTT named JIM'S purchase of the first gun as the incident which triggered Debra's supposed instigation. If Debra indeed confessed [which she never did] - as alleged here by SALDATE - and - according to the prosecution - conspired with JIM STYERS and ROGER SCOTT, why would she make completely contradictory statements about whether or not she knew which method was going to be used for the killing? It doesn't make any sense.

On Saturday morning, she woke up and spoke to JIM. JIM told her that they were planning to do it today and that he was going to pick up ROGER. She said she then got her son dressed in the clothing that she had previously described on the missing person's report and that she told him that JIM was going to take him to see Santa Claus. She said when JIM and her son left, she knew that they were going to do it today but was not positive because JIM had taken him out at least two other times and for several reasons had brought him back.

Comment: Here another interesting discrepancy to other facts of the entire file unravels. SALDATE alleged that JIM STYERS supposedly intended to meet ROGER SCOTT that morning and that both men had planned to commit the murder that Saturday, December 2nd, 1989. It seems as if we have a hardcore invention here because STYERS' ex-girlfriend [GAIL LIPSHULTZ stated in an interview](#) about the evening of the preceding day: "Well, we just like kind of switched back and forth, kind of, during the week because I was going to school and working, so he would watch her. He was supposed to come pick her up the next day." That would have been the crucial Saturday morning. Finally GAIL related about their agreement:

(...)

Tom Buckner: When had Jim brought her home ? Do you remember what day ? Like you say, it was from the day before ?

Gail Lipshultz: Oh, you mean when he brought her here ?

Tom Buckner: Right.

Gail Lipshultz: Yeah, the day before, in the evening. He said he was going to pick -- he wanted to pick her up like early the next day. I told him, wait 'til like later in the afternoon because I wanted to take her somewhere.

(...)

It's clear at this point that JIM STYERS initially had it in mind to pick his daughter WENDY up at GAILS' place early in the morning of the next day. According to all unequivocal testimonies JIM next picked Debra up from her job and the two adults, together with CHRISTOPHER in the car, went home. SALDATE on the other hand asserted that STYERS and SCOTT had a plan which was to be executed on the next day. According to the state's theory CHRIS was shot after having pizza at the 'Peter Piper Pizza' restaurant, therefore sometime after 1 p.m. But GAIL'S statement was also confirmed by neighbor JOHN CIULLA with a report of DET. JUDY TOWNSEND which reads:

"(...) During the course of the day (12/2/1989), JIM'S ex-wife, DEBBIE, kept calling for JIM to come pick up WENDY. WENDY had gone to her mother's the night before, but was to be picked up on Saturday by JIM. (...)"

It should be illuminated at this point that DET. TOWNSEND confused some names and facts here. At first it wasn't JIM'S ex-wife who called, but JIM'S ex-girlfriend [as GAIL is the mother of WENDY]. At second her name is not 'Debbie', but GAIL. But other than these errors this statement of JOHN CIULLA consistently and independently confirms the claim of GAIL in the interview. JIM STYERS intended to pick his daughter up that Saturday morning. He cannot have had a plan as alleged by SALDATE in this paragraph. ROGER SCOTT himself stated about that morning at his own trial on January 31st, 1991: "I called him to see what he was doing. And he said that Debbie was packing some things, so he wanted to get out of the house and just - just go for a ride. He asked me if I had a - anywhere I had to go." And indeed, JIM STYERS also stated at his trial that he only talked to ROGER on the telephone in the morning of December 2nd, 1989. This means that no arrangement had been made when Debra got up and first talked to JIM. The meeting of JIM and ROGER was spontaneous and solely a means to bridge the time until JIM could pick up WENDY from his former girlfriend GAIL.

DEBRA said that during the past month, she has laid in bed next to her son and that her son has told her that he missed his father and wanted to know when his father would be home. She said on those occasions, she felt disappointed that JIM had not done it yet. I asked DEBRA if she was getting angry with JIM and ROGER and she told me she was not getting angry but was disappointed because the longer they waited, the more influence her ex-husband could put on CHRIS.

I asked DEBRA if that morning when her son left, if she gave him a special hug or kiss and she told me that she did not have to. I asked her if she could explain and she told me that approximately one week ago, she told her son that God was coming down and going to take him and that he was going to be going to Heaven. She said she also told him that she would see him later in Heaven. I then asked her if she dressed her son especially for that day with his boots, levis and sweatshirt and she said she did not. She said she let CHRIS pick out the clothes he wanted that day and that he loved wearing his boots.

At approximately 3:20 PM that day, DEBRA said she received a call from JIM and he said that he was at the mall. DEBRA said she immediately realized that he had done it and that her son was now dead. JIM also told her that CHRIS was lost somewhere at Sears and that he had a security guard standing next to him. DEBRA said she never told JIM anything other than to call her back later. When she hung up the phone, she said she immediately prayed to God to take care of CHRIS and that she would not be mad at him if he sent her to Hell. She also prayed to God to do something that would never allow her to have any more kids. DEBRA then told me that she was not crazy and she would hope that nobody thought she was. She said she did this because she loved her son and did not want see him grow up like her ex-husband. She asked me if I understood her and I told her that I understood what she was telling me but that I did not understand the end result.

Comment: People who know Debra unequivocally state that she is not religious. In light of that the claim that she supposedly 'prayed to God' is hardly believable.

DEBRA was worried about her family not understanding and said that she believed her family would

now disown her. I explained to DEBRA that her family was still her family and that they would probably try to help her but she could not expect them to support what she did. She then told me that she was sure her father would probably think that she was crazy and again said she was not. She then asked me if she thought someone would try to pronounce her insane and I asked her if she was. She then responded "no, I'm just an emotionally troubled 25 year old girl who needs help dealing with her problems." She then told me that she has had her problems bottled up in her and that she has never been able to express herself from the time she married MARK until now.

DEBRA then asked me how I felt about her and I told her I could understand what she had been telling me but that there were other alternatives if she did not want her child CHRIS. I suggested to her that she could have given her child to the grandparents, her sister or someone else in her family that may have wanted him. She then told me that she probably could have and then said "I guess I just made a bad judgment call."

DEBRA was very concerned about what was going to happen to her and at the first part of the interview wanted to know if we were going to let her go back home. I explained to her that she was under arrest and that she would be going back to Phoenix and be put into jail. DEBRA kept asking why she couldn't just be let go and given a court date because she had never been in any type of trouble. I told DEBRA that because of the seriousness of her crime, she would have to go to jail. DEBRA continued through the interview asking if it was possible that she could get probation and I told her that she would be charged with first degree murder and that I was not the judge however, first degree murder could carry the death penalty, life imprisonment, or a lengthy jail term. She then asked me if it was possible to get probation for life and I told her it was possible but not very probable. She said she would even let the court tie her tubes and ensure that she would never have kids if they would only put her on probation so she could go back to work. DEBRA then explained to me that her work was very important to her and that was the only thing she ever did good. She said she started as a file clerk and was now in accounting and she said she would really miss her job if she had to go jail.

DEBRA also kept telling me that she felt bad and she felt ashamed and said that she knew that everyone was going to be staring at her because of this. She then told me "I worry about JIM". I asked her why and she continued and said "well, you know, because he had to be the one to do it." I then explained to her that she should concern herself about her future and let JIM worry about his.

DEBRA was transported back to the Phoenix Police Department in a uniform Pinal County Sheriff's vehicle. She and I sat in the back seat of the uniform police vehicle and DEBRA was not handcuffed. Corporal M. ANDONIE #27 of Pinal County was the driver.

Comment : The preceding two, three paragraphs seem to be more than questionable. A lot of things were narrated here which do not match the impression people have of Debra who know her personally, back in 1989 and/or today. Debra herself steadfastly insists that she was only told by SALDATE that she had to go to jail 'because of the seriousness of the crime' and assumed it probably had to do with a charge for child neglect [because she subjected her son to JIM STYERS' care]. In fact, according to Debra's description she only learned about the accusation of participating in the killing on December 8th, two days after this report was written. PAUL HUEBL, reporter for KTVK, met Debra on the floor of the Phoenix Police main station and talked to her. Upon his inquiry whether there was some insurance money involved Debra reacted surprised: "Who told you that? I heard that too. That's off the wall." She also denied any involvement in the crime to MR. HUEBL [who signed an affidavit stating his perceptions of that evening].

Even more suspicious is the fact that SALDATE met his fellow detectives HAMRICK and DiMODICA when emerging from the dispensary room wherein the interrogation took place. In DET. DiMODICA'S report the officer narrated that they met "SALDATE who stated that he had placed DEBRA under arrest for the homicide of her son, CHRISTOPHER" but makes no mention of a 'voluntary confession' of the young mother! And why should he? As we have seen at the beginning of this analysis the arrest was preconceived anyway and SALDATE committed perjury about this fact on the stand [Voluntariness Hearing - 09/10/1990]:

(...)

Ken Ray : Had Detective Ontiveros instructed that you arrest Debra Milke ?

Armando Saldate : No.

Ken Ray : Had you related to any other officer that it was your intention to go down to Pinal County to arrest Debra Milke ?

Armando Saldate : I had not talked to anybody.

(...)

But how then could DET. HAMRICK inform JANET FROEBE that Debra was going to be arrested and 'charged for the death of Christopher' even before this interview was finished? A mystery!!! Additionally the fact that Debra was not handcuffed is highly unusual. At trial SALDATE boasted that Debra was not a threat to him, but it is not reported anywhere that the young woman was searched for weapons. It appears to be much more likely that SALDATE didn't want any attention in executing his preconceived plan to railroad the young woman.

During the trip back to Phoenix, she kept on asking questions to see if I knew what she was going to get and I told her I did not. She asked if she could possibly get bailed out and I told her that it would

probably be a bailable offense and that her family could probably help her in that aspect. She then told me that she didn't believe that her family would help her and that she thought her family would probably disown her. She then commented that her family would probably not understand why she did it like I did. I then again reminded her that I understood what she was telling me but I could not condone her actions. She also asked me if I would call her father, explain to him what she had told me and ask him to try and bail her out and get her an attorney. I agreed and told her when we arrived back into Phoenix, that I would call him from my office.

At approximately 2250 hrs, we arrived back in Phoenix and she was taken to General Investigations Bureau where the booking information was obtained. She was given a Pepsi and some cigarettes were purchased for her. She then asked me if I would call her father which I did. I explained to her father that DEBRA had confessed to her involvement and that she had told me that she had done it because she did not want CHRIS to grow up like his father. I then told him that DEBRA wanted me to ask him to try and bail her out and he immediately told me that he would not. I then told him that DEBRA also wanted me to ask him if he could get her an attorney and he told me that he had gotten in touch with her mother in Switzerland and that she had talked about getting an attorney for her but that as far he was concerned, they should give her a public defender because he would not make any attempts to get an attorney for her. I asked him if he wanted to speak with DEBRA and he said he did not at this time but for me to tell her that he may talk to her several days down the road. He then asked me if I understood how he felt and I told him that I did. He asked me to tell her that he would cross each bridge as he came it to and that at this time he could not talk with her. I then relayed the information to DEBRA.

While waiting to be transported to be booked, DEBRA asked me if I thought there was a possibility that she may be released on her recognizance so she could go to work and I told her that probably would not be possible. She then commented that she had never been in any trouble and that she would never leave the state and would be available for court. Again I told her that it would probably not be possible. DEBRA also asked me if I was going to call her employer and tell him about what happened and I told her I was not. I then asked DEBRA why and she told me that just in case she does get out on bail or on her own, that she would like to go back to work because she really liked her job.

I finally told DEBRA that it was time to go and that I would have to handcuff her for the first time. I then handcuffed her with her hands to her front and she asked if I could go with her. I told her that I could not go with her this time and she immediately said that she was scared. I told her that she would have to face this by herself and that she was an adult and had made an adult decision to do something and now she had to face the music. She then told me that she had never had anyone that she could speak with before and that this may sound strange but she was starting to feel better and she thought she was now getting her self-esteem back. DEBRA was then taken by uniform OFF. BAKER to the main jail and booked.

It should be noted that this interview was not tape recorded because DEBRA refused to have her statement tape recorded.

Comment: At trial SALDATE referred to exactly his footnote, claiming this was more or less a 'technical statement' in regard as to why he didn't tape-record the interrogation. In fact, SALDATE also admitted on the stand that he believes tape-recording is an obstacle to get a suspect to tell the truth. And incredibly, no other report of an interrogation or interview - never tape-recorded, of course - contains such a final statement which would explain the lack of such a recording. Why the special treatment of Debra Milke?

Investigation Continuing.

Please, tell us your opinion now!

Imagine - for a second - you were the judge at Debra Milke's trial. Would you allow this police report into evidence to be used against the defendant? Would you agree that a person's life solely clings on the assertions - that Debra Milke supposedly knew her son was to be murdered - made herein?

Would you allow
this report into evidence?

If you were the judge, how would you
decide?

Yes, I'd allow this report

No, definitely not

I'd need to know more details

This page was last modified :
Wednesday, 10-Sep-2003 01:48:14 PDT



[[Home](#) | [Table of contents](#)]

© 1998-2003
<http://www.debbiemilke.com/> [Renate Janka]