

"Upon observing Mr. Locke, BCSO Fugitive Agents observed Mr. Locke exit his residence with what appeared to be, based off of their training and experience, shotgun or other long gun style firearm, which would be a violation of the injunction which is currently in place." Affidavit for search warrant - structure/residence, CR# [2020-297471](#), 8/31/2020.

12 Q. And you had mentioned that Mr. Locke came
13 outside the house and went back in. So that first initial
14 time he came outside the house then, was it to address the
15 two agents who were either dressed as FP&L workers or
16 construction workers or something of that nature?

17 A. I don't want to -- I don't remember exactly
18 whether he answered the door for them or not. I honestly
19 don't remember. I know that they went and knocked on the
20 door and that they were walking along the side of the
21 property when I, from my position, observed Mr. Locke come
22 out the front door, walk to his car. He walked back inside
23 carrying a long object, like a tool or something. I
24 couldn't tell exactly what it was. He went inside and then
25 it takes -- it takes a little bit of pre-warning for us to

Daughters Reporting, Inc.
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 954-755-6401

20

1 move in in a safe manner. So we did not move to arrest him
2 the first time he came out. When he came out the second
3 time we moved in to arrest.

1. There was no such object within my house. The pictures taken by BCSO prove as much.
2. Florida statute 790.233 states "A person may not have in his or her care, custody, possession, or control any firearm or ammunition **if the person has been issued a final injunction** that is currently in force and effect, restraining that person from committing acts of domestic violence,

as issued under s. [741.30](#) or from committing acts of stalking or cyberstalking, as issued under s. [784.0485](#)."

3. On 8/04/2020 an ex parte temporary injunction is issued against me in case # 05-2020-DR-036701-XXXX-XX.
4. On 8/28/2020 a hearing on the injunction issued in case #05-2020-DR-036701-XXXX-XX takes place and I am not in attendance. An injunction is issued to BCSO to be served on myself.
5. On 8/30/2020 BCSO enters my home and discovers ammunnition.
6. On 8/31/2020 while incarcerated at Brevard County Jail I'm issued a final injunction for case # 05-2020-DR-036701-XXXX-XX.

15 Q. Okay. Was there anything during that arrest
 16 that Mr. Locke had with him that was cause for concern to
 17 you as a law enforcement officer?
 18 A. Afterwards -- after Mr. Locke was placed under
 19 arrest or secured with handcuffs, there was a device found
 20 nearby that was -- it was told to me that this was in his
 21 possession. But it was some sort of a -- it appeared to be
 22 some sort of a destructive device or like a -- I was
 23 advised it was pepper spray with some sort of a battery and
 24 ignition wires attached.

"After Mr. Locke was taken into custody, BCSO agents observed on the ground approximately five feet from the door, laying on the walkway to the house was what is described as a homemade improvised Explosive Device, which was identified by Sergeant Jay Church of the Bomb squad, who is a 13 year member of the Brevard County Bomb Squad and a Certified FBI Bomb Technician. The Device was a cylinder with a red button, wrapped in duct tape. Attached to the bottom of this cylinder is a red and black wire approximately 2 inches long that attaches to what appears to be a 9 volt battery. This battery was also taped up with duct tape. Based on Sergeant Church's expertise, this is in fact a suspicious device meant to cause fear or possibly damage to persons or property." Affidavit for search warrant - structure/residence, CR# [2020-297471](#), 8/31/2020.

"After Mr. Locke was taken into custody, BCSO Agents observed on the ground, approximately five feet from the door, laying on the walkway to the house was what was initially described as a homemade Improvised Explosive Device, which was identified by Sergeant Jay Church of the Bomb squad, who is a 13 year member of the Brevard County Bomb Squad and a Certified Bomb Technician." Affidavit for search warrant - digital evidence [2020-00297471](#), 9/2/2020.

So it goes from "...what is described as a homemade improvised Explosive Device ..." to "...what was initially described as a homemade improvised Explosive Device..."

"Subsequent to the discovery of the Improvised Explosive Device a residential search warrant was obtained due to the belief there may be more devices, booby-traps, bomb making materials, or bomb making reference materials (electronic and paper materials) inside of the residence." Affidavit for search warrant - digital evidence [2020-00297471](#), 9/2/2020

"The Brevard County Bomb arrived and X-Rayed the suspected device. Through Sergeant Jay Church's training and experience, after examining the X-Ray of the device it was determined that this was a device to expel a flame. The cylinder resembled that of a pepper spray container, with the red button as the plunger. The wires from the 9 volt battery placed and ran up the side of the cylinder towards the top of the plunger where the spray would expel from the cylinder. The idea behind this is that the 9 volt battery would cause a spark or heat up and when the button was pressed the liquid inside would ignite causing a flame to expel from the device." Affidavit for search warrant - digital evidence [2020-00297471](#), 9/2/2020.

It's extremely disconcerting that the affidavit for search warrant - structure /residence makes no mention of the BCSO bomb squad being in route to examine the alleged IED. The deputies on scene knew the device wasn't an improvised explosive device, but wanted to move on the search warrant before the bomb squad arrived and confirmed as much. What did the bomb squad say? Are you telling me they didn't have the ability to confirm whether the "device" was explosive or not? Has to be a report or something right? It was a can of pepper spray. How many deputies does it take to identify a can of pepper spray? Pepper spray isn't flammable by the way. Clearly by this point BCSO have determined it's not an improvised explosive device and BCSO come up with this nonsense theory of it being a mini-flame thrower, but BCSO at no point test the content of the container to confirm as much? Bush league.

5 EXAMINATION

6 BY THE COURT:

7 Q. Essentially you had made the comment that --
8 because it was asked by Ms. Ferderigos about the knocking
9 or banging on the door --

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. -- and whether or not you banged on the door
12 and you asked to clarify that. What were you referring to?
13 How did you guys approach the house?

14 A. Okay. So I'd be happy to clarify that. So we
15 use ruses in my line of work with what we do specifically.
16 So sometimes we will have a couple of our undercover agents
17 will go up and let's say dress as like FP&L workers or
18 construction workers and they will go and just knock on the
19 door to see who answers, because often we do surveillance
20 for hours without actually knowing if the person is there.
21 So it's simply an attempt at the front door not to make an
22 arrest, but to see that he's there, and the arrest does not
23 occur at that point.

24 Q. All right. And did you do that in this
25 instance?

Daughters Reporting, Inc.
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 954-755-6401

19

1 A. Yes, we did.

1 A. Yes, we did.

2 Q. Was that before -- so once you-all did that,
3 who were the two agents -- were you present at that time
4 and who were the two agents who did it?

5 A. It was Sergeant Church -- or I'm sorry -- it
6 was -- I'm sorry. It was Agent Holland and Agent McMillan
7 at the time who did that.

8 Q. And then how long was that before the next
9 action was taken?

10 A. They actually -- just minutes before. I would
11 say about two minutes before.


Both affidavits for a search warrant state threats of violence were communicated, but conveniently leave out the following:

← Re: Hearing Confirmation (Case #: 2017-DR-054881 CalDate: 08/05/2020 Confirmation #: 481733)

① Flag for follow up.

① You forwarded this message on Wed 1/27/2021 1:53 PM

ML Michael Locke
Tue 8/4/2020 1:01 PM
To: Kim Mayer; Debbie Lansing



2 attachments (9 MB) Download all Save all to OneDrive

Where I am is better than where you are. This applies to just about everybody. I have no reason to be anywhere but here and that's not going to change.

"3. FS 776.013(2) states a person is justified in using or threatening to use deadly force if "[H]e or she reasonably believes that using or threatening to use such force is necessary to prevent imminent death or great bodily harm to himself or herself or another or to prevent the imminent commission of a forcible felony."

4. Respondent strongly feels he is already in the right to carry out #3, but wants to make sure to pursue all proper avenues of law and order before doing so." (05-2017-DR-054881-XXXX-XX, doc #200, 8/30/2020).

I.e. I made it clear I intended to stay at my residence and pursue the appropriate legal action to the best of my ability.

I keep seeing "no legitimate purpose" regarding contact. Document #199 in 05-2017-DR-054881-

XXX-XX was filed on 08/30/2020 at 12:26:17 PM. It outlines the following information, as well as provides copies of the documents that make up that information:

1. Currently, the state of Florida is averaging 2% of coronavirus/COVID-19 cases resulting in death, while Brevard County is averaging 3%. The state is averaging a 6% hospitalization rate, while Brevard County is averaging a 9% hospitalization rate. Brevard County is doing a considerably worse job handling the coronavirus/COVID-19 pandemic than the average of Florida counties.
2. Respondent anticipated Brevard's lackluster handling of the pandemic from an early point and sought to gain exclusive custody of the children as the petitioner works in a hospital intensive care unit and was/is exposed to coronavirus-COVID-19 patients, but this motion was inexplicably never ruled on.
3. The respondent sought the opinion of a noted expert in an applicable who is recognized as much by the state of Florida, Dr. Jill Roberts of the University of South Florida. Respondent sought this opinion to better make a decision of whether he would be comfortable allowing respondent and petitioners children to attend the day care of the petitioners choice, a day care attached to petitioners employer (a hospital) and whose student population primarily consists of the children of hospital employees ie people at increased risk of coronavirus/COVID-19 infection.
4. Of concern was/is the health and safety of respondent and petitioner's daughter, who due to several ailments is at increased risk of infection, as well as increased risk of severe infection.
5. Petitioner had agreed to cease bringing the daughter to day care on the advice of the children's physician, but subsequently resumed bringing the daughter to the day care.
6. The CDC currently states that a Body Mass Index above 30% puts a child at increased risk of severe illness from coronavirus/COVID-19, petitioner and respondents daughter has a Body Mass Index of 96%.
7. Petitioner's counsel informed respondent that petitioner planned to enroll both children in school.
8. Respondent again sought advice from an expert in an applicable medical field for an opinion concerning the safety of the children returning to school, the expert recommended going by the children's physician/pediatrician.
9. As stated by respondent in #5, the children's physician/pediatrician recommended against the children attending school.

There is nothing on the record to show that the children's physician/pediatrician gave a recommendation contrary to the children not attending school. There is nothing on the record because the children's physician/pediatrician has never given a recommendation that is contrary to the children not attending school. The court has ordered the children to attend school, contrary to the medical advice of the medical expert responsible for the children's medical treatment. The court is putting the children (particularly the daughter) at an unnecessary risk for injury and/or death due to unnecessary potential exposure to coronavirus/COVID-19."

This information from documents 199 and 200 was conspicuously absent from the testimony of Judge Robert Segal on 11/4/2020, despite an apparent thorough review of relevant documents on his part.

STATE OF FLORIDA vs MICHAEL BASS LOCKE
Robert Segal on 11/04/2020

<p align="right">Page 2</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p> <p>5</p> <p align="center">APPEARANCES</p> <p>6</p> <p align="center">FOR THE PLAINTIFF</p> <p>7</p> <p align="center">GREGORY HANSON, ESQUIRE Assistant State Attorney 2725 Judge Fran Jamieson Way Building D Viera, Florida 32940</p> <p>8</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p align="center">FOR THE DEFENDANT</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p align="center">ROBERT SCOTT ROBINSON, ESQUIRE Eisenmenger, Robinson, Blaue, & Peters 5450 Village Drive Viera, Florida 32955</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>	<p align="right">Page 4</p> <p>1 THE COURT: Okay. Would you like to add anything?</p> <p>2 Do you have anything you wish to say to the -- wish</p> <p>3 to -- wish to address -- do you wish to address the</p> <p>4 Court in any way sir?</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.</p> <p>6 THE COURT: Okay, wait. Hold on a minute Judge</p> <p>7 Segal. I'm going to play -- yes, it worked. Okay,</p> <p>8 thank you sir. Mr -- can you raise your right hand</p> <p>9 please? Are you -- are you giving evidence or just</p> <p>10 comment?</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: I'll raise my right hand.</p> <p>12 THE COURT: All right. Do you swear or affirm that</p> <p>13 everything you say here today will be the truth, the</p> <p>14 whole truth, and nothing but the truth?</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.</p> <p>16 THE COURT: All right, thank you. Tell us your</p> <p>17 name for the record please sir.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: My name's Robert Segal.</p> <p>19 THE COURT: All right, thank you. And Mr. Hanson,</p> <p>20 he -- Mr -- the --</p> <p>21 MR. HANSON: Yeah, Judge. Judge Segal, in light of</p> <p>22 the conversation we had yesterday, and in light of the</p> <p>23 additional details that have been flushed out this</p> <p>24 morning what comments do you have or what concerns do</p> <p>25 you have about the proposed plan of treatment and</p>
<p align="right">Page 3</p> <p>1 VIERA, FLORIDA 11/4/2020</p> <p>2 NOTE - Every effort has been made to correctly</p> <p>3 identify speakers, but due to the nature of recordings</p> <p>4 this is sometimes impossible.</p> <p>5 NOTE - Efforts have been made not to transcribe any</p> <p>6 obvious attorney/client privileged conversations, and</p> <p>7 transcriptionist is not responsible for any inadvertent</p> <p>8 transcription of such conversations.</p> <p>9</p> <p>10 WHEREUPON:</p> <p>11 THE COURT: Okay.</p> <p>12 MR. HANSON: Yeah, and I don't -- I was -- I spoke</p> <p>13 with Judge Segal yesterday. At the appropriate time, at</p> <p>14 least as of yesterday, he indicated he may wish to</p> <p>15 address the Court with any remaining concerns.</p> <p>16 THE COURT: Okay.</p> <p>17 MR. HANSON: When I spoke with him yesterday we did</p> <p>18 not -- I had not worked with Mr. Robinson to hammer out</p> <p>19 some of these details of this program. So, he may have</p> <p>20 some additional questions or comments about that.</p> <p>21 THE COURT: Okay. Let me ask -- I don't if --</p> <p>22 Judge Segal, are you -- are you muted?</p> <p>23 THE WITNESS: No, Your Honor, I'm not.</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>	<p align="right">Page 5</p> <p>1 release, conditions of release?</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: Fundamentally we're not opposed to</p> <p>3 Mr. Locke having access to meaningful treatment. It is</p> <p>4 our concern, and when I say our I mean me, my family,</p> <p>5 Ms. Lansing, her family is a very serious concern that</p> <p>6 he cannot safely obtain treatment in an unsecured</p> <p>7 environment.</p> <p>8 I became familiar with Mr. Locke during the course</p> <p>9 of his divorce litigation with his wife. During the</p> <p>10 course of that litigation Mr. Locke began to send me</p> <p>11 emails that were initially annoying, and I asked him to</p> <p>12 stop.</p> <p>13 They grew in intensity to the point where he began</p> <p>14 talking about responding through those means of able</p> <p>15 under the stand your ground law for the alleged forced</p> <p>16 felonies that I and Judge Roberts had committed against</p> <p>17 him with regard to orders that were entered concerning</p> <p>18 the custody of his children.</p> <p>19 As late as August 30, 2020 Mr. Locke filed a motion</p> <p>20 in case number 2017-DR-054881, wherein he sought a</p> <p>21 declaratory judgement asking the Court to enter an order</p> <p>22 that it was okay for him to stand his ground as a result</p> <p>23 of the actions committed by myself against Mr. Locke</p> <p>24 with regard to his children.</p> <p>25 Mr. Locke knows my home address. Mr. Locke knows</p>

STATE OF FLORIDA vs MICHAEL BASS LOCKE
Robert Segal on 11/04/2020

Pages 6..9

Page 6	Page 8
<p>1 my cell phone number. Mr. Locke sent an email to Ms. 2 Lansing with my home address, and attached to that email 3 were pictures of books that he had apparently purchased 4 with regard to how to build booby traps and improvised 5 weapons. 6 He called me on the telephone and he said, hah, now 7 I have your telephone number, following which he sent me 8 a text saying are you going to be at the courthouse on 9 Monday, and forgive me for saying so, pussy boy? 10 So, we have very significant concerns about our 11 personal safety. Again, I am not opposed to Mr. Locke 12 getting help. I am not opposed to Mr. Locke obtaining 13 whatever assistance he may need for the problems that he 14 has. 15 It is my understanding he's been through Veteran's 16 Court before, and he either did not recognize the 17 current need for treatment or simply ignored that fact. 18 When he was arrested he was charged with a count of 19 battery on a law enforcement officer and resisting with 20 violence. I believe those are the charges. 21 When they went into his house they found a room 22 that they called the rage room, and I believe the state 23 attorney has photographs of this. 24 And in that room they found a large chain, and 25 attached to that chain was a very heavy object that</p>	<p>1 THE COURT: Mr. Robinson, would you like to ask 2 Judge Segal any questions sir? 3 MR. ROBINSON: Yes, Your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Okay. 5 MR. ROBINSON: Judge Segal, you mentioned that Mr. 6 Locke had been in Veterans treatment court before. Do 7 you have a case number or do you know what that case was 8 about? That's news to me. 9 THE WITNESS: If you look at case number 10 2017-DR-054881, document number 193 at page three, you 11 will see an email from Mr. Locke. And I'll just read it 12 to you if you'd like. 13 And this apparently accompanied a very violent 14 poem sent to counsel for his soon to be ex-wife. It was 15 an email dated August 26, 2020. It was sent to a 16 gentleman by the name of Sean Clark. 17 THE COURT: Wait a minute. 18 THE WITNESS: His email -- 19 THE COURT: Judge Segal, I'm sorry. 20 THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am. 21 THE COURT: I'm looking for the document and it 22 can't be three. Did you say Aug -- 23 THE WITNESS: Document number 193. 24 THE COURT: Oh, 193. I'm sorry. 25 THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.</p>
Page 7	Page 9
<p>1 apparently Mr. Locke would swing around and apparently 2 destroy the walls, destroy the door, destroy the 3 furnishings, evidently in an effort to soothe some of 4 whatever rage he was feeling. 5 We are scared of Mr. Locke. I now carry a gun 6 every where that I go. And so there's been requests for 7 GPS monitoring. 8 I don't think the Court has the funds to provide 9 Mr. Locke with a GPS monitor. And if he's not working I 10 don't think he can afford to have a GPS monitor. 11 This is not a secured facility, and I am very 12 concerned about whether or not timely notification would 13 be given to anybody in the event that Mr. Locke eloped 14 from the facility. 15 Prior to Mr. Locke's arrest, and immediately 16 thereafter, I've had police patrolling my neighborhood. 17 And they are going to go back and have to do that on a 18 regular basis in the event that he is released. 19 So, I am very strongly requesting that the Court 20 give very serious consideration to releasing Mr. Locke 21 only to a secured facility so that he can get the help 22 that he evidently needs. 23 THE COURT: All right. Thank you Judge Segal. Mr. 24 Hanson, any -- any further questions? 25 MR. HANSON: No, no follow up on that Your Honor.</p>	<p>1 THE COURT: Thank you sir. 2 THE WITNESS: It was an email to 3 sean.clark2@va.gov. "Bey, thanks for the response. 4 That's disappointing. I participated in Veterans Court 5 in my local area back in 2012". 6 This was addressed from MBL22885@msn.com, which is 7 an email address from which Mr. Locke sent me email. It 8 was an email address that I believe was designated as 9 his email address in the dissolution of marriage action. 10 THE COURT: Okay, I -- Mr. Robinson, do you -- are 11 you looking at the email? 12 MR. ROBINSON: I'm not looking at the email. I'm 13 going back and looking through the record and -- 14 THE COURT: Would you -- 15 MR. ROBINSON: (Cont'd) I'm trying to -- 16 THE COURT: Would you like to see the email? 17 MR. ROBINSON: If you have it printed out -- 18 THE COURT: Madam Clerk can print it. I'm -- can 19 you print it? I'm looking at it, but I can't -- 20 THE CLERK: What's the case number? 21 THE COURT: Yeah, I -- it's -- I -- it's the DR 22 case. Hold on. 17-DR-54881. It's -- if you pull up 23 his name just click on his name. You'll see it. 24 It's -- 25 THE CLERK: Yes.</p>

STATE OF FLORIDA vs MICHAEL BASS LOCKE
Robert Segal on 11/04/2020


Page 10

1 THE COURT: Oh, sorry. Yeah, use my -- sorry.
 2 MR. ROBINSON: May I approach Your Honor?
 3 THE COURT: Certainly.
 4 THE DEFENDANT: Am I allowed to speak?
 5 THE COURT: No -- hold on. I think Mr. Robinson is
 6 reviewing something sir.
 7 MR. ROBINSON: Mr. Locke, please do not talk.
 8 THE COURT: Any time you're --
 9 MR. ROBINSON: Okay, yes, ma'am.
 10 THE COURT: Mr. Robinson, I'm sorry, I was
 11 giving -- I -- are you ready sir?
 12 MR. ROBINSON: Yes, ma'am. That was my question.
 13 I read through the email.
 14 THE COURT: Okay.
 15 MR. ROBINSON: Or the correspondence.
 16 THE COURT: Okay. So, is there anything you wish
 17 to ask Judge Segal?
 18 MR. ROBINSON: So, Judge Segal, are you familiar at
 19 all with what treatment that he received through his
 20 time at veterans treatment court?
 21 THE WITNESS: No, sir, I'm not.
 22 MR. ROBINSON: Are you familiar with the
 23 domiciliary and how that is different from maybe -- or
 24 actually what treatment options are available through
 25 veterans treatment court?


Page 11

1 THE WITNESS: No, sir. The only familiarity I have
 2 with it is what was alleged in the motion.
 3 MR. ROBINSON: Okay. And you mentioned, as I
 4 understand it, that you'd only be okay with a secure
 5 lock down facility, is that correct?
 6 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
 7 MR. ROBINSON: Are you aware of any secure lock
 8 down facilities that are available in Florida or
 9 available to veterans?
 10 THE WITNESS: No, sir, I'm not.
 11 MR. ROBINSON: Okay, thank you. That's all the
 12 questions I have Your Honor. Thank you Your Honor.
 13 THE COURT: Okay.
 14 MR. ROBINSON: Your Honor's --
 15 THE COURT: All right, thank you. All right, based
 16 on -- is there any -- Mr. Hanson, anything else that you
 17 would like to --
 18 MR. HANSON: No, Your Honor.
 19 THE COURT: Okay, thank you. Then Judge Segal, we
 20 are going to attempt to un-pin you or pin you, all
 21 right. So, we're -- you are -- let's see. There we go.
 22 All right.
 23 (Whereupon, that concludes the testimony of Mr.
 24 Robert Segal.)
 25

Page 12

1
 2 CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER
 3
 4 STATE OF FLORIDA]
]
 5 COUNTY OF BREVARD]
 6
 7 I, MICHAEL J. CIPO, Deputy Court Reporter do
 8 hereby certify that I was authorized to and did
 9 transcribe the foregoing proceedings, consisting of
 10 pages numbered 1 through 12, inclusive; and that
 11 said pages contain a true and correct record of the
 12 proceeding to the best of my ability.
 13
 14 Done and dated this 6th day of January, 2021 at
 15 Titusville, Brevard County, Florida.
 16
 17 
 18 -----
 19 MICHAEL J. CIPO,
 20 Court Reporter.
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

"The aforementioned emails are believed to have been sent electronically by both Mr. Locke's cell phone and a computer. His cell phone is indicated to have been used in an email he sent on August 13, 2020, as the signature on the email states, "Sent from my iPhone." I have reason to believe the bulk of the emails sent by Mr. Locke were sent via computer as they did not contain the unique signature, "Sent from my iPhone" on the bottom, and based on my experience with the Apple iPhone, when you send an email from the iPhone, it will have that signature present. It should be noted, Mr. Locke's cell phone is an Apple iPhone." Affidavit for search warrant - digital evidence [2020-00297471](#), 9/2/2020.



← Ex-D.C. firefighter sues Fairfax County over false arrest that sent him to prison

🕒 You forwarded this message on Fri 10/29/2021 9:43 AM

ML Michael Locke
Sun 8/1/2021 7:00 AM
To: tom.jackman@washpost.com

Hello,

My name is Michael Locke and I am a resident of Brevard County, FL. Thank you for your continuing coverage of Jonathan A. Freitag. I'd like to take this time to point out that despite the Brevard County Sheriff's office firing Mr. Freitag and how that might come across, the Brevard County Sheriff's office has a very public history of engaging in similar actions as the ones Mr. Freitag is accused of.

<https://www.clickorlando.com/news/2019/11/19/air-force-contractor-suing-brevard-county-sheriff-for-racial-profiling/>


A jury verdict was reached in this case on May 19th, 202, essentially in favor of the Plaintiff.

<https://www.clickorlando.com/news/local/2020/06/12/huge-embarrassment-embattled-brevard-county-lieutenant-resigns-over-controversial-facebook-post/>

Freitag came here to become a BCSO deputy for a reason. Please don't let that be lost in your coverage.

Michael Locke

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10



 Sending



To: Michelle Kennedy

Cc/Bcc:

Re: Locke v. Locke 05-2020-DR-036701-XXXX-X

Would it be possible to get an update on the most recent public records request? Technically, I'm pretty sure the records qualify as exculpatory evidence.




Michael Locke

From: Michelle Kennedy

<michelle.kennedy@flcourts18.org>

Sent: Sunday, October 24, 2021 5:23 PM

To: Michael Locke <mbl22885@msn.com>



Re: Locke v. Locke 05-2020-DR-036701-XXXX-XX Regarding Formal Grievance in Response to ADA Accommodation Request: 05-2017-DR-054881 Locke v. Locke



Michael Locke



To: Michelle Kennedy

Fri 11/5/2021 1:49 PM

Would it be possible to get an update on the most recent public records request? Technically, I'm pretty sure the records qualify as exculpatory evidence.

Michael Locke

<michelle.kennedy@11courts18.org>

Sent: Sunday, October 24, 2021 5:23 PM

To: Michael Locke <mbl22885@msn.com>

Subject: RE: Locke v. Locke 05-2020-DR-036701-

