

## **Public Prosecutor Comodi**

**MC:** Dr Chiacchiera, you carried out your duties where, when, at what moment of the events?

**MaCh:** I was and am the director of the Organized Crime Section of the Flying Squad and I am the vice-director of the Flying Squad. The Organized Crime Section is a branch of the Flying Squad that deals with ... the term, I think that in this place [i.e. the court] it is enough to say that it deals with organized crime. However, I am also the vice-director of the Flying Squad, for which [reason] I deal with, in the case of need, everything that is necessary [for] the various aspects.

**MC:** Can you tell the Court how you became aware of events, who called you, when you became involved?

**MaCh:** Yes.

**MC:** For now, start to tell us, then maybe I will intervene [NdT: i.e. interrupt with further questions] if necessary.

**MaCh:** On the fateful day, at around 12:33, I had gone to the cemetery with my mother. The operations room called me immediately after the discovery of the body.

**MC:** So the 113? [NdT: 113 is the Italian State Police emergency number]

**MaCh:** 110. The operations room of the Questura called me, and informed me of the happenings in an initially obviously very summarized manner. They said to me that there was a suspicious death, a young woman who lived in via della Pergola. I rushed to the place directly in my mother's car. I didn't stop by at the Questura, I didn't go to get the service [i.e. police] car. I got myself taken to via della Pergola. We took about 15 minutes from the cemetery to there, ten fifteen minutes. In the meantime, I phoned the deputy Commissioner Napoleoni, in the temporary absence of the director, Dr Profazio, who arrived later, who was ... he was enjoying a period of leave, and with deputy Commissioner Napoleoni we arrived almost at the same time. We arrived almost simultaneously at the premises. Forensics, too, arrived almost at the same time at the premises.

**MC:** The Perugia Forensics?

**MaCh:** The Perugia Forensics, I highlight, yes.

**MC:** [They were] alerted by you, or ...?

**MaCh:** Alerted by the operations room, and also alerted by me.

**MC:** So you arrive, and who do you find?

**MaCh:** I found there ... there was already deputy Commissioner Napoleoni, there were also a few of Meredith's co-tenants. There was Amanda Knox, there was Raffaele Sollecito. There were two young men who were, I believe, the friend of the boyfriend of one of the co-tenants. In short, there were a few people who had already been inside the house. There was the Postal Police.

**MC:** In the person of...?

**MaCh:** Battistelli and another of Battistelli's colleagues. Inspector Battistelli, with whom there was immediately a discussion in order to understand what were the reasons for his intervention there, because it is not normal to find the Postal [police] in a crime of this sort. And he explained to me immediately what was the reason for his intervention. The origin of the, shall we say of his intervention, was due to the discovery of a pair of cellphones in a period of time, I believe, of an hour, [or] two, I don't recall clearly, that were one in the name of one of Meredith's co-tenants and one in the name of, later it [sic] ... I mean the SIM [card], obviously, the cellphones' SIMs, the cards, they were in the name of a co-tenant and the other in Meredith's [name]. The co-tenant, however, then told us, we then ascertained that both of the cellphones in fact were used by Meredith. And already that was, how shall we say, a first detail on which we began to reflect because, in fact, that was an element that in some way made us [become] immediately occupied/involved from an investigative point of view.

**MC:** So, excuse me, also if the Court already, shall we say, knows this, because others have reported it, on this point however, where were the cellphones found?

**MaCh:** Inside the garden of a villa that is in via Sperandio.

**MC:** In via Sperandio.

**MaCh:** A villa that ... I am Perugian, [and] honestly, I didn't even know there was a villa there. I'm Perugian, and I swear that I would have sworn [sic] that behind there was a wood.

**MC:** A field.

**MaCh:** It [was] the first time that I went in behind there. Instead, I see a marvelous old mansion with an enormous garden that gives ... that is almost adjacent to the street – the street that leads towards Ponte Rio. Anyone from Perugia understands me maybe.

**MC:** From the structure of the fencing/enclosure, could you tell, shall we say, whether it was possible to throw these cellphones from the street, or whether it was necessary to enter the garden itself?

**MaCh:** Yes, obviously, we checked that. In fact, immediately, in short, the detail that seemed, how shall we say, of great investigative interest was that [very point], besides other details that I will go [into] a bit [sic], so to speak, also to give the impression of what the immediate impact was that we saw in the moment when we found ourselves in a situation of this type. So, deputy Napoleoni immediately entered inside the house in order to check it for herself. I did it [entered] shortly afterwards, also because [as] you will imagine that in that moment whoever was there had to notify all those who [sic], amongst whom Dr Mignini who was the Public Prosecutor on duty, and immediately give orders so that the correct checks are carried out. Because it was not just a crime scene that had to be analysed immediately: there also had to be, how shall we say, correlated with the information that we had got from via Sperandio – because the entry of the Postal [police in the case] originated with via Sperandio. And so we immediately asked ourselves: "Ah, what are these cellphones belonging to poor Meredith doing inside the garden of a villa?" And then immediately after, we asked ourselves, obviously, what might be the profile of the possible, or probable, murderer, and we discussed/talked about the crime scene. The crime scene

immediately seemed fairly strange to us, if you wish [NdT: literally “if we wish” in Italian, but meaning the same as “shall we say”, “if you wish”, “so to speak” etc.]

**MC:** Why?

**MaCh:** Because the door did not show... the entry door to the villa did not show signs of break-in. The we checked ...

**MC:** We are not talking about the villa on via Sperandio obviously?

**MaCh:** For the love of god! It was called a “villa” ... (overlap of voices), let’s say the house, of the house on via della Pergola there was no forcing/break-in. We found a forcing on the window. The window is this one, on the side of the house. I don’t know if you’ve seen the house? Anyhow, it is this one on the side of the house that can be seen immediately when you come down the slope from the gate. Logically reconstructing the thing, a hypothetical prowler [NdT: literally “ill-intentioned person”] who entered the house, breaking the glass with a rock - because inside the room, which was Romanelli’s room, which was the, shall we say, hypothetical arena of the entry, was completely in utter chaos. For that reason, what should we have hypothesized? That the hypothetical prowler took a rock, managed to throw the rock; the shutters, the external ones, the external shutters were not ...

**MC:** The dark-green wooden ones?

**MaCh:** The dark-green wooden ones were half shut, for which reason [he] must have had an aim like “Pecos Bill” [NdT: a cartoon Wild West cowboy], takes aim and throws that rock, smashes the window. After, he climbs up and does a turn on the little slope, and has to clamber up towards the window on the smooth surface, it seems to me, that from the ground up to the window there are two and a half metres-three [metres]. And then would have said: “bah, in short” [sic]. Yeah, well, the thing seemed to us.... in short, the first hypothesis that the investigator normally does, finds a level of unlikelihood of this kind of happening. After which, we looked at the house and we saw that an entry of a potential prowler [ill-intentioned person], still reasoning on the hypothesis...

**MC:** Of theft.

**MaCh:** Of theft ending badly. Of theft that then degenerates because the burglar in some way thinks that he will find no-one in the house and instead finds a person, and then it degenerates ... We saw that there were easier means of entry, without wishing to bore you, but behind the house there was the possibility of climbing in a much easier way, without being seen by people that might have passed in the road. Let’s remember that, in short, it was not very late; quite the contrary. Normally people passed there, for which reason, if [he] had done it, the thing would probably have been seen. That thing there, as an hypothesis, we didn’t immediately discount it, that’s clear, because it’s a good rule to never discount any hypothesis. But we immediately considered that it was not a priority.

**MC:** Dr Chiacchiera, I interrupt you. (The witness is shown an exhibit.)

**MaCh:** Ah! I didn’t remember it as being so big.

**MC:** Precisely! You saw it? This is the rock that ...

**MaCh:** Yes, but it has been some time I have not, how shall we say, yes, I saw it. Absolutely. However, it's big, it's huge.

**MC:** Do you consider that it could be this?

**MaCh:** I believe so.

**MC:** I try ...

**GCM:** How?

**MC:** It is this. Yes, it is this one that was collected, yes, that was found.

**GCM:** So the rock is shown. [NdT: an "aside" for the court records?]

**MaCh:** Inside the room where we then found the rock...

**??:** But what was the question about the rock?

**GCM:** If this was the rock. And the witness said ...

**MaCh:** I said yes. Yes.

**GCM:** You saw it? You saw the rock?

**MaCh:** Yes.

**GCM:** When you saw it, where was it?

**MaCh:** The rock [was] in the room of Romanelli.

**GCM:** How far from the window? Can you say?

**MaCh:** A few centimetres [NdT: "un palmo" = "a hand's width"] from the windowsill, under the window, from the wall where the window is.

**GCM:** So from the internal perimeter wall, from where the window gives onto it, a "hand's breadth". So 20 centimetres...

**MaCh:** Mr President ....

**GCM:** ... away from it approximately.

**MaCh:** Yes.

**GCM:** And this is the rock. You remember it.

**MaCh:** Yes, yes, yes, yes. That is the rock.

**MC:** At least as far as size and colour [are concerned], it corresponds thus to the one that was collected [as evidence].

**MaCh:** At least as far as size and colour [are concerned], it absolutely corresponds. If it was collected, I think that ...

**MC:** Very well. WITNESS [sic? Should be MaCh?] and Romanelli's room was a complete shambles. The clothes were on the floor, the glass was strangely on top of the clothes, the [glass] shards were strangely on top of the ... on the windowsill, let's put it that way.

**MC:** The outside one.

**MaCh:** The outside one, precisely. The one that is between the shutters and the shutters [sic. NdT: "imposte" in Italian, but this can also mean shutters, or flap, as in the inner "scuri" shutters, or he may mean the window-frame itself, with the window-panes, given his following description], the green shutters and the shutters, the broken ones in short, where the glass is. The shutters – the wooden ones. The rock was a bit too close with regard to the wall if I [were to] throw it from least two metres. Unless it was lobbed [i.e. thrown in a high arc]. But in that case it's rather unlikely that it would smash the glass. For that reason, I repeat, in the context of immediate likelihood, this one ...

**MC:** Yes, it's true. These are considerations. However they are considerations, shall we say, that refer [sic], because they are reasoning/lines of thought that are formed in the "immediacy" of the events [NdT: i.e. "in the immediate aftermath". NOTE: throughout the text, a number of speakers use "immediatezza" (lit. "immediacy") to convey a number of meanings, from "in the immediate aftermath", or "in the immediate surroundings", or "very soon after", etc. I will translate them appropriately according to the context, without further explanation of the use of "immediatezza"], in order to proceed in one direction rather than another.

**GB:** I never like to interrupt an examination [of a witness], however if one wanted, between the Public Prosecutor's hypotheses, to do that [sic] of demonstrating that from a ballistic point of view it is not possible, then the ballistic expert should be called.

**MC:** But in fact, his considerations are not the considerations of an expert: they are the considerations of an investigator who made certain deductions in the immediacy of the events.

**MaCh:** It happens to us too, at times, to reason/think rationally ...

**GCM:** These reasonings/deductions, then determined your investigative activity in one direction rather than in an ...?

**MaCh:** Yes, obviously, Mr President. I was trying to ... (overlap of voices) it is a premiss/basis to be able to then, how shall we say, reach – I won't say conclusions – but in order to try to understand what our way of broaching the thing was, there and then. We had, I reassert, reasoned immediately also on via Sperandio. So the first thing, I may say, [was] the unlikelihood, or at any rate it was not the top priority hypothesis, the one of a prowler/ill-intentioned person entering. The open door without signs of break-in. But above all, a young woman who is [sic] probably killed in her own room, nude or almost nude, with a

wound of that type, in a lake of blood, covered with a duvet. I repeat, the door was not smashed/wrecked, there's a broken ... a window broken with a thrown rock, how can I say, it's obvious that we immediately found this situation as ... (overlap of voices).

**MaCh:** ... particular.

**GCM:** You formed these considerations, and what did they lead you to?

**MaCh:** That very probably the author or authors knew the person, or at any rate that the author or authors did not enter ... did not enter from the window-pane of that window.

**GCM:** Excuse me a moment, just to give some guidelines, but of the evaluations that the witness is expressing, obviously it's not that they can be taken account of, however we will acquire them [for the trial files] in order to understand the investigation activities, the appropriateness of the investigations that were carried out, directed in one way or in another, there you go. However, maybe, ... there you go, yes, maybe if we can manage to keep with the bare essentials this will help everybody.

**MC:** Well, in short, they were called ... they are the only ones who can describe the whole progression of the investigations - Dr Profazio and Dr Chiacchiera – because they are directors, they are the only ones who will come to describe for me, thus, what was the progression of the investigations. Clearly, in order to pass from one investigative act to another rather than ... and the choice of the subsequent investigative acts. It's clear that they have to describe, in order to make a complete reasoning, even the lines of thought that, as Dr Chiacchiera said, it sometimes happens that they make. However, one point: apart from the break-in, apart from the broken window, there are ... did you acquire further elements that corroborated the idea that there had been a burglary? Nothing from Romanelli's room had been carried off? Valuable things had been taken?

**MaCh:** This ... in fact, in the progress ...

**MC:** Was a declaration/complaint of theft made then, with a list of the things taken?

**MaCh:** In the logical progression, if I may in some way still, in summary, say what ....

**GCM:** Say the objective facts, if you have ....

**MaCh:** Nothing disappeared, so a burglar would have had difficulty ...

**GCM:** Excuse me, nothing had disappeared? Before all else, what thing .... you knew what things were in that room that did not disappear?

**MaCh:** Yes, because, shall we say, the investigation elements that then subsequently emerged, allowed us to deduce that from Romanelli's room absolutely nothing disappeared. There was a complete mess/chaos, but nothing disappeared from Romanelli's room. And this is another element to [lead us] to obviously deduce that the desired hypothesis of a burglar and of a theft was objectively ... But then the burglar does not [sic] close the door and throw away the key. The burglar does not cover the victim. The burglar ...

**GCM:** Excuse me. They key. What is this detail about the key? What is it?

**MaCh:** There was no key.

**GCM:** There was no key where?

**MaCh:** Those who entered into the inside of the house first found the door closed. A closed door that then aroused the suspicions and that then gave concern and then it was decided to ... to break [it] down.

**GCM:** Excuse me, on [sic] Romanelli's room there was no key?

**MaCh:** No, I'm talking of Meredith's room, Mr President; Meredith's room was locked by key. This is another ... how to say, the investigative deductions that we drew from these details that emerged, also from the declarations that we gathered.

**MC:** Was it normal that Meredith closed herself [sic. i.e. her room] by key?

**MaCh:** No.

**MC:** And did you find the key of Meredith's room?

**MaCh:** No.

**MC:** So it was closed by key, but there was no key inside?

**MaCh:** But there was no key inside, so that it was necessary to break down the door in order to enter. Also the almost inexplicable detail of the presence of two cellphones in a garden of a house, doesn't tend to favour the thesis of someone who enters and who accidentally, so to speak, finds a person and then kills them, because [he] is forced to kill them because they have seen [his] face.

**MC:** But is via Sperandio far from via della Pergola?

**MaCh:** No. And there we tried to deduce. And via Sperandio, as I said earlier, Doctressa, is not far from the house. We discussed [this] to understand why these telephones went and ended up there ...

**GCM:** Excuse me. When you say it is not far from the house, can you specify at what distance? How one reaches it?

**MaCh:** Not far from the house means that, by following a route that any Perugian knows, Mr President, one passes through a park and one arrives, let's say, near the gateway of Porta Sant'Angelo. So for this reason, as the crow flies, how much would it be, but less [sic] ... three hundred, four hundred metres. But to reach it by foot from via della Pergola to via Sperandio I think that it doesn't take more than 5, [or] 7 minutes.

**MC:** But do you have to pass by via Garibaldi?

**MaCh:** Yes. But you can also pass through the park – there's a park that then comes out right in front.

**MC:** Of the villa?

**MaCh:** In front of the villa, at the entry to the villa. Looking from the street that crosses with the provincial [road], the one that, shall we say, borders the villa, whoever is looking at it, I repeat, I – who am 44 years old, am Perugian – I did not know that there was a garden behind there.

**MC:** And how far away is via Sperandio from via Garibaldi, corso Garibaldi?

**MaCh:** It's parallel. It's very close, very very close. It's 200 metres away, as the crow flies. I think even much less, because they are almost parallel, let's say. Even that is something that in some way made us understand that there was an interest in getting rid of those cellphones, clearly, by whoever did that thing there.

**MC:** When you arrived for the first time in via della Pergola, did you enter the room of the crime?

**MaCh:** Immediately, no. I went in afterwards, when Dr Mignini also arrived; and later with Dr Lalli. Then I had, how to say, occasionally entered when the crime-scene inspection of the Forensic Police, of the colleagues arrived from Rome, was already begun, so late. I didn't stop long inside the house, I say the truth, also because the measures/orders that I issued immediately were those, yes, of deducing, [of] drawing out all the investigative elements that might emerge in the immediate surroundings [and/or immediately after the facts] to seek to immediately direct the investigation activity, but also to "freeze" [sic. i.e. to solidify, or to make concrete] another aspect, which was that of hearing/questioning all the people who might tell us details on Meredith's stay in Perugia, in general, but above all on her final hours, on her visits/visitors, everything about those who Meredith had known in some way and ... This was the thing that we considered logical to do precisely in relation to this, to these first investigative deductions that we drew from the [above]-described crime-scene.

**MC:** And so that same day you were present when they began to hear/question...

**MaCh:** Yes.

**MC:** ... the people [who were] acquainted with the facts.

**MaCh:** I was present. I did not participate personally in the examination [of witnesses], but I was present, in the sense that both with [my] colleague Profazio and with [my] other colleague from the central operative service...

**MC:** from Rome.

**MaCh:** from Rome. We began to put the pieces together, excuse my [use of] the expression; that is to say all the ... all the elements that emerged from the examination of witnesses, were checked, were gradually verified/cross-checked. Both with cross-checks that enlarged the group of witnesses, of the people to be heard/questioned, and with the checking of the alibis of many people, [as well as] with a technical activity that was carried out.

**MC:** That is to say?

**MaCh:** A technical activity. A bugging activity was carried out. There was also an activity carried out also for the cross-checking of the phone [activity] printouts. There was an activity to understand also the



cross-checking of the [phone] cells. There was a very wide-range activity carried out. Without excluding, I repeat, all also [sic] ... shall we say, the minor hypotheses. For example, the news arrived of a Maghrebi who had been in a rush to wash his own clothes in a launderette, not too far from the scene of the crime. This piece of information was excluded for a very simple reason, because from the first results of the investigative inquiries, he had arrived there in the early afternoon, but instead, in the early afternoon of the day before her death, Meredith was still alive [sic]. Because from the witness examinations we had determined that the last person who had seen her alive, saw her in the late afternoon. After which, we also did another series of checks relative to the one [sic] that there was a strange telephone call that the people who found the cellphones in the famous villa, the beautiful one on via Sperandio, had received in the evening. However, we had, how to say, understood that it was a case of a boy who had made a call from Terni and of a strange coincidence, but absolutely irrelevant for the investigation activity. Indeed, we made checks on all the hospitals in order to evaluate, to check, whether maybe there were [patients] who had presented blade/cutting wounds that in some way might have been compatible with a wound, let's say, or at any rate with a reaction by the victim. Only one had presented, it was a [person] from Foligno who, [while] cutting salami, had cut their hand during the trip back from an away-game with Foligno – he was a football fan. Nothing else. So no investigative hypothesis was rejected. It was, obviously, because this is how it is done, and thus I believe that it is logic, we began to discuss/think in a certain way, because we had deduced from all this scen, another series of further elements, that is to say that the person ....

**MC:** Speak. Don't be afraid to say it.

**MaCh:** No, no. I'm not afraid.

**MC:** That is, let's say, when was it that the investigations turned to, [started] to focus on today's defendants?

**MaCh:** When on the evening of ... they did not focus on today's defendants, that is to say, progressively the analysis of the investigative elements made us ... made us start, even us, to suspect. Because going into a house, finding a [sic] door of Meredith's room closed, a [sic] door of the apartment opened, faeces in the toilet [bow!], while I take a shower, a series of bloody prints...

**MC:** However the faeces were in which of the two bathrooms?

**MaCh:** Of the bathrooms. Me, if I take a shower in a bathroom where there are faeces, instinctively I flush the toilet, in short.

**MC:** Yes, but the faeces were in the other bathroom.

**MaCh:** Yes, yes, I understood. However, in short, in some way it comes instinctively, no?, to flush the toilet? The fact is that ....

**GCM:** Excuse me, do you know how many bathrooms there were in the house?

**MaCh:** Two.

**GCM:** Two bathrooms. Excuse me, please. Do you know that a shower was taken?

**MaCh:** Yes.

**GCM:** How do you know?

**MaCh:** I know because it is a thing that I cannot, I believe, report because it was ....

**GCM:** But you checked...?

**MaCh:** I am trying to be very very careful.

**GB:** Mr President, we are talking of nothing.

**GCM:** Excuse me, Attorney.

**MaCh:** Well, the main point [is] that very slowly we began to understand that there were strong inconsistencies in the revelations that were made. And there were behaviours that on the part of above all, indeed exclusively, of Sollecito and Knox, appeared to us as [being], at the very least, particular. Behaviours both immediately after the event – a sort of impatience/irritability shown [with regard to] the investigation activity that we were carrying out, and obviously we could not but ask [NdT: i.e. “we had to ask”] those who were close to Meredith [about] elements that we considered useful, even necessary, in order to continue the investigation activity.

**MC:** Excuse me if I interrupt you. I’ll just make a few precise questions, thus: you checked, let’s say, let’s call them alibis, even if it’s a term that’s very so [sic] from American TV films, but in any case [it’s] understandable... Did you check the alibis of the people closest, let’s say, to Meredith?

**MaCh:** Yes.

**MC:** In particular, did you check the alibis of the young men from the [apartment on] the floor below?

**MaCh:** Yes.

**MC:** Results?

**MaCh:** Positive for them, in the sense that they were at home, in their own home, that is to say their respective houses, because they were here for reasons of study, so they were not present in Perugia during the days when ...

**MC:** Because they had left for ...

**MaCh:** Yes, for the All Souls’ Day long-weekend, let’s call it that.

**MC:** Did you check the alibi of Mezzetti and of Romanelli?

**MaCh:** Yes.

**MC:** Results?

**MaCh:** The result in this case also [is that] Mezzetti and Romanelli were not there, so ...

**GCM:** Excuse me, can you say what checks you did?

**MaCh:** We carried out a whole series of checks that brought us to evaluate, establish, that these persons were not present in the premises that evening.

**MC:** Let's say, I imagine that you heard/questioned them.

**MaCh:** Yes.

**MC:** Did they tell you where they were that evening, what they did that evening...?

**MaCh:** And in effect, we assessed/considered that ...

**MC:** And you ascertained that in effect ...

**MaCh:** That it was true what they had told us. I can report on the circumstance.

**MC:** Did you check the alibi of Amanda Knox and of Raffaele Sollecito? Was there a comparison between the declarations of Amanda Knox and of Raffaele Sollecito with regard to the night of the murder, and what you were able to compare, shall we say, objectively, through the other declarations, through the phone records?

**MaCh:** Through the phone records and through the checks [that were], shall we say, objective, it was found that what Sollecito had declared was not truthful because there was a phone call that was never received [i.e. answered] by Sollecito at 23:00 hours. Because it turned out that there was no interaction with the computer, but I believe that this ... as declared [sic]. But above all there was an absolute incongruity of the ....

**GCM:** There now. Excuse me. Maybe we will not ask the question in these terms: following the declarations, on which you cannot report, that you got from and that were given by Amanda Knox and Sollecito Raffaele, what type of investigations you carried out...

**MaCh:** We carried out ...

**GCM:** ... and the outcome of these investigations. There now. This is where we're at.

**MaCh:** Well, in summary ...

**GCM:** Following the declarations given by them, you had ... With regard to Sollecito Raffaele, what did you do and what [information] emerged?

**MaCh:** It emerged that, unlike ...

**GCM:** What did you do, first?

**MaCh:** We did an analysis of the telephone traffic, and from the analysis of the telephone traffic it emerged that Sollecito had absolutely not received/answered the 23:00 hours phone call as he had declared. From the analysis of the telephone traffic, there then emerged a very strange detail, in the sense that the cellphones ...

**GB:** (overlapping voices) ... continue with the opinions/judgements, with all the opinions/judgements.

**GCM:** That which emerged.

**MaCh:** A detail/particular emerged ... unlike what .... (overlapped voices).

**GCM:** Excuse me. What emerged?

**MaCh:** It emerged that normally Sollecito kept his cellphones, and also Amanda Knox, they kept their cellphones on until a late hour, evening, [sic] there is no telephone traffic from 20:40 hours. A thing of this ...

**MC:** But did this emerge from the declarations or did it emerge from the analysis of the [phone] records in the preceding days?

**MaCh:** It emerged from the analysis of the [phone] records in the preceding days.

**GCM:** Excuse me. Let me understand. In other words you say: the cellphone was switched off and there was no telephone traffic, these are two different things.

**MaCh:** I'm saying, Mr President. Two things. The first, normally Sollecito's telephone and the telephone of Amanda, were switched on until the late hours. The fatal evening, they were switched off from 20:42 hours until ... one [of the phones] from 20:42 onwards and the other from about 20:50 onwards. One. Two, the traffic ...

**GCM:** Before going on to "Two", excuse me: "normally" – what does that mean? You had ...

**MaCh:** We had done a comparative analysis of the telephone traffic of that evening with the telephone traffic of the preceding evenings. Shall we say the habits ...

**GCM:** And so the "normally" emerges from this?

**MC:** How many evenings? If you recall, or not?

**MaCh:** Months, no ... honestly, I don't remember how many [evenings], but months.

**MC:** I mean to say, not ...

**MaCh:** Not three days, no. The telephone traffic habits were evaluated. [This is point] one. [Point] Two, the element that emerged, that contradicted the declarations, I can't report on the declarations but I can report on the element that contradicted [sic. i.e. provided the contradiction], that in effect no telephone call had arrived at 23:00 hours, as had been declared: on the phone line that was declared to have received that ... the recipient of that very phone-call. Another element: no interaction with the computer emerged, unlike what was declared. So there were a few objective elements of comparison from the analysis and from the technical checks that contradicted what had previously been revealed.

**MC:** For Amanda Knox, were there incongruities of this type?

**MaCh:** Yes, there were incongruities because Amanda Knox was, how to say, contradicted by Sollecito, and then she contradicted herself, if I may ...

**GB:** President, if we continue in this way, then we might as well do the old [trial] procedure.

**GCM:** Excuse me, please.

**MaCh:** The elements, these are [sic], Mr President, I don't know how to do.

**MC:** But it is so difficult, however.

**MaCh:** Mr President, I really don't know what to do.

**GCM:** Excuse me...

**MaCh:** If I have to describe the investigation activity ...

**MC:** He's not referring to declarations.

**GCM:** Regarding these declarations, you can report on this [sic. i.e. in this instance?], and with regard to Raffaele Sollecito, you reported – citing the telephone traffic and citing the use of the computer. There now, and this is one point. With regard to Amanda Knox, you cannot report the declarations. But you may, however, say – following these declarations – what type of investigations you carried out, and the outcome of these. So, following the declarations given by Amanda Knox, did you do similar investigations, as [those you did] for Sollecito Raffaele on the [phone] records? Or was there nothing to do, except to ...?

**MaCh:** Mr President, all the necessary checks were made, but in that immediate moment the most important element ... that is to say, in [this] place [NdT: i.e. "in this Court"], in this moment, in this place, that is to say, when they were ... I said [that] when the arrests were made, I don't, I don't know how to do, however, the incongruity of the declarations with the facts that we had found, and with the declarations that Sollecito had previously given us, [this] was the most important element. I don't know if I have managed to ...

**GCM:** No, excuse me (overlapping voices). So, with regard to Raffaele Sollecito, we have understood these checking activities were carried out on the declarations made, the verification activities carried out, and [that's all] very well. With regard to Amanda Knox, if you also carried out ... maybe there were no objective elements for possible checking, there were no ... or else, there were activities carried out of ...

**MaCh:** Later, there emerged a series of further elements.

**GCM:** Not evaluations on the congruity, incongruity, likelihood, these are evaluations and will be done, there you go, comparably. I'm thinking of the [phone] records, of the use, if she had given indications on the basis of which [you] could carry out investigative activity ...

**MaCh:** In the moment in which ... That is, the arrests were carried out on the 6<sup>th</sup>, four days afterwards. And the elements that emerged in the immediate aftermath were those which I described. Later other, many others, were collected, later. And they are the evidences of the... let's say of the crime-scene

inspection by the Forensic Police and all that that emerged in relation to the checks carried out later. Should I report [on them]?

**MC:** Yes.

**MaCh:** The line of investigation that we had followed was revealed, in relation with the other and later phases of the investigation, to have a better foundation [in fact]. I am trying to measure the terms, Mr President. Even better foundation on the basis of the checks carried out: A) on a knife that was seized from Raffaele Sollecito's house, in the morning, if I'm not mistaken, of the 6<sup>th</sup>.

**MC:** Do we want to speak of this? So let's speak of facts, let's speak of this.

**MaCh:** Yes, in the morning of the 6<sup>th</sup> we did the search in Corso Garibaldi, if I'm not mistaken, I don't remember the street number, at Raffaele Sollecito's house.

**MC:** Before the arrest was carried out, or after? Do you recall?

**MaCh:** I'll take [a look at] the papers, maybe.

**GCM:** Yes, yes, it is allowed, you may consult your files obviously.

**MaCh:** In [the process of being] carried out, Doctoressa?

**MC:** Yes, in short, at the moment when ...

**MaCh:** Well then. The search in Raffaele Sollecito's house began at 10:00 hours.

**MC:** The execution [of the arrests] is at 13 hours and something.

**MaCh:** The execution, as far as Sollecito is concerned, the arrest is at 13:05 hours.

**MC:** Very well. So you carried out a search in Sollecito's house. Thus, you were the highest in rank?

**MaCh:** Yes. I confirm.

**MC:** Then who was there?

**MaCh:** There was Inspector Finzi. The inspectors Finzi, Passeri, Superintendent Ranauro, Assistant Camarda, Assistant Rossi and Assistant Sisani.

**MC:** Were you looking for something specific, or else...?

**MaCh:** We were seeking to understand if there were elements [that would be] useful for the investigation activity. With our luck, we succeeded, we had ...

**MC:** How did you proceed. Report to the Court how you proceeded.

**MaCh:** The question is ... it is easy to give an answer to the question, Doctoressa, because the searches have a standard procedure. In short, they teach it in Police school [in], I believe, the fourth [or] fifth

lesson, because I believe that they are the act, with the arrest, [that is] the most common, the most important act, the act that the Judicial Police must know how to do, a bit like an injection for a nurse, in short. I don't know how to say. So, we did the search and Sollecito's house is composed of two rooms, if I'm not mistaken, with a bathroom that leads off the room that is used as a bedroom. The room allocated as a bedroom is in some way raised with regard to the room that is used as a living-room/kitchen.

**MC:** There's a little step, like this?

**MaCh:** A pair of steps? I wouldn't swear it. A pair of steps, two/three steps, staggered [i.e. on unequal levels]. We did the search, we acquired/collected various things, amongst which was a kitchen knife. I remember even now that Inspector Finzi came to me and said: "Doc, here there are some knives", but what I hold ... that is to say, that which, in short, as an investigative deduction might appear to be immediately compatible with the wound was that one. I said: "Take it. Seize/sequester it", among the other things that we seized. After which, if I may continue, I was particularly struck by some comic/cartoon books that we found inside the bedroom. I don't recall exactly where, however inside the bedroom. Honestly, those comics/cartoons struck me a lot, because, in short, they are a bit far from an evaluation ...

**GCM:** Yes, you may say that comics/cartoons are [sic] without an evaluation on them. We are at the objective data.

**MaCh:** Very well. They are comics that, shall we say, mix pornography and horror. I had never seen this, so they immediately made a fair impression on me. Then after, I discovered that they are called "Manga". I don't know how widespread they are, however ....

**GCM:** What are they called?

**MaCh:** Manga. Am I wrong? They are Japanese comics, they're strange comics.

**GCM:** How many were there?

**MC:** That's already in the Court's case files, at any rate.

**MaCh:** I don't remember.

**GCM:** Just one?

**MaCh:** No, there were a few, a few. Not a collection, but a few. We seized them because they seemed to us, how to say, strange. Various other things. In short, I don't know which, which [ones] might be interesting for the Court, in short. However, these are the elements that I consider should be reported in this place [i.e. in Court].

**MC:** At what moment of the search did you acquire/seize the knife?

**MaCh:** At an initial moment, because the search took place ... because the kitchen, let's say, it is a wall-kitchen, it is adjacent to the entry, if I'm not mistaken. So that part there of the house was searched first.

Even if normally, when searches are being done, still for reasons of completeness, one tries in some way to split the tasks up/share the tasks between [staff], at least on the whole, there you go.

**MC:** And how was the knife collected [NdT: typo: “refertato” = “reported” instead of “repertato” = “collected”] by Finzi?

**MaCh:** As is normally done: it was taken with the necessary precautions. I recall that we all had, obviously, the equipment/outfit for avoiding contamination, in other words gloves and shoe-covers. It was taken and put inside an envelope, which is more or less the kit of a good investigator. In other words, the pen, the little paper with the form of the files of the Judicial Police, and [some] envelopes. I took it, put it inside the envelope, closed [it], sealed [it] and brought [it] back to the Questura.

**MC:** And in the Questura it was ...?

**MaCh:** Along with all the other things, together with all the other things that were, obviously, seized, were brought to the Questura.

**MC:** Together, however, in that envelope, there was also ...?

**MaCh:** No. In the most absolute manner, no! Inside that envelope there was only the knife.

**MC:** Then, in the Questura, it was delivered to whom? By whom was it taken in delivery, this knife?

**MaCh:** The knife was taken delivery of by the Crimes against Persons Section, in the person of Superintendent Gubbiotti, who inventoried it. He inventoried it, I mean, he sealed it inside a box, as is normally done, a rigid box, because when there are items that might prick, [or] cut, like [a] knife, obviously, one tries to avoid that they might cause damage, besides that obviously one might lose the evidence.

**MC:** Listen, going back [in time], unless you have something else to say about this search ...

**MaCh:** No.

**MC:** It is useless for me to ask you what was then the outcome of the biological analyses on the knife. I was saying, turning back to the day on which the body was found; you arrived and the door had already been broken down?

**MaCh:** I confirm.

**MC:** Was it reported to you by anyone [about] who entered, if anyone entered, who entered before the arrival of the Forensics or of the 118 [the Emergency Services], other than the 118, in that room? If you want, I can make the question more direct.

**GCM:** You, excuse me, at what time do [sic] you arrive at the house in via della ...?

**MaCh:** I arrive [sic] a quarter of an hour after the discov... [sic] I did this reconstruction, the time [sic], it's not very easy to say the precise time. I arrived there a quarter of an hour after having received the phone call from the operations room. The operations room, I believe they didn't call me half an hour after



having received the information, [instead] they immediately notified me. So I arrived there, I think, a quarter of an hour after, twenty minutes after the discovery.

**GCM:** And so at what time?

**MaCh:** It was one-thirty.

**GCM:** When you arrived, did you inform yourself on who had entered Meredith's room?

**MaCh:** In that moment, I did not immediately inform myself on who had entered in Meredith's room. In that moment, I was interested in other things that I considered to be – in that phase, in that moment – much more important.

**GCM:** Ok. However the Public Prosecutor asks you....

**MaCh:** I considered, perhaps in error.

**GCM:** ... asks, do you know who entered the room. So, did you inform yourself on ...?

**MaCh:** No, in that very moment, no. I didn't inform myself on who had entered inside the room. Later, certainly, the deputy Commissioner Napoleoni, to whom I asked: "go inside in order to understand immediately what there is that can be intuited/grasped/understood". Because I have finished, Mr President, in that day, three cellphone batteries because you can imagine that in a moment of this type, it's necessary to make and receive ... there are things to do, and one receives thousands of phone calls. So we tried immediately to "freeze" [i.e. fix/establish] each and every element of evidence, but in the moment when we entered inside a room – not me, but I find inside a situation of that type – that is to say, whoever entered inside the room is not my greatest concern.

**MC:** Perfect. However, I'll ask you the more specific question. Does it appear to you that someone, one of the two Postal Police inspectors, had entered inside the room after the breaking down of the door?

**MaCh:** It seems to me that they had seen the situation, and had made sure of the situation that had not [sic] happened there, but actually entered inside the room, I don't ... I don't know that.

**MC:** Do you know who broke down the door?

**MaCh:** Yes, it was ... the name is not coming to me easily. I would have to check the case files. At any rate...

**MC:** Very well, but the Postal Police?

**MaCh:** No, no. It was one of the young men, if I'm not wrong. It was one of the young men who was, if I'm not mistaken, the friend of the boyfriend of Meredith's co-tenant, or the boyfriend. One of the young men. At any rate, it was not the Postal Police. It was one of the young men. Because, I am sure of this, a discussion arose, there were those who said that Meredith was in the habit of locking herself in by key, some others said: "what are you saying? That Meredith locks her door? Meredith has never locked herself in!". So, in the end, they decided to break down the door. This [sic].

**MC:** Very well. On the contrary, you have already reported that you went at least once into the room of the crime, together with Dr Mignini?

**MaCh:** Yes, I reported this, and it was so.

**MC:** So when ... first; [you] didn't even peep round the door?

**MaCh:** How not? I peeped round the door, I repeat, in the moment when I managed in some way to free myself of all the duties [NdT: typo the Italian has "incombente" = "overhanging/impending" but it should be "incombenze" = "tasks/duties"] that I had to do with the telephone. Then I went in, then I went in. Yes. But not as far as the room [sic]; I went in and I saw the body, the scene, shall we say, precisely the room where Meredith was, together with Dr Mignini, whom I had gone to fetch, for that matter.

**MC:** Do you recall if there was Vaseline present?

**MaCh:** Yes, yes.

**MC:** You recall this?

**MaCh:** Yes, I remember it.

**MC:** What is it? A jar/pot? Do you remember where it was?

**MaCh:** Inside the bathroom, if I'm not mistaken?

**MC:** In the room of the crime, or ...?

**MaCh:** Yes, in the room of the crime, yes.

**GCM:** Or in the bathroom? Where was it?

**MC:** You said [it was] in the bathroom.

**MaCh:** Inside the room of the crime, yes, excuse me, but ... I took a chill [sic].

**GCM:** Can you be more specific, where it was?

**MaCh:** Inside the room.

**GCM:** But where? On the bed, on the bedside table, in a closed drawer?

**MaCh:** It was, it was on the floor.

**GCM:** Where?

**MaCh:** It was on the floor, where it was found ...

**GCM:** On the floor?

**MaCh:** If I'm not mistaken, yes. There was a pot of Vaseline, yes. It was on the floor.

**GCM:** This pot, was it opened? was it closed? Was it new?

**MaCh:** It was an open pot, it was a pot that ... used, I am wrong [sic: “sono vado errato”. I believe this is a typo as it is not correct grammar, and should actually be “se non vado errato” = “if I am not wrong”], yes.

**GCM:** The wrapping/labelling was worn away, there you go, if one may say, in short.

**MaCh:** If there was Vaseline, I remember. But the precise description of the Vaseline I honestly can't give [you].

**MC:** You didn't examine it, I imagine?

**MaCh:** Well obviously not.

**GCM:** Yes, but excuse me. We need to know: the contents had been used or not used? Was it an untouched/full jar or it had never been used?

**MaCh:** Mr President, I remember that there was a pot of Vaseline, but honestly I wasn't there observing if the pot of Vaseline had been used or not, honestly.

**MC:** At that point in time, Amanda Knox and Raffaele Sollecito, where were they when you arrived?

**MaCh:** When I arrived, they were in the little courtyard outside the house, as I remember it, for the little I was able to see of them, they remained there. Up until they were accompanied to the Questura to be examined, to be heard [questioned] for the minutes [i.e. witness statement], they were there.

**MC:** What were they doing? What was their behaviour? Did you note anything that remained particularly impressed [in your mind], or did they have a behaviour ...

**MaCh:** Shall we say, they had a very affectionate behaviour between them. They did not, when I saw them, me, they never separated. They were there, they were hugging, they were there, always together. I repeat, the behaviour that I considered, me, I considered most strange ... at any rate, a behaviour that was different compared to [that of] the other co-tenants, let's put it that way. Whereas the other co-tenants had a behaviour that was obviously the result of bewilderment, they were devastated by what had happened, I did not note – outwardly – that Amanda and Sollecito behaved also ... also they in the same manner. On the contrary, they displayed, as time passed, more and more impatience/intolerance.

**MC:** [Intolerance] for the questions they were asked?

**MaCh:** For the questions, because they were called several times, because obviously we were trying to reconstruct, also through them [i.e. their testimony], and perhaps especially through them, everything that could help us to reconstruct the murder.

**MC:** Listen, from the case files, it appears that ... I believe that it was you, or at any rate a file with your signature, that ordered, correct me if I'm mistaken, at any rate, that ordered the acquisition/seizing of Inspector Battistelli's shoes?

**MaCh:** I confirm.

**MC:** You ordered the acquisition?

**MaCh:** May I?

**GCM:** Certainly. You are authorised to consult the files.

**MC:** Why did you order the acquisition only of Inspector Battistelli's shoes, and not also those of Assistant Marsi who was with him?

**MaCh:** Because it was ...

**MC:** Second question: did you order the acquisition for potential comparisons with what thing ...?

**MaCh:** With an imprint...

**MC:** Wait for me to finish. Only the shoes of Battistelli, or also of others?

**MaCh:** No. Well, I ordered that Battistelli should carry out a check on his shoes to exclude in an absolutely categorical manner the abstract possibility that the shoe print, [which was] fairly clear/sharp, that we found on the floor could have in some way been left accidentally by someone who had entered for reasons of duty. The check that resulted gave a negative outcome because the only one who had gym-shoes was Battistelli – he had a pair of Stan Smith that have underneath a sole with little leaves [sic], I actually had them photographed in order to do the thing very precisely. Then I asked him: “since you're here, do me a favour, *ad abundantiam* [NdT: i.e. in addition/as an extra], also do for me the checks on the people that entered with the 118 [Emergency Service team]”. He did this and both declared that they were wearing work-boots [“scarponeini” in Italian – probably a typo for “scarponcini” = “hiking boots/ankle boots”, such as Doc Martens] with cleated soles, which are those they are equipped with [i.e. part of their uniform], I believe. So we excluded categorically that that imprint could have been one of us, I say clearly.

**MC:** You participated then in the crime-scene inspection of the ... Shall we say, in what other investigation acts did you participate, and apart from your role as Vice-Director and coordinator of the investigations? In which other investigation acts did you personally participate, other than the search of Sollecito's house?

**MaCh:** I personally participated in the search of Lumumba's house.

**MC:** There now. How did you arrive at Lumumba? How does one arrive at Lumumba?

**MaCh:** One arrives at Lumumba through, I'm forced [to say it] the declarations of Amanda, and through a comparison – that is [the comparison] of the text messages that were sent on Amanda's cellphone. Because Amanda worked occasionally/irregularly at the Le Chic pub, which was the pub ...

**MC:** Managed by Lumumba.

**MaCh:** Managed by Lumumba. That evening, the evening before the crime, the evening of the crime, Amanda receives [sic] a message in which Lumumba tells her: “don’t come, we’ll see each other later” [NdT: “ci vediamo più tardi” in Italian]. She answers [sic]: “we’ll see each other later”. Because, I repeat, Amanda told us that Patrick had entered inside Meredith’s room, she had heard screaming...

**GCM:** Yes, obviously you cannot report. However, you can report wherever it is indispensable in order to understand the subsequent investigative activity.

**MC:** I would say it’s indispensable.

**GCM:** Obviously, these declarations are not taken into account. (overlapping voices).

**MC:** ... went to arrest Lumumba, in short.

**MaCh:** In extremely summarized form. Amanda told us.

**GCM:** So on the basis of Amanda Knox’s declarations.

**MaCh:** Not only, but also on the basis of a comparison, which was that of the [text] messages.

**GCM:** And from the messages you arrived ... this is what the Public Prosecutor is asking. Please.

**MaCh:** I believe that better than this ...

**MC:** You continued ... because you did not participate right up until the end of the investigations, [is that not] true?

**MaCh:** No. Let’s say that there was a phase ... shall we say in the immediate aftermath of the event there was a phase, such that the whole Questura was involved, and not just [them], [there was] also the Central Operations Service, the colleagues from the Rome ERT [NdT: Emergency Response Team?]. In short, it’s clear that there was a general/overall involvement. Then after, gradually, as the investigative activity advanced, it’s clear that then the section that naturally deals with crimes against the person, which is the one [section], in short, that Deputy Commissioner Napoleoni is responsible for.

**MC:** Very good. And so you, in the moment when Lumumba was in some way – I always use television terms, but this way it’s understood better – was cleared, you were living [sic] personally still involved in this investigation, or not?

**MaCh:** No, I was already involved in another investigation that, in short, I think that ... I think that it is superfluous to report on in this Court.

**GCM:** At any rate, you were no longer dealing with it?

**MaCh:** I was no longer dealing with this investigation.

**GCM:** Please.

**MC:** Thus you were not present either at the Forensics’ crime-scene investigation of 18 December, or yes?

**MaCh:** Of 18 December, no.

**MC:** At what date can we pinpoint/place your exit from the scene?

**MaCh:** We can situate my exit from the scene shortly thereafter... two days after Patrick Lumumba's arrest. Then there was, how to say, another phase, a couple of days in which there was the identification of Rudy Guede as the owner of the imprint, if I can use this technical term. It's clear that in that moment, we were all once again "reactivated" for the search, a couple of days. And then I once again effaced myself/withdrew, let's put it that way, in the moment when Rudy Guede was arrested.

**MC:** After having participated in the search of Sollecito's house, [on] the 6<sup>th</sup>, did you ever return to via Della Pergola?

**MaCh:** No.

**MC:** For now, Mr President, no further questions.

**GCM:** The civil parties?

### **Civil Party Attorney Pacelli**

**CP:** Just one. Attorney Pacelli, defence [attorney] for Patrick Lumumba. I would like to show you the print of the SMS sent from the cellphone of Amanda Knox to Patrick on the date of 1 November 2007, at 20:32 hours, if you recognize it. It is a communication signed, for that matter, by Dr Profazio, in the footnote.

**MaCh:** Given that I never saw the text message in real life, however...

**CP:** No, I'm asking whether by chance you saw it, since you cited it earlier.

**MaCh:** I cited it for a simple reason...

**CP:** In any case, it [comes to] the same, for that matter, that you had ...

**MaCh:** Everybody knew it.

**CP:** It's [all] the same, for that matter, Mr President, that ...

**MaCh:** but I didn't see it.

**CP:** ... first you pointed out the colleague Della Vedova. You even showed it, even politely, to the counsel of the defendants.

**GCM:** What is it, the text of the SMS?

**CP:** The complete text of the SMS ...

**GCM:** You, at any rate, had never seen it?

**MaCh:** Attorney, I can tell you that very probably it is this one, but not ... that is to say, it is compatible with what was reported to me, but not everyone saw it physically [NdT: i.e. in real life].

**CP:** Very well. I reserve the production with a later witness. Thank you, Mr President. You may show it, maybe.

**MaCh:** ... compatible with the one that we were ...

**CP:** You can show it also to the defences. Thank you. I have no other questions.

**GCM:** The defendants' defence [teams]?

### **Defence Attorney Bongiorno**

**GB:** Attorney Giulia Bongiorno. You pointed out that among the particularly significant elements, especially at the beginning, against Sollecito, there was that analysis of the [phone] records from which emerged, you said, an anomaly, because you had made comparisons, a new fact came out; that is to say this turning on and switching off in an anomalous manner with respect to the preceding [phone] records. Excuse me, but how does one establish, on the basis of [phone] records, when a cellphone is switched on and switched off?

**MaCh:** Is this a technical question, or else ...?

**GB:** No, it is a question that is based on the fact that you defined as anomalous a thing that, as you know, is not revealed by the cellphones, is not revealed by the [phone] records.

**MaCh:** Why not?

**GB:** Because from the [phone] records it does not appear when someone switches on and switches off a cellphone, but, if anything, the incoming and outgoing calls are shown.

**MaCh:** Absolutely, yes. However, from the telephone records, as will be explained by anyone who is more technically knowledgeable than me, but I believe I can state this thing anyway, even if I am not a technician in this subject: that one may absolutely reconstruct the telephone habits of a person. And we saw that that evening, unlike what had not happened [sic], as I stated earlier, Sollecito's cellphone did not show/have the activity it normally had. And furthermore, there is another passage [sic], that the phone call of 23:00 hours, which Sollecito affirmed he had received, was not there.

**GB:** So, try and follow my question. You referred, in the course of the [witness] examination, to an anomaly linked to the switching on and off: we will see this in the transcription, and you said that this was an anomaly. So forget, for now, how many phone calls I receive and how many I don't receive, if the telephone is switched off or on, you said you can tell this from the [phone] records.

**MaCh:** We can tell/deduce this when ...

**GB:** Excuse me. Let me finish the question. And you managed to say that this is an extremely serious, anomalous, element, against Raffaele Sollecito.

**MaCh:** I said only that there was an anomaly.

**GB:** Explain to me, on the basis of the [phone] records, how one establishes whether someone's phone is on or off? Or else whether, on the contrary, you indirectly deduce the switching on and off from the number of phonecalls that arrive and leave. Which is completely different. Because you understand very well that if I have my cellphone on, I might not receive phone calls, but that doesn't mean that it's switched off.

**MaCh:** May I answer? Well then, technically, the switching on and switching off of a cellphone appears from the moment in which is re-downloaded/re-charged [sic] ... when a little text message of re-switching on is re-downloaded at the moment when the person who calls has found the telephone [is] switched off. This is technically possible. Then I said another thing. That Sollecito's habit was found to be different in previous times. And, that is to say, that normally Sollecito received and made phone calls until a more late hour, and vice versa that telephone did not move again until ... from 20:42 ... I don't remember well, Attorney, I don't remember clearly the exact hour. However, I confirm with firmness what I said earlier, and that is that Sollecito's habit was different with respect to that of the evening of crime.

**GB:** Yes. If you could answer me on the ... then we'll go to the preceding [one] and let's see the comparison with the other [phone] records. For now, I'm telling you: if we take the [phone] records of any given subject, and in particular these ones, why do you, on these, will we find written "the cellphone was switched on, was switched off"?

**MaCh:** Attorney...

**GB:** Answer me that.

**MaCh:** No.

**GB:** No. There you go. So we start to say that switching on and switching off ...

**MaCh:** But it's obvious, Attorney. Certainly, yes, yes, it's true.

**GB:** It's true this, what I say?

**MaCh:** Certainly.

**GB:** For now this ...

**MaCh:** From the telephone record one does not/cannot deduce the ...

**GB:** Can you let me finish the questions?

**MaCh:** Go ahead and make your question, but don't make me say things that I never said.



**GCM:** Look. Let's do it this way. You remain still in the same position as earlier that this way ...

**MaCh:** That is to say, which?

**GCM:** Look at the microphone. Turn around, so that in this way the defence's question reaches you more slowly and you are not tempted to start these dialogues that, in short, answers and questions overlap each other and we can't manage to understand.

**GB:** From Raffaele Sollecito's [phone] records, did you deduce, I read, the switching on and the switching off? For now, let's answer this.

**MaCh:** No, I did not deduce the switching on and the switching off, because even an ignorant person [ignoramus] like me in technical subjects knows perfectly ....

**GB:** Mr President, this does not seem to me to be a [seemly] way of answering!

**MaCh:** You know perfectly [well], Attorney, that the switching on and the switching off ... ignorant, I can say that I ignore [NdT: as in "don't know"], how to say, specific aspects that will be described better than me by whoever deals with these technical aspects, with authority, for the State Police. However ...

**GB:** Yes, this now ...

**MaCh:** These technicians, Attorney, write this in a note/annotation, and I did not say that the switching on or switching off of a cellphone can be seen from a telephone record. I said simply that the telephone habits, the habits of whoever telephones with a given SIM [card], can be deduced from a telephone record.

**GB:** Well then ...

**MaCh:** If you have understood, excuse me, that I said this thing ... (overlapping voices).

**GCM:** Dr Chiacchiera, simply answer the questions.

**MaCh:** Very well.

**GCM:** At any rate, I too had noted that there was a certain ambiguity between switching off and phone traffic.

**MaCh:** I will clarify ...

**GCM:** So the question was pertinent because the curiosity about the technical datum has been established that was the subject of the relevant question. However you clarified also on the aspect relating to switching off, the little message that arrives. However that which interests [us] is that from the [phone] records can be seen this lack/gap of telephone traffic and that ... that is to say, there was no telephone traffic on the records examined, also following the declarations – which was what we started from – given by Sollecito Raffaele. At a certain point, you also said: “unlike what had occurred for the previous days, to the extent” – you added – “that there was phone traffic until a certain hour/time”. There

you go, if you can say up to what [that] certain hour was, just to complete your answer. Then, the recommendation ...

**MaCh:** Yes, I will be very brief...

**GCM:** Let's avoid the extra in answers, that serves no purpose even. We are simply at the question [stage].

**MaCh:** May I?

**GCM:** Please. The certain hour. Always look at the microphone, look at the Court.

**MaCh:** It's not instinctive for me, Mr President. I'm sorry, but it doesn't come instinctively to me.

**GCM:** "until a certain hour", to what does this refer?

**MaCh:** The checks on the [phone] records are done by technicians who use computer tools. Then they write and say, our technician, the inspector who dealt with this and has dealt with it for years, wrote this, that is to say that there is a different, a different behaviour of this cellphone, if I may say, with respect to the habit that this cellphone has, of making and receiving phone calls until, normally, a later hour. If I may, in a way, clarify my earlier description in this way, I would be grateful to you.

**GCM:** Until a later hour, what does that mean?

**MaCh:** Until a later hour means that normally [it] happens up to 23:00 hours, up to midnight. That is to say, normally there is a cellphone activity that [on] that evening did not happen.

**GB:** Well, now ... exactly. Seeing as we said switching off and switching on, we have it clear. Let's pass to this anomalous traffic. How many [phone] records were compared, for how many months were these records compared? That is to say, was an analysis of six months, of a year, carried out?

**MaCh:** I don't know how many months. I don't know.

**GB:** How many times previously was it found that there were similar moments of non-existent [i.e. no] traffic? In what months and on what days?

**MaCh:** Attorney, I was saying ...

**GB:** Speak with the President.

**GCM:** Look, the questions are useful, especially in the answers, for everyone. So the defence attorney is asking ... you understood however ...

**MaCh:** Yes, I understood perfectly, Mr President.

**GCM:** [You] simply need to avoid, maybe, that ...

**MaCh:** Well, if I have to say that the police official sets out to read each and every [phone] record...

**GCM:** No, excuse me, you said earlier ...

**MaCh:** I did not read the [phone] records, I inspected/compared what was said to me by a reliable/authoritative colleague who did this analysis, and I am reporting it in this Court. For that reason, I take it as the [Gospel] truth.

**GCM:** Then, maybe, there will be other witnesses who [sic] on this reference, since even you, however, make reference to this [sic], it is in everyone's interest to know the elements which you know.

**MaCh:** Yes.

**GCM:** In particular, earlier you said: "it was anomalous this silence in the telephone traffic compared to other earlier, verified, situations". The Attorney asks, and the question pertains to us, [do] these other different situations go back to several days, a week? Can you quantify it? Or else do you not know?

**MaCh:** No, Dr Comodi also asked me the question earlier. I reported that it concerned a lapse of time that was sufficiently adequate in order to evaluate...

**GCM:** How many days. Because then ...

**MaCh:** Months, Mr President, obviously. But a period of this time, this procedure ...

**GCM:** Just by way of example, from the first to the 2<sup>nd</sup> November, at 20:30, on Sollecito Raffaele's cellphone there was no telephone traffic from 20:30 until around 06:00. The day before, did you check what the telephone traffic was? And the day before that again? There you go, this [is what we want to know]. It is useful only to establish a practice, a habit, to check whether it is a practice, if it is a habit.

**MaCh:** Among the other thousand checks that are done, also this. The check that was done gave this outcome: normally Sollecito's telephone speaks [sic] until late, and receives until late. That evening, it stopped speaking and receiving much earlier compared to the usual. Wait, I don't slip, I'm not slipping. I don't know if previous telephone traffics were done for a year, two years, eight years, I don't know, Mr President. I know, nonetheless, [that] it is a suitable period of time in order to be able to evaluate a person's habits amongst the other thousand things, but also through the use of his cellphone. One must necessarily go back retroactively until a suitable date.

**GB:** Mr President, I believe ... my need is this: I believe that a witness may have done checks or may not have done them. If he did them, we ask questions, if he did not do them, it might as well be the Public Prosecutor who answers even during the questions, no? You spoke specifically of an anomaly, I am asking you [what are] all the specific elements - so that I can check/compare them, I can agree with you, and stop [sic. i.e. "and that's it/all"] - on the basis of which you expressed an opinion of anomaly. That's all.

**MaCh:** The elements are given to me, and there are data from the person who, in that moment, was evaluating the telephone traffic.

**MaCh:** [sic? GB?] Can you show me?

**MaCh:** I told you [it]. What I know is this, and what I know is in the case files. And what I know was, how to say, written with in the necessary manner, in a service note, by ...

**GB:** You're telling me the month of October? Let's talk about the month of October. In the month of October... (overlapping voices).

**GCM:** Please...

**MaCh:** I already told you that I don't know if [in] the month of October he phoned or did not phone.

**GCM:** Let's avoid speaking three at a time ...

(overlapping voices)

**GCM:** Did you do this check?

**GB:** Did you do it or not? If you didn't do it, [then] stop. We'll change ....

**MaCh:** But I'm telling you, Attorney, that I didn't ... but not... but a police official, who together with others tries to make sense of/draw together the threads of a thousand checks that may make ...

**GB:** Why are you raising your voice?

**MaCh:** Excuse me, because it comes to me instinctively.

**GB:** And why does it come instinctively?

**MaCh:** Emphatically reporting that which should be clear, that is to say, the activity of an official ...

**GCM:** Please, this does not help ...

**MaCh:** If it's not clear what a police official does ...

**GCM:** But the question is simple: if you did it yourself, this check. It seems that you did not do it yourself?

**MaCh:** But it's obvious that I did not do it myself, Mr President.

**GB:** Very well.

**MaCh:** Because there's the person who does the checks and there's the person to tries to put them together, and there's the person who tries to deduce from these checks, by connecting them.

**GCM:** This we wanted to know. So [at this point] we're at, Attorney, maybe it will be the subject of subsequent ...

**GB:** Certainly, Mr President. Maybe, if maybe [we] had avoided the judgement/opinion first, there wouldn't have been my questions.

**MaCh:** I didn't make any judgement. I only reported that which was a check carried out by others, Attorney.

**GCM:** Let's avoid that which is not useful for the acquisition of evaluation elements, and that is not useful either for the hearing. We are simply at the questions and at the answers [stage].

**GB:** You said, it can be seen in the transcription, that another anomaly would be given by the fact that, indeed/in fact, Knox took a shower in a bathroom, and in the same moment, you said verbatim – because I wrote it here – you said “to me, this seemed anomalous, because if I see faeces in the toilet, I flush the toilet, and I don't take a shower”.

**MaCh:** Yes, I was wrong: she didn't take the shower there.

**GB:** She didn't take the shower there. You see, therefore, that this is your error. Perfect. At what time/period did you enter in the ... I didn't understand this, if you said “in the house” or “in the room” of the crime, with Dr Mignini.

**MaCh:** In the crime-room I never went inside, that is to say, I did not cross the threshold because I would have run [sic] ... but it was full of blood, [as you can] imagine, I would have run the risk of contaminating. Then, it's a good rule when there's the Forensic police, who are already doing the crime-scene inspection, to avoid in any way disturbing [them/it]. I went in ... you surely, Attorney, will know how the house is made [i.e. laid out]...

**GCM:** Excuse me, speak with everyone.

**MaCh:** Excuse me, you're right. The house has a corridor. At the end of the corridor there's a little bathroom. On the left there's the room ... that is, next to the little bathroom, at the end of the corridor, on the left, there's Meredith's room. Let's say that I kept/held myself in such a way as to observe everything that there was inside the room, but not ... it was also, how to say, very difficult to enter inside because the body was in such a position that entering inside [the room] would have been difficult. Then, furthermore, inside there there was already, in the moment when we arrived with Dr Mignini, the lads from Forensics who had begun to do ...

**GB:** My question was much more simple. That is, we are talking only about the day ...

**MaCh:** I was trying to give a complete answer.

**GB:** We're talking about the day of the 2<sup>nd</sup> [November]?

**MaCh:** We're talking about the immedia [sic] ... of the afternoon following the discovery of the body. That is to say, “following” in the sense [that it was] the afternoon of the discovery of the body. The body was discovered at a certain hour, it must have been two-thirty, three. In short, we arrived with Dr Mignini, and I did not go inside. I kept/held myself in such a way as to observe everything that ...

**GB:** Being in the house, but not in the room, correct?

**MaCh:** Yes.

**GB:** Did you go in all the rooms, or only in some rooms.

**MaCh:** I went into Romanelli's room, where there was the stone. I entered the inside of the corridor, went along the corridor, that I recall. I looked at all the various traces that there were inside the little bathroom. I saw the faeces, so I also went into the other bathroom. I also saw the kitchen, but in a very brief way. I don't remember, at this moment, in this Court, having seen the other rooms. Then, later ... I don't know if I'm going too far [i.e. beyond the scope of the question]? Interrupt me where that's the case.

**GB:** No, I wanted to know what other entries you made.

**MaCh:** There now, exactly. I also went into the house [i.e. flat] below. There a situation had come to be created, no? Also there, we considered that it might be necessary to enter, and then we entered, and I entered also inside that house in order to check and to evaluate whether there were useful elements.

**GB:** Other days after the one on which you entered?

**MaCh:** I certainly entered another time, on the occasion of a crime-scene inspection for the checking of ... if I'm not mistaken, all of the knives; we did that checking.

**GB:** That was the day of 4 November?

**MaCh:** Probably, yes. Then ...

**GB:** No. Let's stop a moment on the 4th November. With whom did you enter on 4 November?

**MaCh:** Ah. There were a few people. I remember that was deputy Napoleoni, if I'm not mistaken there was also Amanda, if I'm not mistaken [sic], there was ... in short, there were a few ... there was Romanelli. I don't remember, honestly.

**GB:** But how many of you were there, on the 4th?

**MaCh:** A few people. I don't know, truthfully.

**GB:** How long were you there?

**MaCh:** We were there the necessary [amount of] time to be able to do that type of check of ...

**GB:** How much is the necessary time to do this check?

**MaCh:** I can't say with certainty how long the time was. Also because our concern, in that moment, was to remove the people who had entered inside the house from the aggression of the press [i.e. take them away from]. Because there were videocameras outside, a bit ...

**GB:** The 6<sup>th</sup>?

**MaCh:** The 4<sup>th</sup>.

**GB:** And what was it you had to do? Take whom away from the press?

**MaCh:** Yes. There were videocameras there outside, so in some way we also took care to do this. We made the people concerned stay there. If I'm not mistaken, there was Amanda, there was Romanelli, there was Dr Mignini, there was deputy Napoleoni, it seems to me there was also Dr Prefazio, imma [sic] ... there was certainly Dr Prefazio. But the thing that I was concer...

**GB:** Very well. I've understood, this thing of the press. Instead, I wanted to know inside the house, do you know what each of these subjects did on that occasion?

**MaCh:** No. That is, I don't ... it is does not appear/come back to me. I was not inside the house for very long.

**GB:** That Romanelli, for example, went inside the bathroom to look for something?

**MaCh:** I don't know.

**GB:** That they were all in one room, you don't know?

**MaCh:** No. I remember that there were some people inside the kitchen. But I didn't go in to do particular checks.

**GB:** There was the Forensics, in the meantime, no?

**MaCh:** Yes. It seems so to me, yes.

**GB:** At the end, did you write up a report/minutes?

**MaCh:** I don't remember.

**GB:** When one enters, one does crime-scene inspections, normally one writes up a report/minutes?

**MaCh:** Sometimes ye, sometimes no.

**GB:** In what circumstance does one not write one?

**MaCh:** One doesn't write a report in the moment there's a crime-scene inspection that has gone on for days, and that continues.

**GB:** What?

**MaCh:** There's a crime-scene inspection that lasts and continues. And then there's the presence of Dr Mignini in this place [Court?]. I don't know if the Judicial police might have written minutes as much as the judicial authority also does. In short, this is a forensic disquisition that I don't know to what extent, in this Court, ...

**GB:** What is the forensic disquisition?

**GCM:** Excuse me. So, the report/minutes: as far as you know they were not... You don't remember?

**MaCh:** ... it should be done, if we want to speak of law, certainly, certainly, certainly [sic] ... I'm telling you the facts.

**GCM:** Yes, please, can we go [on]? There are other questions. Please.

**GB:** Yes. You said that, on the contrary, when the knife was collected in Sollecito's house, a colleague of yours took a knife ...

**MaCh:** No.

**GB:** Please.

**MaCh:** He made a choice on the basis of a logical deduction, and on the basis of his knowledge of the type of wound. For this reason, sometimes, as I said earlier, the deductions have a positive result for the prosecution, other times not. In that occasion, it went that way because there were other knives, but we decided to take that one because it had characteristics ...

**GB:** I ask you this. What were the characteristics?

**MaCh:** The characteristics were those of a fairly big knife, to make a wound of that type, with an edge, not a serrated blade, a knife [that is] fairly, how to say, pointed, that is, it had characteristics that seemed compatible with the crime weapon.

**GB:** So a visual judgement was [made] in that moment, or did you also have elements on the basis of which [you could] express this judgement? Technical experts' [reports], notes?

**MaCh:** No. We had the judgement of compatibility made by an Inspector who has been doing this work for 30 years, for which reason, in short ...

**GB:** Let's turn to the comics that were ...

**MaCh:** That went well, for others, that judgement; [it was a] correct judgement.

**GB:** Look, this is one of the many judgements that you, in this ...

**GCM:** Excuse me, please. They will use the elements ...

**GB:** Yes, Mr President. However it does not seem to me [to be] a testimony of those ...

**GCM:** Every testimony, there you go, are so many pages. When one comes to re-read these pages, only a few are ... there you go, excuse me. Please.

**GB:** Mr President, if we can abstain, in an absolute manner, on the part of everyone from making comments.

**GCM:** Yes, thank you. Yes. This fulfils a widespread requirement.

**GB:** It seems shocking/perturbing to me. "That went well" is a personal judgement/opinion. It should be removed, this.



**GCM:** Ok, ok. Let's avoid comments.

**MaCh:** Pardon me, Mr President. It's instinctive.

**GCM:** At any rate, they will not be useable.

**MaCh:** It's instinctive.

**GCM:** Please.

**GB:** The imprint that was initially attributed to Raffaele Sollecito – of a shoe found in the room of the crime – what investigative outcome did it then have?

**MaCh:** Later, it appeared much more plausible the hypothesis that Raffaele Sollecito was perhaps barefoot in that moment, so ...

**GB:** Yes, I was asking you: that imprint that was found in the area of the room, that was an element for which he ended up in prison – in effect, is it still now an element against Raffaele Sollecito, or did you discover that it belongs to another person?

**MaCh:** I believe that it was discovered that it belonged to another person.

**GB:** Ah! Well then ...

**MaCh:** It was in a moment when, I believe, I had “eclipsed”/effaced myself from the investigations.

**GB:** I understood. Listen, you cited these pornographic comics/cartoons. It was an enormous collection of pornographic cartoons/comics ...

**MaCh:** I said it earlier. No, it was not a collection. There were some pornographic comics/cartoons – enough to capture my attention.

**GB:** In reality, there were a great number of cartoons/comics also of a different nature, that then were listed/catalogued in the context of your report/minutes?

**MaCh:** There were not that many ... there were, there were also other books, other things that obviously we in some way evaluated.

**GB:** In the context of this report/minutes, I find an “infinite” [i.e. very long] description of comics/cartoons, I believe that they were ... this, that I find here, [does it] correspond to the truth?

**MaCh:** I think it's superfluous to say it. Of course it corresponds to the truth!

**GCM:** Let's avoid at any rate any superfluous evaluation. I understand that ...

**MaCh:** ... evaluations that I make, and then it's insinuated that I write a falsehood in the report/minutes!

**GCM:** Let's avoid any ... it's difficult, perhaps, that whoever carried out the investigations [must] then become a witness who has to report only facts and circumstances. This is difficult, especially if ...

**MaCh:** Normally I write the reports/minutes with great attention, Mr President, and I never write falsehoods, obviously, in my reports/minutes.

**GCM:** However an effort must be made that the witness is no longer the investigator who participated with his/her whole soul, maybe, in the investigations: he/she is a witness who reports the facts, excluding all the evaluations that maybe, during the activity of the investigations, were necessary, also in order to carry out further investigative activities. So, all this that is not strictly inherent [to] the objective circumstance that must concern the question that has been asked, we must seek to avoid.

**GB:** Well then, the Trigum (phonetic) comic, is it a pornographic comic?

**MaCh:** I don't know.

**GB:** MP Psycho (phonetic), is it pornographic?

**MaCh:** No, I'll ... I'll forestall you immediately. So, some comics were ... or at any rate a lot of documentary material, many books or comics were then in some way taken ad abundantiam: there is no problem, I can easily say. Some comics, now honestly I have difficulty to pinpoint them, they are comics inside which [there was something] that struck me for a simple reason ... should I stop?

**GB:** No. I've understood. I wanted to ask you, how many in total there were, with regard to the pornographic ones, that's all.

**MaCh:** How many in total there were, with regard to the pornographic ones? [Of] the pornographic ones, there were four, five, if I remember correctly.

**GB:** There were four, of which by chance two were open, and then you opened two?

**MaCh:** I don't recall. It may be.

**GB:** They were closed with cellophane, and you opened them yourself?

**MaCh:** But, it may well be, but it may absolutely be so. It may be that I opened them myself, even if they were closed with cellophane.

**GCM:** The defence [attorney]'s question maybe also was tending towards this. Earlier you said: "a few comics/cartoons caught my attention" because of the characteristics that you highlighted earlier. These few comics, you quantified them as being three or four, it seems to me that I understood. Was it only these comics that caught your attention?

**MaCh:** Yes.

**GB:** And were there others of a different type?

**GCM:** This is it. I think that this was the question you were tending towards.

**MaCh:** It's written in the report/minutes.

## **Defence Attorney Donati**

**DD:** Yes, Mr President. Attorney Donati. I hope that with me you'll be calmer, because I am frightened.

**GCM:** No, he's calm. However, excuse me Dr Chiacchiera, excuse me. We are still at this morning, which has been long, but also the afternoon will not be any less. You [must] still look at the Court, in this way maybe we might avoid an immediacy in answering the question that maybe ... instead, in this way we let pass several seconds after the question and we answer calmly.

**MaCh:** I'll make an effort.

**GCM:** Please, please, Attorney.

**DD:** I would like to turn for a brief moment to what the scene was that you found in the moment when you arrive [sic] in via della Pergola, so the afternoon, at one-thirty, you said to me [sic], it seems, around 13:30.

**MaCh:** Yes, around that time, maybe even a minute after, also.

**DD:** Very good. Listen, in the meantime, a preliminary question. When you arrive [sic], the journalists are already there?

**MaCh:** Good question! For that matter, I asked myself that. Because I arrive [sic] ... no, because I arrive with my mother's car, from above the guard-rail, and I actually asked myself before entering. If I were to answer instinctively, I would say that it's not that I reca[sic]... I recall that at any rate when I went down, immediately I had this impression of all the journalists that were at the guard-rail. However, when I arrived by car I don't remember honestly, because I took a secondary route, that is to say ... I arrived ... I don't even remember whether by the gate or not, however if I have to answer instinctively I would say that they arrived almost immediately, yes.

**DD:** Almost immediately.

**MaCh:** Yes, immediately, certainly.

**DD:** Immediately, so, from one-thirty, let's say, immediately.

**MaCh:** With certainty, they arrived in the moment when I was in the little courtyard. When I arrived in the little courtyard, I raised my eyes, the first image that I remember is that of having seen all the journalists and cameramen with TV cameras, cameras, so yes.

**DD:** Well then, very well. So we have seen this. Listen, when you arrive [sic], just as soon as you arrive, the shutters of Romanelli Filomena's window are open?

**MaCh:** They're ajar/slightly open. This thing struck me also because then/after we made a series of attempts to clamber up.

**DD:** No, well excuse me...

**MaCh:** No, I'm saying it.

**DD:** The question is this, then after ...

**MaCh:** They were .. I don't know how ....

**GCM:** A little bit opened?

**MaCh:** I don't know how to describe better. I don't know how it can be put into words: they were a bit opened. They were maybe at 45 degrees, something like that, let's say...

**GCM:** 45 degrees, so a half door [sic], compared to the 90 degrees of a completely opened door, at 45 degrees [that's] a half.

**MaCh:** 45 each, let's say.

**DD:** Listen, then, I ask you this: you [all] arrive practically first, you touch in some way these shutters before the video signals [sic] arrive ... now I don't know what they're called, video-photo-signal system/detector? Those that then do the little film?

**MaCh:** It doesn't seem to me, honestly, that I touched them, no no, absolutely not.

**DD:** You didn't touch them. So let's say the state of the shutters is that which is seen ... that you saw when you arrived; it is that which is seen in the film, correct?

**MaCh:** Yes.

**GCM:** Excuse me, attorney. Are we talking about the inside shutters [*scuri*] or of the door [sic]?

**MaCh:** The inside shutters.

**GCM:** So, the inside shutters.

**MaCh:** I'm trying to remember with extremely great care, I'm trying to remember with extremely great care [sic]; honestly, it seems to me that actually no, it seems to me not.

**DD:** That you did not touch them, then?

**MaCh:** It seems to me, no. I don't know if maybe ... no, it seems to me that no, no.

**DD:** No. Very well. So they will be these. Listen, earlier, answering the Public Prosecutor, you made an assertion, saying that right then it seemed strange to you that it would be a robbery, that is to say, a robbery is a thing that ... and that window, in particular, is a window that according to you is not easy to, let's put it this way, to quote-unquote climb/scale. Listen, do you recall if down below that window there is another window?

**MaCh:** Actually lined up underneath it/in line with it?

**DD:** Yes.

**MaCh:** Lined up ... I don't remember, it seems not to me, I don't remember.

**DD:** You don't remember. In particular if on this window there's also a grate?

**GCM:** The one underneath?

**DD:** The one underneath.

**GCM:** That would be below. The witness has already said that ... excuse me, Attorney, however the witness tells us that he doesn't remember. There you go. Let's perhaps avoid...

**MaCh:** Honestly, honestly, no.

**GCM:** ... questions that presuppose, obviously, that he remembers it.

**DD:** Can I show a photo?

**GCM:** What photo is it? It concerns the window, no? The representation.

**DD:** There's [a] window, yes. It's a photo that was taken ...

**MC:** Here there's opposition, because it is the same subject/discussion. There's no date, there's no ...

**GCM:** Yes, but it's a representation of the premises. Can we see this photo? Photos shot, there are the 2<sup>nd</sup> November [sic]? The photos were shot on 2 November? There are photos?

**MC:** Yes, of course!

**GCM:** This, at any rate ... if you recall.

**DD:** There are so many photos.

**GCM:** Very well. We can show this photo.

**DD:** Mr President, excuse me. In the case files there's the CD with the photos, it should be there at least, from the index, I ... This is in fact more, Mr President, a photo [that is] neutral, let's say.

**GCM:** If we can show this photo, certainly, this one. We could acquire it [for the files] – that is more difficult, at least at the moment.

**DD:** At any rate, I ask that this be acquired. I ask to acquire it [for the case files].

**GCM:** There now, these are ... well, can you maybe give a description of the photo, of the image that you are looking at?

**MaCh:** It's not in line, however, in fact, recollect ... it's not actually perfectly ...yes, at any rate there's the grate, it's this. The window is this. I didn't remember that it was there. I remembered that we attempted ...

**GCM:** So, below there is a little window, equipped with gratings?

**MaCh:** Absolutely, yes. It's this, yes.

**GCM:** Please, Attorney.

**DD:** If I may show, Mr President. This is a photo that's in the case files, it should already be in the files: one of the photos shot by this video-photo-detector, and it is the photo of the window. I would like to ask, given that Dr Chiacchiera was practically one of the first to enter, so if this was the situation of the window that he saw when he arrived?

**MaCh:** ... remember.

**DD:** Certainly, however, if nobody touched it.

**MaCh:** May I ask this thing: who took the photo?

**GCM:** On this photo, what is the question?

**DD:** If the state of the shutters of Romanelli Filomena's room was that which is reproduced in this photograph. In this photograph, yes. This is [shot] by Forensics, the photograph.

**MaCh:** Yes, it seems compatible with the other. Yes, yes, yes.

**GCM:** You remember it in this way, in short?

**MaCh:** Mr President, it's not so easy to remember, [to] photograph the degree of inclination [i.e. of opening].

**GCM:** As an indication, it might be so?

**MaCh:** Of one, of one of the shutters. I'd say yes, I'd say yes.

**MaCh:** It's not as though [I went] with a goniometer [NdT: a tool to measure angles], Attorney, to measure the degree of inclination of the shutter.

**DD:** Mr President, I request the acquisition of both these photos, this one of the window ...

**GCM:** The other one, however (overlapping voices), however it is representative ...

**MaCh:** Excuse me if I speak in French, but ...

**GCM:** Excuse me, it is representative ...

**CDV:** Mr President, on this one here there's opposition.

**GCM:** Then we'll acquire the other photo. There you go, yes. There are other questions? Attorney, please.

**DD:** Yes, listen, when you arrive [sic], when you arrive in via della Pergola, you go [sic] into the interior of Filomena Romanelli's room?

**MaCh:** When I arrive [sic] in via della Pergola? Immediately, no. I went in afterwards, I don't remember when, but I ... yes, I gave it a quick peep, precisely because I checked all the things that I read [sic. typo? "letto" instead of "detto" = "said"?] earlier, so it's of no use then for me to repeat them.

**DD:** And so you went in. Indeed, earlier, in answering the Public Prosecutor, you asserted that there was a stone, that stone that was shown to you, this stone here, and this stone, according to what you said, seemed too close to the window? This, it seems to me, [is] what you said.

**GCM:** He said it was close to the window; 20 centimetres.

**DD:** No, he, but he expressed an opinion, saying that it was too close with respect to a potential throw from the outside, if I did not understand wrongly.

**MaCh:** May I repeat and clarify, Mr President? Very briefly and succinctly.

**GCM:** On opinions we've already said [sic].

**MaCh:** No. Yes, I said that, I said that, I said that it seemed to me, how to say, anomalous because it was ... the whole situation was anomalous. And also this detail made me incline towards, made us incline towards the anoma... [sic] ... among the other, many other particulars, towards the anomaly of the situation.

**DD:** Listen, do you recall the "oscurante" [NdT: the inner window-shutter] of the window, in particular the part where there was the broken pane, did it also present a breaking of this, of this "oscurante" [shutter]? Do you not recall this?

**MaCh:** No.

**DD:** That is to say, externally.

**MaCh:** No, I don't recall it. No.

**DD:** You say [sic] "among the other elements, this [sic] the stone did not really seem to us [to be] in a position compatible with a throw from the exterior". What were the other elements that, on the basis of which, you said that this burglary/theft must be considered [to be] improbable? Objective elements, obviously.

**MaCh:** Yes, it is an aggregate of objective elements, but then I would have to repeat the evaluations.

**DD:** No, without evaluations. Objective elements.

**GCM:** He has already said. No, he has already reported, Attorney: the [window]panes that were ...

**MaCh:** However, no ... I can say that normally burglars do not close their own victims inside rooms, throw away the key ... this is [an] evaluation. Perfect. So ....

**GCM:** Excuse me, Dr Chiacchiera. There now. But if we may, Attorney, ask questions that have not yet formed ... on this it has already ...

**DD:** So one element was this [one] relating to the [window] panes, if I have not understood wrong.

**MaCh:** No, the element was the one relating to a difficulty because of the whole situation that revealed itself: [the angle of] inclination of the windows, type of breakage of the [window] panes, the position of the rock, the position of all the things that had been ransacked/made topsy-turvy, the position of the shards of glass, some of which were even on top of the things that were on the floor.

**DD:** There now, on this point...

**MaCh:** A series of ... the fact that ... makes me say only this thing, Attorney, pardon me. The fact that nothing had disappeared from that room there.

**GCM:** Yes, you already said.

**DD:** Listen, this element ...

**GCM:** Attorney, let's avoid maybe repetitions of questions that do not help, please.

**DD:** You will excuse me Mr President, but ...

**GCM:** No, no, well ok, if there are any ... OTHER [sic]

**DD:** The witness is not Sollecito's defence.

**DD:** But we are in counter-questioning.

**GCM:** Yes, yes, ok. Attorney, maybe on the glass shards perhaps you wanted to ask something. Please.

**DD:** These glass shards that you say, the glass shards on the clothes. Did you see these shards on top of the clothes? Did you see it yourself, personally?

**MaCh:** I went in and I found the situation that was, yes, that one. This situation appeared, I repeat. There's also another particular.

**GCM:** Excuse me, the glass shards on top of the clothes, you saw them?

**MaCh:** Yes, yes. I confirm [that], yes.

**DD:** Where? In relation to which clothes?

**GCM:** If you remember it, if you can specify.

**MaCh:** Excuse me, Attorney, it is becoming difficult. It is an important particular but it is a particular that I cannot remember, or rather, I remember this thing because of the impression that it made on me, and because of the evaluation that I made about a situation, but if I had to tell you that the glass shards were on top of the blouse rather than on top of the trousers, rather than on top of the lilac or beige sweater, honestly I am absolutely not able to do so.



**DD:** No, but I'm obviously not asking ... I would never have asked you to recall if they were on top of the lilac or beige blouse, that's normal.

**GCM:** Excuse me, Attorney, however there are also the Forensics' photos, so maybe ...

**DD:** In fact, I'm getting there, that is the reasoning, Mr President.

**GCM:** However, he said that they were on top of the clothing, he cannot clarify the nature of this clothing. There you go. We are at this. Please.

**DD:** At any rate, you saw them, yourself?

**GCM:** He saw them. He has already said that he saw them. Please.

**ATTORNEY [sic]:** Listen, but what is the role of the video-photo-detector technicians? Anyhow, in this case, did they take part?

**MaCh:** Yes.

**DD:** And they are, if I am not mistaken, Inspector Cantagalli, Assistant Montani, Assistant Calmieri and Assistant Brocci Gioia, right?

**MaCh:** Yes.

**DD:** There now. These people, that is to say, these video-photo-detector technicians, what were they meant to do? What do they do, what is their role at the scene of a crime?

**MaCh:** A question, this, [which] is the most simple. They must obviously video ... not photo-detect: photo-detecting is something different, Attorney. They have to document the crime-scene inspection that they are doing, and they have to give, let's say, [an] account of that which ... of that which is the crime scene, let's put it that way.

**DD:** So everything that they see, they describe and photograph everything that appears before their eyes, in relation to the crime scene, correct?

**MaCh:** Yes.

**DD:** Listen, [it's] a curiosity of mine. Earlier you were speaking of the search in Raffaele Sollecito's house on 6 November, and of the seizure/confiscation that was made of a few cartoons/comics. Do you recall if inside that apartment there was also a Harry Potter book written in German?

**MaCh:** No.

**DD:** You don't recall it?

**MaCh:** What was this search, Attorney? Can you repeat the question for me?

**GCM:** The one of the cartoons/comics.

**DD:** Search of the 6<sup>th</sup> November, search 6 November [sic], when the knife was seized/collected, in effect. On that occasion you also seized some comics/cartoons, and I ask if in that ...

**MaCh:** It's in the minutes.

**DD:** No, it was not seized because it's not there [in the minutes?] as an [item of] seizure/sequestration. I ask if you recall if there was a Harry Potter book written in German?

**GCM:** Yes, he has already answered, he already said no. Please.

**DD:** He doesn't recall it or he doesn't know?

**MaCh:** No, I don't remember it. I don't recall if it was there, and I don't recall if maybe it was not considered useful. If you are telling me that there was a book ... that if I remember whether there was a Harry Potter book there, no, I don't remember. In the event that it was there, I don't believe I would have considered it useful for the activity, in that moment, in this situation [or "in this Court"], clearly.

**DD:** Earlier, in responding to the Public Prosecutor, you said that so many investigations were carried out, amongst which was heard [sic], in any case there was a check, in relation to a young woman who had seen - in a Laundromat - a person washing clothing, shoes, if I didn't understand wrong. Correct?

**MaCh:** yes.

**DD:** You said, say [sic]: however this is not a check that we considered [it useful] to carry out, going beyond ...

**MaCh:** It's not that we did not consider doing it.

**DD:** ... because there's a problem of ... what was the problem?

**MaCh:** The problem was that ... no problem. It's that in the immediate [moment] we had gathered all the elements that were possibly useful. It's clear that with the passage of the hours, and with the revelation of another series of elements, certain checks or certain things that might seem plausible hypotheses are rejected, but for obvious reasons.

**DD:** Well then maybe I understood wrongly myself, Mr President, because I signalled/indicated/noted, perhaps I'm mistaken to signal/note/indicate, me, that he reported earlier that the investigation was not done then because in reality this young woman seemingly said that she had seen this young man when Meredith was still alive.

**MaCh:** Yes, if I'm not wrong, it was so: it's a distant memory that I have, but it seems to me that it was that.

**DD:** I understood wrong?

**GCM:** No, no, I also, we also had understood. Yes, however, let's avoid questions, maybe, on these circumstances.

**MaCh:** I said this, yes, you said this. [sic]

**GCM:** Yes, however if there are any clarifications to be requested.

**DD:** I have here a service report of Assistant Marini, which indicates precisely that he had immediately notified you, Dr Chiacchiera, which is of 2 November. So on 2 November, and it refers to this young woman who had seemingly seen this person with soiled clothes, who had gone into a laundromat in the afternoon of this day [sic]. So on the 2<sup>nd</sup> November.

**MaCh:** No. Later, yes, later, yes [sic].

**DD:** So what you said earlier, in reality is not ...

**MaCh:** It's not particularly exact, no. What I said earlier was, we had the goal of in some way giving an account of any lead that was revealed to our eyes. This lead, whatever it might be, that was revealed to our eyes in the immediate [aftermath] of the event. This lead here, like many others, I don't know if I should repeat them all, but ... this lead here, we ruled it out, because honestly it could not be considered a plausible hypothesis.

**DD:** Why?

**MaCh:** Because, I have to repeat the evaluations/opinions that I made earlier. The evaluations that I made earlier that then led [us] to understand that in effect the priority lead was the right one, and that was that the person ...

**DD:** Ah. I understand, so ...

**MaCh:** Listen, that the person ...

**DD:** ... you did not do this investigation [i.e. on the person in the laundromat] because in the meantime you had already in effect found the correct lead.

**MaCh:** No, don't say that, Attorney, for the love of God! We had evaluated/considered, looking at the case files, we evaluated a such a series of investigative hypotheses that this thing absolutely cannot be sustained, and that is that it was overlooked ... that the hypothesis of a a fraudulent entry into the house was disregarded – that is not true!

**DD:** I'm not talking about the fraudulent entry.

**MaCh:** It was then subsequently, considered not immediately a priority that type of check, there.

**DD:** Yes, but with respect to the fraudulent entry, I think that this does not come into the equation at all, so I ask what the reason was that at a certain point ...

**MaCh:** Excuse me, but what does it say inside the service report? If I may, maybe I will also find it myself.

**GCM:** Yes, maybe if we put it ... the defence [Attorney]'s question was if ...

**MaCh:** I believe I have answered the question of the defence [Attorney]. If there is something else to ...

**GCM:** We also understood in these terms, that is to say, this investigative hypothesis was set aside/shelved because you had discovered that this washing-machine had been operated when Meredith was still alive and ...

**MaCh:** I rectify [that].

**GCM:** In the note, it seems on the contrary that this thing is different. Did you find it?

**MaCh:** I didn't find it.

**GCM:** Maybe if we make it available [to all]?

**MaCh:** You do [it] first, because I have a ton [NdT: literally "a hundred-weight"] of papers!

**DD:** Service report by Marini Gianluca, of 2.11: "around 21:30 approx., I was in via Sant'Antonio where I was carrying out a filtering service in front of the habitation where the body of the English student was found, and I was approached by a couple of young folk, of whom a young woman in particular declared that her name was Alice Puleo, telephone [number] ... she reported to me that in the early afternoon – so I presume on the day of the 2<sup>nd</sup> [November] – in the early afternoon she had been, together with a friend of hers, in the self-service Laundromat on via Faretti, and while they were busy doing their laundry, they noticed a North-African citizen who very rapidly, and with suspicious behaviour, undressed himself and washed his own clothes, including his shoes; having learned subsequently via the press about the criminal episode, Puleo had come together with her friend to the scene of the event, seeking members of the State Police in order to notify them precisely of the suspect; on site, they found the undersigned, who notified in that moment Dr Chiacchiera of the occurrence and subsequently reported with regard to the above, as by duty bound."

**MaCh:** I repeat, the speech [i.e. declaration] that I made earlier is not exact, obviously she was no longer alive. The fundamental point however is that that lead, there, was not considered – like many others – to be a lead [worth] following, for a very simple reason.

**DD:** Which [reason]?

**MaCh:** That, I repeat, I must then continue to make evaluations. The idea of a person, a North-African, who enters for reasons that are linked to a possible armed robbery or a person who enters and does not know the victim, in relation to what we had assessed/judged/evaluated in the immediate [aftermath], and in relation to those subsequent results that were then ...

**DD:** That person could have been anyone.

**MaCh:** Yes. He could have been anyone, Attorney. However, you must understand how many notifications we then had ...

**GCM:** Dr Chiacchiera, you must only answer the questions.

**MaCh:** It was not considered [necessary] to have to follow-up that lead there, as [for] many others that were in some way not considered suitable.

**GCM:** Regarding this hypothetical lead, other than the evaluations you have presented, did you also carry out checks? Or else not? We carried out this check, we did not believe in the theft, we shelved [it] because ...

**MaCh:** Yes, it is so.

**GCM:** Please, Attorney.

**DD:** You obviously know who and what [sic] was arrested subsequently, unfortunately perhaps too subsequently...

**GCM:** Excuse me, Attorney, the question. The same thing goes for the questions, as goes for the witnesses.

**DD:** ... with respect to Sollecito and Amanda Knox?

**MaCh:** And that is?

**GCM:** What is the question?

**DD:** Do you know, you are aware ... obviously I think so, the question is fairly ... if you know who, [which] other subject, with the exclusion of Lumumba, was arrested for this proceeding, other than the current defendants?

**MaCh:** Yes.

**DD:** Who?

**MaCh:** Who was arrested after Lumumba, Amanda Knox and Raffaele Sollecito?

**DD:** Yes.

**MaCh:** Rudy Guede? Yes.

**DD:** Rudy Guede was a subject who, on the basis of investigations that you then, I think, carried out subsequently, he was a subject who knew Meredith Kercher, who frequented Meredith Kercher's home?

**GCM:** Excuse me, Attorney, let's make questions: did you carry out checks on the potential/possible acquaintances of Rudy Guede? Is this what you want to ask, Attorney?

**DD:** Yes, no, the question, Mr President, is also a bit in relation to what he answered earlier.

**GCM:** Which is what?

**DD:** Saying: I did a number of evaluations according to which it had to be a person who frequented that house. So I ask if he, on the basis of the investigations that were then subsequently carried out, had

verified/confirmed whether Rudy Guede was a subject who frequented that house and who knew Meredith Kercher.

**GCM:** If he frequented that house. Let's go by degrees, Attorney.

**DD:** That house.

**MaCh:** He wasn't like an unknown/extraneous North-African; he was a person who had frequented the house [sic. i.e. apartment] that was underneath, and who had met Amanda in a rather particular occasion. A party, if I don't remember wrongly, that took place some time before the murder, and during which he had had the opportunity to meet the people who were in that environment there, amongst whom [was] Amanda.

**DD:** Very well.

**MaCh:** Then, he frequented the little basketball court that is above via della Pergola, the one that is above in piazza Grimana – just so we understand each other, Attorney: you are also Perugian, so ... and he played basketball with the young men who lived below, and who were also passionate/mad about basketball. For that matter, Meredith – if I'm still not mistaken – had a romantic relationship, which someone of my age would define as a “betrothal” [NdT: “fidanzamento”/”fidanzati” in Italian doesn't necessarily imply betrothal as in a formal engagement, but generally used rather to denote a recognized partnership between boyfriend/girlfriend], it doesn't seem to us [sic], but [at any rate] a romantic relationship with that perso... with a young man who [lived] downstairs. So Rudy Guede, called “the Baron”, was known. And thus I don't believe that one can consider him absolutely extraneous/unknown, as someone who throws a rock from [sic] the window, enters furtively at night, and knifes a person ...

**GCM:** We are only at the answers. Only if Rudy Guede frequented the house. Please.

**DD:** The last question. You said: we did not see a phone call from Raffaele's father to Raffaele. Are you sure of this assertion?

**MaCh:** Must I repeat?

**GCM:** Yes.

**MaCh:** I have faith in the person who does this type of check.

**DD:** Because the person who did the check excluded ...

**MaCh:** And from the check of the telephone traffic that is normally done with the aid of tools that should be considered technically certain, this fact emerges. I repeat, I was not ...

**DD:** That is to say that Raffaele's father, on that evening, did not telephone his son?

**MaCh:** It enabled us to contradict Raffaele's declarations – on which I cannot report.

**GCM:** Excuse me...

**MaCh:** He did not telephone Raffaele on the line that he had declared to have been the receiving one.

**GCM:** But when you are told something, always turn towards us, because this way it is easier for us. I wanted to ask you, regarding this question: can you say if from the [phone] records it can be seen that Raffaele Sollecito's father called the line used by Raffaele Sollecito? This is one thing. Then the second thing is: can you say if it can be seen from the [phone] records whether there was an answer to this call? Because maybe there was a phone that called and did not receive an answer because the other telephone is switched off or is unreachable. And this is one thing. There's the possibility that a call corresponds to an answer, and therefore there's a conversation between the two, there you go, to know this. Because it seems to me that the Attorney is asking now if Raffaele Sollecito's father [sic], if you can say if he made the call. Then we'll see if there was an answer, or not, to this call. In the meantime, if we can establish this, if it appears to you.

**MaCh:** As I said earlier, it appears not. It appears that at 23:00, as we were told by Sollecito, having received the phonecall ...

**GCM:** Please Attorney. Please, continue with the answer.

**MaCh:** The technical check contradicted Sollecito's declarations with regard to the circumstance of having received a phonecall at 23:00 from his father. This is what [appears].

**DD:** Very well. Do you know, the last phonecall that Raffaele Sollecito received on his cellphone, who it was from?

**MaCh:** No.

**DD:** The one at 20:35 it seems to me it is.

**MaCh:** No.

**DD:** You don't remember whether it was the father?

**MaCh:** No.

**DD:** Thank you. No further questions.

### **Defence Attorney Ghirga**

**LG:** Defence [attorney] of Amanda Knox. I will be very brief because Sollecito's defence [team] are ...

**GCM:** Always look at us.

**LG:** Well, so, I turn to the little messages [SMSs] that Lumumba and Amanda exchanged on the evening of the 1<sup>st</sup>. You, with great correctness, say: "I see it now, but I did not see it before", the one that

Amanda sends [sic] to Lumumba. And the one that Lumumba sent to Amanda, did you ever see it? Did you hear about it? What did that message contain? If you know.

**MaCh:** The message ...

**LG:** Did you ever see the little message ...

**MaCh:** No.

**LG:** ... that Lumumba sent to Amanda?

**MaCh:** No.

**LG:** Do you know if it's in the case files?

**MaCh:** Yes, it's in the case files, but I didn't ...

**LG:** Very well. It's not important. On 4 November, I tell you with great serenity, it turns out from the case files that the Rome ERT, the Forensics, was carrying out its evidence-collecting. On 4 November, it turns out from the declarations also of Dr Profazio, that in the house on via della Pergola there was also Dr Mignini, Dr Napoleoni, yourself, Dr Profazio, Mezzetti Laura, Romanelli Filomena, at a subsequent moment [there was] Amanda, accompanied by someone from the Questura. There is no minutes/report from these crime-scene inspections. [Do] You continue to consider [it], rightly or wrongly, normal that none was made ... You, because you said: there's the Public Prosecutor, there's no Public Prosecutor, you don't know .... [Do] you continue, despite the presence of all these people, from your point of view, continue to consider ...

**MaCh:** From my point of view, Attorney, my points of view [about] when it is that they matter and when it is that they don't ....

**GCM:** [This] is not allowed. He has already reported that there was the Public Prosecutor, and so (overlapping voices) ... they will not take account, but they were not specific questions on evaluations.

**LG:** Mr President, I tried to make a question to say if ... I think that he even answered with a great deal of consideration. He has already said his point of view. Enough. Over. Last ... (overlapping voices). Ah, I understand. However, he said that it was regular because there was the Public Prosecutor, and it is not so.

**GCM:** Please, Attorney.

**LG:** Third point of question, and I've finished. Seizing/sequestration of the knife, 6 November, in Raffaele Sollecito's house. You were there, did you see this knife?

**MaCh:** On that occasion?

**LG:** Yes.

**MaCh:** Yes, yes. He showed me the knife.



**LG:** Was it new, was it dull, was it shiny, was it ... what memory do you have of this knife? Because you saw it.

**MaCh:** A memory ... a knife that would normally be used not to cut bread, but to cut cold-meats/salami/cold-cuts [processed meats].

**LG:** I did not ask you that.

**MaCh:** And that is to say, it is a knife of a certain ... (overlapping voices).

**GCM:** Let us allow the witness to answer.

**LG:** But meats/salami and bread, Mr President.

**GCM:** These are the characteristics.

**MaCh:** Yes, because normally ... however, it is so.

**GCM:** Was it new? The Attorney asks, was the knife new, or was it already used?

**MaCh:** No, it was used. It was a used knife.

**LG:** Was it dull or was it shiny? Was the handle black, was it red, was it yellow?

**MaCh:** The knife was dark, the knife ... it's not as if I was there, observing it for 40 minutes, turning it over and over. There was an immediate evaluation: let's take it.

**LG:** I did not ask this. I said: it was in the first drawer in the apartment of ...

**MaCh:** In a drawer.

**LG:** Together with how many other knives?

**MaCh:** Together with how many other knives? I don't know, because I did not do ... I am obliged to answer [you] with the truth, Attorney.

**LG:** You saw it for a moment, you said. You have this memory.

**MaCh:** I saw it because there was Inspector Finzi ...

**LG:** Yes, but I'm asking you now: you saw it for a moment, you said, you didn't linger over it. Is it so?

**MaCh:** No, I didn't linger over it. I had faith in the Inspector.

**LG:** I'm coming to that which you [sic] wanted to say. The judgement/opinion of compatibility ...

**MaCh:** However let me say that which I want to say, Attorney.

**LG:** There's the President, if ever ...

**GCM:** The question, Attorney?

**LG:** I said that you saw this knife, you saw it for a moment, you described it from your point of view. You said that you don't know how many other knives it was together with. And I now ask you the third question.

**GCM:** He said it was not new.

**LG:** The judgement/opinion of compatibility, because you wrote it thus, was it your [judgement], or was it that of Finzi? Whom you said, Finzi [is] in his thirties ...

**MaCh:** The judgement/opinion of compatibility? The judgement of compatibility wa... [sic]

**LG:** If it was yours, or if you borrowed it from Finzi. The question is precise.

**MaCh:** It is both the Inspector Finzi's and mine. Because in the moment when Inspector Finzi was carrying out the search inside the drawers, he came to me and said: "Doc, but this one could in some way ...". I say: "Yes, Armando! Take it." There you go, this was the judgement of compatibility, Attorney, but it seems so obvious to me.

**LG:** But because you had to make ...

**GCM:** Please, Attorney. The other questions...

**MaCh [sic: maybe should be LG?]:** How long was the wound? On 6 November, did you know the dimensions of the wound?

**GCM:** Excuse me. In order to make a judgement/opinion of compatibility, what did you know, you, about the wound?

**MaCh:** About the wound? I knew that which I had seen during the crime-scene ...

**LG:** Ah. There you go! From the door, from the doorway (overlapping voices)

**GCM:** Excuse me, please, let's let ...

**MaCh:** I didn't say that. If I may clarify, I was on the threshold during the subsequent phase of the ERT [Emergency response team], at night, when it was ... I followed [observed] a part of an extremely long phase that then led also to the removal of the body, and I had the opportunity not of carrying out an evaluation direct on the body, but at any rate of evaluating sufficiently what the wound was like in order to be able to say to the inspector that that knife could have been [the one] to kill [Meredith]. But I am neither the coroner nor the expert.

**LG:** For that matter, it's true that ...

**MaCh:** Can I finish the answer? Excuse me, but I believe that in order to carry out the search and the acquisition of one of the thousand elements that we acquired during that particular search, this type of evaluation is enough – this is what my idea was (overlapping voices).

**LG:** We're at the morning of the 6<sup>th</sup>, at 11:30; this is the moment of the search. Do you know when Dr Lalli gave the Public Prosecutor and the First-Instance Judge the first observations on the wound, on the depth, on the other two wounds, on the compatibility and on which knife [sic] the compatibility? When did they give them to you and when, with respect to the 6<sup>th</sup>?

**MaCh:** I don't know. But I ...

**GCM:** Please, Attorney. Dr Chiacchiera, I wanted to ask you this ... (overlapping voices).

**MaCh:** ... necessarily evaluations of this sort.

**LG:** Afterwards it [becomes] an historical fact, a chronological datum.

**GCM:** I wanted to ask you, precisely on this aspect; you said that you remained for a long time, observing. Did you also look at the wound while it/she was washed? What thing, the work...? [sic]

**MaCh:** I looked for a long time.

**GCM:** But the work of whom? Of the coroner?

**MaCh:** No, I watched to work both of the coroner ... but for a period [that was] not very long, but enough to be aware/get a sense of the wound.

**GCM:** So you saw the wound that was present on the young woman.

**MaCh:** Yes. I saw the wound that was present on the young woman, which was generically compatible with fifteen hundred knives, amongst which the one that we seized/sequestered at Sollecito's house.

**GCM:** Stay simply with the question. You saw the wound [when it had been] washed?

**MaCh:** Yes, also.

**LG:** But when [was it] washed?

**MaCh:** But, washed ... that is ...

**LG:** I [sic] saw it washed, when [was it] washed?

**MaCh:** I saw the wound/

**GCM:** But was the wound bloodstained? How was it?

**MaCh:** I saw the wound... so, during the removal of the body, I was there and I saw the wound sufficiently [well] to be able to make this type of evaluation and to be able to hypothesize that that knife was compatible with that wound.

**GCM:** Very well.

**LG:** No, it is not very well.

**GCM:** We're at this [point], Attorney.

**LG:** He saw the wound even at half past midnight on the 2<sup>nd</sup>, when Dr Lalli began the operations of external examination of the body, and that's all? He saw it again there? When did he see this wound?

**MaCh:** But I saw it, ... Attorney ...

**LG:** Excuse me, Mr President (overlapping voices).

**GCM:** It is not a dialogue between you and the defence [Attorney] who from time to time asks questions.

**MaCh:** I beg your pardon again.

**GCM:** And then, don't speak over [others]. It is not a dialogue between you and the various defence [Attorneys]. You are the witness, and you answer the questions. Let them finish the questions, take two seconds and then answer. The Attorney is asking you: this wound, for how long you saw it, what conditions it was in? This is [what] he is asking you.

**MaCh:** I remember, in a phase that was obviously full of events, having entered three times inside the house. I entered when I accompanied Dr Mignini from his house; I entered later and at the end of the day, during ... in a small phase of the ERT crime-scene inspection, when the quilt had already been removed and when they were doing some of the operations/measures on the body. I don't remember the time, because over six days we slept a total of three hours.

**GCM:** So you had a chance/the means ...

**MaCh:** I was able/had the opportunity to see the wound, but I don't remember [whether it was] washed, not washed: this, Mr President, I honestly don't remember. But I saw the body, and I saw the wound.

**GCM:** We're at this [point]. Please Attorney (overlapping voices).

**LG:** No, look; I took note of the answers with great attention. I repeat the question: if you know when Dr Lalli consigned to the Public Prosecutor ...

**GCM:** He has said that he does not know, Attorney.

**LG:** If he ever had news of the definitive conclusions of the expert advice/opinion of the Public Prosecutor of [sic] Dr Lalli.

**GCM:** On what thing/subject?

**LG:** Well, first he doesn't know when Dr Lalli delivered to the Public Prosecutor the first conclusions in preparation for the hearing of 8 November, which was the validation hearing and the hearing in which the precautionary [detention] measure was applied. He said that he doesn't know, at any rate he delivered it on the 7<sup>th</sup>. If he is aware of the conclusions of the definitive report that Dr Lalli submitted, it seems to me in February, to the Public Prosecutor, if he is acquainted with the conclusions.

**MaCh:** Negative.

**LG:** On the wound, on the dimensions, on the ... if he knows these answers.

**MaCh:** No.

**LG:** That is enough.

### **Defence Attorney Dalla Vedova**

**CDV:** I want to understand better some of your declarations today, and then I'll ask a few questions on a few other circumstances. So, turning to the [your] presence in the house, you said "I arrived around one-thirty on the 2<sup>nd</sup>, and later I entered when the Public Prosecutor arrived". You also said that you never entered Meredith's room, but you remained on the threshold, and from there – in order to not contaminate – you saw the scene.

**MaCh:** Given that I could not have contaminated because I had shoe-covers; I didn't enter precisely because it was impossible, let's put it that way, to enter. But I approached/went near, because there were other people. In the phase, for example, of the crime-scene investigation, there were other people inside.

**CDV:** Other people inside the room?

**MaCh:** Who were carrying out the crime-scene inspection, who were ...

**CDV:** So already at one-thirty?

**MaCh:** Yes. In short, the body was removed afterwards.

**CDV:** How many people were there?

**MaCh:** I never went in physically into the inside, the inside of the room, but I approached/drew near enough ...

**GCM:** That was the question. We are simply at the question.

**MaCh:** ... to be able to observe everything inside the room that might have been useful in order to continue the activity.

**CDV:** Your subordinate, Mr [sic] Finzi, who was with you on the day of the ...

**MaCh:** Inspector Finzi.

**CDV:** Inspector, excuse me, who was with you the day of the seizing/sequestering of the knife, Exhibit 36, was he with you on the day of the 2<sup>nd</sup>?

**MaCh:** No.

**CDV:** Do you know if he saw the body?

**MaCh:** No, he did not see it, he did not see the body, him.

**CDV:** So, turning to the choice of the knife from among all the knives that were in Sollecito's house, this once again evaluation of compatibility on the basis of his [your?] experience, in reality he had not even seen the body, neither you nor Finzi?

**GCM:** No, excuse me ...

**MaCh:** Attorney, perhaps ...

**GCM:** It is not a dialogue with the Attorney. They are answers that you give to everybody on the basis of the questions that are posed.

**MaCh:** However, I've already given this, Mr President.

**GCM:** On this, the witness has said that he saw the body. He dwelt on this. However the Attorney asked: that judgement of compatibility that you, in answering previous questions, referred to – as well as to you, also to your colleague, the Attorney asks, your colleague: on the basis of what [did he make that judgement], since he could not have seen the body?

**MaCh:** On the contrary, he should not even have seized/sequestered the knife....

**GCM:** Please, say simply with the questions. So ...

**MaCh:** I saw the body, me. Finzi did not see the body. Finzi comes to me and says: "Doc – he's from Foligno – tha knife could be goo?" [sic: NdT: Finzi "chops" the ends of his words off, and Chiacchiera imitates his speech patterns, which are typical of Foligno]. [Which] translated into Italian is: "this knife might be compatible [don't you think?], you who saw and who knows better than me", given that he did not participate in the initial phase of the investigation activity? Chiacchiera [sic. NdT: he refers to himself by name – he's evidently acting out the scene as it happened] answers: "snatch it, Arma". Translation: "take it, Armandino, because it could be good". Full stop.

**GCM:** Please, Attorney, if there are other questions.

**CDV:** Yes, still on the ...

**GCM:** On the judgement/opinion of compatibility we have already given answers.

**CDV:** In the face of the presence of other knives, did it not enter your mind to say, still with your Perugian accent: "dear Finzi – I don't know how to do it [NdT: i.e. to copy Chiacchiera's mimicking of local accents] – why don't we take also the second, third, fourth knives, which perhaps ... since he had not seen the body, how did he manage to be sure that the blade was, as you said, compatible?

**GCM:** Did you have a doubt also for other knives, or only for that one?

**CDV:** Did [you] not have the least doubt?

**MaCh:** No, because in the evaluation it was considered that this could be a knife [that was] useable for a certain purpose. I didn't see the other knives, Attorney, this is my ... either because there was a serrated blade, or for other reasons, they [i.e. other knives] were not taken.

**GCM:** However you did not see them. Please, Attorney.

**CDV:** Still on the subject of the knives, I ask you: did you see knives in Meredith's house on via della Pergola?

**MaCh:** Knives in Meredith's house?

**CDV:** Yes.

**MaCh:** I presume that there were some, but I did not see them.

**CDV:** And instead, in the downstairs apartment, when you broke in/burst in [sic], did you see knives? In the apartment occupied by the young men.

**MaCh:** Attorney, I don't remember it. Also there, I believe that there were knives. Normally there are [knives] in houses. But not ...

**GCM:** The question is only if you saw them. Please.

**CDV:** You recounted that the knife was collected according to protocols.

**MaCh:** Protocols, according to a ...

**CDV:** Formalities.

**MaCh:** ... a precaution that is normally used.

**CDV:** First in an envelope/bag, then the envelope/bag inside a cardboard box.

**MaCh:** No, the bag/envelope ... this, honestly, I don't have a direct perception, but I believe that the knife was taken from the envelope/bag in order to be put inside the box, I believe.

**CDV:** All this at Sollecito's house?

**MaCh:** No, all this [took place] later.

**CDV:** And where? In your offices, or in the laboratory?

**MaCh:** Inside the offices of the Questura. I did not follow the subsequent phases of the collection/cataloguing [of exhibits].

**CDV:** Do you recall where the box was then placed?

**MaCh:** No.

**CDV:** But was it a box of the type for shirts?

**MaCh:** If [sic] I don't recall, Attorney.

**CDV:** However, you said this morning that on the contrary it was taken from the bag/envelope and then was put inside a cardboard box.

**MaCh:** Yes, I said that it was taken from the bag/envelope and put inside the cardboard box.

**CDV:** And who told you that it was put in the cardboard box, if you did not see it?

**MaCh:** Who told me ... well, afterwards it was something that was said.

**CDV:** Who? If you did not see the cardboard box, but you are sure that it was inside the cardboard box (overlapping voices).

**MaCh:** ... which was spoken of, I mean to say, with colleagues [we] spoke of it later; it was put in a cardboard box.

**GCMS:** So you knew this from colleagues.

**CDV:** And do you know, by chance, which of your colleagues put the knife from the bag/envelope in the cardboard box [sic]?

**MaCh:** It seems to me that this inventorying/cataloguing [of exhibits] activity was carried out by Superintendent Gabbiotti. I said it this morning.

**CDV:** Gabbiotti.

**MaCh:** Yes.

**CDV:** Thank you. Another circumstance that you reported about the checking of the shoe, of the sole of Battistelli's shoe, that was an Adidas Stan Smith. I ask you: on site – and you explained this morning – there was also another Postal [Police] agent, do you know?

**MaCh:** Yes, I'm aware.

**CDV:** Was it, perchance, Mr Marsi Fabio?

**MaCh:** I don't remember. At any rate, yes. I don't remember if it was him. I don't remember the name.

**CDV:** Were there others from the Postal [Police]?

**MaCh:** As far as I'm aware, no.

**CDV:** How on earth is it that you only made a request for a check on the sole with regard to Battistelli...

**MaCh:** Because there was...

**CDV:** Wait. And not even with regard to del Marsi, who at any rate also he, in hypothesis ...



**MaCh:** Yes. It was an “ad abundantiam” [NdT: i.e. extra/surplus to requirements] check because let’s remember that Battistelli had a pair of gym-shoes, and the other one didn’t. And then, seeing as we did not have a direct perception of the footwear used by those from the 118 [emergency service], however we excluded immediately that the other one had gym-shoes. Someone said to me, I don’t recall who: “let’s be careful because Battistelli also had gym-shoes”. For that reason, [it was] precisely “ad abundantiam”, precisely in order to avoid any type of risk we also carried out this check.

**CDV:** How can you say that the other policeman didn’t have gym-shoes?

**MaCh:** Because we remembered on the contrary that Battistelli had gym shoes and the other one didn’t. But we didn’t know, I repeat, the footwear that they had ... in the office, it was done then in the office ... Once it was ascertained that there was this print, we said: “but it couldn’t be, surely not, might it not be maybe one of us who entered?”. [And], no, it wasn’t, in fact.

**CDV:** So the doubt came to you that one of the two, either the policeman, the agent from the Postal Police, or the two from the ... might have left that print.

**MaCh:** In order to exclude with certainty this eventuality, that had already to be excluded, in abstract however, let’s say. And so we ...

**CDV:** It was to dispel this doubt, as you said, “ad abundantiam”. You were almost certain that no-one had entered, but at any rate you asked also ...

**GCM:** Very well. Please, Attorney.

**CDV:** Were you present when Lumumba was arrested?

**MaCh:** Yes, I arrested him myself.

**CDV:** At what time?

**CDV:** The morning ... the arrest was notified to Lumumba ... are you making me drag it up/bring it out, Attorney?

**CDV:** Certainly, if it is a thing ...

**GCM:** We can make it available; it’s a case file/deed that ... Take it. I don’t know if there are other questions on this. It’s better that you keep it.

**CDV:** However he didn’t answer, at what time?

**MaCh:** Excuse me, I was making sure of this. So, this is the notification of the decree of arrest, however obviously this is the notification of the decree of arrest [sic], but all the material activity that is carried out in order to execute the decree of arrest led to a [series of] check[s] that were also rather laborious. If you want, I can ...

**GCM:** Yes, at what time? He is only asking at what time, the Attorney.

**MaCh:** At 12:05 the arrest was notified materially to Lumumba, but in order to find him we had carried out a series of checks because we did not know where he lived. For that reason, in the immediate [moment] of the, quote-unquote, excuse me, “a-technically” [sic], confession of Amanda, and of the attribution of responsibility in the night of the ... what was it? the 6<sup>th</sup>, we went immediately... I had, how to say, headed a service in order to find Lumumba. No, at what hour we arrived actually at Lumumba’s house, I wouldn’t know. However, it was day, it was early morning ... no? However, in short, it was early morning.

**CDV:** And Lumumba, when you found him, how was he? What was he doing?

**MaCh:** Lumumba, when ...

**GCM:** Was he sleeping? Was he up?

**MaCh:** No. There was the wife, there was the child, if I don’t remember wron... [sic]

**CDV:** And how was he dressed?

**MaCh:** He had on overalls/a coverall?

**CDV:** Pyjamas?

**MaCh:** I don’t remember, it seems to me ...

**CDV:** Or a garment, a jacket, a tie?

**MaCh:** I don’t remember; I don’t remember how he was dressed.

**CDV:** And when you arrested him, did you ask him if he had an alibi for the evening?

**MaCh:** We asked him if he had an alibi?1

**CDV:** Yes.

**MaCh:** We took him to the Questura, and we limited ourselves to carrying out that which was necessary to carry out. The query of whether he had or didn’t have an alibi was not made, also because we had simply carried out an order/measure, and so we did not ... there and then, I didn’t do it. I don’t believe it was done either by my men, let’s put it that way.

**CDV:** Yes, but when you spoke with Lumumba, you notified him of the reason for which you were taking him ...

**MaCh:** We notified him, then, when he arrived in the Questura ...

**GCM:** Excuse me, Attorney, it is an order/measure of arrest that they are executing.

**MaCh:** ... a decree of arrest from the Public Prosecutor (overlapping voices) ... apply the arrest [ordered] by the Public Prosecutor...

**CDV:** However, I don't understand one thing, Mr President; every time that I ask a question about the activity of the officials, without that this [question] should necessarily be interpreted as a criticism, we are not at that point ... here we are carrying out an exercise of justice, it seems to me, so I am not making an evaluation/judgement of the person because I don't know anyone and I know even less Dr Chiacchiera. However, it seems to me that a judgement about the reliability of the declarations and also of the procedures should of necessity be made. It seems to me that every time that I manage to analyse an element of fact such as this, what happened when you said to Lumumba "I'm taking you away", on this there is immediately opposition on the part of the Public Prosecutor, and they fly off the handle as if ...

**GCM:** Excuse me, Attorney, obviously it's not appropriate to ... it's not the place. However, in the execution of an order/measure of arrest, this was ...

**CDV:** It would have been enough to say: "yes, we read him the order of arrest". I asked: "did you inform Lumumba of why you were taking him away?", that's all.

**MaCh:** Yes, we informed him.

**CDV:** Is this not a circumstance of fact?

**GCM:** You asked him if he had asked Lumumba whether he had an alibi, in truth, they were executing an order/measure ...

**MaCh:** I don't [sic] do it because an order/measure ...

**CDV:** Mr President (overlapping voices) ... it was also done ...

**CDV:** Either direct or reported.

**GCM:** You said two things, Attorney.

**MaCh:** I entered the interior of the house, and I was made to note that besides all the other things, there was – as a useful element in order to be able to then make a series of investigative deductions – also a jar of Vaseline. However, if I had to relate to you that I remember perfectly where it was, if it was open, if it was closed, if it was ... no. Because, I'll try to explain briefly, in some way or another I was aware of/had knowledge of many things, because they were reported to me by my collaborators. Then I entered, but – as I repeat to you – I emptied three cellphone batteries because I needed to coordinate many things. Have I made it clear?

**CDV:** Yes, very clear on this [point]. Precisely on this latter aspect, I wanted a clarification. You obviously, even now/today, fulfil an important directorial role, so I imagine that those days must have been terrible, not only because of the tragedy, but also for the carrying-out of your functions. I wanted to understand; you spoke of journalists, you spoke of this pressure that you had in [sic] the telephone, answering – I imagine – to the authorities, to your officials, to your subordinates, [in order] to organize the various investigations. It must have been, evidently ... there now; all this, especially with regard to the journalists, how did you manage/organise it? Was it you ... did you take decisions? Did you order, for example, the removal/distancing, for example, on site, when you recounted that in the immediate [aftermath] there was immediately ... Who is it that dealt with this?

**MaCh:** Who is it that dealt with what?

**CDV:** With the management, for example, of the media pressures in the imminence [sic: probably “immediacy”] of the finding, on the 2<sup>nd</sup>? You said that there was already, at one-thirty ...

**MaCh:** Attorney, I tried to manage/organize a great many things, amongst which also this. However, you [must] understand that at times ... and in this occasion there, the journalists are a presence that is, how to say, impossible to ... one must manage/organise/supervise them, it’s clear. I attempted to manage/organise/supervise them, seeking to not be detached from what I was doing, and attempting to keep my concentration in what I was doing; in this way I tried to manage/organise/supervise the situation. If you ask me if I arranged to make them go away, I tried several times. I think that then in the end, in some way, we even managed – but it was not easy. You can imagine that in certain cases it becomes truly difficult, no?

**CDV:** Thank you.

**GCM:** To complete the parties who have requested to examine the witness ...

### **Public Prosecutor Comodi**

**MC:** I just wanted to ask the President to be allowed to show Dr Chiacchiera the folder with the cartoons/comics which we spoke of, because they are already acquired for the case files of the Court, if he recognizes them, if it is these ones that he subjected to sequestration/seizure, and among these, which are the ones that he considered to have a pornographic character or at any rate, content.

**??:** we’re talking of the comics/cartoons?

**MC:** Yes.

**??:** who produced these?

**MC:** They’re in the file/folder, as objects of sequestration.

**MaCh:** This ...

**MC:** Do you recognize them all?

**MaCh:** No: I’m looking one at a time. This one, certainly, yes, this one certainly yes.

**GCM:** These are the comics/cartoons. If we can also substitute this ...

**MaCh:** This one certainly yes.

**GCM:** This demonstrative pronoun, if we substitute it with the indication ...

**MC:** Read the title.

**MaCh:** MPD Psycho (phonetic), “in the labyrinth of the mind”.

**GCM:** And the others?

**MC:** Read also the others that you have already pulled out.

**MaCh:** Blood Last Vampire (phonetic), 2000. This one is, I already said, MPD Psycho.

**GCM:** These ones in box 3 of the attached are acquired. I read in a note: sequestered books, search of 6.11.2007.

**MaCh:** It becomes almost impossible to pronounce ... Urozuki Doji (phonetic). The same for this.

**MC:** In order to understand which ones were not then ... very well, this one is from the same series, it seems to me.

**MaCh:** Urozuki Doji. Also this one ...

**MC:** What is it called?

**GB:** I haven't understood what activity we are doing. That is to say, an evaluation of the comics/cartoons?

**GCM:** If these are the comics/cartoons that were sequestered (overlapping voices).

**MC:** No, which, among these, Dr Chiacchiera considered to have a pornographic content.

**GB:** Excuse me, we cannot ask a question of the witness whether, according to him, it is ... what is it, a consultant, what is pornography, what is horror ...

(overlapping voices) There is opposition.

**MC:** May I answer? Attorney Bongiorno first asked Dr Chiacchiera if he had sequestered only the mangas, that is to say that he considered pornographic, or other comics/cartoons that he did not consider to have pornographic content. So I would like to make this screening/selection.

**CDV:** I oppose this, Mr President, because excuse me, now we are neither censors nor moralists, nor are we carrying out a judgement of what pornography is. The question was asked badly (overlapping voices).

**GCM:** Please. Go ahead, Attorney.

**CDV:** There's no contestation on the fact that we are [sic] these books, because they are in the files, they are sequestered.

**GCM:** First you said: there were comics/cartoons that attracted my attention. Your attention was drawn by these comics/cartoons that you said now?

**MaCh:** Yes.

**GCM:** Over and above the content, etc. This, as an objective datum, we can acquire.

**MaCh:** If I had found Mickey Mouse, I would not have sequestered it.

**??:** can I ask a question?

**GCM:** Attorney, in your time, at the end... when the Public Prosecutor has finished, it will be your turn. Please, Public Prosecutor.

**??:** I wanted to know where they are indicated in the hearing files, these sheets/documents [sic].

**GCM:** They are in box 3. At any rate, they are in the acquired case files. Please, Public Prosecutor.

**MC:** I didn't want to ask any other questions, thank you.

**GCM:** The civil parties who have indicated Dr Chiacchiera as a witness.

#### **Civil Party Attorney Maresca**

**FM:** Telegraphic [i.e. quick] questions for the Dr, when he has finished reading.

**MaCh:** Excuse me, I've finished reading. At any rate, almost all of them, Dr [Comodi].

**GCM:** Please, Attorney.

**FM:** I seems to me you already touched on; I ask you to make an effort to remember, more or less, your [length of] stay in the house during the evening of ...

**MaCh:** You mean during ...

**FM:** The night.

**MaCh:** I was not there that much. Honestly, I wouldn't know how to quantify it precisely, but I believe around a quarter of an hour, something like that, during the phases in which the body was removed, and in which the operations were carried out on the body. Before [that], a couple of times, but very brief, fairly brief, one together with Dr Mignini, and one later.

**FM:** So you came and went with regard to the house, or with regard to the inside of the house? That is to say, did you leave altogether, or did you remain in the area?

**MaCh:** No, I even left altogether, in the sense of going out into the courtyard, and then going back inside the house. I entered for the first time with Dr Mignini, then I went out. The second time, in mid-afternoon, late-afternoon. And the last time, [on] the evening of this ... let's say in the course of this day, if we can call it thus, during that phase when the body was handled/manipulated, if I can use, excuse me, this term.

**FM:** When the body was handled/manipulated, as you said; was it handled/manipulated by the Forensics operators/workers?

**MaCh:** And there was ... yes, also.

**FM:** Also?

**MaCh:** Also.

**FM:** So during the course of the video filming, with the long crime-scene inspection minutes/report, which we will then [i.e. shortly] talk about, with the Forensics operators.

**MaCh:** Yes, in a short lapse of time, yes.

**FM:** Your presence was in parallel, in that lapse of time, with that of the Forensics operators?

**MaCh:** It was settled [i.e. chosen] simply because of a moment of quiet that I had in the telephone communications, in order to seek to also see for myself the situation that there was inside Meredith's room. Because until then, in short ...

**FM:** About the analysis of telephone traffic, and regarding the checks on the [telephone] records, was everything produced/developed by Inspector Latella?

**MaCh:** I confirm.

**FM:** So you, as an official/officer, as you said earlier, acquired them ..... how?

**MaCh:** No, a joke/search/blow, shamefully, so to speak, an activity of connecting [the dots], there you go.

**FM:** That was the perfect description of your work. So you acquired, just like other elements, the result?

**MaCh:** Yes, together with other colleagues, yes absolutely.

**FM:** Was it solely Inspector Latella who dealt with this ...?

**MaCh:** It was primarily Inspector Latella, who is in the Central Operative Service, who dealt with them. But also two other colleagues from the Flying Squad assisted Inspector Latella in this work.

**FM:** Who are they?

**MaCh:** If I'm not wrong, the task was given to Assistant Sisani and Assistant Buratti, however I wouldn't want to say something stupid.

**FM:** [These are] the same subordinates of yours who worked on the telephone- and room-bugging?

**MaCh:** They also did the phone- and room-bugging, which however I didn't follow, let's say that in the material activities I didn't follow them. I, in some ways, participated in seeking to give an input to the evaluation of the results, for a certain period of time.

**FM:** That is to say, to the outcomes of the buggings?

**MaCh:** Yes.

**FM:** Thank you, Mr President.

**GCM:** Amanda Knox's defence [team], if you have any questions? There are no questions.

### **President**

**GCM:** You said that the villa on via Sperandio is rather hidden; can it be seen from the street?

**MaCh:** No. From the street ... it's not easy at all! I lived in a nearby area ...

**GCM:** Somebody who is going along the street, would they notice ...?

**MaCh:** I went along that street many times, but the villa ... one can guess that there's a habitation/house because there's the gate, but one doesn't come near the house, and it can't be seen. Furthermore, the gate seems to me that it is not ... [it's] a gate with an actual sheet of metal, so one cannot see inside. One can guess that there's a house, but that there is a house there, and how large the garden is – it is absolutely impossible to see, at least at the time of the finding [of the phones/body]. There an extremely dense multitude of conifers.

**GCM:** On this gate, is there a name, [or] something? There is? If you know, if it can be seen?

**MaCh:** It seems so to me.

**GCM:** This rock, did you carry out checks to establish where it could have been taken from? In what area, how far from the house? It was found in the house.

**MaCh:** There should have been some I know ... the area, at any rate, is a countr... let's not say a countryside/rural area, but it's an area that has a large adjacent rural area. I presume it was taken from there, in short.

**GCM:** Are there other similar stones in the area?

**MaCh:** Yes, yes. Around about, yes.

**GCM:** Around the house, there are other stones ...?

**MaCh:** Yes, I think that it was taken from precisely there close by.

**GCM:** You said that the key to the door of the room occupied by Meredith was not found?



**MaCh:** It seems to me, not.

**GCM:** Did you find other keys? The keys for the rooms of Romanelli or of Amanda Knox or of Mezzetti Laura?

**MaCh:** The truth is that I don't remember this.

**GCM:** If there are no other questions, the witness is dismissed. We will take a small break of five minutes.