1

3

7

10

11

Q

Q

0

Q

Q

0

12

13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

0

Q

we agreed on a date Saturday night. You said that you became sexually agressive

or made overtures toward him and he calmed down. Did you engage in any kind of sexual activity

A

with him? Well, he said due to the pains in his

Is that what he said?

Yes.

And did you have any kind of sexual relationship

with him while you were in the car? He asked for oral sex but I kind of

refused and he became agressive in another way.

chest he couldn't perform.

What happened after that?

I drove myself to my home in Boston and

Those are the words he used?

Yes, he asked for oral sex. Those weren't the exact words, but --

No, I didn't.

Now, did you ever report this to the police?

Did you ever go out with him again after that?

No.

Now at some point in time, on or about

1		1
2	And the second s	January 1, 1980, did you see Mr. Paradiso again?
3		A Yes, I did.
4	Q	Where was this?
5		A This is in Frankie's Place. It was
6		New Year's Eve, about two in the morning.
7	Ó	Was Mr. Paradiso there?
8		A Yes.
9	Q	Had you seen him during that intervening period
10		of time between the summer of 1972 and 1980?
11		A I saw him chucking quahaugs at the Feast,
12		yes.
13	ú	Down at the North End?
14		A Yes.
15	Q	Did you have any conversation with him then?
16		A No.
17	Q	Now in 1980, New Year's Eve, at this particular
18		bar, Mr. Paradiso was there?
19		A Yes.
20	ó	Who was he there with, if you know?
21		A He was there with people, men and women.
23	Q	Did you know them?
24		A No.
24	Q	And did you have a conversation with him?

.

1		118.
2		know he killed Marie Iannuzzi.
3	Q	You him that
4		THE COURT: What did you say?
5		I didn't get the last part of that answer.
6		THE WITNESS: That I know he
7		killed Marie Iannuzzi.
8	Q	You told him that you knew that he had killed
9		Marie Iannuzzi?
10		A Yes.
11	Q	And who else was there when you said that to
12		him?
13		A No one else heard us. It was just between
14		him and I.
15	Q	Did your friends later arrive there?
16		A Yes, they did.
17	Q	And did you leave with them that night?
18		A Yes.
19	Q	Now one other thing
20		MR. BURKE: Judge, may we
21		approach the side bar at this time?
22	BENCH	CONFERENCE as follows:
23		MR. RAPPAPORT: I'll object in
24		advance.

- Separate Company

4 5

6

1981.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. BURKE: She saw the Webster family on TV, when they were making a

plea for assistance or help in finding their That was in, I think, December of daughter. She subsequently called the --

MR. RAPPAPORT: It was January of '82.

MR. BURKE: January of '82. She called the parents anonymously and told them that she had information pertinent to the Joan Webster investigation. I'm not sure what bearing that has on this particular overall issue, but I wanted to at least put it on the record, that is, if I asked her those questions, that would be in substance what she would testify to.

THE COURT: Well, you're trying to show a pattern of conduct showing a scheme, The fact that she calls some parents, what would that have to do with it, unless you want it in?

MR. RAPPAPORT: No, no, I'm I don't think it's objecting to it, your Honor.

relevant. What we're concerned with is what he may have done to her back in 1971 or '72 that may show a common scheme, a common pattern and/or whatever. I don't think the fact that she may have seen Joan Webster's parents and said 'well, this guy did it to me, he must have done it to her", I don't see that it's relevant.

MR. BURKE: I'm not going to go into that.

THE COURT: Okay.

END OF BENCH CONFERENCE.

THE COURT: May I see you gentlemen for a minute.

BENCH CONFERENCE as follows:

THE COURT: I'm going to
adjourn at quarter of four today. Do you
think you'll be going beyond that in cross?

MR. RAPPAPORT: I don't think
I'll go beyond that.

THE COURT: What do you have, two more witnesses?

MR. RAPPAPORT: Judge, I should say, it's just a little bit of a problem.

this issue.

Apparently, her story, I intend laboring it out first, but she would testify that she never reported this Paradiso thing to the police.

THE COURT: Apparently not.

MR. RAPPAPORT: But that she reported it to some friends in the North End, who then paid him a friendly visit, whatever. I want to know who she spoke to. I want to know who she reported it to.

MR. BURKE: Judge, I would object to that. I don't think that has anything to do with this particular area we're going into.

THE COURT: Maybe she'll be intelligent enough to say "I don't remember".

MR. BURKE: Well, she won't.

I mean, she's honest, but it's not relevant to

MR. RAPPAPORT: Oh, I think it is. If she's made the statement before, it will either buttress what she's saying now or perhaps it will be inconsistent with what she's saying.

MR. BURKE: Well, we're not

.

offering here any testimony that might come from either of these two men. I don't think it has any bearing whatsoever. We're dealing specifically with --

THE COURT: Well, I suppose it's like a fresh complaint in a way.

MR. BURKE: Yes, but if I tried to introduce them as corroborative witnesses, you certainly would say that I was going afield on that part.

MR. RAPPAPORT: On this issue, it depends. If I impeach her in some way and I contradict her testimony, you have a right to show it's not recent contrivance, certainly, by showing that there was a complaint to these people earlier. I'm trying to say at this point that there was a contrivance.

THE COURT: It wouldn't be uncommon to ask a witness, is this the first time you've told anybody this story? Did you tell anybody back in '72?

MR. RAPPAPORT: My question is, what happens if she doesn't divulge the names of

these people she alledgedly said it to? At that point, what I would do is, I would move to strike the testimony of the witness.

MR. BURKE: Well, that's going a little bit far.

MR. RAPPAPORT: I could go further; I could ask the Judge to order it, hold her in contempt if she doesn't. I mean, I'm not going that far; I'm just saying she can't just play half the game.

THE COURT: Well, I suppose
what we could do is -- you want to talk to these
people as part of your investigation?

MR. RAPPAPORT: Judge, my client has indicated to me that this basically didn't happen, and I have to do what the man tells me to do. The man has got me in a position where --

THE COURT: Well --

MR. RAPPAPORT: I mean, what I'm saying at this point is, I mean certainly I could --

THE COURT: If she says she doesn't want to give the names, why don't you

say them? Do you know what the names are?

MR. RAPPAPORT: No, he doesn't know; otherwise, I'd make him tell me.

THE COURT: Well, I think he's entitled to it, really.

MR. BURKE: It's not relevant though, Judge.

THE COURT: It's relevant,

I suppose, as to whether it's a recent contrivance
or not. I mean, here it is 1984 and she's telling
us about something that happened in '72.

MR. RAPPAPORT: Judge, my

position vis-a-vis this, even if my brother

could show something common, I mean I don't

think we've gotten to a nexus anyway, that is,

even in point of time. I don't know that anything

we've heard yet is necessarily relevant to this

particular case. It seems awfully strange to me

that out of the blue, suddenly she comes forward.

MR. BURKE: This is a North End situation where a lot of things are done, street justice is administered without the benefit of --