

PERJURY

Committed by Deputy King during Amick murder trial.

June-July 2011

Sections I-VII

Attn: Missouri Director of Department of Public Safety.

My name is Linda M. Amick. I have information conclusively showing that Mr. Eric R. King, a licensed Missouri Peace Officer and the current Chief Deputy of the Oregon County Missouri Sheriff's Department, has by his actions placed himself in a position in which "cause" exists to discipline/suspend his Missouri Peace Officer's license.

Deputy King's actions fall under RSMO.590.080.1

- 1) The Director shall have cause to discipline any peace officer licensee who;
- 2) Has committed any "criminal offense", whether or not a criminal charge has been filed.
- 3) Has committed any "act" while on active duty, or under color of law, that involves moral turpitude or a reckless disregard for the safety of the public or any person.

Deputy King's actions include the commission of Class A Felonies, during the trial of my son, Michael Edward Amick, for 1st Degree Murder, June 28-29, 2011.

Deputy King committed multiple acts of Felony perjury while testifying under oath during Michael Amick's trial. Deputy King's actions constitute Class A Felonies under RSMO 575.040 (7) (1) (See attached Missouri State Law definition for perjury committed for the purpose of securing a conviction for murder.)

Deputy King's actions also constitute Felony Perjury in the various proceedings leading up to Mr. Amick's trial in which he also gave testimony which was in conflict with, or contradicted by, his later trial testimony. These include Amick's Preliminary Hearing, Pre-Trial Hearing, Deputy King's Deposition, and Deputy King's sworn affidavit and Probable Cause Statement to the court.

Simply put, Deputy King gave different, and sometimes opposite answers to the same questions, when asked under oath at different proceedings....Deputy King KNEW he was committing perjury, (Class A Felony)

At any one of these court proceedings Deputy King could have chosen to change his testimony, and tell the truth. He did not do so. Michael E. Amick was convicted of 2nd Degree Murder and 2nd Degree Arson, due to the criminal acts perpetrated by Deputy King, and given a Life Sentence (30 years) in Missouri Department of Corrections.

I have sent Deputy King's SWORN testimony from the trial in 2011, the Preliminary Hearing in 2009, Pre-Trial Hearing in 2010, and Deputy King's Deposition in 2009, to allow you to see for yourself the PERJURY committed by Deputy King. Deputy King was the lead investigator in Amick's case. I hereby request that you

immediately investigate these Class A Felonies committed by Deputy King. I also request you notify the Missouri Supreme Court, which is in the process of deciding Michael Amick's case, that your office is investigating Deputy King for committing perjury during the trial.

Thank you,

Linda Amick

Deputy King

Perjury I

- 1) Deputy King gave perjured testimony regarding Amick giving him information about the .22 caliber Heritage Arms revolver registered in Amick's name on December 5, 2008.

Deputy King testified that AFTER he told Amick that a gun had been found in his pond on December 5, 2008, Amick "stopped cooperating" with Deputy King and refused to answer his questions. Deputy King claims he did NOT question Amick after this about the .22 Heritage Arms revolver registered to him, and that he did NOT check out any information Amick gave him on December 5, 2008.

Both of these statements are FALSE. Deputy King knew they were when he made them during the 1st Degree Murder trial of Michael Edward Amick, in Alton, Missouri from June-July 2011.

Deputy King made these statements in an attempt to make the jury believe Amick was guilty of murder and arson.

Deputy King wanted the jury to believe, that when he told Amick that a "gun" had been found in his pond,...Amick reacted with an "Angry/Oh My God,...they've found the gun! I've been caught!" – type of reaction. And then that Amick stopped cooperating and answering King's questions. Thus, Amick must be guilty, or he wouldn't have reacted in this manner and "refused to cooperate" with Deputy King.

In fact, Amick did continue to cooperate and answer Deputy King's questions. AFTER Deputy King told Amick that a gun had (allegedly) been found in his pond,...Deputy King then asked Amick if he owned a .22 caliber Heritage Arms revolver. Amick told King he did NOT own the revolver, that he had bought one brand new many months ago, but had sold it only a few weeks after buying it. And that even though it was registered in Amick's name, it had been bought by Zach Reifschneider, and had been in his possession.

Only one other person besides Amick knew this information, Sara M Amick, who is Amick's wife. Mrs. Amick did NOT share the information with anyone, including Deputy King or any other members of Law Enforcement.

Oregon County Sheriff's Department deputies left Amick's home on December 5, 2008 at 5:15 p.m. and went to find Mr. Reifschneider. They did in fact successfully locate him, and he confirmed what Amick had told Deputy King about the .22 revolver registered in Amick's name.

Mr. Reifschneider told them he had bought the .22 revolver from Mr. Amick around June of 2008. *Therefore, it could not be the weapon that killed Mrs. Vaughan on December 2, 2008. Mr. Reifschneider filled out an Oregon County Sheriff's Department report at 6:13 p.m. on December 5, 2008, stating that he bought Amick's .22 revolver.

This PROVES that Amick did have the conversation with Deputy King about Mr. Reifschneider buying the .22 revolver, and that Amick did continue to answer Deputy King's questions and "cooperate." And that Deputy King did "check it out," regarding the .22 revolver sold to Reifschneider.

If Deputy King's testimony were true?,...then how did the Oregon County Sheriff's Department "know" to go and find Mr. Reifschneider, immediately after questioning Amick on December 5, 2008, and ask him about the .22 revolver he bought from Amick? They couldn't have "known."

The simple, logical fact is they would not have known anything about Mr. Reifschneider if Deputy King's testimony had been true. The police statement filled out by Mr. Reifschneider proves Deputy King's testimony was FALSE. Deputy King committed perjury.

Deputy King was the only person who questioned Amick on December 5, 2008 after Amick was in custody. Deputy King was the only person who Amick gave the information to about selling the .22 pistol to Mr. Reifschneider.

* See Amick trial transcript pages 528, 529, 557, Deputy King's Deposition page 35, and Oregon County Sheriff's Department Report filled out by Mr. Reifschneider on December 5, 2008.

Deputy King

Perjury II

- 2) King gave perjured testimony about being unable to find Amick's truck, in order to get a search warrant for it. And King testified that the Amick family had not been forthcoming with the truck's location, etc.

Deputy King testified that "since the crime had occurred" (December 2, 2008) the Oregon County Sheriff's Department had made attempts to find the truck from the Amick family. And that the Amick family has not been forthcoming with the truck's location. (See Page 459 Trial Transcript)

On December 5, 2008, Michael E. Amick was in Arkansas a short distance across the Missouri/Arkansas state line, on land owned by the family, doing farming related activities. Christopher D. Amick (his brother) came and told him that the Oregon County Sheriff's Department was searching his house and farm, and that the "word" was they were going to arrest him (Michael).

Michael Amick then drove his truck, the truck in question, back across the state line into Missouri. He drove back to his home and delivered himself, and his TRUCK, to Deputy King for questioning and inspection/seizure.

Mr. Amick arrived at his home during the execution of the search warrant, held by Deputy King on December 5, 2008, in his truck. (See Trial Transcript Page 553) So the “logical question” would be,...since the crime occurred on December 2, 2008, and Mr. Amick brought the truck to Deputy King on December 5, 2008,...then HOW was Mr. Amick and his family “not forthcoming” with the truck’s location since the crime occurred? (December 2, 2008) The answer is Deputy King’s testimony IS FALSE.

Deputy King had possession of, and complete control over, Mr. Amick’s truck on December 5, 2008. Deputy King had a valid search warrant for the truck, and had the truck right there in front of him at Amick’s home. Deputy King chose NOT to photograph, search, or seize Mr. Amick’s truck.

Furthermore, the facts are after December 5, 2008, Amick's truck sat parked, in the exact same spot that Amick left it in after being arrested on December 5, 2008, for approximately six months. And nobody from any law enforcement agency, including Deputy King and Oregon County Sheriff's Department, made any attempts to return to Amick's home to search, photograph, examine, or seize it. After six months, it was moved approximately 2 miles away to Amick's parent's home, which was still in Oregon County Missouri. It was in an open area at that residence and still could have been easily searched, or seized. It remained there for approximately one year.

It was then taken to Christopher Amick's home in Arkansas where it remained until Amick's trial in 2011. It still remains there to this day. At one point, prior to the trial, Christopher Amick had made some arraignments with Oregon County Sheriff's Department Sheriff Underwood for Underwood to examine/inspect and photograph the truck. Underwood failed to come to Chris Amick's home to do so,...Underwood wanted Chris Amick to bring the truck to him in Missouri.

Defense counsel for Michael Amick had then instructed Chris Amick NOT to take the truck to anyone in Law Enforcement unless compelled to do so by a court order from the trial court. As this is the PROPER "Legal method" for such things to be done by in a 1st Degree Murder case, in the State of Missouri.

Deputy King was the "lead investigator" in the 1st Degree Murder case, and was fully aware that he needed simply to ask the county or state prosecuting attorney to request the trial court to issue an "order" (Under Missouri Supreme Court Rule 25), for Amick's attorney/family to produce the "physical evidence," the truck, for inspection/photographing, etc. Deputy King failed to do so, he chose not to do so. Deputy King knew he could ask for such a "court order" at any time, and that by doing so the court would provide him any "access" to Amick's truck that he needed.

Deputy King was fully aware of all these “facts,” when he testified, that he could not locate Amick’s truck in order to get a search warrant for it.

- 1) He knew he’d already had a search warrant for it, AND had it in his possession/control on December 5, 2008.
- 2) He knew that nobody had been “hiding” it from anyone in Law Enforcement.
- 3) He knew he didn’t even need a “search warrant” for it, because all he had to do was ask for a court order to produce it for inspection.

Deputy King testified falsely, ...committing Felony PERJURY, in an attempt to convince the jury that Mr. Amick and the Amick Family were engaged in an ongoing conspiracy to “hide” the truck from Law enforcement. And that Mr. Amick must therefore be guilty of murder and arson.

* See Trial Transcript pages 459,515,516,553, 555, 556, 559, and 560. And Search Warrant issued for Amick’s home, property, and vehicles on December 5, 2008.

Deputy King

Perjury III

Deputy King gave a perjured testimony, regarding Mr. Amick “not being cooperative” with him during the murder investigation of Leona M. Vaughan, at Mr. Amick’s trial in June-July 2011. Deputy King’s trial testimony also directly contradicts his prior sworn testimony from Pre-Trial and Preliminary Hearings.

Deputy King testified that on December 5, 2008, when he interviewed Mr. Amick (after Mr. Amick was under arrest and in custody), Mr. Amick at some point refused to cooperate , and continue answering Deputy King’s questions. (See Trial Transcript Page 550-551)

However, just prior to this testimony, Deputy King had testified that Mr. Amick was cooperative on December 5, 2008, the day of the search of Amick’s residence and farm. (See Trial Transcript Page 507)

* This “point” is also clearly shown by the section of this document entitled “PERJURY I”, which discusses Mr. Amick’s “cooperation” with Deputy King regarding the .22 caliber revolver sold to Mr. Reifschneider.

In addition to Deputy King’s contradictory trial testimony, regarding Amick being cooperative with Deputy King during the investigation, we also have Deputy King’s sworn testimony from Mr. Amick’s Pre-Trial Hearing (June 22, 2010) and Mr. Amick’s Preliminary Hearing (January 21 , 2009) which Directly Contradicts Deputy King’s trial testimony.

During Amick’s Preliminary Hearing, Deputy King testified that Amick was “always cooperative with him during the investigation” (See Preliminary Hearing Transcript Page 128) and that he “could not recall a time when the defendant refused to talk to him, or answer any of his questions.” (See Preliminary Hearing Transcript Page 137)

During a Pre-Trial Hearing on June 22, 2010, Deputy King acknowledges that Amick was being “fully cooperative” with him during the investigation. (See Pre-Trial Hearing Transcript Page 10)

Deputy King’s deposition on November 12, 2009, also provides us with an “insight” into his inability to tell the truth regarding Amick being cooperative with King during the investigation. Initially Deputy King testified that Amick wasn’t a “cooperating witness.”

However, if you read the following pages of his deposition testimony (See Pages 24-29), you will see that Deputy King's answers to the questions posed to him describe exactly what a "cooperating witness" Amick in fact, was.

Deputy King's trial testimony about Amick's "Not cooperating with him" during the murder investigation of Leona M. Vaughan was a flat-out lie. Deputy King committed this perjury, in an effort to make the jury believe that Amick "refused to cooperate", because he was guilty of murder and arson. Deputy King did this in an effort to secure a 1st Degree Murder conviction against Mr. Amick.

Deputy King

Perjury IV

Deputy King gave perjured testimony regarding himself, and other law enforcement personnel, “looking” in Amick’s truck for a cutting/acetylene torch set on December 5, 2008. Deputy King implied to the jury that he had personally looked at/in the back of Amick’s truck during the execution of the search warrant on December 5, 2008. Deputy King testified that he didn’t find, or see, a torch set in Amick’s truck. (See Trial Transcript Page 553) Deputy King gave this testimony on June 28-29, 2011, approximately 31 months AFTER the execution of the search warrant.

However, on January 21, 2009, approximately 2 months after the execution of the search warrant, Deputy King testified at the Preliminary Hearing that he DID NOT “look” in the back of Amick’s truck for an acetylene/cutting torch on December 5, 2008. (See Preliminary Hearing Transcript Pages 124-125)

At his deposition on November 12, 2009, approximately 11 months after the execution of the search warrant, Deputy King testified that he doesn’t even know if any law enforcement officers actually looked for any cutting/blow torch at Amick’s residence on December 5, 2008. (See Deposition Pages 59-60)

Deputy King states that he only looked in the “carport area” of Amick’s residence for a cutting torch on December 5, 2008. (See Deposition Page 94) Deputy King NEVER states that he personally, physically “looked” in Amick’s truck for a torch on December 5, 2008.

Deputy King purposefully lied to the jury at Amick’s trial about himself looking for the cutting torch in Amick’s truck.

Why did Deputy King choose to do so?

Former Sheriff Tim Ward had “claimed” to have seen a cutting torch in Amick’s truck the very day before the execution of the search warrant.

Deputy King would have appeared to be highly incompetent, and untrustworthy, in front of the jury if he had admitted that he failed to search the very place that Sheriff Ward claimed to have just seen the “cutting torch.”

Also by claiming to have “looked”, and not found, a cutting torch on December 5, 2008, Deputy King was also trying to convince the jury that Amick was guilty.

Example: Sheriff Ward claims he saw the torch in Amick’s truck on December 4, 2008. (So there must have been one there because the Sheriff “says” there was, etc.) Then on December 5, 2008, they claim to find “gun parts” cut up by a “torch”, so they look in Amick’s truck for the “torch” but it’s not there (Amick must have gotten rid of it , and is therefore guilty, etc.)

In fact there’s NO EVIDENCE there ever was a “torch,” period. And nobody, Deputy King especially, ever looked in Amick’s truck for a “torch” on December 5, 2008.

Deputy King

Perjury V

Deputy King gave perjured testimony regarding the size/description of the “pond” the gun parts were alleged to have been “found” in on December 5, 2008.

At trial, Deputy King testified it was a “relatively small-to-midsized” pond. (See Trial Transcript Pages 525-526)

However, Deputy King’s “report”, dated December 5, 2008 at approximately 2100 hours, identifies it as a small pond. (See Trial Transcript Pages 525-526)

Deputy King’s Preliminary Hearing testimony on January 21, 2009, identifies it as a large pond. (See Preliminary Hearing Transcript Page 119)

Deputy King’s Deposition testimony on November 12, 2009, identifies it as being a medium-sized pond. (See Deposition Transcript Page 97)

So basically we have, ...December 5, 2008, small, January 21, 2009, large, November 12, 2009, medium, and finally, June 29, 2011? Back to small! Or rather “small to mid-sized”.

All of this testimony was UNDER OATH!!!

* All given while trying to secure a conviction for 1st Degree MURDER.

It should be painfully obvious to anyone reading Deputy King’s sworn testimony that he, in fact, has no idea what “size” the pond was where he claims the gun parts were alleged to have been found in.

Instead of saying “I don’t know how big or small the pond was,” and looking bad in front of the judges and the jury,... Deputy King chose to lie. And he simply could not keep his lies “straight.”

* It should be noted that Deputy King was also solely responsible for “losing” all the one hundred –plus digital photographs he “claims” to have taken of this pond, and of Law enforcement retrieving the gun parts from it on December 5, 2008. Thus there was no evidence to corroborate (or contradict) Deputy King’s testimony.

Deputy King

Perjury VI

Deputy King gave perjured testimony, as well as a directly contradictory statement, about obtaining a search warrant for Amick's truck.

First, Deputy King testifies that on December 5, 2008 he applied for, and obtained, a search warrant for Amick's home/residence,...and that he also served the same search warrant on December 5, 2008. (See Trial Transcript Page 462, and also copies of search warrant, etc.) * This search warrant authorizes Deputy King to search Amick's vehicles as well. (Amick's truck)

Later Deputy King testifies that he did NOT "get out a search warrant for it", the truck. (See Trial Transcript Pages 555-556)

Deputy King's testimony makes no sense. Deputy King, DID, in fact apply for, obtain, and execute a search warrant for Amick's home, property, and vehicles on December 5, 2008. Mr. Amick's truck was there, under Deputy King's control during the execution of the search warrant.

Deputy King

Perjury VII

Deputy King gave perjured testimony, regarding Law enforcement officers “checking the time” on the cash register at the Myrtle Flash Market, to ensure it had the correct time, or was “accurate” with the actual time it was, etc. He gave this testimony at Amick’s trial in 2011.

Deputy King testified that he “remembered looking at the time shown on the register, and that it was right on the same timeframe as the time showing on his watch.” (See Trial Transcript Pages 456-457)

This is the first and only time that Deputy King has ever testified about ensuring the cash register’s time was “accurate.” He never said any of this during his Deposition, Preliminary Hearing, or Pre-Trial Hearing testimony. Nor is it documented in ANY of his official reports that he made sure the cash register’s “time” was accurate.

Deputy King testified to this, approximately 31 months after the crime, in order to help corroborate the state’s key witness’ story, and thus bolster his testimony.

The “key witness”, Mayberry, claims to have seen Amick’s truck at the crime scene at a specific time. He also claims to have been at the Flash Market (convenience store) at a specific time, and to have purchased certain items while there.

Deputy King, Fire Marshals Brazeal and Johnson, all three went to the Flash Market at the same time to verify Mayberry’s story, etc. They found and photographed a portion of the cash register’s “receipt roll” which showed items Mayberry claims to have purchased. The receipt shows a “specific time” on it. Deputy King claims that by using the “time” shown on the receipt, it can be proved what “time” Mayberry claims to have seen Amick’s truck at the crime scene, etc.

Therefore it was absolutely crucial, to the case against Amick, that somebody (King) testify that they indeed made sure the cash register’s “time” was accurate.

However, this NEVER HAPPENED.

Missouri Fire Marshals Brazeal and Johnson were both with Deputy King when he went to the Myrtle Flash Market to investigate the time Mayberry claimed to have been there, view the cash register receipts and interview their employees.

The investigation was being “ran” on December 2, 2008 and up until approximately 12:00p.m.on December 3, 2008 by the Missouri State Fire Marshals. This would be the timeframe when they investigated the Flash Market “receipt” and cash register.

Fire Marshal Brazeal testified at the Preliminary Hearing (See Preliminary Hearing Transcript Pages 85-86) that he did not check to see how the cash register’s “timing” was with the rest of the world.

He further testifies that “We” (himself, Johnson, and KING) did not check to see if their watches matched the timing of the cash register.

Deputy King knew they didn’t, and he lied about doing so during Amick’s trial in order to get Amick convicted.

It should be “noted” that nowhere in any of Deputy King’s reports does it state that he did, in fact, make sure that the cash register’s “time” was actually accurate. Nor does any of his “reports”, state that anyone from Law enforcement made sure the cash register’s time was accurate.