

# THE COST *of* TRUTH

*by Kat Rowoldt*



In the midst of football games, upcoming elections, United Nations diplomacy, and life in general, behind a set of double doors on the 7<sup>th</sup> floor of the Dallas County Courthouse, in the 162<sup>nd</sup> District Courtroom, a trial was quietly held in September that would last two weeks. On trial was TRUTH.

Unbeknownst to me, the date for this trial had been set. I had totally forgotten about the issue, would have even assumed it had been dismissed or settled. But suddenly, I received an email alerting me, and countless others, to the pending date and critical needs at hand.

Former Minnesota Hennepin County Sheriff, Richard Stanek, had filed suit against John Guandolo, President of Understanding the Threat, and UTT itself, for damages sustained from a fist-a-cuff brawl that happened in June of 2017 in Nevada between the two men while they were attending the National Sheriffs' Association Convention. Guandolo, who chose not to file a suit when it first occurred, ended up counter suing after Stanek's suit was filed later that year.

I found a seat by the courtroom entrance in the foyer, as it appeared everyone was having to wait outside. Sitting directly across from me was a woman in her hijab. She had a laptop in her lap and was busy typing away. I snapped a shot of her. She looked up. Shortly afterwards she photographed me too, to identify me.

I would learn shortly she was Huma Yasin, a board member of CAIR Dallas and who is an attorney. The Court Bailiff came out of the courtroom and called the jurors to line up as they had been assigned. Apparently, they had been on lunch break and were

awaiting the final call on who would serve and who would be released.

He gave them instructions on where to sit, that the chosen jurors would be announced, and then they were to exit if they were not chosen. He had slips of paper for those who needed one to take to their employers. I was shocked when I saw the number of people who had reported to jury duty. The pool was very large. They marched in as instructed and within minutes they were pouring out of the courtroom grabbing their papers and leaving. The hallway appeared rather empty.

When the potential jurors had cleared out, those of us who were there as spectators for the trial entered the courtroom and found our seats. Those who supported Guandolo sat to the left, those who were attached to CAIR sat on the right. This seating pattern would not change for the duration of the trial. If one of the CAIR folks missed their cue and sat on our side, they were quickly given the eye and moved to the other side, even if it meant literally squeezing between people on the wooden benches.

One last comment on the trial attendees. Over the course of two weeks I would see lots of people come and go on the CAIR side of the aisle. Some of them were clearly seasoned attorneys, others were young people, lots of young people. It appeared they floated through the courthouse and would be called in to sit in on various trials. They were always there at key moments. Yet, they would leave and be in another spot - all on cue. I guess their job was being a courtroom intimidator by filling up the side where CAIR wanted the win.

CAIR (Council on American-Islamic Relations) had a presence in the courtroom every minute of the trial. When Huma Yasin had to leave around 3pm in the afternoon each day, another CAIR rep would arrive to continue the watch so she could exit. They were all very connected. They greeted one another, talked among themselves, and waved their folks over to sit. FYI - CAIR is Hamas. For more information on that, go to [www.UnderstandingTheThreat.com](http://www.UnderstandingTheThreat.com).

While the courtroom only had 3 rows of benches, theirs were often full. We had anywhere from 2 to 10 people on our side at any time, with plenty of space between us. It gave us the advantage of being able to move around to get better angles of the jurors or witnesses on the stand.

The jury was made up of 13 individuals, 12 jurors and 1 alternate. Their demographics were 7 black, 1 white, 1 oriental, 4 Hispanic. Only 4 were men, all black, one of whom would become the jury foreman. I later learned one of the jurors attended Angelo State University.

One last thing to set the scene of the trial. Stanek had three attorneys. Peter Kraus, of Waters Kraus & Paul, was the lead. Kraus was a major fundraiser in Texas for Mr. Obama. Chris Johnson also represented the same law firm. Their one female attorney is worthy of note. Lisa Blue Baron, of Baron and Blue, is easy to google. She pops up quickly on Wikipedia. In reading through the information on her, I discovered she lives on a 35.3 million-dollar estate and was Hillary Clinton's top fundraiser.

John Guandolo's team was made up of Stephanie Gase, Theresa Peel, and Allen Adkins. The team, except for Mrs. Gase, had only ten days to prepare for the case. Gase had previously been a part of Guandolo's representation, until the previous lead attorney withdrew from the case, [The former law firm withdrew because Guandolo/UTT were unable to pay the massive legal debt which was growing. This was the purpose of this lawsuit - to financially shut down the work of Guandolo/UTT.] pulling even Gase from the case. Her previous knowledge was from taking depositions eighteen months prior. She too had ten days to prepare, sometimes without files in their hands because they were still in the possession of the prior attorney. One special note: Peel and Gase are mother and daughter, a new legal team. This was only their second jury trial each, and the first time together as a team.

For a case which had to do with a brawl between two men in Nevada, you'd wonder why CAIR was all over it. The answer was simple. The brawl got them into a courtroom, but the purpose of the whole trial was to shut down and shut up John Guandolo and his

team. Guandolo and Understanding the Threat (UTT) have been key trainers for law enforcement, community leaders and civilians about the Islamic movement and their plans to turn America into an Islamic 3<sup>rd</sup> world country. CAIR was totally behind this lawsuit. It's plausible they even funded it. Who knows?

More than two years had passed since the incident occurred. When Stanek brought this before a judge in Nevada as a criminal case, it was dismissed for lack of evidence that Guandolo assaulted Stanek. It was a fist-a-cuff between two grown men after which everyone walked away. That is exactly what John Guandolo had done. Even though Stanek had choked John with the necktie he wore so tightly a deputy sheriff had to assist to get it loose. It had knotted up so tightly. Yet, Guandolo had chosen to walk away. In self-defense Guandolo had landed only one punch to Stanek's jaw, but Stanek chose to use it to file charges. Since Nevada wouldn't hear it, Stanek elected to file the suit in Dallas, Texas where Guandolo resides.

So why did two men with professional reputations get into a fist fight at the National Sheriffs Association annual convention in Nevada? Because Stanek discovered Guandolo and his team were educating law enforcement officers about Islam, including work the association supported. Plus, John had recently written an article which he had personally named Stanek in it. Stanek was determined to stop UTT. He had his deputy sheriff arrange a meeting between them after a presentation.

When John arrived, he asked to start the meeting with prayer, a normal course of action John and his team do regularly/daily. Stanek refused. Stanek then asked Guandolo to retract his article where he was mentioned, Guandolo refused since it was all fact based. Stanek slammed his things down, abruptly stood up, and John followed suit, stood up, only to be chest-bumped by the Sheriff. When John pushed him back to get space between them, Stanek grabbed his tie and the choking commenced, which ultimately led to John swinging in self-defense. His first swing completely missed the lawman, but he landed his second punch. Several deputies jumped on Stanek's back to pull him off of John to break-up the fight.

Over the two years since the incident happened, which finally was termed an “altercation” in the courtroom, several things had occurred. Stanek ran for re-election as the County Sheriff and lost. He continued to see many doctors and it appears told a variety of stories as to what had happened to him. He continued to enjoy life at home with his wife, along with special trips to their beautiful home they own on the lake. His life appeared to be comfortable, though his attorneys tried to paint a very different story.

Guandolo, on the other hand, is faced with COUNTING THE COST OF TRUTH. His self-launched organization stays under constant attack by CAIR (an un-indicted co-conspirator from the Holy Foundation Trial in 2008, the largest successfully tried terrorism funding case in U.S. history). His legal fees to fight this case are mounting into the hundreds of thousands of dollars. He does not have an agency or organization funding his work or to cover his legal fees in this court battle. The funds his organization brings in just keep his group afloat and working across the nation. The legal fees are mounting. If you'd like to assist with his legal fees, go to: <https://www.understandingthethreat.com/product/donate-directly-to-utt/>.

CAIR on the other hand is flush with money. It has more than enough to fund its fight to shut down TRUTH and silence those who know exactly what their ultimate goal is.

It was very interesting to sit through a full-blown jury trial from beginning to end. I learned that there were several things that the defense team COULD NOT use or let the jury know about while making their case. For example: a few deadlines were missed while Guandolo was without legal counsel. As a result, his counsel, when he got some, could not bring up it was self-defense as an explanation for the physical attack; Nevada courts would not hear the case; and several other major points.

Here's a quick run-down of several days of people on the stand.

Stanek's Medical Expert: He was first up on the stand and laid out a dreary forecast for Stanek's quality of life. All of his woes in his health were due to this one blow from Guandolo to his left jaw. A

friend jotted down on a notepad to me: “John must be superman. In one blow this man can no longer have sex, drive a car, shoot a gun, turn his head, and.....” It was a good chuckle.

John’s attorney made mincemeat out of this witness. Everyone was shocked to learn that this medical expert did not review any prior medical records and had no interest in doing so. It appears that Stanek’s prior medical records show that he has been suffering with these issues for many years prior to this altercation.

Stanek’s wife was next: She did not come across as a willing participant in this trial. It seemed she kept looking for signals on what to say from her husband or someone. She flew in and out in the same day. No, she did not sit by his side and give support to him. They seemed rather estranged.

Enough said about her.

Stanek himself: While he told a very interesting tale, the main thing was his closing remark. We, of course, expected to hear “his” version about what occurred. When his attorney asked him point blank as to why he filed this case as his final question, without hesitation he said, ‘I have to stop hate speech. I have to silence John Guandolo and shut Understanding the Threat down.’ Where did this come from? The case was about his medical condition. He never mentioned his physical condition when asked why he filed the case.

The plaintiff’s side paused their case. They worked well with the defendant’s side on hearing witnesses while they were in town, so several had to be heard out of order. Their remaining witness was the Deputy Sheriff’s videoed deposition. It was bumped by one of John’s witnesses who had flown in to testify that day.

John Guandolo’s eyewitness, Chris Gaubatz: Chris was the Vice President of Understanding the Threat at the time of the altercation. He has since left UTT and ventured out to do work on his own. Chris’ calm and unruffled manner was very visible from the stand. This man had gone undercover for six months into CAIR’s national headquarters years ago and later had a book written about his

experience while there. He took the questions as they came and gave his perspective on things. Bottomline: Stanek had instigated the altercation and Guandolo was put into a position of self-defense, though Gaubatz could not really go into that due to the gag-order on it.

The balance of the first week's trial was Stanek's attorney calling John Guandolo up to be questioned on Friday. There was just enough time left for Guandolo's attorney to cross-examine what had been said before the clock ran out on Friday afternoon. The defendant's side felt rather confident with the ending of the first week and leaving John's final comments as the last thing on the juror's minds before a 3-day weekend. The trial would not resume until Tuesday due to the courtroom having been previously booked for other legal matters.

Tuesday picked up where Friday left off. Guandolo's attorneys would finish up with him, then he was cross-examined by Stanek's attorney. Also, on Tuesday would be John's one other witness, along with the recorded deposition of Stanek's deputy sheriff. The deposition had been cropped to 45 minutes out of multiple hours of questioning.

The last witness was Stephanie Ameiss, John's other eyewitness and his lead investigator. She too would report that Stanek came across as hostile from the beginning of the meeting which Stanek had invited John and his team. She was the one person who voice recorded the encounter. This was prompted by her years of experience as a police officer when she sensed things were not friendly at the table.

The defendant's attorneys finally had their opportunity to put John on the stand and try to bring the juror's minds back to their perspective. Once again, given the opportunity to dig back into John, Kraus worked tirelessly to paint a false picture of someone filled with hate, who even called Black Lives Matter an organization of terrorists. Kraus' lies about Guandolo and UTT seemed to hang in the air. It was difficult to listen to this. Instinctively you wanted to shout out the truth.

Finally, it was time for closing arguments. The defendant's side went first and led the jurors step-by-step back through the altercation. Still unable to mention the self-defense aspect of it, she reminded the jurors of key elements from the trial which they had heard and wrapped up their arguments.

The other attorneys had their time once again to argue their case and highlighted John and his organization as literally fueling the hate speech in our country, causing these horrible shootings and crimes. Tragically, their attorney could spew total vitriol and the defendant's side could not respond. His closing few minutes were alarming.

Kraus put up a picture on the overhead projector of a mocked-up New York Times newspaper front page, and another major rag, with the headlines declaring how this Dallas jury had saved the world from HATE SPEECH by their verdict against John Guandolo and Understanding the Threat. He declared they had more power in this moment than they would ever have again in their lives. He proclaimed they could protect the world from HATE SPEECH by ruling against Guandolo. How could this be his closing statements? Wasn't this a trial about physical injuries?

It left us all breathless. How extreme, vicious and untrue was the swaying of a jury we had just witnessed. Wow.

Now we had to wait for two and half days for the verdict to come in. Yes, truly hate speech was on trial, though the case in hand was about damages from a fist-a-cuff brawl.

Across the country another trial is happening. The gentleman and his team who reported the horrors about Planned Parenthood and their business of selling baby parts are being sued by Planned Parenthood for exposing them and ruining their reputation. Double wow.

Headline news reports were filled with the vitriol from the Democrats trying to impeach our President because they do not like him, because he is cleaning up the swamp and bringing an end to their corruption.



I'm sure there are many more. The battle rages. If you are trying to expose truth, educate the public about what is secretly going on, you are going to be sued, or worse, to try to silence you. Truth must prevail. America must wake up.

As we continued to wait, and the trial lingered on, we began to hope for a hung jury. Finally, we were alerted the jury had suddenly produced its verdicts. Everyone was called into the courtroom within just a few minutes.

John Guandolo and his business, Understanding the Threat, were both being sued for damages, separately and together. The plaintiff's side had asked for upwards of \$15 million in personal damages and \$100 million in punitive damages. They needed the punitive damages to shut down Guandolo's work.

Their decision was a weighted decision. This was the first time I had been exposed to this type of ruling. They found both parties equally liable for the damages, but in the end gave Guandolo one more point. The ruling went from 50/50 liable to 51/49 with Guandolo responsible for 51% of the damages. On the multiple counts they had before them, they ended up throwing out ALL of the punitive damages and only ruled on the personal. They gave a value of \$600,000.00, which in a weighted case such as this, John Guandolo is responsible for \$306,000.00, payable to Stanek.

There is so much more I could say about all of this. The day in which we live requires us to take a stand, fight against this growing evil, and support those who are willing to be on the front lines for us. We cannot let these men and women who are willing to go into harm's way to bring us truth fail. We must support them in every way possible.

John has decided to appeal this ruling. Now that he has a defense counsel by his side, they can prepare properly for the next case and NOT have such key elements excluded from the jurors.

We had the opportunity to visit with 8 of the 12 jurors after the trial. That was fascinating. They all kept their focus on the actual

brawl and would not give any attention to the hate speech part of the trial since that is not what the case was about.

They were livid to learn what was kept from them and shocked to learn John's attorneys only had ten days to prepare. They wanted to know this type of information.

I left with a great respect for the men and women who served on this jury. They sincerely wanted to be fair and just. They ruled based on what they were "allowed" to know and ruled fairly. God bless them.

Until next time...

# **Kat Rowoldt**

Christian Reporter News

[www.ChristianReporterNews.com](http://www.ChristianReporterNews.com)

[If you enjoyed, please forward to a friend and share!](#)

© 2011-2019 CHRISTIAN REPORTER NEWS. Kathryn G Rowoldt - all rights reserved. You are welcomed to forward and share this with friends and family, but all rights are reserved, and no part of this material may be published in any form without written consent from the CHRISTIAN REPORTER NEWS.