

From: VolusiaExposed.Com <VolusiaExposed@cfl.rr.com>

To: Davidson, Gary <GDavidson@vcso.us>

Cc: Haught, Brandon <BHaught@vcso.us>, volusiaexposed@cfl.rr.com

Bcc: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Wooley - request for public information

Date: Thu, 26 May 2011 12:49:05 -0400

Mr. Davidson - VCSO Public Information Officer:

(to the Wooley family - you have been BCC a copy of this email for your FYI - VolusiaExposed.Com will soon address your concerns in another email directly to you)

We shall respond to your 5-24-11 email as follows:

1. Thanks for the follow up update on the Wooley death investigation.
2. As per your request, see the attached PDF file with two emails sent to your office (May 16, 2011 and May 23, 2011)
3. We appreciate your appreciation of the First amendment to the U.S. Constitution.
4. We do, to a certain extent care about your personal opinion of VolusiaExposed.Com.
5. It is our opinion that you should take some of your own advice and never "infer" anything regarding our intentions or emails - if you have a question, just send us a friendly email asking for clarification.
6. While we acknowledge your two documented concerns (the URL incident and your concerns with our last email) - it is our desire that you point out where we are misinformed involving such situations as the inmate death investigations - the Osowski situation, the Willard situation - basically everything covered in the below web link.

<http://volusiaexposed.com/vcso/problemsvcso.html>

We would be extremely thrilled if you could bring some clarity to those concerns. In fact this is our second invitation (see the below web link) to you to just send us a friendly email and bring some clarity to these issues and tell us how we are mistaken.

<http://volusiaexposed.com/vcso/davidsonemaildec212010.html>

Mr. Davidson, VolusiaExposed.Com has no personal axe to grind with you or any other person. In a civilized society, we need the police to enforce our laws. But just as important, our police and government need to be closely observed by their citizens. Therefore, VolusiaExposed.Com strongly believes that we have the right to ask such questions (a few examples):

1. How can jail guards document that they had spoke with a dead inmate just minutes prior to her being discovered dead – but the decease inmate has apparent rigor mortis? Were jail records falsified? Why didn't the VCSO investigator follow up on this?

2. Why didn't a VCSO MAJOR CASE investigator swear in a female complainant that alleged to having been groped by a male deputy? Why did this investigator refer to the complainant as "sweetie" and ask her if she saw "boggy men"? What significant was obtained in the investigation by pointing out that the transport of the female complainant from the gas pumps to the jail was within an expected time frame? Didn't the complainant allege that the groping incident took place prior to leaving the gas pumps? Deflection by the VCSO investigator?

Gary, not only would we welcome any answers you can provide to our questions, so that we can provide them to our readership – we shall also gladly post any positive achievements transpiring within the VCSO that you can forward us.

We look forward to your response.

Thank You

VolusiaExposed.Com

Keeping the public employees we trust to enforce our laws, within the

On Tue, 2011-05-24 at 14:15 -0400, Davidson, Gary wrote:

> In response to your question, I still maintain the position of Public
> Information Officer for the Volusia County Sheriff's Office. FYI, prior
> to yesterday, the most recent correspondence I had received from
> VolusiaExposed inquiring about this case was in an e-mail sent to me at
> 1:26 p.m. on March 29, 2011. (Both Pamela Renfro and Bernice Wendland
> were CC'd on this particular e-mail.) Within 32 minutes of receipt of
> your e-mail, you had received a reply from me regarding the status of
> the ongoing investigation along with an attached copy of the initial
> incident report. At that time, you were advised that I would maintain
> your request on file and re-contact you when the case is closed and the
> remainder of the Sheriff's Office records can be released. You then
> responded at 5:19 p.m. on the same day acknowledging receipt of my
> e-mail response.

>
> While you are always welcome to re-contact me to inquire about the
> status of this or any other request, let me assure you that no follow-up
> inquiries are required in order for you to receive any records you may
> request through me. Having said that, please note that I can find no
> record of having received any follow-up e-mails from you inquiring about
> the status of this case or your records request since our March 29th
> exchange. However, I continue to monitor the status of the case, as