

Mandy Matney 00:03

Hello and Happy Friday. We are still out on the West Coast, which made this episode extra challenging but really rewarding. On this special episode of Cup of Justice I am joined by my husband and Luna Shark producer David Moses as we chat with my dear friend South Carolina attorney, Mandy Powers Norrell. Mandy Powers Norrell has had a wildly successful career in civil practice before entering politics as a South Carolina state representative and later running for lieutenant governor. She continues her private practice but also lends her significant talents to the Sixth Circuit Solicitor's Office prosecuting domestic violence cases. We had a blast this week discussing trial strategies for prosecutors and defense lawyers with a focus on how repetition and coercive narratives can make or break a case. We also dive into strategies deployed during the first Michael Colucci murder trial and how Andy Savage was able to confuse the jury and ultimately win the day, for now. Luna Shark Premium Members will also get our complete conversation on the impact of live coverage of court proceedings and other challenges prosecutors face Learn more at lunashark.supercast.com. And since we're on the road, you'll also hear a variety of sounds like crickets, frogs and traffic, which I hope you'll forgive us for. We're back on schedule next week with Eric Bland, Liz and me. So stay tuned for Cup of Justice 79 Tuesday. For now, sit back, relax, and let's get into it. We have an exciting show for y'all today. I am so happy to be joined, first of all by my husband for the first time ever on Cup of Justice.

David Moses 01:57

For those of you that don't know me, you may have heard my vocal renditions of Dick Harpootlian, Jim Griffin, Chief Justice Toll and many



others. I hope you'll enjoy my natural voice as much as some of you say you'd like my acting voice. But I'm not here to talk about me. We're here to talk about former candidate for lieutenant governor in South Carolina, the ineffable, the impressive, the spectacularly talented and majorly committed Mandy Powers Norrell. Thank you so much for joining us, Mandy, and we couldn't be more happy to have you on the show. So thank you again, why don't you tell us a little bit about why you're interested or how you got interested in the law, politics, and why you're currently working with the Lancaster Solicitor's Office, prosecuting domestic violence and abuse cases.

Mandy Powers Norrell 02:48

Thank you. And thank you all so much for having me. I'm so excited about this. I got interested in the law, I think just because I was one of those kids growing up who cared a lot about fairness and justice. And that sort of became a natural fit. I went to law school and then came home to practice law in my hometown of Lancaster, where I grew up and where my parents grew up sort of in the village that helped raise me and I get to, to represent my, you know, friends and neighbors who I've known my whole life. And I was in the legislature for four terms, and was involuntarily retired in 2020. I'm a Democrat who was running in a very red district, and they would vote for me until they wouldn't. And that all came to an end in 2020. And so I was sort of cast back to my formal role. And our Attorney General Alan Wilson, who was a friend of mine called and said, Would you, you know, you're gonna get bored, and I have an idea for you, why don't you call the local solicitor and see if he will let you just come in and prosecute domestic violence cases just on a contract basis, because that will fill the void, the energy that you're going to miss from being in the legislature, and I'd helped write the



domestic violence statute. So it was a great fit. And I called up our local solicitor and he said, you know, sure, because nobody really likes prosecuting domestic violence cases, I think. So he let me come in and take on domestic violence. And I've been doing that since 2022. And it's been really, really fulfilling. I'm learning a lot. I've never practiced in criminal law, and I'm still doing my private practice, civil law practice law with my husband here in Lancaster, but domestic violence has been and just prosecuting in general has been such a great learning curve. And at this point in my life, I didn't think that I would be learning anything big and new. So it's been like this awesome challenge, and I've loved it.

Mandy Matney 04:54

That's really cool that you were saying that Alan Wilson suggested that for you and I think a lot of our audience will know you from your legendary commentary of the Murdaugh murderers trial last year and you actually had a very big impact on the trial. You're the one that found the family annihilators theory and texted Alan. Tell us about that.

Mandy Powers Norrell 05:17

Well, thank you for that. I didn't tell anybody for a long time because I thought, well, it's not mine to tell. And then Alan told it, so I thought, well, that'll be okay. Attorney General Alan Wilson told it and I thought that it would be okay for me to acknowledge it now. I was so excited when Creighton said, you know, Mr. Murdaugh, are you a family annihilator because it was early in early in the trial, and I thought they had the motive wrong. I thought, you know, people don't kill their family just to create a temporary distraction. But people do, family. annihilators kill their family for just really weird reasons. And the reason



doesn't matter as much as just the fact that they meet all of this criteria that this group of people who do this really have in common. And those are generally well educated, well respected, often, usually men who decide to annihilate their families after having some big financial crisis, they do it at home or in a remote area. They're facing embarrassment. And they have always been very upstanding people in the community. It just like it checked all the boxes for Alex Murdaugh. And so I found just sort of a blurb and screenshotted it from the internet. And I texted it to Alan Wilson during the trial and just said, Have y'all looked at this as him being a family annihilator. And he immediately texted back and he was in trial. And I was kind of watching him on Court TV. And he said, Where did you get this? And I said, I got it from Google. And so then later found out that he had contacted the the person who came up with that, that psychological profile in the 80s. And ask him to look at videos of Alex Murdaugh in interviews, and then to you know, give them an analysis of whether he fit that psychopathy and he said that he did. And then that sort of informed how they like questioned him and information that they got out of him after that he helped in their formulation of questions. So that was so fascinating and exciting to kind of have a little bit of input there.

David Moses 07:33

When you were watching the trial, and what was that that was like, February, late February, when you saw Creighton ask that question, what did you think of Alex's response?

Mandy Powers Norrell 07:47

I didn't see him ask the question. I was listening to it on my AirPods when I was in the grocery store. And I screamed. I was at Food Lion in



the checkout. And he said, Mr. Murdaugh, are you a family annihilator? But Alex didn't know what he was talking about. And most people, you know, unless they really focused on, you know, the psychology of murderers. They don't know the term. And so he said, What do you mean? Like, did I kill my family? No, I didn't. And it was sort of like, you know, Alex didn't know that the word family annihilator the term meant, like a litany of checkboxes that he fit. So I don't think that he was asking that in order to get a yes or no response. I think he was asking it to kind of plant the seed for people who were interested in that psychological profile to look it up.

Mandy Matney 08:45

Which was brilliant.

Alex Murdaugh 08:47

A family annihilator? You mean? Like, did I shoot my wife and my son? Yes. No, I would never hurt Maggie Murdaugh. I would never hurt Paul Murdaugh under any circumstances.

Mandy Matney 09:08

I thought that that was a really smart move to move that in there without saying it. You know.

Mandy Powers Norrell 09:14

I think so. I would get so mad at the commentators who would say, oh, he's he shouldn't be asking open ended questions. He should be only asking yes and no questions. But you couldn't do that with Alex. I thought everything you did was brilliant in that, right.



Mandy Matney 09:33

So cats out of the bag on this one. You have known personally, Alex Murdaugh for a long time as an attorney and as a friend really.

Mandy Powers Norrell 09:49

Really great.

Mandy Matney 09:52

Oh my gosh tell me about. I mean, you were one of my best sources during the crazy time. but not only because you presented a different side of Alex that I didn't really see. And I also understood the people that were really suffering because of him. The people that thought that they really knew him and were questioning their own judgment. Yes. How do I, how do I judge people from this point on if I didn't see that this guy could tell his family? So how did you know him?

Mandy Powers Norrell 10:26

So I knew Alex since I met him in 2008, my husband was on the board of the trial lawyers with Alex and I remember after that first meeting, the Board meeting, and Mitch came out, and he said, I met this guy, and you are gonna love him. His energy matches yours, like, you're just gonna think he's just the greatest. And when he came out, it was just like, I knew exactly who, which one Mitch was talking about. And after that, I felt like I'd known him for years, if you would, and I just had dinner with a friend who has known Alex, as long as I have. And I said, I was charmed by him, were you and she's a very discerning person. And she's like, Absolutely, I was charmed by him. And we both independently had gone through sort of almost this crisis of, I thought I was a good judge of character. And yet, I, I was really taken in I was if I walked into a room



and knew nobody in the room, but Alex, I would be comfortable, because I would know that he would welcome me in, he would make sure he introduced me to everybody, because I knew he would know everybody else in the room that I didn't know. And he was just so you know, everything you hear about him. And, you know, once you know, the things about him that we know, now, it's easy to say, Oh, I would have seen through him as a, you know, a sociopath. But, I didn't. And I like to think I'm a good judge of character. But I've kind of gone through this whole questioning everything since then. And I really didn't want him to be guilty. He was. He is.

Mandy Matney 12:10

But you saw the facts. And that's what was important. And I appreciated that you. Like some people were just Alex stands, they were just like, I'm gonna support him to Matt, like, everybody who's reporting on him, shame on them, blah, blah, blah, without looking at the facts. And I appreciated that you still come with open mind, and you really didn't want it to be. And I also remember to want it to be, you were saying how much pride he took in his sons and his family? Yeah, he didn't he bring Buster and Paul's like every event when they were little kids?

Mandy Powers Norrell 12:47

Everything, everything to the point that I would tell Mitch, I'm like, I feel like we're bad parents, because Alex is bringing a pollen Buster to every event. And we're not taking our kids because our kids were the same age. And like, we're not taking our kids to these things. But he's bringing his kids to everything. You know, who's right, who's the better parent here? And Mitch is all he's not in the comparison culture, like,



you know, like I think most people are. So he's like, don't worry about it. We're just doing parenting our way. And he's doing parenting his way. But I really, you know, thought what an amazing guy bringing his kids to every single thing that he goes to and introducing them again and again, to everybody, rooms full of adults. Right? That's true.

David Moses 13:33

What's the end to those means was it to continue the dynasty and, and all of that or something else?

Mandy Powers Norrell 13:40

I see it as that. Now, I think that that's probably how he was brought into the fold, because it is sort of the legal community is sort of a family. And if you're if you plan for your kids to be lawyers, then you would bring them into the fold by making sure that they become a part of that family at a very young age. So that they're welcomed in and and always remembered. And I get that now, like I see that was probably just a natural progression of generational, like lawyering. And I'm first in my family to come anywhere close to being a lawyer. So I wasn't raised like that. I didn't, I didn't see it at the time. I just thought, wow, he just he always has his kids with him. But my friend tonight who I was having dinner with, she's like, and they were always drinking with him to Mandy remember that, like you don't think that, you know these as great parent because his kids were would be drunk and underage at these events.

Mandy Matney 14:42

So at lawyer events which is kind of crazy for the rest of the world to think about like, I can't imagine I don't have lawyers in my family, but I



can't ever imagine my parents bringing me to anything as a teenager and letting me drink in front of their co workers. his colleagues may either, etcetera. I've heard all sorts of stories of that.

Mandy Powers Norrell 15:05

But I grew up as an evangelical so I don't know. Yeah, that's that's way different. I can't imagine my parents drinking so.

David Moses 15:15

And he was a prosecutor, I mean, maybe just to name only but he had a responsibility to uphold and enforce.

Mandy Matney 15:23

Like he would be going to dinner with sheriffs, and he would bring and deputies and he would bring his sons and they would order drinks in front of sheriff's, and as underage kids, and it's just so crazy. And then you think about being raised like that, and how problematic that would be that like, yeah, no, there's nobody that you're afraid of. They're telling you no, like, I would have been terrified. Yeah, order any drink ever run up to my parents, but you to run out of law enforcement and my parents chief law enforcement chief law, like the law enforcement, and putting them in that position to like, I think of Alex putting the sheriff in that position. And what I like power move that is sitting a Sun's down and being like, you're gonna order drinks, and you can't do anything that's just so bizarre. And you know, Randolph to correct.

Mandy Powers Norrell 16:18

I didn't like it. I don't know if he would have been like, hey, there's Mandy. I know her. But I knew he was like, the pinnacle of the trial



lawyers, he was so respected, and so honor, like we honored him at several events that I was at. And when he would speak, he just, he had the best comedic timing, he would tell these like wild stories of how it used to be to practice law back years ago. And Mitch and I would kind of look at each other like, Oh, my God, we couldn't get away with that today. And I don't remember the stories, but I remember being shocked by them. And just thinking, wow, they did they did it like that back then. And it's just and how the practice of law has changed. But he was he was larger than life, very well respected, and very much like, not afraid to talk about things that would probably get you into a lot of trouble today. I just don't remember the details of the things he would tell he would tell it those events, but he was he was very entertaining.

David Moses 17:26

When when you think about the interaction between trial lawyers at the conventions? Were they you know, moving and shaking around the room? They were well liked. Was it? Was it a fear thing? Was it intimidation? Was it something else? Was it respect?

Mandy Powers Norrell 17:42

The thing at the conventions is, that's where everybody lets their guard down and just relaxes, it was very much like a family atmosphere. When you go to like the bar convention, that's where you see like, a lot of posturing and people on the elevators, just trying to, you know, build themselves up and be like, Hey, I had a big case last week, let me tell you how big it was. It was really big. And, you know, at trial lawyers, it's more like, you know, just people just kind of letting it all hang out and just, like, chilling and not, and, you know, really more the talk more about their losses than their wins. And just, I liked the atmosphere of



trial lawyers a lot more than the bar convention. The my entire career, I've liked it better, because people are more relaxed, and you look around. And you know, there's a lot of people who made a lot of money and had a lot of power. But I think that's the place where they would go and feel like they were very protected and protected by each other and could just finally exhale in their lives. So it it was it's not the atmosphere that I think a lot of people would imagine that it is

David Moses 18:53

Last week when Eric was talking about how uncommon it is for lawyers to sue other lawyers. You know, it got me thinking that there is this cloistered sort of protectorate, where, where if you call out people for their bad behavior, well, then does that reflect poorly on you as a professional within that community? Right. But when when he mentioned that other people turn down malpractice suits, I just wonder if in those environments, it's helpful or hurtful to have such a self loathe net, a close knit relationship personally and sometimes professional, right?

Mandy Powers Norrell 19:33

Well, I think, you know, you're certainly going to turn down anything that's against somebody that you know, and you might know details about or, you know, something like that, or if, you know, legal malpractice is not your area, you know, I've learned not to take on things that I don't need to have an expertise in. But it's, I think it's also there is you know, there's a ethics canon that says that if we know about someone who was doing something that is a violation of the canon of ethics, then we are duty bound to, like contact the ODC. And give the details of what we know. And very often, and we have an hour of ethics



at most continuing legal education events that we get to where we have to get a certain number a year, a certain number of hours, that's often a question of like, do we have to actually know, do we? What if we just suspect that they're violating the canon of ethics? Do we have to actually have knowledge because people don't want to turn people in? It seems like there's a lot more malpractice than there used to be or a lot more sloppiness, I don't know that. It's theft, like Alex, but just seems like there's a lot more sloppiness. And there used to be a lot more people who don't quite understand the roles, a lot more people who just aren't putting, you know, as much time and effort into the practice as they should, or is that we're taught to, but then there's also this sort of fear of karma, you know, like, oh, my gosh, if I were to, you know, turn so and so in for this, this thing that they may have done, then is that going to create like the stream of bad luck for me, myself in the future? And and sometimes karma gets assisted by people in the profession who will help karma along so you just get a little bit right. I think a lot of lawyers are fearful about that aspect of the canon of ethics that says you have to to turn in anybody that you know of that's that's doing something wrong.

Mandy Matney 21:38

I thought it was so interesting. When Judge Newman sentenced Alex after the financial for the financial crimes, he mentioned that he saw Alex at the 2021 trial lawyers convention on Hilton Head, and he watched him at the bar, taking shots and drinking and have a good time. And I remember I was getting your there, but I was getting that far. Like that whole weekend was like a flood of Alex's texts and everything. But it's so funny that Judge Newman was there. And I just picture him and like a nice Hawaiian shirt, shirt and a nice hat to sit in



there. Just shaking his head and just chill out and do like this scene of that, but it's so funny that he noticed that and then years later, like

Mandy Powers Norrell 22:33

There were a lot of people who are like, yeah, yeah.

Mandy Matney 22:37

Everybody was looking at them that weekend. I remember.

Mandy Powers Norrell 22:40

Yeah, everybody noticed that, though, about him being there, because it was just a couple of months after the murders. And I was stunned. I got off the elevator. And there he was. And I just thought and you know, and me being the Pollyanna that I was at the time, I thought, well, he just...and I think we had like lunch that Sunday after the bar convention, me and you and Liz, David. And Liz was like, listen, why was he there? And I was like, because he just needed to be around the people who love him after the murders. You know, just trying really hard to believe that he didn't have anything to do with it. Oh, my gosh. And so yeah, I was very much a Pollyanna through that.

David Mosese 23:27

You know, you mentioned something about, you know, sloppiness on some lawyers parts when it comes to upholding ethics, etc. But I think also, you know, in your experience in the solicitor's office, I think we want to talk about a little bit after the break this Colucci trial and the 2018 prosecution. Michael Colucci for the death of Sara Lynn Colucci, and we'll talk about that right after the break. And we're back. So Mandy, you are currently prosecuting cases for Lancaster County and



have significant experience working with domestic violence and abuse victims and prosecuting folks on behalf of the state. And one thing that we've been examining is the Michael Colucci trial that occurred in 2018. For the 2015 murder of Sara Lynn Moore Colucci, you've had a fantastic few Twitter threads and commentary on that case. And I think what we'd love to learn from you is insights on how the prosecution handled that case in 2018. And how the defense attorneys, you know, led by Andy Savage, defended Michael Colucci and ultimately achieving a mistrial in that case. So let's start with the prosecution. You've watched the whole thing parts of it bits and pieces. What did you think about Meghan Birchstead's performance?

Mandy Matney 25:05

What is the most compelling evidence that they have and what they need to go with?

Mandy Powers Norrell 25:09

I think I think I watched the whole thing, you know, isn't those videos like 19 videos on Court TV? And so I confusing it was it was, so I would think that I was clicking the next video, and then I'd sometimes I'd have to go back and watch one that I'd missed. But I think I got the whole thing again. And I was frustrated. Often, I think, though, that when you look at these, you know, especially prosecution cases, you have to remember that, you know, Andy savage may have had one or two big cases a year, and they're going to, you know, I mean, that could find his his entire year, but the prosecution, they get paid the same no matter what. And they're juggling hundreds of cases. So they don't get to spend as much time on a case as, as a highly paid defense lawyer generally does. So, you know, the prosecution can prep a case and in a



week and have it ready for trial. And they're not going to have the resources that a highly paid, defense lawyer will have. And they will, they'll argue with you on that, because there'll be like, Well, you've got law enforcement, you've got investigators, you've got all these people that contribute to the prosecution, but it is very often imbalanced. So I mean, that being said, I think that there's an art to practicing law, there's an art to trial practice. And there in some of it is kind of like basic, that doesn't require extra resources. And that is, when you have a good point, you drive it home, you don't just you know, make your point, check the box, and then you're done. You, you really drive at home, you use repetition, you change the inflection of your voice, you get louder, you ask the witness Wait, did you say so and so to let the jury know, and you start out in your opening with, here's what I want you to look for, during this trial, here's what you're going to see, here's what's important, because they're going to hear a lot of boring chain of evidence stuff, and you want them to stay engaged when they hear those things that you told them to look for. So you know, those are just like some basic things that you do.

Mandy Matney 27:24

Like a thesis, like Creighton had a thesis the whole time, there was a storm building around him, and you're gonna hear about this storm, you're gonna hear about this, this was going on in that and it's an emotional narrative that you can, the jury can visualize and understand. And, like you said, there's just so many boring things and trials that gets so lost. And if you don't have a prosecutor to string it along, and make sure that they're like, Okay, but you remember this, this, this, this is all a part of the thesis, and it all goes back to the thesis.



Mandy Powers Norrell 27:59

And you should always be able to at the beginning of any trial be like this case is about x. And, you know, this case is about greed. This case is about you know, jilted lover this case is about so and so it's something that everybody can relate to and sink their teeth into. And if they get, you know, if they stray off course, they just remember this case is about x. And Creighton did great with the storm. And so but if the church should just remember it could not have happened the way Michael Colucci said it happened, period, it could not have happened the way he said it did. So therefore, he lied. And that in and of itself may not be enough for beyond a reasonable doubt that when taken together with all of the facts, then I think you do get to overcome reasonable doubt really, really quickly.

David Moses 28:55

When you think about the facts presented by the prosecution, what resonated most with you, or what was the best argument that they made that those jurors should have come back with a guilty verdict?

Mandy Powers Norrell 29:07

I did a thread on this and they were like 10 things and one was just the impossibility that you don't fall into a noose you know, you don't and it's not a noose anyway, you know, that just the seeming impossibility that anyone could just fall into a loop and unknotted hose and strangle themselves hose?

Mandy Matney 29:27

Yeah, not even a noose, right. Yeah, that's even crazier.



Mandy Powers Norrell 29:32

Fall into a house and die. I mean, I don't think that has ever happened. And I would be very interested, if it did, how it happened. And then the fact that the medical examiner said that at least two ligatures were used to constrict her breathing and at different parts of her neck and on different sides. You know, you just know it did not happen the way that the defense wanted us to believe it happened and then the fact that she had been dead for longer than she could possibly have been dead. By the time 911 Got there if you know his story was true, because she was already blue, and her blood had started pooling at her lowest parts and with liver mortis had set in. So she was dead, like at least a half an hour before they got there. But under Michael Colucci, his timeline, it would have been more like five to 10 minutes. And so that was an impossibility. He had a busted lip and a busted eye that corresponded to busted glasses. You know, if I was the prosecutor, I would have used that picture of his face from that night just over and over everybody who saw him that night I'd put it up on the screen and be like, is this what he looked like? What do you saw? Did you notice his lip? Did you notice is I can you get you ever seen anybody give CPR and get a busted lip and a busted eye from that and just keep driving that home? And I know they got it in. But there's a difference between getting the evidence in and really driving that evidence home and letting the jury know that that's super important. Right?

Mandy Matney 31:14

Well, like in the Murdaugh murders trial. Another thing and another point that Creighton just brought home over and over again, was he lied about the kennels. Why would he lie about being at the kennels? He lied about the last time that he saw his wife and son, that doesn't



make any sense of why you would do that. And he kept lying until he was caught and all of that evidence combined. Like you said, it just removes all reasonable doubt because you're like, there's no way there is. There's just no way that anybody else could have been on the property at that time. There's no way that anybody else would sneak on the property without weapons of their own. That doesn't make any sense. Like, that's where the reasonable doubt removes for me in watching the Colucci trial. It was just kind of frustrating that that stuff was getting lost. Like for instance, uh, you were saying ligature to different ligatures. What does that mean? Can you explain that to the audience?

Mandy Powers Norrell 32:07

So well, one was, the medical examiner said that the hose was just too big to create the marks that she saw on her neck, that the marks she's on her neck are like three quarters of an inch. And she happened to be wearing a gold necklace that was three quarters of an inch. And then the other side of her neck, they said it was something else which could be hands or something else. But it was from two different sides of the neck. And that's, you know, which was used to strangle her two different things and from two different angles. And neither one was an industrial hose. One thing that Creighton did that I thought was great that should have been done in this trial is he used that 911 Call over and over again. And he would stop it and ask a question about what was said there, and then start it back and stop it again. So we would hear it in its entirety. And then we would hear clips of it. And the more you heard it, the more you heard the theatrics and the acting and the deception. And if you just hear it once, you know, Southern people want to take folks at their word, they want to believe them when they're saying something. But



you know, in the back of your mind when something's wrong when somebody's lying, and the more you hear them lie or do these theatrics, the more you're going to detect deception. So I would have used that 911 call over and over again.

Mandy Matney 33:36

That was interesting, too, because they I was just thinking about that. They also use interviews with Alex and showing him why the police and showing him this was x weeks later, like him with Corey Fleming was a very, I mean, everybody's jaws were dropped, like, oh my god, this is he's not acting normally. And it's so weird that he lied like this.

Mandy Powers Norrell 33:59

I don't know if and the body cam footage.

Mandy Matney 34:03

Right. And I don't know if Colucci if they ever interviewed him. They certainly didn't bring it up at trial. And another thing that I thought would have been extremely compelling. And I realized that the murder happened in 2015 then technology's changing all the time, but the prosecutors acted like they did not need any GPS and the latest press pass it said that he was at the that he knew that he was at the scene at this time when the murder when the murder occurred. That's all we needed. And it's like, well, he had this whole story about them going to rave before and the attorney's office and all of this other What if they went to the gold standard like hours before they actually did and what if they never went to the grave? That would be another moment where like the Creighton moment of like you lied there. Yeah, lie there. And right, and it just shows again, Then I just really hope that they focus on



that this time. And I think another thing, have you had a case that you prosecuted that was this old because 2015.

Mandy Powers Norrell 35:12

Now we have some old cases, we have some cases, your COVID backed everybody up. But you know, so far I'm looking at like 2019, as the oldest cases that that I'm seeing on my roster, but the and that was just the ones that they didn't get to before COVID stopped everything. But you know, I know from I don't know, if y'all follow the Adnan Sayed trial, and that was from significantly longer ago, and like 2002. And they talked about like cell phone, location data and all that. And Andy Savage kept saying, it can tell you your cell phone, GPS can tell you exactly where you are, like down to within an inch. But it's really unless you've got those apps on and tracking and recording the tracking, the cell phone's not going to tell you that your OnStar might tell you that if you had that on your car, or something like that, but I don't know that they would be able to know these things. And I know Andy was like, just kind of driving home that, you know, it would have pinged off of this tower, that tower and the prosecution didn't beat that back by saying, Well, if this tower is full, then it pings off of the next closest tower. You know, there's like a, there's like an overload thing that goes on with the cell phones. So cell phone location data is not as accurate as Andy Savage was trying to present it as being but the prosecution didn't have the questioning that I think the right questioning of the expert to sort of bring that out. And they didn't have their own expert to kind of pull that back in. As Andy Savage was making the point of, you know, they were exactly where they said that they were going to be, but it would have been very helpful if they had had like a GM moment, like the OnStar data that



showed up at the last minute. And that was just that was like Perry Mason.

Mandy Matney 37:15

And it was just so helpful like that it was a Perry Mason moment to see all of Alex's movements and also being here at speed that was super that told a story like the story of footsteps changing as the orientation orientation of all of that was fascinating. I also think it's something that people like Alex wouldn't think about.

Mandy Powers Norrell 37:40

And he's right. I didn't think about it. It got me scared like my phone's tracking me like that.

Mandy Matney 37:46

I did you see a it started with a podcast. And then it was a show of called something or something about Pam. And it was this woman and she was caught with. She was caught basically setting up somebody else for this murder and for the insurance or the insurance money. And she was, it was a crazy story. But how they nailed her was she completely lied about where she was on this on this day of this murder. And they tracked yourself on her. It was like you said it was like a Google App or whatever was open for the entire time that she was doing. And it just gave her exact steps. And it nailed. I was shocked. But like you said, if you don't have your location services, on your cell phone, and I turned most of mine off that one point, I saw some scary New York Times story that was like, Oh, that's really creepy. They're like selling your data to target about, like, what sections you're in? And yes, why is?



David Moses 38:47

Yeah the data that's available is pretty impressive. And Andy Savage touches on that, you know, when we watch the footage on Court TV, and Savage was a prosecutor for awhile, so he knows what I guess you're supposed to do on the other side of that table and exploited it when it wasn't done. And the other thing that Andy did, and I'd love to get your insights on this, Mandy, is the defense strategies that AMD deploys are very purposeful, you can tell that he's lining up the shot, and he's thinking six steps, seven steps ahead. And it wasn't always perfect. I mean, when he was handling the evidence of the gold chain, and he and he's getting very dramatic, and he's squeezing it and he's manipulating the chain, and then he breaks the chain and his hands are bloody. I don't know how they're going to bring that chain back into evidence when he was Vinnie politan touched on this in a couple episodes ago when he was choking himself with the with the hose, and the jury must have been mouth a gape. Now those were dramatic moments that I think the jury remember, but in your opinion, what were some of the other strategies that Andy deploys? that the prosecution just couldn't overcome.

Mandy Powers Norrell 40:03

Oh my gosh. Well, I mean, one of the big things with him is he would pretend to be confused and act like I'm just trying to get to the truth I, I'm not really advocating for one side or the other. They just, this is just so screwed up. I'm confused. And he confuses the jury by acting as if he's confused himself. And that, and that makes him like, more likable than I think he would otherwise be. And he just, it was masterful. It was making me mad, like I was watching it like you're not confused. Andy



Savage, stop pretending to be confused. Do you know what you're doing? No. But he did it well.

David Moses 40:44

Yeah, he did. He didn't say I'm just a small town country, lawyer, but like he was using that tactic pretty effectively. Right?

Mandy Matney 40:54

And like you said, just the massive confusion, there were several times where the trial would just steer so far off course, as a prosecutor, what do you do to stop something like that? Like, their objections?

Mandy Powers Norrell 41:07

Well, yes, through objections. And also Andy would ask, like, did you do x? And the witness would say, Well, no. And and then he had them looking incompetent. But you've got to prep them to not just say, No, I didn't do that. No, I didn't test that piece of evidence. No, I didn't. You have to prep them ahead of time to say that is outside the scope of my role in this investigation, that would have been done by someone else, you should ask that of, you know, John Doe, when he comes up here to testify, because that's what he would have done, rather than just saying, No, I didn't test that. And that was, you know, he had sort of a condescending tone. So the more he talked to a witness, and the more he got them to say what they didn't do, the less credible that witness seemed over time, and he would take a lot longer with a witness than the prosecution would. So it would seem like he was scoring a lot more points than than they were. He really was he really was he did a really good job at that. I hate to say I always want the people I disagree with to not be smart. But unfortunately, that rarely happens. And he was



pretty smart in this. But he testified he should not have gotten away with that either. Right?

Mandy Matney 42:31

Can Use what was he doing? Like? How did he testify? For example, he would testify he's like, do you know me? Do you know how much I cost? I am a very expensive lawyer. Maybe he was getting that money for me. And I'm like, objection.

Mandy Matney 42:48

And what's crazy about that is the Yeah, that guy was going into that guy was talking about borrowing money, right? It was a bartender or something talking about Colucci has money problems. And then Andy was went on and said like, do you know he can afford me? Clearly he doesn't have money problems. But what's so crazy about that is he filed a motion a pre trial motion, saying that nothing can be said about his status, how much he costs as an attorney cooperate?

Mandy Powers Norrell 43:25

And he did it himself. Right.

Mandy Matney 43:27

And what was so funny to the judge was going through the pretrial motions, and she was like, are you serious?

David Moses 43:35

What did you say? Yes, it's happened before anytime.



Mandy Matney 43:37

She was like, what are you worried about? Exactly. And like, it happens all of the time.

David Moses 43:45

I have a quality person. And people use that against us.

Mandy Matney 43:50

I want to talk more about Andy in a moment, because it was wild lawyering. But right after this break.

David Moses 43:57

We'll be right back.

Mandy Matney 44:10

I think another thing that Andy did, that was so horrifying to me as a woman. And I don't know if you saw this part. But when he again, and this is an example of a tangent that he went off of whether or not she could have fit through the fence. If that didn't fit, not with her breast size. Yes. And that really didn't matter. Because like you said, it's just impossible that you would have been hung by a hose at all. So let's just pull back away from the whole could she fit through the fence? And not only did I have his wife dress up in the exact same dress that saralyn was wearing that night, go to the crime scene and then he had her shimmies through the gap, the gap to prove that right there was that which was horrifying. And again, I don't know how the jury wasn't just like I disagree with everything that this man is doing. And this is so gross and weird. But on top of that, to prove this point further that again, it's a point that does not he was scoring points for himself just to



confuse the jury, just so at the end of the day, the jury could be like, well, that guy seemed to make a lot of points today. And so it seems like they're right. Exactly. That has nothing to do with the murder. So he just kept and he he tested the dirt went into the dirt a lot. And literally the dirt talked about the dirt when the dirt didn't matter.

David Moses 45:42

Did you test the dirt? Right?

Mandy Matney 45:43

Did you test it? Did you take photos?

Mandy Powers Norrell 45:47

Did you test the dirt? No, I didn't. You didn't even test the dirt.

Mandy Matney 45:50

Did you test? Are you? Are you a dirt expert? Yeah, like it's true. Because even I would be sitting there like, are we sure the dirt doesn't matter what but but that's the prosecution that's got to be like this has literally nothing to do with anything.

David Moses 46:07

And Megan Birchstead at moments object? I don't know. I think it's, you can you can be subjective with her performance. But she I think she tried and Joel Kozak tried. But there was just so much misdirection and distraction. And pageantry, really. And when Andy Savage uses and I guess it must be in the handbook of South Carolina lawyers to make the same joke about special agents in SLED.



Mandy Powers Norrell 46:38

Oh, my God, I know he did the same thing as Dick Harpootlian.

David Moses 46:42

Apparently is must be in that book somewhere that says, if you have a SLED agent on the stand.

Mandy Matney 46:46

Tell them that they're not special.

Mandy Powers Norrell 46:50

What's so special about you, special agent?

David Moses 46:54

And the answer is nothing. It's just my title.

Mandy Matney 46:56

But then that somehow like it, it confuses them, and it confuses the jury. And in that case, like, that was another like weird point that he was able to score. But what really worried me with a lot of the police officers that were involved that they that were on the stand back in 2018. They didn't remember a lot. Back then they said both of them said, Sir, like, several of the state's witnesses, on several occasions would say I don't remember it was long time ago. And that freaks me out, right? Because now I mean, it's years later.

David Moses 47:36

It's even more...yeah, it's more time.



Mandy Matney 47:38

It's more time how, as a prosecutor, do you overcome that?

Mandy Powers Norrell 47:42

Prep. I mean, you just have to really prep them, you know, because you can refresh your memory with your statements at the time. There were some, there were some witnesses that you could tell just really hadn't read their statements. They weren't they weren't ready for their testimony. And so it's, um, it's all just, it's prepping. And I think they're going to be more prepared this time, because it is a retrial, and they have done it before. But it's, it's a matter of just, you know, now they're going to know how Andy savage tries a case, they're going to know, you know, what he sees is important what his theory of the case is. And I think there'll be better witnesses this time around than they were the time before. And there were some really stellar witnesses in the original trial, but I think there'll be better in the retrial. I hope they will be.

David Moses 48:37

And that's what Vinnie Politan is saying, too. And has this been your experience that on retrial the prosecution has an edge for that reason, that they know what the defenses tricks are going to be? I think so. Have you ever experienced that with a retrial? And how did that work out?

Mandy Powers Norrell 48:54

I've never had a retrial, you know, I've only been prosecuting since 2022. And and have been a civil lawyer for 26 years. So never never had a retrial in a civil case and and haven't had, of course, one and in a criminal case, it's for they're very, very rare, I think. But I would imagine,



because, you know, I think that a lot of the prosecution's problem in the initial Colucci trial was the fact that they were had so many cases that they're working on, this was one of many, many weren't able to devote a lot of time and resources to the preparation probably in now that they've done it once. You know, they have devoted that that time and resource they know that the eyes of a lot more people are on them this time. And so I think that they're going to be a lot more prepared. Now. When we look at resources, the resources devoted to the Murdaugh trial. Where was that was very uncommon. You know, that was like millions of dollars, maybe a lot of money. was spent to prosecute Alex Murdaugh, you can't just practically you can't devote those kinds of resources to every murder trial even that you have. So that's, and that's not on them. That's just a matter of, you know, we don't have that much tax money allocated to the Attorney General's office to do that. So they were doing, you know, what they could with what they had. But now they know, at least what the defensive strategy is.

David Moses 50:29

Do you think it makes a difference that in 2018, Court TV had recorded the proceedings and then broadcast later, and we intend to as do other agencies, broadcast it live? And so Joel is going to get feedback in real time? Do you think that hinders or hurts the prosecution's chances or gives the defensive advantage? Or does it not make a difference at all?

Mandy Powers Norrell 50:57

I think it helps, I think it helped in the Murdaugh trial. I think I really think that they were they had somebody and they'll say that they didn't, but I think the prosecution had somebody paying attention to the tweets and podcasts and and to everything that was going on because,



uh, you could see those micro adaptations because they a lot of people pull in for them. They had 1000s of little mini investigators and just brilliant minds on this, thinking about it. And the best ideas were bubbling up to the top and getting retweeted and everything and, and you're getting that as a prosecutor even though you're prepping for the next day, somebody has got to be looking at Twitter and the blogs and the blogosphere.

David Moses 51:49 And podcasts.

Mandy Powers Norrell 51:52

The Podcast, the podcast, and yeah. And saying, hey, you know, here's a, here's sort of the zeitgeist, here's what people are feeling about today. Here's what they think here's where they think we're doing well, and where they think we need to adapt, and it's gonna, I think it's gonna help and factor in. Absolutely.

Mandy Matney 52:15

I have a question for you as a domestic violence prosecutor, and we've talked about this a little bit. It's really hard in this is the Colucci case is obviously a very abusive and volatile relationship. And Sarah is what you call an in or an imperfect victim and everyone is they all are a they are how, how do you overcome that as a prosecutor to get the jury to see somebody for that they don't deserve this, that they are a victim in all of this, that they were in an abusive relationship? And like, how do you build that kind of narrative and drill at home to the jury, and it's difficult to do that.



David Moses 53:03

I think Meghan Birchstead in her closing argument says, well, she wasn't very nice.

Mandy Powers Norrell 53:08

She described her the word mean, and like, she was mean, she was mean. She was mean, and I think she did that to say she was a fighter. She was fighting him, we saw signs of a struggle in the car. And, you know, she was mean, she wouldn't kill herself. And it was this notion of meaning people don't kill themselves. And but I think people, a lot of people, like kind of think that. Not not as exactly true. But I think that it's the hardest thing, because every victim that you know, we have is generally going to be imperfect. There and very many of them are going to be imperfect on a on a pretty high scale. So, you know, if you've got jurors who are going to judge somebody for doing drugs or or being drunk or having, you know, had, how they dress, how they talk, how they, you know, we see victims being judged constantly. Then you do have that problem and you have to overcome it. You have to just sort of confront the jurors with their own prejudices and preconceived notions about people. And I think that's why Meghan birch said was saying, She's mean, it's to say, you can't hold that against her. You can't think that she deserved to die because she's mean and, and that kind of thing. It just I think it wasn't, the connection wasn't made between She's mean yet, you know, you've got to set that aside, but because she also had drugs in her system, and she also had alcohol in her system, but she didn't deserve to die because of those things. And she was and she would text him some pretty, you know, some Pretty main things, and I'm betting he responded to her in some kind of way, as y'all often are pointing out that his responses are just missing. And there's no way



that anybody in their right mind, who is like a reasonable person in a relationship is going to respond with a love you, darling, please come home, when they're being hit with, you know, I hope you die on a toilet or you know, something like that. It's just like, Oh, thank you, I love you. You know, that's not, that's not normal. It's either somebody who is trying to create a record than being the reasonable one, or it's somebody who is responding in a different way. That's not recorded.

David Moses 55:45

Andy Savage touches on too, when, when the witness was talking about the Celebrate data, the witness talks about how it might be on one phone, but might not be on another. And, and then Andy just says, Oh, that's weird. Let's talk about that.

Mandy Matney 56:01

And then a tangent. And another question I had with the text, the prosecution decided to present I want to say four weeks of text or something like that, um, is that and obviously some of them made her not look great. But some of them made him look a little better, but you can't pick and choose how does that work as a prosecutor? Or if you didn't, if you didn't include some text? Would that come to bite you? Is that what happened?

Mandy Powers Norrell 56:32

Right? I think that between the two of them, they were like trying to come to some kind of agreement as to how much to present. And And then ultimately, they left it up to the judge, you know, the it wasn't clear how very much Andy wanted them to present, you know, in terms of a timeline. And then Megan Birchstead was like, well, we provided him



with this, but we don't want to overwhelm the jury and have text messages read to them for an entire week. And, you know, ultimately, you want to come to something because it's all got to have probative value, it's got to have value to the case, it can't just be a year ago, they were texting about, you know, picking up bread at the grocery store or something like that, it's got to be within a timeline that has some value to the case. Talking about the Celebrate data, though, I think that if Andy had pushed farther on that, he might have gotten some information he didn't want, because I kind of get the sense that it's possible to have, you know, because they gave him his phone and her phone back. And I think it's possible for him to have gone into both and deleted all of his angry, abusive, potentially texts, and then given them the phone's back. And they've got to do certain things in order to it within a certain period of time in order to retrieve deleted messages. And so you know, perhaps because I remember with Alex's case, the sled investigator who pulled the Celebrate data was saying, we were able to retrieve these from this phone, even though they were deleted, but they weren't on another phone. So there may be something that he could have done or that sled wasn't able to retrieve deleted messages. But that would have been interesting to explore.

Mandy Matney 58:26

Right. And I think each carrier it changes for like, if you delete a text, how long they stay, how long you can get them from the clouds. And I was also thinking of losing our were kind of going through a bunch of different scenarios. And I was just thinking of a former of a former life before David when I was in an abusive relationship. And I would delete text messages from him that were bad because I didn't want that. Like I was still wanting to create this narrative. And I didn't want evidence in I



know that that sounds so weird, but like, you don't want that you want to keep the fairy tale alive. And if you get a really shitty text message, even in your own head, right? You don't want to look up you don't want to scroll up and see it and I think that could have gone on but I think there was clearly more communication from his end that we didn't get and that was super sketchy and it was just kind of sad. It was just kind of disappointing and I know again, hindsight is 2020 and I understand they probably didn't have a lot of resources dedicated to this case and I really hope that they look at everything that they did last time because it was just kind of unfortunate how they ended on the prosecution ended on the text messages and Andy kind of blur Andy blurred the lines there of what was going on with the text messages because he was like trying to get way more text in and it wasn't like a compelling oh my god narrative. This is all doubt is removed. This is the timeline. This is this is the like with those text messages. For instance, they barely went, they barely talked about his money problems. And I feel like his money problems were a huge gigantic stressor in his life, combined with his marriage. And those were two things like in the Murdaugh case that like, you can, you can just see this gathering storm building up and making it can make somebody snap. And those are things that juries can understand and hold on to. And it was just really unfortunate that when first of all the guy who read the text message is bless his heart, but it was just the most boring. What do you do as a prosecutor when you have a witness like that, that is like...

Mandy Powers Norrell 1:00:50

He was so monotone.



Mandy Matney 1:00:52

Reading these incredibly dramatic, horrifying text messages of like, I hate you, blah, blah. But it just in a complete monotone. What do you do with it?

Mandy Powers Norrell 1:01:03

I hate you, I hope you die of a heart attack. And I think I would stop and say, Can you repeat that? I didn't get that. What did you say, you know, just you gotta get that repetition, did you? She said, I hate you. I hope you die. And he said, you know, he wait, she's responding to him. But we don't see what she's responding to. Am I missing a text message here? No, it's not there. Huh? Okay. Okay, go on, you know, just to kind of let the jury know, there's something going on here that we're not seeing, ask a question. wonder about it, connect the dots.

Mandy Matney 1:01:42

And I think that in another thing that was just so clear in this case that they didn't have in the Murdaugh case, is the narrative that he or she was about to divorce him. And he seemed like a control freak in the relate. Like, he seems like a type of guy that held power over his relationship and would not like to be left in might exactly choose violence. When I'm sure you've seen those scenarios over and over. It's scary when women leave, and they're in abusive relationships. That's the contrast.

Mandy Powers Norrell 1:02:16

Control is always a thing. Right?



Mandy Matney 1:02:19

And don't they say like the one of the most dangerous period for a woman is when you're leaving, when you're leaving somebody like that's when your life has the most at risk. And if you're leaving an abusive relationship,

Mandy Powers Norrell 1:02:32

It is. It is.

David Moses 1:02:33

Was there any other evidence from the Colucci trial that sort of stood out to you before we move on?

Mandy Powers Norrell 1:02:40

Well, the signs of the struggle in the car, you know, just the broken sunglasses that corresponded with his eye injury, and her broken acrylic nail that was in the floorboard. And Andy Savitch made a lot of noise about that saying, Oh, well, acrylic nail is just a piece of plastic that's just sort of stuck to your nail like they don't. And then he had the acrylic nail expert there say these weren't applied correctly and all this, but acrylic nails, and I've never had them, but I have seen the kinds of injuries they can do. I had a victim who needed a she was well, she probably was a victim, but she was charged as a defendant in a case. And I got her back there. And I was talking to her because she was not represented. And so I was telling her, you know, you need to get a lawyer and all this. And so but I said, you know if you can talk to me if you want to, but you don't have to, and I would recommend that you get a lawyer but I have an offer for you. And I think she ultimately took the offer. But I was showing her the pictures of the injuries to the man. And there was this just she



had dug his flesh off of his arm with her acrylic nails. And she said my nails did that. I got good there. And so you know, it was just one of those things that I'm like, wow, these acrylic nails, they're like bear claws. And so it takes a lot for one of them to pop off. I had a waitress tonight at the restaurant that I went to. And she had a broken she had a cast on her arm and my friend said what happened to you? And she said I was in the gym and I did this jump box thing and I caught my fingers. my fingernail caught the handle of the box and it broke my finger. And so she had the cast on but her nails were still perfect. And she said I had just had my nails done. And I said then your acrylic nail didn't come off and she's like no, I have to go and have them removed. I'm so tired of them because they cause me to break my fingers. But my nails stayed on through that like it broke her finger but not her nail. So it takes so much to break an acrylic nail that That was some kind of, I think, serious struggle in the car that day for her nail for zero Gucci's nail to be broken off.

David Moses 1:05:09

And that was Special Agent David Owen that was testifying about the struggle. And I think that there was an inexperience and a lack of understanding on both Andy Savage's part, which was likely intentional.

Mandy Powers Norrell 1:05:22

I'm confused. Just a piece of plastic.

Mandy Matney 1:05:26

Yeah. And he was base. Yeah, that lady was like, her nails or a plaque that their trash nails like, yeah. Press on nails. I was like, Oh, my gosh, this is just so far off the rails. That's another example.



David Moses 1:05:42

Especially to no one was saying, Well, yeah, I mean, it's a it's a sign of a struggle. And that comes off. I mean, I don't, I don't have acrylic nails. But I you know, that it makes logical sense that that would be some sort of trauma to to that finger. But yeah, that's that's a great point. And, and we'll probably go back and watch. Yeah. Special Agent. Oh, and doing that. Yeah.

Mandy Matney 1:06:05

Dick did that in the Murdaugh trial, too. But Mandy, I really, really appreciate your time that this has been amazing. But one question that I had, you have taught me a lot about domestic violence. And you've learned a ton as a prosecutor in the last couple years, and I have been more educated my reporting of domestic violence. And one thing that you told me a long time ago was that you a lot of your victims flip, and they don't want to work with you anymore. And what is the primary reason for that? And what what have you learned?

Mandy Powers Norrell 1:06:46

Financial dependence, generally, financial and emotional dependents, you know, I tell them, they, you know, over half of them say, I don't want you to prosecute, I want to drop the case. And I have to tell them, it's not your case, it's the state's case, I decide if we're going to prosecute, and I want to go forward. And they will call me everything but a child of God. I mean, they just hate me for prosecuting their boyfriend, generally is their boyfriend and, or their husband or whoever. And you know, it's a trauma bond is stronger than a love bond. And because a love bond is based in equality, and just the notion that, you know, I don't have to have you in my life, I am secure, I have what I need emotionally to go



forward. But I choose to have you because I love you. A trauma bond says You are my identity. Without you, I do not exist. And most of these relationships are formed with a trauma bond and not a real love bond. And it's a it's a very difficult thing, to, to get someone to, to let go of and to, and to, you know, go forward with the notion that, you know, they're going to prosecute someone who's been who's been physically harming them. I, I wish I had the answer for how to fully overcome that the best thing for me that I found is time and distance. So if if the defendant poses a danger, or a flight risk, then we can oppose bond and keep them in the county jail until trial or an or for a while, or at least, and that distance, physical distance and time, often we'll let the victim see that they can make it on their own, that they can pay their bills that they can, you know, take care of their own personal needs without the defendant in their lives. And once they, once that chain is broken, a lot of times they'll participate in the prosecution and in really stand up for themselves. But very often, it's, I mean, that's the biggest obstacle in the case is getting the victim to cooperate.

Mandy Matney 1:09:05

I mean, and I, you tweeted a while ago, but it was it just really resonated with me that the best thing in the world to teach your girls is financial independence. And if you want them safe, that like it means it could mean their life. Because if you think about like, a lot of women who get into the trap of an abusive relationship and the trap of being married and being a housewife and not having any of their own fallback, and then what do you do?



Mandy Powers Norrell 1:09:36

And if you got a lot of these mamas out here, they'll say, Have you a go bag, which means a bag with a change of clothes and some money in it so that you can grab it and go because the mamas had been in abusive relationships. But it's it's, you know, ultimately the best thing to do is have more than a go bag have your own, you know your own source. of income because a lot of people are teaching their their daughters find you a good provider. And that's I think that's terrible advice.

Mandy Matney 1:10:10

Right we're like kind of reverting back to the whole house wife thing is becoming a thing again and becoming and girls are getting really into like stay at home girlfriend which stay at home if you want to I don't that that is fine but I think the point that you make so clearly is that you have to realize that it's giving up your financial independence like you're giving up a lot when it comes to your independence in your in it's bad for your safety if you want to you have to be able to think of something beyond your relationship and every woman needs a fallback and an education and financial independence is the best thing in the world and yeah, I mean it's if you want to choose to be that traditional life and a stay at home I have friends that are stay at home moms, they love it and but it's it's just really important that everybody has their What do you do scenario? Right? Yeah, right. And not that I do.

David Moses 1:11:09

You would do fine on your own.



Mandy Matney 1:11:11

Y'all happen to have you have a company bond, a lot of fun with that good stuff going on.

Mandy Powers Norrell 1:11:20

Right. You've got the right bond.

Mandy Matney 1:11:24

Right? Yeah. Well, this was amazing. I know it's late on the east coast, but I can't thank you enough for we finally made this happen. And we overcame all the challenges this week and so cups down, Mandy.

Mandy Powers Norrell 1:11:38

Cups down. Thank you all so much for having me.

David Moses 1:11:41

So good to talk with you Mandy, and thank you so much. Cups down, Mandy and Mandy.

Mandy Powers Norrell 1:11:47

Cups down.

Mandy Matney 1:12:01

Cup of Justice is a Luna Shark Production created by me Mandy Matney and co-hosted by journalist Liz Farrell and attorney Eric Bland. Learn more about our mission and membership at lunasharkmedia.com. Interruptions provided by Luna and Joe Pesky.