



## COOK & COOK

COOKANDCOOKLAWFIRM.COM

LAW FIRM, PROFESSIONAL LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY

COOKANDCOOKLAW@GMAIL.COM

Criminal Defense, Personal Injury & Family Lawyers  
214 Dwyer Street Suite 300 San Antonio, Texas 78204  
T: 210-271-2800 F: 210-271-9262

February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2012

Yonovjtz & Joe, L. L. P  
Attn: Mr. Herbert Joe  
P.O. Box 702287  
Dallas, TX 75370  
Re: *In the State of Texas vs. Reginaldo Salas*

Dear Mr. Joe:

I met my Client, Reginaldo, for the first time in August of 2011. He had been incarcerated for about 8 months when I was appointed to represent him. As you now know, he had been charged with violating a protective order. In sum, the complainant female alleged that Reginaldo called her and left a voicemail message in direct violation of his protective order. At the outset, just by reading the facts, the guilt of the Defendant seemed obvious. It was when I first sat down with him and spoke with him about the facts that I started to suspect he might be innocent of the offense. Reginaldo was adamant, and I do mean, *adamant*, that he never had called the woman, not once, in violation of his protective order. I gave him the choice to plea bargain the case with a "time-served" offer from the prosecution, which would result in a conviction for the offense. He absolutely refused any and all plea bargains. He insisted that he would wait for a jury trial.

At this time, I started playing the voicemail that was allegedly his voice, over and over. I must have listened to it 100 times. I could not tell whether this was my Client's voice. We sought out an expert on that question and discovered your vast credentials almost immediately online.

Your telephonic assessment of the recording was astonishingly helpful. Based on the brief conversation we had, I formed a cross-examination for the alleged victim that I could not have written, on my own, or even come close to. After you helped me create the cross, you sent over the preliminary expert report regarding the voicemail. With extreme attention to the details of the recording, you concluded that this was fabricated evidence, and that it was not a voicemail recording, as so claimed to be by the "victim".

In the face of the report, the State dismissed the case. It should be noted that the State did not dismiss the case just because of the report, but also because of the person behind the report. That is, your credentials demonstrated that you are an expert that testifies for both the defense and prosecution. Your decisions are not conjured up for the paying Client, but are based on your expertise. The State noted and appreciated this fact. In a similar vein, when I asked for you to compare the voices of the voicemail and my Client, you explained that you could not do so fairly. You stated that the voicemail was too distorted to properly make this assessment. Again, you were clearly working to find the truth of the matter, despite who it helped or did not help.

As a final note, the dismissal did not come until after the actually innocent Defendant spent 420 days in county jail, on county money, awaiting his long deserved trial. Yet, he will not live with a dent on his criminal record. Instead he was properly dismissed, and I credit that outstanding accomplishment to your fine work.

(Thank you)  
Best Regards,

Megan V. Cook, Esq.