STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)	**IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS FOR THE TENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**
COUNTY OF ANDERSON)	
State of South Carolina,)	**WARRANT NOS.: 2023A0410101937-940**
Vs.)	**INDICTMENT NOS: 2024-GS-04-0221AG, -0222AG, -0223AG and -0224AG**
Rosmore Wayne Vilardi,)	**MOTION TO EXCLUDE TESTIMONY FROM ERIC DEVLIN**
Defendant.)	

If the Court rules that Eric Devlin had proper authority to extract the devices, then, the Defendant, Rosmore Vilardi, by and through the undersigned Counsel, moves the Court to exclude the proposed expert testimony of Eric Devlin pursuant to Rules 104(a), 403, 702, and 704 of the South Carolina Rules of Evidence, as well as the rules against hearsay, including Rules 801 and 802.

INTRODUCTION

The State intends to call Eric Devlin as an expert witness at the trial of this case. Devlin is a Texas-based digital forensic examiner and attorney who serves as an on-air consultant for the television show *Cold Justice* on TNT/Oxygen, which reinvestigated this case and whose involvement appears to have led directly to the December 2023 arrests of the Defendants.[1] Devlin prepared a 303-slide presentation purporting to cover the "Electronic Evidence" in this case, bearing the case number LFG20231020-1, indicating his engagement began in October 2023.[2]

[1] A copy of the Devlin presentation is attached as Exhibit 1. The presentation bears Bates numbers Vilardi 045744 through 046046.

[2] See Exhibit 2 (Eric Devlin Curriculum Vitae, Vilardi 045721-045743).

A TRUE COPY
JUL 10 2026
C. Reena Thomason
CLERK OF COURT

FITSNEWS

Devlin's presentation, and his anticipated testimony, is fundamentally flawed in several ways. While portions of his work may involve legitimate forensic extraction of data from electronic devices, the vast majority of his presentation goes far beyond technical forensic analysis. Devlin curates, labels, interprets, and editorially characterizes the content of private text messages and social media posts to construct a motive narrative for the prosecution. He presents cell tower location analysis despite having no demonstrated qualification as a cell site expert separate from his digital forensics background. He refers to the Defendants as "suspects" throughout his presentation, revealing a lack of the objectivity required of expert witnesses. Finally, his presentation functions as a vehicle to place otherwise inadmissible hearsay evidence before the jury under the guise of expert testimony.

The Court should exclude Devlin's testimony.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Eric Devlin holds a B.A. from Southern Methodist University, a J.D. from South Texas College of Law, and completed the Basic Texas Peace Officer Course at Alvin Police Academy in 2010.[3] He served as an Assistant District Attorney in the Harris County District Attorney's Office from 2001 to 2012, primarily prosecuting child exploitation and cybercrime cases. Since 2012, he has operated Lone Star Digital Forensic Group as Managing Director and forensic examiner.

Devlin has served as an on-air digital forensic and investigation consultant for *Cold Justice – Homicide* on TNT/Oxygen since Season 2 in 2013, continuing through the present. He has been

---

[3] EX 2 at Vilardi 045721

FITSNEWS

a member of the cast and production team for the show's reinvestigation of cold homicide cases for over a decade. The *Cold Justice* team's reinvestigation of this case appears to have generated the breakthrough that led to the arrests of the Defendants in December 2023, approximately eight years after the date of the crimes charged, even though, the show does not seem to have uncovered a shred of new evidence in this case.

It is important to note this is not a "cold case" as the term is commonly used. Cold cases generally involve unsolved crimes eventually solved through some type of new evidence that leads to a breakthrough in the investigation. This case involved years of dead ends until the State found investigators willing to overlook the myriad problems with the case and finally arrest the Vilardis. Nothing materially changed during that time period.

Devlin's 303-slide presentation covers three broad categories of evidence: (1) social media records from Facebook/Meta (slides 2–77); (2) cell tower location analysis from Verizon and AT&T records (slides 78–148); and (3) digital forensic examination of numerous electronic devices and accounts, including laptops, hard drives, tablets, phones, USB drives, SD cards, and Gmail accounts (slides 149–303). The presentation includes extensive editorial characterizations of message content, labeling individual text message exchanges with interpretive summaries such as "Complaints about Victims," "Financial Trouble," "Marital Problems," and "Ross instructing that victims are not to have contact with children at church."

Notably, Devlin labels evidence throughout the presentation as "Recovered from Suspect's home," revealing that he approached this engagement not as a neutral forensic examiner but as an investigator with a predetermined conclusion about the identity of the perpetrators.

LEGAL STANDARD

Rule 702 of the South Carolina Rules of Evidence allows expert testimony when

"scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge" will help the jury understand evidence or determine a disputed fact. To testify to an expert opinion, a witness must be [4]

"...qualified as an expert by knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education..." S.C. R. Evid. 702. [5]

Admission of expert testimony in South Carolina requires three elements: (1) the expert must assist the trier of fact, (2) the expert witness must be qualified, and (3) the underlying science must be reliable. Admission of expert testimony should remain limited to the precise area of expertise in which the witness is qualified.[7] Opining on other matters risks reversal even under the abuse of discretion standard.

Rule 403 provides that relevant evidence "may be excluded if its probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusion of the issues, or misleading the jury, or by considerations of undue delay, waste of time, or needless presentation of cumulative evidence." S.C. R. Evid. 403.

ARGUMENT

1. Devlin's editorial characterizations of text messages and social media posts do not constitute expert testimony and should be excluded.

The largest portion of Devlin's presentation consists of Facebook messages and text

---

[4]See, e.g., EX 1 at slides 250–266 (editorial labels including "Complaints about Victims," "Financial Trouble," "Unable to pay shop Rent," "Marital Problems," and "Ross instructing that victims are not to have contact with children at church").

[5] EX 1 at Vilardi 045812, 045906 (slides labeled "Bill Recovered from Suspect's home").

FITSNEWS

messages displayed on individual slides, each preceded by an editorial label summarizing the content and its purported significance. These labels include "Complaints about Victims," "Financial Trouble," "Unable to pay shop rent and landlord confrontation," "7K in arrears for shop rent," "Law Enforcement Called to Home," "Marital Problems," and "Ross instructing that victims are not to have contact with children at church."

None of these characterizations require any specialized forensic knowledge and they are certainly not appropriate areas for expert opinions. Any literate person can read a text message and understand its content. [6]No forensic tool, methodology, or technical process is needed to determine that a message discussing unpaid rent might relate to financial difficulty (though without context that may not be the case), or that a message expressing frustration with family members constitutes a "complaint." Devlin's editorial labels add nothing that the jury cannot determine on its own from reading the underlying messages, if those messages are even admissible at trial.

a. The editorial labels do not assist the trier of fact.

Rule 702 requires that expert testimony "assist the trier of fact to understand the evidence or to determine a fact in issue." The content of a text message or Facebook post is self-evident.

---

[6] See *State v. Council*, 335 S.C. 1, 19–21 (1999); *State v. Wallace*, 440 S.C. 537, 543–44 (2023). S.C. R. Evid. 702.

State v. Herrera, 425 S.C. 558 (2019).

See EX 1 at slides 6–77 (Facebook messages), slides 250–291 (text messages with editorial labels).

When Amy Vilardi writes to her husband about being unable to pay rent, the jury does not need a forensic examiner to explain that the message might concern financial difficulty. Devlin's characterizations merely place the imprimatur of expert authority on inferences any juror could (but is not required to) draw, improperly bolstering the State's theory of motive.

b. Devlin's curated narrative exceeds any forensic expertise and usurps the role of the jury.

Devlin has not merely extracted data and presented it. He has selected specific messages, arranged them in a sequence designed to build a narrative of financial desperation and family conflict, and attached interpretive labels that tell the jury what to conclude from each message. This is advocacy, not forensic analysis. It is the function of the prosecutor in closing argument (if any of this is admissible, which Defendant does not concede), not the function of an expert witness. By wrapping this narrative in the credibility of a "digital forensic examiner," the State improperly amplifies the persuasive weight of what would otherwise be ordinary documentary evidence that the jury is competent to evaluate independently.

c. The editorial characterizations violate Rule 403.

The prejudicial effect of having a credentialed expert narrate a curated motive narrative vastly outweighs any probative value. Jurors are likely to give undue weight to Devlin's characterizations precisely because they come from someone presented as a forensic expert, yet the characterizations rest on no greater analytical foundation than the jurors' own ability to read. The risk of unfair prejudice is compounded by the sheer volume of Devlin's editorial slides, which comprise the majority of his 303-slide presentation and collectively construct a comprehensive prosecution narrative under the guise of expert analysis.

FITSNEWS

2. Devlin's role as a member of the Cold Justice investigative team disqualifies him as an objective expert witness.

Devlin's curriculum vitae reflects that he has been an on-air digital forensic and investigation consultant for *Cold Justice – Homicide* since Season 2 in 2013. He is paid by *Cold Justice – Homicide.* He is not a witness retained after the fact to offer an independent assessment of evidence. He is a member of the investigative team that reinvestigated this cold case and whose work product appears to have provided the basis for the December 2023 arrests. His case file number, LFG20231020-1, indicates his engagement began on or about October 20, 2023, approximately two months before the arrests.

Expert witnesses are expected to be objective and independent. *See Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*, 509 U.S. 579, 595 (1993) (noting that expert testimony should be grounded in "the methods and procedures of science" rather than the "subjective belief or unsupported speculation" of the expert). When an expert is embedded in the investigative team that built the case, the risk of confirmatory bias is acute. Devlin did not receive evidence and independently analyze it. He participated in the investigation that generated the evidence and identified the targets. [7]

This embedded role is further revealed by Devlin's language throughout the presentation. On at least two slides, he labels exhibits as recovered from "Suspect's home" rather than using the neutral language expected of an objective examiner (e.g., "the Vilardi residence" or "the defendants' residence"). This language demonstrates that Devlin approached this work with the

[7] EX 1 at slide 95 (Vilardi 045838): "After 10-31-15, All Calls/Messages are Incoming – No Outgoing Calls – No Outgoing Messages – No communications appear to be answered."

conclusion already in mind and was functioning as an advocate, not an analyst.

The Court's gatekeeping obligation is particularly important here. If Devlin is permitted to testify as an expert, the jury will hear from a witness who presents himself as an independent forensic examiner, but who is, in reality, a central member of the investigative team that built this case for the prosecution. This false appearance of independence is itself a form of unfair prejudice that Rule 403 is designed to prevent.

3. Devlin's presentation encompasses areas far beyond his qualifications.

Devlin's curriculum vitae reflects expertise in digital forensics, specifically the extraction of data from electronic devices using tools such as Cellebrite, EnCase, Magnet Axiom, and similar forensic platforms. His professional background is in cybercrime prosecution and child exploitation investigations. His training, education, and experience do not qualify him to testify as an expert in the following areas covered by his presentation.

His presentation includes financial documents, business records, client lists, and employee time reports recovered from electronic devices. If the Court rules Devlin to be qualified to testify that he extracted these files from specific devices, he is not qualified to interpret their financial significance, draw conclusions about the Defendants' financial condition, or present them to the jury in a manner that builds a financial motive narrative. [8]That is the province of a qualified financial expert, and this Court has already been presented with a separate motion regarding the State's financial expert.

Devlin also presents surveillance video from a QuickTrip convenience store as part of his digital forensics presentation, despite the fact that the recovery and presentation of surveillance

[8] See, e.g., EX 1 at slide 173 ("Client List"), slide 192 ("Hannah Schneider's Time Report"), slides 69, 163 ("Bill Recovered from Suspect's home")

video from a commercial establishment requires no forensic expertise whatsoever.[14] The inclusion of this material in a forensic examiner's presentation is calculated to lend the appearance of scientific authority to evidence that is entirely lay in nature.

Expert testimony must be limited to the precise area of expertise in which the witness is qualified. *State v. Herrera*, 425 S.C. 558 (2019). This Court should exclude any testimony from Devlin that exceeds the narrow technical scope of forensic data extraction

4. Devlin's presentation is a vehicle for introducing inadmissible hearsay, and the use of an expert is an attempt to circumvent the rules against hearsay.

The most troubling aspect of Devlin's anticipated testimony is its function as a mechanism for placing otherwise inadmissible hearsay before the jury. The bulk of his presentation consists of out-of-court statements: Facebook messages, text messages, and social media posts made by the Defendants, the victims, and various third parties. These are classic out-of-court statements offered for the truth of the matters asserted and are inadmissible hearsay under Rules 801(c) and 802 of the South Carolina Rules of Evidence.[15]

a. The messages are hearsay regardless of the medium from which they were extracted

The fact that Devlin extracted these messages using forensic tools from electronic devices does not change their character as hearsay. [9]A text message does not become admissible simply

---

[9] See EX 1 at slides 155–303 (examination of laptops, external hard drives, USB drives, tablets, iPads, SD cards, cameras, phones, and Gmail accounts).

S.C. R. Evid. 801(c); S.C. R. Evid. 802.

because a forensic examiner presents it on a PowerPoint slide. The forensic extraction process authenticates the message and establishes that it was present on a particular device. It does not transform the message's content from hearsay into admissible evidence. Yet that is precisely the effect of Devlin's presentation: by embedding hearsay messages within a forensic expert's presentation, the State seeks to place their content before the jury without having to satisfy any hearsay exception or exclusion.

b. Third-party messages are inadmissible hearsay not subject to any exception.

Many of the messages in Devlin's presentation are communications from third parties to the Defendants or to the victims. These include messages from Pam Isbell, Kevin Smith, "Shelley", Meredith Owen, and numerous others. These statements are hearsay, and the State cannot circumvent the hearsay rules by routing them through an expert witness's presentation. No hearsay exception applies to these third-party communications.

c. Even statements by the Defendant require independent admissibility determinations.

While statements by the Defendant may qualify as admissions of a party opponent under Rule 801(d)(2), the admissibility of each statement must be determined independently based on its content, context, and the purpose for which it is offered. Devlin's presentation bundles hundreds of messages together and presents them as a single package of "electronic evidence." This approach denies the Court the opportunity to make individualized admissibility determinations and denies the defense the opportunity to object to specific statements.

d. The business records exception does not apply.

The State may attempt to argue that electronic records extracted from devices or obtained from service providers qualify as business records under Rule 803(6). However, the business

FITSNEWS

records exception applies to the records of the business (i.e., the carrier's or platform's records showing that a message was sent at a particular time), not to the substantive content of communications transmitted through the business's systems. Facebook's records may establish that a message was sent from one account to another at a particular date and time. They do not make the content of that message admissible for the truth of the matter asserted.

e. The Confrontation Clause is implicated.

To the extent third-party statements in Devlin's presentation are testimonial in nature or are being offered for their truth, the Confrontation Clause of the Sixth Amendment prohibits their admission unless the declarant is available for cross examination.[17] Devlin's presentation includes statements from numerous individuals who are not parties to this case. If these individuals are not called as witnesses, the defense is denied its constitutional right to confront and cross-examine the declarants whose statements are being used against the Defendant.

The State should not be permitted to use an expert witness as a conduit for hearsay. If the State wishes to introduce the content of specific messages, it must do so through the declarants themselves or by establishing that a recognized hearsay exception applies to each individual statement. Packaging all of these statements within a forensic expert's presentation is an end run around the rules of evidence that this Court should not permit.

f. The "state of mind" exception to hearsay is not applicable. [10]

---

[10] [16]S.C. R. Evid. 803(6).

[17]See Crawford v. Washington, 541 U.S. 36 (2004).

CONCLUSION

Eric Devlin's proposed testimony suffers from multiple disqualifying defects. His editorial characterizations of message content require no forensic expertise and do not assist the trier of fact. His cell tower location analysis exceeds his demonstrated qualifications. His embedded role in the *Cold Justice* investigative team that built this case undermines any claim of objectivity. His presentation encompasses financial analysis, business records, and surveillance video that fall outside his area of expertise. And fundamentally, his presentation serves as a vehicle for placing hundreds of inadmissible hearsay statements before the jury under the guise of forensic analysis. Finally, he had no legal authority to extract any information from this phone or other sources.

For these reasons, this Court should exclude Devlin's testimony from the trial of this case or, in the alternative, limit his testimony strictly to the technical process of forensic extraction and require the State to independently establish the admissibility of each item of evidence Devlin extracted before it may be presented to the jury. This is argued in more detail in a separate motion.

KENT LAW FIRM, LLC

Shaun C. Kent, Bar #68565
19 South Mill Street
Post Office Box 117
Manning, SC 29102
(803) 433-5368

Manning, South Carolina
July 10, 2026

FITSNEWS

EXHIBIT 1

FITSNEWS

EXHIBIT 2

FITSNEWS

Curriculum Vitae

Eric Headen Devlin, B.A., J.D
Digital Forensic Examiner
Technology Expert

Lone Star Forensic Group

Areas of Specialization

Digital Forensics (Mobile Device, Storage Device, and Computer)
Cybercrime
Digital Intrusion and Breach
Cell Site Analysis
Technology Investigations
Child Exploitation
Cybersecurity
Social Media Investigations

Education:

Southern Methodist University — Dallas, Texas
Bachelor of Arts in History 1998
Bachelor of Arts in Political Science 1998

South Texas College of Law — Houston, Texas
Juris Doctorate 2001
Admitted to the Texas Bar- 2001

Alvin Police Academy — Alvin, Texas
Basic Texas Peace Officer Course 2010

Work Experience:

Lone Star Digital Forensic Group
Managing Director 2012-Present
Forensic Examiner (Tx DPS License No. A18389)
Technology Consultant
Legal Consultant in Technology Law

Television Legal & Digital Forensic Consultant
Season 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7- Cold Justice- Homicide on TNT/Oxygen 2013 to Present

* On air Digital Forensic and Investigation consultant in Cold Case Homicide Investigations.

Season 1- Cold Justice- Sex Crimes on TNT 2015
* On air Digital Forensic and Investigation Consultant in Cold Case Sexual Assault Investigations.

TTSNEWS

Season 1- Serial Predators
* On air Digital Forensic and Investigation Consultant in serial homicide and sexual assault suspect.

Season 1 & 2- Prosecuting Evil with Kelly Seigler
*Legal and Forensic Consultant 2023 through present

On Air Consultant for Fox & ABC on digital forensic stories

Harris County District Attorney's Office
Assistant District Attorney 2001-2012
Chief Prosecutor
Child Exploitation and Cybercrime Section
262nd District Court
228th District Court

Felony Prosecutor
Child Abuse Division
Juvenile Division
Felony Trial Bureau Prosecutor

Misdemeanor Prosecutor
Chief of Justice Court Section
Chief of County Court at Law No. 10
Family Criminal Law Division
Misdemeanor Division Trial Court Prosecutor
Justice Courts Section Prosecutor

Houston Metro Internet Crimes Against Children Taskforce
Founder
Deputy Commander 2006-2011
Member 2006-2013

Houston Area Child Sexual Abuse Team (HACSET)
member

United States Secret Service Taskforce on Electronic Crime
Prosecutor/Member 2008-2013

Awards and Citations:

Distinguished Service Award 2012
Internet Crimes Against Child Taskforce

FBI NEWS

- for outstanding service in support of child exploitation and cybercrime in Houston

Team Excellence Award *2010*
Children Assessment Centers of Texas
- for outstanding service in the field of prosecution of child sexual abuse crimes

Commendation Letter *2010*
Texas Commission on Law Enforcement
- for contributions in writing and creating the first program in the United States for State Certification of Police Officers in Cybercrime

Lone Star Emmy Award *2009*
The National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences
- as a member of the cast of Public Service Video about the child sexual abuse investigation and prosecution process for victims.

Served as an Expert Witness for the 81st, 82nd, & 83rd Texas Legislative Session (2009, 2011, 2013) on Cybercrime.

Served as Attorney and Investigator Member of TCOLE Board writing Certification Course for Cybercrime Investigators in Texas

Forensic Certifications

Mobile Device Forensics
CMFF, CLO, CPA, Advanced IOS, Advanced Android, Advanced Blackberry, Cellebrite, Magnet Acquire, Magnet Axiom, Paraben, Mobilyze, Katana Forensic's Lantern,

Hard Drive Forensics
Encase I, II, Axiom, SMART Triage, FTK, STOP, Blacklight/ Inspector, Gargoyle, Axiom, X-Ways,

Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Cybercrime Instructor

Specialized Cyber Training:

CyberSleuth Course 2007

Columbia, South Carolina
National Advocacy Center
University of South Carolina

Not Victimless Crimes: Efforts to Make Victims Voice Heard in CP Cases (Child Victim ID Training)	2007
Advocating for Victims of Online Child Exploitation in Offline World (Child Victim ID Training)	2007
Understanding Internet Technologies used to Exploit Children	2007
Who Are These Children & How Can We Rescue Them? (Child Victim ID Training)	2007
Presenting & Explaining Computer Forensic Evidence	2008
Child Pornography & Child Abuse	2008
Medical Analysis of Child Pornography (Child Victim ID Training)	2008
Online Grooming	2008
Project Safe Childhood Team Training Houston, Texas	2008
Introduction to the Virtual World of Second Life	2008
Age Regression	2008
NCMEC Child Victim ID Training (Child Victim ID Training) *Became Member of NCMEC Child ID Lab	2008
Child Pornography Victimization (Child Victim ID Training)	2009
NCMEC ICAC Commander School	2009

FTSNEWS

Advanced Undercover Chat	2009
Understanding Online Grooming	2009
Fantasy Defense in Internet Cases	2009
Cyberbullying: Train the Trainer	2009
Understanding BitTorrent	2010
Texas Cybercrime Investigator Certification	2010
United States Secret Service Technology Crimes and Identity Theft Training	2010
Case Study: Child Predator Ring Broken by Law Enforcement and Private Sector	2024

Forensic Training:

Introduction to ENCASE	2007
Introduction to FTK	2007
Mobile Digital Evidence Previewing	2007
Understanding Forensic Exams and Their Ability to Make a Case	2007
Digital Evidence Search and Seizure	2008
Susteen SecureView Mobile Forensics	2008
Introduction to Secure Forensic Imaging	2008
Image Scan	2008
Basic Computer Forensics	2009
Microsoft Windows 7 First Look Forensic Training	2009
Handheld and Mobile Forensics	2009
Live Response Forensics *Hardware Certification	2009

FTSNEWS

Fast Onscene Computer Forensics	2009
Forensic Scan TLO Product	2009, 2010
Forensic Triage to Protect Child Victims	2009
Cellular Phone Forensics	2010
Secure Techniques for Onsite Preview *STOP Software Certification	2010
Identifying and Seizing Electronic Evidence *Trainer Certification	2010
Wireless Network Investigations	2010
IPhone Search and Analysis	2010
Limewire 5.x Forensic Analysis	2010
Paraban Device Seizure 5.0 Training	2013
Paraben P2 Commander Training	2013
Paraben Device Seizure 6.0 Training	2013
VTC Computer Forensic Course	2013
Sumuri Mobile Forensic Essentials	2013
Sumuri iOS, Android, &Blackberry	2013
Paraben Level 1 Hard Drive Forensics	2013
Paraben Level 3 Mobile Forensics	2013
Access Data Custom Carving & File Types	2013
Access Data Registry Artifacts	2013
Access Data EFS Decryption	2013
Access Data PTRK Password Decryption	2013

FTSNEWS

Guidance Encase 7.0 Transition	2014
Windows 8 Forensic First Look	2014
Guidance Software: Protecting Against Insider Threats	2014
Guidance Software: E Discovery System	2014
JTAG 101- Technique Background	2014
Guidance Software V7 Encase Forensics I	2014
Guidance Software V7 Encase Forensics II	2014
Cellebrite's Mobile Forensic Fundamentals	2015
JTAG 102- Device Connection	2015
JTAG 103- Image and Pattern PIN	2015
Understanding Location Information Extracted From Mobile Devices	2015
Analyzing Evidence From Mobile Devices, Including Hidden and Deleted Data	2015
Investigating Sexual Crimes in the Tinder Age	2015
Malware: Gargoyle Investigations	2016
Blackbag Technologies Hard Drive Forensics with Blacklight	2016
Wild PCS JTAG Forensic Success 1	2016
Access Data's Forensic Bootcamp	2016
Access Data's Forensic Triage	2016
Access Data FTK 6.0 Transition	2016
Magnet Forensics "Artifacts in the Cloud"	2017

FTI NEWS

Access Data Cerberus & Malware Analysis	2017
Magnet Forensics "Connecting the Dots between Artifacts and User Activity"	2017
Access Data Dark Web Forensics	2017
Magnet Forensic- Axiom Transition	2018
Magnet Forensics- Fraud, IP, Theft, and Intrusion Forensics	2018
Cellebrite Certification Renewal	2018
Mobilyze Update Training	2018
Blacklight Update Training	2018
Magnet Forensics- Memory Analysis	2019
Access Data- FTK 7.0 Transition	2019
Magnet Forensics- Forensics That Matter	2019
Cellebrite Operator Recertification	2019
Cellebrite Physical Operator Recertification	2019
Inaccesible Data & DVR Examination	2019
Taking a Byte out of ChromeBook Forensics	2020
Teeltech: Preparing your Chip for a Read	2020
Investigating Corporate Misconduct	2020
Cloud Forensics	2020
T2 Chips & Mac OS Forensics	2020
Reverse Engineering for Examiners	2020

FTSNEWS

How to Collect Data from MDM Devices	2021
Emoting over Emotet and Maldoc	2021
Loading Different Evidence in Axiom	2021
Forensic Considerations for Cloud Data Storage	2021
Tips & Tricks // Get to Evidence Faster with Media Explorer	2021
RAM is King: Analyzing RAM in AXIOM	2021
Unique Tips of How Handling Locked Devices	2022
Ransomware: Current Trends and Updates	2022
Building a Pattern of Life iOS Location…	2022
[Air]Tag You're It!- a Look at location Arti	2022
Modernize Digital Inv with Crypto Insights	2022
Putting Geolocation Data on the Map	2022
Lost Time, Can it Be Found	2022
Basics of Digital Image and Video Comp	2022

Cell Tower Location Analysis Training

Houston Police Department & United States Marshall Service Cell Location Training	2010
Penlink Training	2010
Paraben Mobile Forensics Unit III- Cell Tower Location Analysis	2013, 2015
CellHawk Cellular Technology, Mapping, and Analysis	2019
CellHawk Using Advanced Analytics	2019
CellHawk- Real Time Ping Listener	2019

FTI NEWS

CellHawk User Update Training	2019
Cell Hawk Tower Dumps	2020
Carrier Records Breakdown	2020
Cell Hawk:Using GEO Location OSINT Data	2020
Kelsey Smith Abduction and Murder Case Study	2021
Cloud Investigations	2021
Collecting and Analyzing Data from Off Network Sites	2021
GNU/Linux Examinations	2021
AT&T Carrier Breakdown of Records	2021
Digital License Plates	2022
Bill Ekwaso Case Study	2022
Connected Cards: The 30K Cellphone	2022
Cyber Security: Risks and Ethics	2023
Search and Seizure in Digital Realm	2023
Use of Location Data: Cell Phones to Cell Records	2023
Remote Data Collection	2023
Cellebrite Mobile Ultra: Transition	2024
Cellebrite Guide to Insyets	2024
Cellhawk User Training Update	2024
Developing Responsible AI	2024
Developing Corporate Policies for AI	2024
Ethical Issues with Generative AI	2024

FTSNEWS

Investigate a Turncloak: A Case Study	2024
Ethics in a Mobile Digitized World	2025
AI and Ethics	2025
AI Machina Tools, Risks, and Ethics	2025
Face Recognition and Due Process	2025
Social Media Laws	2025
AI and Ethics	2025
Digital Evidence Case Studies	2025
Generative AI and Ethical Issues	2025
DeepDive AI Image Generation Magnet Forensics	2026

Peer 2 Peer Training:

Introduction to eP2P	2007
Wyoming Toolkit Training	2008
Operation Fairplay Part 1	2008
Operation Fairplay Part 2 *License Obtained*	2008
Advanced P2P Training	2009
Child Protection System *License Obtained*	2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014
Roundup for P2P Investigators Training *License Obtained	2010

Specialized Legal Training

Basic Prosecutor Course	2002
Prosecuting Sexually Violent Offenders	2004
Career Prosecutor Course	2005

FTSNEWS

Strategic Cross Examination (Course Facilitator) 2008

Basic Prosecutor Skills Course (Course Facilitator) 2009

Texas Death Penalty Prosecution 2012

Teaching:

"Preparing a Child Abuse Case for Prosecution" 2007
9th Annual Protecting Texas Children Conference
Harris County Children's Assessment Center

"Child Exploitation Investigations and Case Study I" 2008
10th Annual Protecting Texas Children Conference
Harris County Children's Assessment Center

"Child Exploitation Investigations and Case Study II" 2008
10th Annual Protecting Texas Children Conference
Harris County Children's Assessment Center

"Child Abuse Victim Case Study: Steven Anderson" 2009
11th Annual Protecting Texas Children Conference
Harris County Children's Assessment Center

"How to Make a Successful Cyber Crimes Prosecution While Protecting Child Victims" 2009
11th Annual Protecting Texas Children Conference
Harris County Children's Assessment Center

"Why We Do What We Do: Internet Investigations and the Toll it takes on Us" 2009
11th Annual Protecting Texas Children Conference
Harris County Children's Assessment Center

"Child Abuse Victim Case Study: Understanding Female Sex Offenders of Children" 2009
11th Annual Protecting Texas Children Conference
Harris County Children's Assessment Center

"State and Federal Internet Child Exploitation Statutes 2009
Project Safe Childhood: Southern District of Texas

"Search Issues Including Consent to Search and Drafting Search Warrants" 2009
Project Safe Childhood: Southern District of Texas

FISHER

"Search Warrant Execution" 2009
Project Safe Childhood: Southern District of Texas

"Child Exploitation Investigations in Texas" 2009
High Tech Crimes Investigator Association

"Technology in Sexual Abuse Cases" 2009
2009 Children's Assessment Center's of Texas

"Technology and Sexual Crimes" 2009
Harris County Annual Legal Update

"Internet Crimes and Investigations" 2009
TDCAA Annual Update

"Photo Sharing Website Investigations" 2010
National ICAC Conference

"Technology in Sexual Abuse Cases" 2010
2010 Children's Assessment Center's of Texas

"Beyond the Computer: Nontraditional Forums 2010
for Child Exploitation
National District Attorney Association

"Courtroom Presence and Testimony" 2010
Alvin Police Academy

"Technology in Sexual Abuse Cases" 2010
TDCAA/Baylor University Advanced SxAbuse

"Cyber 101: Technology for Lawyers and Judges" 2010
2010 Bench Bar Conference

TECLOSE Cybercrime Investigator Certification 2010
Houston RCFL

"CyberBullying and Internet Safety" 2011
Alief Hastings High School

"CyberBullying and Internet Safety" 2011
Spring Branch Independent School District

"Introduction to the ICAC" 2011
FBI Command College

FTSNEWS

"CyberBullying and Internet Safety" Clear Creek ISD Faculty Training	2011
"Courtroom Presence and Testimony" Alvin Police Academy	2011
TECLOSE Cybercrime Investigator Certification Harris County Constable's Office, Pct 4	2011
TECLOSE Cybercrime Investigator Certification Harris County Constable's Office, Pct 4	2011
TECLOSE Cybercrime Investigator Certification Victoria Police Department	2011
TECLOSE Cybercrime Investigator Certification Longview Police Department	2012
TECLOSE Cybercrime Investigator Certification Harris County Constable's Office, Pct 4	2012
"Technology in Criminal Cases: P2P Cases" Texas Criminal Defense Lawyers Association	2012
"Protecting Yourself from Child Predators" National Leadership Council- Houston Branch	2013
"Texas Law in P2P Cases" HMICAC/HCCP4	2013
TECLOSE Cybercrime Investigator Certification Harris County Pct 4, Houston ICAC	2013
"Forensics for Lawyers" Texas Criminal Defense Lawyers Association	2014
TECLOSE Cybercrime Investigator Certification Harris County PCT 4	2014
"Protecting your Home and your Child" Memorial Drive Elementary Parent Association	2015
TECLOSE Cybercrime Investigator Certification Harris County PCT 4	5/2015

FTSNEWS

TECLOSE Cybercrime Investigator Certification Harris County Sheriff's Academy	7/2015
TECLOSE Cybercrime Investigator Certification Harris County Sheriff's Academy	9/2015
TECLOSE Cybercrime Investigator Certification Fort Bend County Law Enforcement	12/2015
Computer and Mobile Device Forensics Harris County Criminal Lawyer's Association Spring 2016 CLE	3/2016
Tackling Digital Experts Harris County Criminal Lawyer' Association	6/2016
Technology for Criminal Defense Lawyers Texas Criminal Defense Lawyer's Association	9/2016
Technology in Family Law Cases Gulf Coast Family Lawyer's Association	10/2016
National Charity League "Protecting Yourself in the Digital World"	2/2017
Texas State Bar Continuing Education "Technology in Criminal Cases"	3/2017
Houston Cyber Security Summit Government Regulations Panel and Speaker	4/2017
TECLOSE Cybercrime Investigator Certification Harris County Sheriff's Department	6/2017
National Charity League CyberSafety for Teens	10/2017
Safety in a Digital World Memorial Middle School, Houston, Texas	3/2018
Business Safety in the Digital Age Houston Branch, US Federal Reserve	04/2018
Capital Defense Training- Location Analysis Houston, Texas	6/2018

FTSNEWS

Rusty Duncan Seminar- Digital Experts San Antonio, Texas	06/2018
Texas Criminal Seminar- Emerging Forensic Issues Texas Bar Association, San Antonio, Texas	07/2018
TECLOSE Cybercrime Investigator Certification Harris County, Sheriff's Department	08/2018
University of Houston Law School- Trial Advocacy Houston, Texas	03/2019
TECLOSE Cybercrime Investigator Certification Harris County, Sheriff's Department	5/2019
Introduction to Technology Evidence and Experts Fort Bend County District Attorney's Office	6/2019
Forensic Technology and its Applications South Texas College of Law	10/2019
TECLOSE Cybercrime Investigator Certification HCSO and Montgomery County Law Enforcement	12/2019
Cell Phone and Cell Tower Discovery- Harris County Public Defender's Office	4/2020
Cell Phone Discovery and Ethics of Digital Forensics Harris County Criminal Lawyers Association	5/2020
Introduction to Forensics and Cell Location Analysis South Texas College of Law of Houston	6/2020
TECLOSE Cybercrime Investigator Certification	2/2021
Houston Metro Internet Crimes Against Children Online Undercover Chatting	4/2021
Introduction to Digital Forensics South Texas College of Law	6/2021
Rusty Duncan TCDLA Seminar Forensic's in Child Exploitation Cases	6/2021
TECLOSE Cybercrime Investigator Certification	7/2021

FTSNEWS

St. Thomas Episcopal PTA- Internet Safety and CyberBullying- Parent Edition	10/2021
Introduction to Forensics and Cell Location Analysis South Texas College of Law of Houston	10/2021
St. Thomas Episcopal Middle School Internet Safety and Cyberbullying- Student Edition	12/2021
Memorial Middle School, SBISD Internet Safety and CyberBullying- Parent Edition	1/2022
Houston Bar Association Bench Bar Conference 4th Amendment in Regards to Cell Site Location Records	4/2022
TECLOSE Cybercrime Investigator Certification	5/2022
Advanced Criminal Law Seminar Introduction to Location Evidence Acquisition	7/2022
TECLOSE Cybercrime Investigator Certification	9/2022
Active Shooter Training Christ Memorial Lutheran School	10/2022
Rusty Duncan: Cell Phone and Location Technology San Antonio, Texas	06/2023
Advanced Criminal Law Seminar: Digital Forensics and Location Analysis Houston, Texas	07/2023
TECLOSE Cybercrime Investigator Certification	7/2023
Dealing with Tech Experts Harris County Public Defender's Office CLE,	8/2023
"Confronting Cybercrime Experts in Court" Harris County Public Defender's Office Seminar Series,	9/2023
"Artificial Intelligence in Fraud" Houston JCC Adult Learning Series,	10/2023
"Suppression of Cell Phone Evidence Texas Defense Lawyers Association	2/2024

FTSNEWS

Internet Safety, Human Tracking, and Cyber Bullying Memorial Jr. High Parent Association & SBISD	2/2024
Technology Pitfalls: AI Scams and Internet Safety Houston Area First Women's Forum	3/2024
Internet Safety: Student Edition National Charity League, Winchester Chapter	3/2024
CyberBullying and CyberExploitation Stratford High School	3/2024
Cyberbullying and Cyber Exploitation Memorial High School	3/2024
Houston Bar Association 2024 Bench/Bar Conference Digital Search and Seizure	10/2024
South Texas College of Law: Drafting Search Warrants "Partnering with Your Forensic Examiner" Texas Homicide Investigators Conference, March 2025	01/2025
Texas Peace Officer Cybercrime Investigator Certification Texas Commission on Law Enforcement- HCSO,	07/2025
"Partnering with Your Forensic Examiner" Texas Criminal Defense Lawyers Association,	09/2025
Cybercime Investigator Course Harris County Sheriff's Department,	10/2025
Drafting a Search Warrant South Texas College of Law, 2026 Winter Course	01/2026

Writings:

The Texas Prosecutor Magazine, V38, N2, March-April 2008
"The Door to a Predator's Lair"

"Hacking: The New Armed Robbery", training manual in cyber security for lawyers and other professionals- 2012, 2014, 2016

Section 4 "Technology and the Law" of the Cybercrime Investigators Manual
Texas Commission on Law Enforcement 2010, 2012, 2014, 2016, 2018, 2021

A Texas Lawyer's Guide to Electronic Crimes- 2014, 2016, 2018, 2020

FTSNEWS

"Emerging Technologies and Forensic Techniques"
Texas Criminal Defense Lawyers Association, July 2018

"Online Predators, an Internet Insurgency: a Field Manual for Teaching and Parenting in the Digital Arena" By Jeff Lee, forward by Eric Devlin, August 2020

"Artificial Intelligence in Digital Forensics"
Texas Criminal Defense Lawyers Association, July 2021

"The Rule of Completeness"
Texas Advanced Criminal Law Seminar, July 2022

"A Gunfight with an Empty Holster: Digital Investigations in Criminal Cases"
Texas Criminal Defense Lawyers Association, June 2023

"I Love Me Some Me: Establishing Your Expert's Credentials"
Texas Advanced Criminal Law Seminar, June 2023

"Suppression of Cell Phone Data"
Texas Association of Public Defenders, January 2024

"Partner with your Forensic Examiner"
TCDLA- Motions and Trial Publication, July 2025

Testimony:

2026

- State of Texas vs. Dwain Galentine, 184th District Court, Harris County, Texas: Expert witness in Cell Phone Forensic Examinations and Homicide Investigations.h

2025

- State of Texas vs Noel Stephens, 9th District Court, Montgomery County, Texas: Breach of Computer Security; Expert in Computer Forensics, Cloud Forensics, Computer Security Investigations.

- Metz v Shute, FO-24-00000188-0000, Ontario Court of Justice (Family)- Hague Hearing. Digital Forensic Examiner

- State of Texas vs. Wayne Taylor, 248th District Court, Harris County, Texas; Compelling Prostitution of a Minor; Expert in Digital Forensics and Human Trafficking

2024

- State of Texas vs. Devon Jordan; Galveston County, Texas; Capital Murder; Cell Phone Forensic Examination and Call Detail Record Analysis.

- State of Texas vs. Gregory Newson, Gregg County, Texas; Capital Murder- Neutral Appointed Court Examiner for State and Defense; Examination of a Cell Phone and Location Analysis.

- State of Texas vs. James Griffin, Liberty County: Sexual Assault- Cell Phone Forensic Examination, Child Exploitation Review

- State of Texas vs. Keona Mouton, Harris County, Texas: Homicide Case- Cell Phone Forensic Examinations and Cell Tower Location Analysis

- Remy v Remy, Galveston County District Court, State of Texas: Digital Forensic Expert

- Raizada v Raizada, Fort Bend County District Court, State of Texas: Digital Forensic Expert

- State of South Carolina vs. Gene Alexander Scott; Chester County South Carolina: State's Forensic Expert in Digital Forensics, Cell Location Analysis, and Social Media Evidence

- Britten vs. Griffin, Montgomery County, Texas, 418th District Court: Digital Forensic Examinations and Cyber Crime Investigations.

2023

- United States vs. Rick Pleaza, Cause No. 4:19-cr-00450, United States District Court, Southern District of Texas: Digital Forensic Expert

- State of Texas vs. Randy Estrada, Cause No, 20-12-15700; 435th District Court, Montgomery County, Texas; Digital Forensic Expert

- State of Texas vs. Chancese Brown, Cause No, 19-09-12213-CR; 435th District Court, Montgomery County, Texas; Digital Forensic Expert

- United States vs. Imad Wadi, SA-21-CR-0244; United States District Court Western District of Texas; Digital Forensic Expert, Call Detail Records Expert

- State of Texas vs. Byron Collins, Cause No. 1799146, 174th District Court of Harris County, Texas; Digital Forensic and Call Detail Records Expert

•Jane Doe (D.L.) vs. Marques Jackson, Cause No. 202220061, 113th District of Harris County, Texas; Cybercrime Investigations Expert

EISNEWS

• State of Texas vs. Jonathan Gutierrez, Cause No. 22.03-03974, 435th District Court, Montgomery County Texas; Digital Forensic Expert, Cloud Forensic Expert.

•Chad Verret v Cheryl Verret, 507th District Court, Harris County, Texas; Family Law Case, Mobile Device Expert

•United State vs. Ronald Brown, Southern District of Texas, Cause No. 30807-479, Cell Phone Records Expert

- State of Texas vs. Gregory Ager, Cause No. 21-37766, District Court of Jefferson County, Texas; Cell Location Expert

- In the Interest of Thomas Metz, Samuel Metz, Minor Children, Cause No. 17-09-11340, 418th District Court of Montgomery County, Texas. Digital Forensic Expert

2022

- State of Texas vs. Arturo Leyva, Cause No. 19-10-14605, Montgomery County, Texas: Digital Forensic and Child Exploitation Expert

- ANGELIQUE ELIZONDO and ANTONIO HERNANDEZ vs GULFMARK ENERGY, Cause No. 202002282m 152nd District Court, Harris County, Texas: Digital Forensic Expert.

- Fitzgerald V TTE, Cause No. 18-12-59004-CV; 79th District Court, Jim Wells County, Texas: Digital Forensic & Call Detail Records Expert

- State of Texas vs. Jesse Lansphere, Cause No. 380-80833-2019, 380th District Court, Collin County, Texas: Digital Forensic Expert, Child Sexual Abuse Expert

- State of Texas vs. Waymon Jordan, Cause No. 20-02-02178, 435th District Court, Montgomery County, Texas: Digital Forensic and Cell Location Expert

- State of Arkansas vs. Charles Devine, Cause No. 2019-0911, Circuit Court of Craighead County, Arkansas, Western District: Digital Forensic Expert, Cell Tower Location Expert

- State of Texas vs. Terrance Harper, Cause No 2018-CR-13416, 186th Judicial District Court, Bexar County, Texas: Digital Forensic Expert, Electronic Discovery Expert

- State of Texas vs. Barrington Combs, Cause No. 1790627, 248th District Court, Harris County, Texas: Digital Forensic Expert.

2021

- In the interest of Katherine Lilly Quigley Porter, A Child, Cause No. 2014-68848, 312th District Court, Harris County, Texas: Digital Forensic Expert
- United States vs. Augustine Ruiz, Cause No. SA-20-CR-0343, The Western District of Texas; Digital Forensics and Child Exploitation Investigations
- United States vs. Javon Opoku, 4:20-cr-00381-1, The Southern District of Texas; Digital Forensic's and Electronic Search and Seizure
- In re Eugene Kesselman, Maria Tsenaeva-Kesselman, Debtor; Cause No. 20-33714, United State's Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of Texas, Houston Division; Digital Forensic Expert
- The State of Texas vs. Thomas Wood et al, Cause No. 1680890, 1680898, 1708090; 228th District Court, Harris County, Texas- Digital Forensic Expert, Court Special Master
- The State of Texas vs. Cody Johnson, Cause No. 19-03-03070-CR, 221st District Court, Montgomery County, Texas- Digital Forensic Expert and Child Exploitation Investigations

2020

- The State of Texas vs. Michael Godfrey, Cause No. 1720518, 176th District Court, Harris County, Texas, Digital Forensic Expert
- Francisco and Jennifer Martinez as Next Friends of Francisco Rodriguez Martinez vs. Equipment Leasing Specialties, L.L.C. et al; 266th District Court, Erath County, Texas- Digital Forensic Expert.
- Petroleum Products and Services, Inv D/B/A Wellhead Distributors International and Tiva Technologies, LLC vs. CP International Inc, China Petroleum Technology and Development Corporation, Guylan J. Johnson and Henry OTohill, Cause No. 2019-46100, 80th District Court, Harris County, Texas- Digital Forensic Expert.

2019

- The State of Texas vs. Wade Thomspon, Cause No. 18,072, 12th District Court, Grimes County, Digital Forensic Expert
- The State of Texas vs. Jamari Martinez, Cause No. 1549120, 351st District Court, Harris County, Texas, Digital Forensic Expert, Geo Location Expert.
- EdTech Invest, LLC and EBackpack vs. Zilinskas, Cause No. 1-17-125, 439th District Court of Rockwall County, Texas- Digital Forensic Expert

2018

- Keith Story vs. Lisa Storey, Cause No. 201744898-7;157th District Court, Harris County, Texas, Digital Forensic Expert

- Sandra Rooney vs. James Rooney, Cause No. 201458482-7; 310th District Court, Harris County, Texas, Digital Forensic Expert.

2017

- United States vs. Heriberto Latino, Cause No. 4:15-CR-295, United Sates District Court, Southern District of Texas.- Digital Forensic Expert, Cybercrime

- State of Ohio vs. Tim Sheline, Cause No. CR-14-590948-A, Cuyahoga County Court of Common Pleas, Ohio; Digital Forensic Expert & Geo Location Expert

•State of Texas vs. Richard Trask, Cause No. 103702, County Court of Liberty County, Texas; Digital Forensic Expert.

FITSNEWS