

# **Motion To Hear Roger Carroll Jr. Retrial Will Be At 1 P.M. Aug. 19, 2020**

by Dan Brannan, Content Director  
June 25 2020 10:33 AM





JERSEY - The motion hearing for Roger Carroll Jr. to determine whether or not a judge will allow a retrial is set for 1 p.m. Aug. 19, 2020, the Jersey County Courthouse, the Jersey County Circuit Clerk's Office said Thursday.

The defendant - Carroll - had a motion for a new trial filed in Jersey County Court by his attorneys Clyde L. Kuehn and Scott Snider.

Jennifer Mudge and Crystal Uhe were named special prosecutors in the Carroll case. Eric Pistorius is the judge in the Carroll trial and will rule on the motion for new trial.

Carroll is convicted of luring Bonnie Woodward to Jersey County where he killed Woodward with a Stoeger Cougar 9mm Luger by shooting her several times before burning her corpse and concealing it.

Uhe interviewed recently, said the new trial motion is a standard procedure when an appeal to a higher court is planned and said she felt the conviction will withstand the motion.

The Carroll attorneys in summary, emphasized the following points in their motion:

"The in-court positive identification of the defendant by Wanda Busily and the circumstances attendant to it constituted plain error, requiring a new trial."

**Other items listed were:**

"The court erred in barring the defendant's attorneys from reviewing notes written by Nathan Carroll that constituted written memoranda of him of that to which he was going to testify."

"The Court erred in admitting evidence of the crimes that the defendant committed against his wife in early March of 2018."

"Apart from the question of the relevancy of the statements made by the defendant to his wife on March 2, 2018, it was error to admit them because the defendant made them to his wife and intended them to remain confidential when he made them."

"It constituted error to permit Nathan Carroll to testify to anything about how the defendant's other family members treated him after testifying against the defendant before the grand jury. How the defendant's parents decided to treat after his testimony against the defendant was irrelevant, and absent evidence that the defendant directed or encouraged his parents not to speak to Nathan and/or threaten him, the testimony should not have been admitted."

