



Ms. Geddry had led us, I asked her from which direction she had heard the gun shots. Ms. Geddry indicated the direction by pointing North-northeast from the position we held, which was toward the vicinity of the corner of the north property boundary she shared with the Iversens.

At this point I asked Ms. Geddry how many shots she heard. Ms. Geddry stated that she heard two very loud shots. I asked Ms. Geddry how much time lapsed between each shot, to which she stated that it was about one to two seconds between each round fired. I then asked Ms. Geddry if she heard any other noises. Ms. Geddry stated that she had heard a dog "cry" or yelp, and that she immediately identified the sound as that of her own dog "Junior".

Ms. Geddry stated that after the last shot she looked toward the northeast corner of her property and saw a white Chevrolet pickup truck parked on the east bound shoulder of Little Lake Road. Ms. Geddry also noted that the pickup was facing the west and that as she ran about 25 feet north she saw two individuals in the pickup truck, and that one of the individuals was wearing a baseball cap. I asked Ms. Geddry if she knew the pickup truck, to which she stated that she recognized the truck as the "Iversen's" because as it sped west away from the shoulder of the road she noticed that it had a large silver (chrome) tool chest in the pickup bed and that there was an oiling device attached to the chest.

I asked Ms. Geddry if she recognized either of the people occupying the vehicle prior to it speeding away. Ms. Geddry stated that she could not positively identify the occupants of the vehicle. I asked Ms. Geddry what she did after the shooting. Ms. Geddry stated that she called for "Junior", but did not get a response, nor did he return to her. Ms. Geddry went on to explain that she feared for her safety and was reluctant to proceed any further without notifying the Sheriff's Department. Ms. Geddry stated that she ran back to her home and called 911 and requested assistance. Ms. Geddry then went back outside to find "Junior".

According to Ms. Geddry, as she reentered her front yard, which is moderately wooded, she saw "Junior" trying to crawl through the bushes at the northeast corner of her property, where he subsequently collapsed and died minutes later. I asked Ms. Geddry to identify the location where she found "Junior". Ms. Geddry led me to a spot about 175 feet from her home and about 110 feet from Little Lake Road. At this location, Ms. Geddry pointed out trace amounts of what looked like blood. I then asked Ms. Geddry to indicate where it was that she saw the pickup truck after the shots had been fired. Ms. Geddry led me to Little Lake road where she indicated the location of the vehicle when she first noticed it [approximately 25 feet west of the Iversen-Geddry property line].

The location indicated by Ms. Geddry was actually on the east-bound side [south] of Little Lake Road, and directly in front of the northeast section of Ms. Geddry's property. I noted a memorial to "Junior" set up along the roadside at the northeast corner of her property, the spot indicated by Ms. Geddry and included in Mendocino County Sheriff's Deputy Eric Riboli's report as the location where the initial shooting had occurred

[approximately 12 feet from Little Lake Road].

At this point I asked Ms. Geddry for any photos she may have taken that would be relevant to our investigation. Ms. Geddry did supply me with a set of photos that were taken the evening of June 1st, 2002, which will be entered into evidence. At this point I concluded my interview with Ms. Geddry.

ACO Bottom and I proceeded to 41575 Little Lake Road, home of Mr. Walter "Ron" Iversen. After knocking on the door of the Iversen home we were greeted by Mr. Ron Iversen. I identified ACO Bottom and myself and then explained to Mr. Iversen that as part of an ongoing investigation into the June 1st dog shooting incident that I wished to speak with him to clarify certain facts borne out during the initial Sheriff's investigation. Mr. Iversen invited ACO Bottom and I into his home and then stated that he was "uncomfortable" discussing in any detail the events of June 1st. I explained to Mr. Iversen that he was not under any obligation to speak with me, and that my purpose for speaking with him was to get details of events prior to the June 1st incidents.

Mr. Iversen agreed to speak with me and offered details related to several incidents involving his dogs and the Geddry dog. Mr. Iversen stated that he was dissatisfied with the fact that Animal Care & Control did not impound and/or destroy the Geddry dog before it had destroyed his dog "Brutus". I asked Mr. Iversen how it was that he knew that Ms. Geddry's dog had killed his dog, to which he answered that though he had not seen the incident, that he recognized the nature of injuries as those being inflicted by Geddry's dog.

At about this time, a young woman identifying herself as "Dee Ann" entered the room and asked why we were asking questions about the incident, and then stated that she believed the Sheriff's department was conducting the investigation. I explained to this woman that Animal Care & Control was also investigating the matter. I asked Dee Ann if she had any information that she could offer about events leading up to the June 1st death of "Brutus" and subsequent shooting of the Geddry dog. Dee Ann, who was at this time identified by Mr. Iversen as his son Donald's wife, stated that she did not witness the killing of Iversen's dog "Brutus". I asked Dee Ann if she knew who it was that shot the Geddry dog, to which she stated only that the dog would not have been shot if it had not been a danger to others.

I asked Mr. Iversen if his son Donald was home, to which he and Dee Ann both remarked that Donald was "in the woods" working. I asked when Donald would be home, to which Mr. Iversen stated that he would be home soon. At this time a woman identified as Marlene [Iversen] came into the room and asked why I was wanting to speak to Donald. I informed Marlene that I was conducting an investigation into the shooting and that according to information obtained from the initial Sheriff's investigation that Donald had admitted to shooting the Geddry dog. Marlene at this point stated that I had no right to investigate the matter, or question Donald about the matter. I informed Marlene that evidence existed that indicated that a crime against an animal may have been committed and that this matter was within my scope of duty and jurisdiction to investigate. Dee Ann

Iversen then intervened and stated that I would have to speak to their lawyer before Donald answered any questions. I said that would be Donald's right if he elected to do so. I also reiterated to the Iversen's that I did not wish to arrest Donald if he cooperated with my investigation.

A short time later Dee Ann Iversen had contacted her attorney, Greg Petersen, by phone, and after speaking with him she handed the phone to me stating that her attorney wished to speak to me. I introduced myself and Mr. Petersen identified himself as the attorney for the Iversen's. Mr. Petersen asked me on what charges I was planning to arrest his client [Donald Iversen] to which I stated that I had not yet decided to arrest Mr. Iversen and that I wished to confirm his statement as provided in the Sheriff's investigation and to impound the weapon used in the incident.

Mr. Petersen stated that he had instructed Donald not to provide any other statements without his attorney present. I acknowledged this right, yet reminded Mr. Petersen that his client had admitted to shooting the Geddry dog, and that probable cause existed to take him into custody. I then reiterated with Mr. Petersen that my primary interests were in speaking with his client and obtaining the shotgun used in the shooting. At this point Mr. Petersen stated that his client would be making no other statements, but that he would advise his client to surrender the weapon. At this point Mr. Petersen asked to speak with Dee Ann Iversen.

I handed the phone back to Dee Ann, at which point she resumed her discussion with Mr. Petersen. After a few minutes Dee Ann ended her conversation with her attorney and then stated that she had been advised by her attorney to hand over the shotgun Donald had used to shoot the Geddry dog. Dee Ann asked Ron Iversen and I to accompany her to her home to retrieve the gun. Mr. Iversen and I walked to Donald and Dee Ann's home where the shotgun was retrieved from a gun safe in the family living-room. The weapon was a Remington, Model 870 Magnum (20" barrel), pump-action 12 gauge shotgun [serial # W502641M]. I issued a Record of Notice for receipt of the weapon and advised the Iversen's that the gun would be impounded as evidence with the Mendocino County Sheriff's Department.

With the gun in my possession I left the Iversen residence without incident and proceeded to the Sheriff's Substation in Fort Bragg to impound the weapon as evidence. Once at the Sheriff's Substation Sheriff's Sergeant D.J. Miller, Deputy E. Riboli and I discussed the process by which the gun would be impounded. We resolved to impound the weapon as part of the Sheriff's investigation and that I would provide a supplemental report to their case.

## SUMMARY

Though this investigation centers around the shooting of a dog whom some families in the Little Lake Road area considered dangerous or vicious, the motivations and actions of those responsible for shooting and killing this animal must be reviewed with prudence.

The following is what is known to have transpired on June 1st, 2002:

0715 hrs- Dee Ann Iversen claims to see Geddry dog leave the wooded area north of Little Lake Road where the body of the Iversen's dog "Brutus" was found dead, presumably mauled by "Junior".

0815 hrs- Sheriff's Deputy, B. Walker, arrived at the Iversen residence to conduct an investigation into the mauling and death of the Iversen's dog "Brutus". Iversen's unable to produce eyewitness for their claim that their dog had been killed by Geddry's dog "Junior". Shortly after interviewing the Iversen's, Deputy Walker interviewed Mary Geddry who claimed her dog had been confined behind a fenced yard for several days. Deputy Walker inspected "Junior" and found no signs which would indicate that the animal had been engaged in a dog fight.

1910 hrs- Mary Geddry claims that she is in her front yard, approximately 190 feet from Little Lake Road, when she hears two gunshots erupt from the north end of her property along the roadside. Geddry claims that within seconds she notices a white Chevrolet pickup truck belonging to the Iversens leave the east-bound shoulder of Little Lake Road heading west. Geddry claims to have seen two individuals in the truck as it sped away.

1915 hrs- Deputies Riboli and Bushnell respond to 911 dispatch request related to shooting. Dispatch notifies Deputies that a California Highway Patrol Officer [Berg] had stopped the suspect vehicle on Little Lake Road and Gurly Lane. Riboli proceeds to Geddry residence and Bushnell responds to Little Lake and Gurly to interview occupants of suspect vehicle.

In the early morning of June 1st, 2002, the Iversens called Mendocino County Sheriff's to report that their dog had been killed. The Iversens claim that their dog was killed by Mary Geddry's dog, yet no one in the Iversen family witnessed the killing. The investigation deputy, B. Walker, inspected Geddry's dog and found no clear indication that "Junior" had been involved in a dog fight.

Ms. Geddry claims that she had witnessed the Iversens drive in front of her property at a very slow speed on at least two occasions after deputy Walker left. Ms. Geddry stated in her interview with me that she believed that the Iversens were stalking her dog.

Between 1900-1910 hrs. Ms. Geddry claims that she witnesses one of the Iversen speed from the location where her dog had been shots seconds earlier, noting that she believed that the vehicle was occupied by two individuals. Within minutes Mary Geddry contacted 911 and the suspect vehicle had been intercepted by CHP Berg. In his report, deputy Bushnell states that the suspect vehicle was occupied by two men who he identified as John and Donald Iversen. Though deputy Bushnell did get an admission of the shooting

from Donald Iversen, he opted to release John Iversen based solely on Donald's claim that he had nothing to do with the shooting and that John had an appointment to attend to [note the time as 1915 + hrs.].

According to Bushnell, John Iversen claimed to have just picked up his brother Donald, yet this claim seems to contradict the progression of events around the shooting, for Donald admitted to shooting the dog prior to Bushnell releasing John Iversen from the scene with the suspect vehicle. At this point deputy Bushnell drives Donald Iversen back to his home and decides not to detain/arrest him despite not consulting with deputy Riboli and Mary Geddry. This is troubling when one considers that evidence collected at the scene of the shooting indicates that Donald Iversen was on Little Lake Road when he shot the dog, and his claim of self-defense is questionable considering that the evidence gathered indicates that the dog was shot on its own property.

Probable cause existed to detain and/or arrest both Donald and John Iversen; Donald as the shooter of Mary Geddry's dog, which is based on his own admission; and John, who acted as an accessory by driving the vehicle away from the scene after Donald shot Mary Geddry's dog. Mary Geddry claims that the Iversens had "cruised" or "stalked" her property throughout the day, and considering the inconsistencies of either Iversens' statements, it appears that both Donald and John Iversen were involved in the incident.

Included with this report is a diagram of the shooting scene as described in deputy Riboli's report and later reiterated by Mary Geddry when I interviewed her on June 18th.

---

Lt. Robert Arbayo- (ACO #310)  
Field Services Manager- Dept. Animal Care & Control  
County of Mendocino