1 3. SEP. 1989

5.01

Budapest, 05 September 1989

PLANTRONIK GmbH.

Irrevocable Corporate Purchase Order ( I.P.O. )

H-1021 BUDAPEST II., VÖRÖS HADSEREG ÜTJA 52. UNGARN To: Seller, c/o: Mrs. M. L. Conley

Authorized USA Mandated Agent Royal Star Distributors San Antonio, Texas, USA Telefon: 512.333.2333 Telefax: 512.828.2333

Seller's code: GW/500/12.5/AU

Buyer's code: AU/12.5/25W/50989

Dear Gentlepersons:

We hereby confirm with full corporate responsibility, our irrevocable Corporate Purchase Order (  $\mbox{IPO}$  ), to purchase the following metal commodity:

Commodity

: AU metal in 12.5 kg bars bearing International Hallmar with fineness of 999.5/1000 or better,

Specification

: bearing International Hallmarks with fineness of

999.5/1.000 or better

May WEIN

Quantity

: 500 metric tonnes with rollovers

Tranches

: Twenty five metric tonnes per day, four (4) days/week

Payment

: By S.W.I.F.T. ledger transfer guaranteed and confirmed by a World Prime Bank as follows,

Delivery

: Into a high security vault in a freezone / Zloten, SW

Closing Bank

: Bankhaus WINTER, A-1010, Wien, Austria, Liliengasse 8/1 Officer in charge: Ms. Mauz Tlx no: 111513, 113121 Telefax: 43 1 515 04 213 Telefon: 43 1 51504

Discount

: Three (3.00%) percent gross; two (2.00%) net to Buyer below second LMER fixing

Commissions

: 0.3333% to Seller's Group; Mrs. M. L. Conley, Royal Star Distributors, San Antonio, Texas, 0.3333% to Intermediary Group Paymaster, Dr. Atilla T.A Fazekas, Atilla Management, Kirkland, Quebec, Canada, and for Messrs. J. Austin and M. Born, 0.3334% to Buyer's Group, Mr. L. Wanta and assigns.

Non-circumvention Agreement - We also irrevocably covenant and agree not to divulge to third parties, any information received in the course of this metal transaction, in particular, the names, addresses, telephone, telex or telefax numbers of the sources of bullion; agents, attorneys, banks, sellers and trustees, or to perform any act to assist, promote or permit Sellers and Buyers to arrange a Contract without your individual services, now or at anytime in the future, for the supply of precious metals.

We further irrevocably and unconditionally agree to all those who become privileged of this information, shall automatically be bound by the International covenants of Non-circumvention and Non-disclosure for a period of five (5) years from the date above. If this covenant is violated the offending party shall be liable for all damages, attorney fees and

05, 05, 89

1039.31 PLANTS VINGENSTR. 13

5.01

EINGELANGT

Budapest, 05 September 1989

GmbH.

1 3. SEP. 1989 Irrevocable Corporate Purchase Order ( I.P.O. )

H-1021 BUDAPEST II., VÖRÖS HADSEREG ÚTJA 52. UNGARN

To: Weißer, c/o: Mrs. M. L. Conley

Authorized USA Mandated Agent

Royal Star Distributors San Antonio, Texas, USA Telefon: 512.333.2333 Telefax: 512.828.2333

Seller's code: GW/500/75/AU

Buyer's code: AU/75/25W/50989

Dear Gentlepersons:

We hereby confirm with full corporate responsibility, our irrevocable Corporate Purchase Order ( IPO ), to purchase the following metal commodity:

Commodity

AU metal in 75 kg bars 5

Specification

bearing International Hallmarks with a fineness of

999.5/1000 or better

Quantity

500 \*\*\*\*\* metric tonnes with rollovers

Tranches

Twenty (20) metric tonnes per week

Payment

: By S.W.I.F.T. ledger transfer guaranteed and confirmed

by a World Prime Bank as follows,

Delivery

: Into a high security vault in a freezone / Zloten, SW

Closing Bank

: Bankhaus WINTER, A-1010, Wien, Austria, Liliengasse 8/1 Officer in charge: Ms. Mauz Tlx no: 111513, 113121 Telefax: 43 1 515 04 213 Telefon: 43 1 51504

Discount

: Four (4.00%) percent gross, Three (3.00%) net to Buyer

below second LMER fixing

Commissions

: 0.3333% to Seller's Group; Mrs. M. L. Conley, Royal Star Distributors, San Antonio, Texas, 0.3333% to Intermediary Group Paymaster, Dr. Atilla T.A Fazekas, Atilla Management, Kirkland, Quebec, Canada,

and for Messrs. J. Austin and M. Born,

0.3334% to Buyer's Group, Mr. L. Wanta and assigns.

Non-circumvention Agreement - We also irrevocably covenant and agree not to divulge to third parties, any information received in the course of this metal transaction, in particular, the names, addresses, telephone, telex or telefax numbers of the sources of bullion; agents, attorneys, banks, sellers and trustees, or to perform any act to assist, promote or permit Sellers and Buyers to arrange a Contract without your individual services, now or at anytime in the future, for the supply of precious metals.

We further irrevocably and unconditionally agree to all those who become privileged of this information, shall automatically be bound by the International covenants of Non-circumvention and Non-disclosure for a period of five (5) years from the date above. If this covenant is violated

# PLANTRONIK GMBH

H-1021 Budapest, Vörös Hadsereg útja 32. Ungarn

# FAX MESSAGE

To: Attila Management, Quebec, Canada Your fax no: 00-1-514-630-4920

Aun: <sub>Dr.</sub> Attila Fazekas

cc - Mr. Adam Lloyd/London agent

Our fax no.00361-7764-969

Date: 18th Oct.1989

Page no:

Distributed to: Mr Leo Wanta and

Mr. H.K.Kok,Chairman Republic of Singapur

Subject: Au/Pt metal update - GW transactions

- 1) GW/50G/12.5/AU
- 2) GW/500 /75/AU
- 3) GW/500/12.5/PT

Dear Dr. Fazekas,

Please be advised that Mr. Wanta and I are preparing immediate plans to attend to the closing preparations with our Singapore partner, and our closing bank senior management -

Berliner Handels und Frankfurter - BHF Bank Singapore Bank

Account name: H:K.Kok

We have concluded our preliminary requirements with the necessary banking personnel, and will promptly advise the travel itinerary for your approval and attendance with our Singapur Banking institution.

Please prepare all documentation required to assist the BRF senior banking personnel to effect a timely closing of these AU/PT metals transactions to meet your listed requirements and related guidelines.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to work with your good offices in this mutual metals package.

For and on behalf of Plantronik GmbH, Budapset, Hungary, et al.

Authosized by:

Mr. András Szász, Chairman

Witnessel by: Charleman

PLANTRONIK GmbH

H-1026 Budapest, II., Lotz Károly u. 7/a. UNGARN

> atilla management attn: dr. atilla fazekas 53 grace shantz kirkland, quebec, h9j 3a4, canada telefon: 00 1 514 694 73 04 talefax: 00 1 514 630 49 28

subject: metals transaction, gw/500/12.5/au gw/500/75.0/au. gw/500/12.5/pt

dear dr. fazekas:

confirming that mr. wents and i will be enroute/arriving singapur monday to finalize,

- as. the irrevocable and confirming 'bank endorsed 'purchase orders to meet your revised requirements;
  - bb. the release and distribution of the 'bank endorsed': "
    seller's group, intermediary group and buyer's group
    irrevocable and confirming payment orders as instructed.

additional information required from berliner handels und frankfurter. bank of singapur will be addressed at the senior bank officer's meeting with our s. e. asian partners, we have been advised that their will be no further delay to meet your closing metal transaction requirements.

Resident of address

Brazevien necunere -Thulaire de passeguir. An interologing juggestaff.

CHEST STATEM WITH A PASSED STREET CRYDNESS e on evela kilpagasi

The state of the s

Conditional Swift Montage, MT 149

fm: JUGGRANKA D.D. BELORADE

TO: MANUFACTURERS HANOVER CORPORATION/MANTRUST 270 PARK AVENUE, New York, NY, USA 10017

SWIFT-CODE: MAHAUS 33 A

Telex Numbers: 62814 MHT UN 2323378 MHT UR

We JEGOBANKA D.D. BELGRADE, herewith transfer to your bank for credit to Arab Jordan Investment Bank A/C No 136068 IID AREAC CREDIT DEC LES NO 53369 and as per transaction code KDN, 91/881/L80 = 3008 = 28 Densi Finance - Invest Ltd., Heigrade, Conditionally by order of our clinic Ltl PURO-17NANCE-INVEST LTD, clean, clear and of non criminal crigin Up tollars in the amount of 47,375,000, — in exchange for clean, clear transferable and legal bender KUWAITI DINARS 25,000.000, pre 10 Aug. 1990/pre-invesion KDN.

Above transaction is to the effected with same value date and the condition that the amount of KOWAITI DINARS 28,000,000, as transferred to Jugobanka's KD secount which is to be opened with a prime lack by let neelstance of your bank.

Kindly inform us which bank would be willing to open account in a name of our bank.

Best recards,

HA ALLOYFIED O. O. BETCHAOT

FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS

LY CIA ITSA. OPS AND

TOTAL GENCE CHENTY



tolex 71004 "dilute! 7100% 7 1:39, 4 7 1195.1 Lefetox, 11-6790-970 Sw. 24 A. C. O. W. ..

Condes, Jugi hanks, Europead Telephone, 11m.10 6.72

Conditional Chief Mossage, Mr 190

自動作者にも特別AP

DE STORMERA P.D. HETCHADE

MARIO INTERIOR DATO, DE CEPTORATION/FARCIGET 1 5 8 5 L SEQ NO. ISN 41187 16 Sept 91 11 46 Am 276 Park Averus, New York, MY, LSA 19917

EWITT-COLL MARAUS 33 A

Selox kumbers: 52834 MND EW 2323378 MBU UR

FOR EREDIT THE ARAB JORDAN INVESTMENT MANK AVC NO 136006 TEO ANEKO CHUTTI Fig. 14d. No 52399

HERESANTES I DEL KOM, 91/861/650 - 3000 - 25 FURC - PINANCE - INVIET 180., MAGRADE

Tegoning, p.o. pirculars, herewith transfer COMBUT ANNUAL CO. TRO-CIMBLES TEXTER LID. clean, clear and of non-criminal origin. in the assent of 47,375,000, in exclones for clear, clear end and RUWARD DINAMS, pre 02. August 1990/pro-invasion KDN, ex per include the 1.1.1.11

1000 95 /680 /1800 # 35-25 PURO-11 LANCH INVEST 14D. BERGRADE

equal merger of RESALTS LIBRAR 25,000,000,000 to be transferred to the serve. Mi account thick is to be opeled by the resistance of your land.

6

un ungerseres

一组在方 土木土木砂 有效 医不致致病 病療机的學 美树干机

THEASE DELIVER TO - MR BIRTHACKER (SULLE 432/HYATT)

## MANAGEMENT SERVICES CONTRACT

THIS CONTRACT ENTERED INTO THIS. 22 No. . DAY OF , 1991, IS BETWEEN: -11 11 Y ANEKO CREDIT PTE LIMITED, SINGAPORE 101 CECH STREET. SUITE 12.04/05 REPUBLIC OF SINCAPORE 0106

ANEROL SEAL

EURO FINANCE - INVEST LID (EFI)

ATIN: MESSRS STROBEL AND STEINACKER

C/O JINGOBANKA D.D., BELGRADE, YUGOSI AVIA

TFAX: 38 11 636 910 IELEX N° 11894 JUBOT YU

## STITNESSEIN THAT:

Mary.

WHEREAS PARTY FOR THE FIRST PARTY AND PARTY OF THE SCOND PARTY AGREE TO MAXIMIZE THEIR FINANCIAL 3 SOURCES TO ACCOMPLISH CERTAIN MUTUAL SERVICES AS I INTO IN ADDENOUM EFT. AND

SHEREAS, PARTY ONE HAS OBTAINED CERTAIN RESOURCES AND AS AGREED TO OFFER THEIR MANAGEMENT SERVICES TO -MOVIDE CERTAIN FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SERVICES PER FODENDIM FFI . AND

WIEREAS, THE SECOND PARTY, THE THE RESOURCES OF COOD, FLEAN. CLEAR AND ERELLY-TRANSFLRANCE USOOLLARS VIA ...W.I.F.I. WIRE TRANSFER AND/OR TELFCHAPHIC TRANSFER THE TRANSACT THE OLD INFO MUTUAL ENDEAVOR. REFERENCED I'S ALDENDAM EFT, AND

WILKEAS, BOTH OF THE PARTIES RECOGNIZE THE UNIQUE SERVICES IN THEFT IN J WALTENG THE SUBJECT TRANSACTION 'ND

WEREAS, THIS CONTRACT WHEN STONED, SHALL CONSTITUTE A FULL RESPONSIBILITY AND MUTUAL MANAGEMENT SERVICES CONTRACT BETWEEN THE PARTIES, AND

WHEREAS, BOTH PARTIES CONFIRM THAT EACH IS FULLY EMPOWERED, LEGALLY QUALIFIED AND DULY AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE AND TO DELIVER THIS MANAGEMENT SERVICES CONTRACT AND TO BE BOUND BY ITS TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

WHEREAS, BOTH PARTIES AGREE TO ABIDE BY THE RULES OF NON-CIRCUMVENTION AND NON-DISCLOSURE ESTABLISHED BY THE INTERNATIONAL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, PARIS, FRANCE FOR A PERIOD OF FIVE (5) YEARS FROM THE DATE HEREOF. THIS UNDERSTANDING SHALL SURVIVE TERMINATION OF THIS CONTRACT FOR ANY REASON. AND,

WHEREAS, THIS CONTRACT SHALL BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL AND IS NOT TO BE REPRODUCED IN ANY MANNER WHATSDEVER. FORFT ON A DIRECT "NEED TO KNOW BASIS."

MEITHER PARTY MAKES ANY REPRESENTATIONS REGARDING THE MAXABLE CONSEQUENCES, IF ANY, OF THE TRANSACTION SIGNAVISIONAGED BY VIRTUE OF THIS CONTRACT SIGNING, IT LEING UNDERSTOOD BY EACH PARTY THAT ACCEPTS THEIR OWN LIABILITY. IF ANY, FOR TAXES, IMPOSIS, LEVIES, DUTIES OR CHARGES THAT MAY BE APPLIED BLE IN EXECUTION OF THE PRESENCE OF THE PROPERTY OF T

FUNCURRENT, WITH THIS SIGNING OF THIS CONTRACT, PARTY FWO AGREES TO RELEASE THE USDOLLARS TO IMMEDIATELY AMPLEMENT THE PURPOSE OF ADDENDUM \_EFT\_.

SIL STATEMENTS AND REPRESENTATIONS UNDER THIS CONTRACT

FOR PARTIES CONSISTENT WITH THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THIS CONTRACT, THIS CONTRACT IS NOT ASSIGNABLE OR TRANSFERABLE WITHOUT THE PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE OTHER MARTY.

MILES CONTRACT IS A FULL RECOURSE AGREEMENT CONCLUDED AND THE LAWS OF THE REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE AND SAID TORUM SHALL BE THE AFTELLAND. LAW GOVERNING THE MINISTRUCTION. INTERPRETATION. EXECUTION, VALIDITY, INFORCEABLE ITY AND FERFORMANCE, AND ANY OTHER SUCH MATTERS IN RESPECT TO THIS CONTRACT, INCLUDING BREACH OF ULAIM. THE PARTIES AGREE TO HAVE THE MATTER(S), IF MAY, UNDER ARBITRATION UNDER THE RULES OF THE A.B.A.. FORMENT UPON THE AWARD, IF ANY, MAY BE ENTERED INTO HAVE COURT HAVING JURISDICTION THEREOF.

POSPIED BY - ANEKO CREDIT PIE LIMITED

SINGAPORE 0106

TELECOPIER Nº (65) 22 33 595

TEGEX Nº RS 33933

LEO EMIL WANTA, MANAGING DIRECTOR

ECCEPTED BY - EURO-FINANCE-INVEST LTD.

ALIN: MR STPOREL

MR STEINACKER .

670 JUCOBANKA D.D., BELGRADE, YUCOS

TLLECOPIER N° 38 11 636 910

SLETNACKER

ME STROBELL

THE IRST PARTY, ANEKO CREDIT PIE LTD. WILL OBTAIN UP TO TWO HUNDRED BILLION KUWATTI DINARS (KDN200,000,000,000). PRE D2 AUGUST 1990 / COL-INVASION KON 10 THE SECOND FOR SWIFE WI" PARTY BANKING U ...ES.

THE SECOND PARTY, EURO-FINANCE-INVEST LID (EFI). WILL IMMEDIATELY SWIFT WIRE TRANSFER AND/OR TELEGRAPHIC US\$ BASED ON US\$1.895 PER KUWAITI DINAR PER THE AGREED UPON DAILY EXCHANGE TRANCHE SCHEDULE, BASED ON A MINIMUM FOUR (4) DAY BANKING SCHEDULE, USOOLLARS TO HE REMITTED TO THE BANK OF CHINA -SINGAPORE, UNLESS INSTRUCTED IT SEWHERE BY ANEKO CREDIT PIR LIMITED DIRECTORS. MR HOWE KWONS KOK AND/OR LEO FMIL WANTA.

EXTENDED THRU 24 JULY 1791 - 100 HRS \*\* VALIDITY 15 1 11 - 23 JULY 190 HANK CHOSTING

ACCEPTED BY -

ANEXO CREDIT PIE LIMITED. SINGAPOR

LEO SMIL WANTA, DIRECTOR

AND/OR

## Competency/Fitness to Stand Trial

#### Burden of Proof.

State v. Leo E. Wanta, 224 Wis.2d 679, 592 N.W.2d 645 (Ct. App. 1999).

For Wanta: James M. Shellow.

HOLDING: Wanta argues that Wis. Stat. § 971.14(4)(b) is unconstitutional, because it requires proof of incompetence by clear and convincing evidence when the defendant claims that s/he is competent (vs. proof of competency by mere greater weight of evidence when the defendant claims incompetence). The court construes the challenge to be one of equal protection. § 971.14(4)(b), the court holds, aims to protect two competing rights - not to be prosecuted when incompetent, and not to be deprived of liberty without due process - and the court applies a strict scrutiny standard. Proof of incompetence by the higher burden of clear and convincing evidence diminishes the risk that a competent defendant would be deprived of liberty and is therefore "clearly constitutional."

## Doubts Arising between Plea & Sentencing: need for retrospective hearing.

State v. Michael W. Farrell, 226 Wis.2d 447, 595 N.W.2d 64 (Ct. App. 1999).

For Farrell: Kevin M. Schram.

**HOLDING**: Finding of incompetency subsequent to plea proceeding is a factor to consider but in and of itself neither creates doubt as to prior competency nor requires retrospective competency hearing.

## Evidence -- Consideration of Current Counsel's Opinion

State v. Jeffrey J. Meeks, 2002 WI App 65, review granted, 4/22/02

For Meeks: Howard B. Eisenberg, Dean, Marquette Law School

Issue: Whether the trial court's competency ruling overlooked current counsel's opinion that the defendant was incompetent.

Holding: "¶23. We agree with Meeks's unstated premise-in almost all cases where competency is at issue, defense counsel is in a uniquely advantageous position to advise the court whether the defendant understands the proceedings and is able to assist in the defense....

"¶24. Thus, a careful court will recognize the singular value of counsel's opinion and carefully consider it, in light of all the evidence at a competency hearing...." In this case, the trial court followed that prescription.

(The opinion stresses that the issue is very close, and the trial court could well have come to the opposite conclusion. ¶24 n. 8.)

## Evidence - Consideration of Defendant's Demeanor in Prior Case

State v. Jeffrey J. Meeks, 2002 WI App 65, review granted, 4/22/02

For Meeks: Howard B. Eisenberg, Dean, Marquette Law School

Issue: Whether the trial court properly considered defendant's demeanor in a previous case.

Holding: "\$\textstyle{27}\$. As Meeks all but concedes, his understanding of the 1997 legal proceeding was relevant to the court's determination of his competency to proceed in 2000. The judge did not testify, but did carefully consider the transcribed record and her recollection of the 1997 proceeding. That was proper. We see no substantive difference between a judge's observations of a defendant's demeanor at the time competency is challenged and the judge's observations of the defendant at an earlier proceeding; both may be probative. See <a href="Byrge">Byrge</a>, 2000 WI 101 at \$\frac{44}{101}\$ n.18 ('The circuit judge has a unique vantage [point] from which to make a competency determination because the judge has significant personal exposure to the defendant.')."

#### Evidence - Consideration of Prior Counsel's "Character"

State v. Jeffrey J. Meeks, 2002 WI App 65, review granted, 4/22/02

For Meeks: Howard B. Eisenberg, Dean, Marquette Law School

Issue: Whether the trial court, in ruling on competency, improperly relied on its perceptions of the defendant's attorney in a prior case, in stressing that that attorney hadn't raised competency.

Holding: "¶19. 'A trial court sitting as fact-finder may derive inferences from the testimony and take judicial notice of a fact that is not subject to reasonable dispute, but it may not establish as an adjudicative fact that which is known to the judge as an individual.' State v. Peterson, 222 Wis. 2d 449, 457, 588 N.W.2d 84 (Ct. App. 1998) (footnotes omitted). Here, the court's judicial notice was of undisputed facts, and its knowledge of Ms. Scholle had not been gained 'as an individual,' but rather, as a court, in its formal role.

"\[20. Meeks did not object to-and still does not dispute-the court's comments about Ms. Scholle. The court observed that Ms. Scholle was 'accustomed to dealing with people in the real world' and 'ha[d] tried [a] case before [the court of a] mentally ill man, and who [was] ... acutely conscious of the cultural milieu from which so many of her clients and the clients of the state public defender's office come." The court's observations were relevant to its explanation of why it was giving considerable credit to the fact that Ms. Scholle, in representing Meeks previously, had never deemed it appropriate to raise the competency issue."

(Note: The opinion stresses that neither the attorney's testimony nor her credibility was disputed; where credibility is at stake, and the trial court has a preformed notion of that credibility, then recusal is warranted. ¶21 n. 7.)

### **Reopening Competency Determination**

State v. Jeffrey J. Meeks, 2002 WI App 65, review granted, 4/22/02

For Meeks: Howard B. Eisenberg, Dean, Marquette Law School

Issue: Whether the trial court erred in failing to order an additional competency evaluation after counsel raised renewed doubt as to competency.

Holding: "¶46. Denying Meeks's requests for additional competency evaluations and/or hearings, Judge Konkel referred to Judge Lamelas's competency determination and concluded that because Meeks had not offered anything to establish a change in his condition since that determination, no further competency evaluation or hearing was required. Judge Konkel's findings were not clearly erroneous; his conclusion was correct." (Note: Post-competency determination, a couple of different doctors expressed concern as to competency; one's concern was "serious," sufficiently so that he strongly recommended re-examination. ¶59. These recommendations were discounted, apparently, because they were based on review of prior reports, rather than any "new" development. ¶¶61-62.)

#### Standard of Review

State v. Jeremy J. Byrge, 2000 WI 101, 237 Wis. 2d 197, 614 N.W.2d 477, affirming as modified published decision of court of appeals, 225 Wis. 2d 702, 594 N.W.2d 388

For Byrge: Steven P. Weiss, SPD, Madison Appellate

ISSUE: Whether competency determinations are reviewed deferentially.

**HOLDING**: Because a competency determination "pivots on factors only a trial court can appraise," the court "do(es) not disturb our holding in (State v. Garfoot, 207 Wis. 2d 214, 558 N.W.2d 626 (1997)) and adhere(s) to the clearly erroneous standard for reviewing circuit court determinations in competency proceedings." ¶44, 45.

Go To Brief

## Sufficiency of Evidence

State v. Jeffrey J. Meeks, 2002 WI App 65, review granted, 4/22/02

For Meeks: Howard B. Eisenberg, Dean, Marquette Law School

Issue: Whether the evidence supports the trial court's conclusion of the defendant's competency, which relied largely on lay testimony as opposed to the experts, who thought the defendant incompetent.

Holding: "¶15. The court's consideration of the lay testimony was particularly appropriate in this case where, as appellate counsel concedes, Meeks 'can relate facts regarding his crime and can even answer questions about the historical facts,' but where, appellate counsel asserts, Meeks 'has no comprehension or understanding of the legal process.' Because the defense was seeking to establish that Meeks was too cognitively impaired to proceed, it was logical for the State to counter with evidence establishing that his mental condition had not changed since the time Scholle represented him and that, when she did so, Scholle deemed Meeks competent to proceed.

"¶16. Only the trial court can judge the credibility of witnesses who testify at the competency hearing,' and weigh their testimony. Garfoot, 207 Wis. 2d at 223. Moreover, while 'a competency inquiry focuses on a defendant's ability at the time of the present proceeding, not on the defendant's competency at some point in the distant past,' State v. Farrell, 226 Wis. 2d 447, 454, 595 N.W.2d 64 (Ct. App. 1999), the defendant's past mental condition may be relevant to the present determination of competency, see id.; see also State v. Weber, 146 Wis. 2d 817, 827, 433 N.W.2d 583 (Ct. App. 1988). "¶17. Here, unquestionably, the record reflects the court's careful consideration of all the evidence and its measured evaluation of the interplay between the opinions of the mental health professionals and the more remote information from the lay witnesses. See Farrell, 226 Wis. 2d at 455 ('The court considers all the factual evidence presented to it when determining whether a reason to doubt competency exists.'). We see no error."

#### Time Limits for Competency Exam.

State ex rel. Michael J. Hager v. Marten, 226 Wis.2d 687, 594 N.W.2d 791 (1999), affirming unpublished decision. For Hager, Gerhardt F. Getzin, SPD, Wausau.

HOLDING: The issue is whether the § 971.14(2) time limit, requiring completion of competency exam w/in 15 days "of the arrival of the defendant at the inpatient facility," was violated. Resolution turns on whether the court specifically ordered an inpatient exam. No written order was entered, helping to create an unfortunate ambiguity. The trial court merely ordered an exam "at Winnebago." This did not, in and of itself, specify whether the exam would be inpatient or outpatient. The court has the authority to order an inpatient exam, § 971.14 (2)(a), in which case the 15-day time limit begins running when the exam is ordered. Otherwise, if an exam is merely ordered, then the department has discretion under § 971.14(2)(am) to determine whether it will be in- or out-patient. And, under this provision, then the time limit for an inpatient exam is triggered by arrival at the facility. Hager wasn't transported to the facility, instead languishing for five months in jail. But given the lack of precision in the judge's order, the statutory 15-day time limit didn't begin to run because he wasn't sent to Winnebago and the statute therefore wasn't violated. Hager could have, the court intimates, asserted a statutory speedy trial violation, § 971.10, but failed to do so. The court also suggests that a written order would have clarified the judge's intent with respect to whether he was ordering an inpatient exam (immediately triggering the other time limit). The concurrence laments the lack of written competency order, and concludes that a § 971.14(2)(a) order for inpatient exam must be in writing to trigger the relevant limitation period. "Michael Hager fell through the cracks" largely because of this failure, given that a written order provides "notice of what action must be taken."