

This is to document what I believe may be the connections and order of events regarding Chris T. Brunea's involvement in murders that occurred twenty one years ago.

My research into this began years ago, when finding information on Chris T. Brunea never being removed as suspect in a murder case in Jamestown NY . I did not find anything further until recently, when I decided to look further into that case.

I persisted and found that the case was never resolved- two suspects were said to be connected with the murder of Kathy Wilson, but the Public Defender for the one accused of the murder exposed the obvious flaws in testimony of the defendant's friend- which was obviously led and coerced by Police and Pennsylvania District Attorney and prosecution.

Barry Smith, Esq., won the trial for Billy Buckley, but Buckley remained in prison until he died of cancer many years later.

Buckley was given opportunity to 'come clean' before dying, and he said he did not do it.

Buckley was 37 when the murder occurred. To the best of my knowledge, he had a past of many crimes, including theft of a vehicle, with the female owner in it, jumping out, and Buckley then ran a red light and struck an innocent driver, who was killed.

The police felt he deserved justice for that 'murder', and decided he would be an excellent scapegoat for the Wilson murder, even if he was not guilty.

His young friend and accomplice, Mark Brown was in his teens when he was brought in by police. He was led to believe that he would be cleared of his several crimes and be paid between \$25,000 and \$28,000 for turning in his friend Buckley. Brown then repeated information given to him by police and others wanting to incriminate Buckley.

Brown soon learned that he would not be receiving any money, or freedom from other charges, and in fact he was charged with murder as well, with penalty of life imprisonment or death penalty.

Smith then in Court disproved Brown's fraudulent statements by hiring Ronald Cotten, who was a Private Investigator and former Police officer from Jamestown to research the claims, which were impossible to have occurred.

A huge turn of events had occurred in the case, which involved a New York State resident, Kathy Wilson, who was abducted in Faloner, NY. Her body was found in Pennsylvania, some twenty miles away. She had been dismembered by animals in the 16 or 18 months she lay in the dirt. No signs of trauma to her bones was evident, and no signs of sexual abuse or rape- possibly because nothing but bones remained.

The New York State police agencies, local police and many other investigators had been involved, and Pennsylvania police only remotely involved, as it was not their case because of jurisdiction.

Once the case went to Pennsylvania, the reports and findings were sent from Jamestown task Force, to Pennsylvania. This meant that all investigations prior to the move were now second-hand evidence, and not created, taken and processed by the police then in charge.

Buckley was chosen as the number one suspect, and Brown to be his informant. Jamestown police no

doubt had personal vendettas against these individuals. Pennsylvania Commonwealth then set out to prove them guilty.

What has been significant to me, is the connection of the conceptual basis of the two murders, when compared to the nature of the Guardianship case for my father.

Both murders were apparently planned and proceeding as kidnappings.

A list of similarities existed between the two.

Yet, murders were the outcomes in both cases.

It would appear that bungling and errors were the reason for the murders.

This is not completely established as true, but does make sense.

The Guardianship of my father represented legalized kidnapping of an elder. His return to the family could have only been made by expensive, immediate and successful litigation against the petition for Guardianship.

The attorney my mother and I hired in essence colluded with the opposing counsel, in that she told us our chances of winning were almost non-existent, that I 'looked guilty', despite my assertions that I was not- in essence, our attorney allowed the perpetrators and their attorney to take complete control of the elders' assets, the outcome of which would be decided by the fairness of the Court and its counsel.

In fact, the outcome was the destruction of a million dollars worth of assets, by selling to and among 'friends of the court', and \$407,000. minimum in court-approved fees and services, all of which were in essence fraudulent, as the correct processes of law never occurred; as violation of rights, collusion, malpractice and fraud became the rule in NY Supreme Court. The same practices have been allowed to carry into Surrogate's court, and now collusion and 'accessory after the fact' has occurred between eleven lawyers and four judges.

The connection between the two failed kidnappings and the kidnapping of my father is that

1. a person was abducted
2. the ability to regain that person was available,
3. the return of that person was available at a large price
4. the individuals taken were from families with assets ample enough to get the family member back
5. in all cases, the family member was not returned
6. in all three cases death of the kidnapped resulted from actions in the process of kidnapping.
7. In all three cases it appears that fraud in the investigation of the kidnapping and murders has occurred
8. I believe that in all three cases, one individual was involved, Chris T. Brunea, Esq.

In our case, the kidnapping failed, and access to the assets was foiled because my mother, wife of the kidnapped and incapacitated elder, filed for divorce of her husband of fifty-four years.

That action removed access to all funds owned and in the name of my father, Arthur L. Maecker.

Otherwise, all assets would have been available to Chris T. Brunea's client, who lived fifteen hundred miles away, and had in essence no control over assets; it was Mr. Brunea who had control of assets and spending, as much as he was allowed by Justice Patrick H. Nemoier and other counsel, with whom Mr. Brunea has close working relationships.

No sale of assets of the incapacitated man occurred while the Guardianship case existed. All sales were conducted immediately after my father's death, the death of the ward. No warning or option to purchase assets was given to the family; all sales were conducted by the same man that was appointed to determine my father's mental condition, Mr. Terence Newcomb, Esq. An obvious conflict of interest existed there. Mr. Newcomb, in obvious partnership with Mr. Brunea, refused to observe all evidence the family presented that clearly made obvious the mental incapacity of my father, and therefore the documents he signed were of no value in the making of Guardianship.

Through teamwork within Supreme Court, between all counsel there, and the Judge, the kidnapping process yielded losses (and thereby gains) of a million dollars in assets, with charges of legal fees and service being the same as 'RANSOM MONEY' would be, if the kidnapping process had not been LEGAL and overseen by a Court of Law.

The strange coincidence of a visit by Mr. Chris T. Brunea, twenty-one years ago, to the home of his former friend Mark Wilson and his wife Kathy Wilson was disregarded by the many teams of investigators investigating that case.

In sharp contrast to assertions of lack of credibility of ALL other suspects, Team Leader of the Task Force said flowery, empathetic words in describing the poor, but bright and legally motivated Chris T. Brunea. In Welch's testimony, his description of Mr. Brunea sound more like a description of a sad victim who has now become a handicapped person, and therefore should be removed from suspicion- Despite the absurd connection of being ordered out of his friend's home, possibly the day before the murder of the friend's wife- and the husband of the murdered wife warning her NOT to let Mr. Brunea come near her if the husband is not around.

Somehow this statement immediately after the husband's wife was murdered was dismissed by investigators, and substituted with a sad empathy for the possible murderer.

Welch treated Mark Wilson with the same attitude and empathy, despite Wilson being the prime suspect.

In like manner, when I discussed this scenario with Ronald Cotton, Private Investigator hired by Barry Smith to investigate testimony given by Mark Brown against Billy Buckley, Mr. Cotton told me that Mark Wilson had a history of emotional problems, with the example of Mr. Wilson dropping out of West Point Academy, due to his instability.

That statement of compassion for mental instability is consistent with the Investigator Welch, regarding Mr. Brunea. In fact, though Mr. Cotton was retained to disprove statements made by Mark Brown, which had been coerced by Pennsylvania Police and DA, Mr. Cotton was a retired police officer from Jamestown, and would have obviously known Officer Welch very well.

When I suggested to Mr. Cotton, that I was considering contacting Mr. Wilson, whose wife had been murdered, possibly by his ex-friend Brunea, Cotton said that was not a good idea, he wouldn't contact Wilson, he doesn't want to be involved any more.

Those words by Cotton suggest to me some connection between Wilson and the murder.

What man, whose love of his life and mother of his children has been murdered, would NOT want her murderer to be found?

Except one who already knows who the murderer was- and who does not want that murderer to be exposed; for reason, either that hje is a friend, and has compassion for that friend; or that he may personally be implicated in her murder; either by direct connection; or by having been forewarned of the plan of kidnapping and potential murder, by his ex-friend Brunea; or having been extorted by Brunea before the \kidnapping and murder; and having done NOTHING to avioid it.

In fact, one testimony was of a gay man who claimed to know Kathy Wilson; that she was having an affair with hios friend; which is supported by statements of others saying that she had not had sex with her husband for over six months; and the husband was accusing her of affairs; that gay man said he knew she was going to the bank to withdraw money so she could leave the area.

It is consistent with the thought that she was present when Brunea came to their home, out of the blue; that she heard Brunea make some sort of statement that led tio her husband to order Brunea to leave- and for her husband to forbid her from allowing Brunea near her when the husband was not around;

It is very possible she feared for her life at that time.

It is possible she went to the bank the next day, after wrapping up her work at the office; at lunch time she left, went to the bank; where she was intercepted, and then instantly murdered--- perhaps even after handing over money, as she would have been able to identify her murderers and expose the extortion.

It was noted that a difference between the Weiner kidnapping and the Wilson kidnapping was the lack of ransom notes for the Wilson case, and the abundance of ransom notes for the Weiner case.

A possible reason for the difference between the two kidnapping is that

1. Sally Weiner was actually kidnapped with full intent of extorting funds for her return. It IS strange she was murdered right away, IF she was; in any case, i do believe Copenhefer may have had an accomplice
2. the Weiner kidnapping failed. No money was obtained for her return, she was then shot.
3. Brunea, going to Wilsons' home the day before the kidnapping/murder may have been to personally present an ORAL ransom note; from Brunea to BOTH of them, or just his ex-friend, Wilson.
4. Brunea would have known that Wilson had some time earlier benefited from inheritance from Wilson's father's death; in fact, as they were close, perhaps Brunea himself may have felt he deserved of some money from Wilson's father's estate, as he visited the father at his deathbed in the hospital, it was said by Welch in testimony.
5. It is possible that when Wilson ordered Brunea from their home, Brunea knew the plan was about to fail, as the Weiner kidnapping had also failed a month before. It is therefore possible that the abduction of Kathy Wilson was NOT for the purpose of kidnapping, but for the purpose of murder; in order to silence her from telling what she had learned the day before, from Brunea.
6. It is possible that someone was watching the bank where they knew she would go to get money to leave.
7. It is possible that the money she was getting was NOT to leave, but to pay BRUNEA a ransom which he may have demanded the day before, in order to save her own life; in order to save their family from threat of murder, and save her children;
8. It is possible she MET the murderer after getting money from the bank- to pay him directly, perhaps because she may have known him personally, either Brunea, or the man she had an affair with, possibly Bruce Erickson, who four people said had committed the murder, and who

she would not be afraid of getting into a vehicle with.

In all these possibilities, the one connection is CHRIS T. BRUNEA.

It would be Brunea as connection between the kidnapers form thirty days before, which had failed, and left them without money they were hoping to have gotten.

It would not mean Brunea himself murdered Kathy Wilson, though that is possible.

It does mean that Brunea knew of the plot to kidnap and harm his friend's wife, who fit the description of the previous kidnapping, and who had probably already been determined to be a next or alternative target.

It means that Brunea, by this knowledge, was an accessory to her murder, even if he was not involved; he did not go to authorities.

Nor did Husband Mark Wilson go to authorities.

Mark Wilson would then be guilty as an accessory to murder, which explains his acceptance of the the verdict that was reached.

This explains why Wilson did not tell police anything about Brunea's visit, other than the first statement he made; which was most likely able to be considered 'excited exclamation' under the law- Wilson told police something that he may have regretted, about Brunea; and hoped it would never be investigated further.

The statements by two policemen, Welch and Cotton, regarding the mental instability of Wilson and Brunea, and their having compassion for that instability; leads one to think there is compassion in the wrong place, where objective and critical investigation should have occurred.

In fact, knowing now that the two men most sincerely considered 'murderers' are not only NOT the murderers, but NO suspects have been drawn after dropping the case twenty-one years ago- suggests a revisiting of the investigation should occur.

Investigation of the purpose of Brunea's visit, which was worthy of mentioning to the first police officer as a potential suspect, by the victim's husband, of a suspicious occurrence the day before the murder, absolutely warrants pursuit.

Investigation of the common grounds between Mr. Brunea and the convicted. but twenty years later, un-sentenced David Copenhefer should be researched.

Relationships between Brunea and the suspect who four people said DID commit the murder is worthy of investigation.

One can only guess at this time, why these connections were NOT investigated, or why the investigations there were not investigated further.

No mention was made in testimony by Investigator Welch of the potentials of more than one kidnapper, except in regard to Brown and Buckley.

A look at the actions of Chris T. Brunea, Esq., some twenty-one years later causes doubt as to fairness in the courts. Collusion, malpractice, fraud and cover-up have been rampant in the kidnapping and indirect murder of Arthur L. Maecker.

Why would anyone assume such collusion, malpractice and fraud did NOT occur in the two cases of murder from long ago.

Especially after proof of coercion existed, which proved the two suspects held as the murderers, were NOT.

It is worthy of consideration.

William Albert Maecker,
Power of Attorney for
Arthur L. Maecker
and Helen V. Maecker

PS

In possibly (un)related but interesting coincidences, my cousin mentioned today that my half brother Arthur L. Shilling who found and retained Brunea, once lived in Emporium, PA. Emporium may be an hour drive to Corry, PA, and possibly less to Jamestown, NY. Shilling told my cousin stories of his going to Corry. Also, the year before coming here for Dad's birthday, (2004) Shilling stopped in PA and picked up a cousin and brought him to Dad, in an effort to persuade Dad to change the will and include him.

Dad did not remember the cousin, as i recall, and did not change the will. The man left without swaying Dad, as was obviously the purpose of his visit. He had told Dad a story of one of his relatives who had been cut out of a relative's will. There was clear intent in his visit. Perhaps he had some connections with Brunea?

Another coincidence worth noting is that the victim Kathy Wilson's sister Amy is married to a lawyer who, like Brunea, works in the medical litigation field, and involved with elders with dementia. His name is Vince Amendola, of Connecticut. I found an article online about his client being stopped by neighbors, from expanding a Nursing Home facility from expansion, where the expansion would be specifically intended for elder patients with dementia. This is current.

So, he is in the same field as Chris T. Brunea- where care for elders with dementia is a big moneymaker, and his efforts for his client, a Nursing Home, is to pave the way for expansion in that lucrative field.

BTW, Brunea represents Doctors as clients, for collections for them, and probably fighting malpractice suits against them.

This may be the reason that Dr. LeeKwen would never acknowledge my calls, or my several visits to his office. Brunea may represent him; and he could not afford to have bad representation by his attorney; and would do what thew attorney advises.

It may well be there is a connection between Brunea and Amendola.