

Blood Town S1-E4

Buddy System

[00:00:00] **Penny:** I'm Penny Dearmin, and this is Blood Town.

Jim: You were a sheriff in Baldwin County?

Deputy: I was.

Jim: When?

Deputy: That would kind of pinpoint who I am.

Jim: Okay.

Deputy: So, I'll say it was in the early 2000s.

Jim: Early...

Deputy: Yes. For several years.

Jim: And you were talking about the Sheriff who was watching, or supposed to be watching, Marcus. He was on the phone?

Deputy: Clark. The one who was watching Clark was. The other deputy on scene had Marcus, was putting him in the back of his car, and [bleep] was supposed to be watching the other suspect. Then when the other deputy was walking the guy to his car, putting him in the back of the car, and he said he was walking back towards the porch, I think. And they heard a gunshot and he kind of hollered to [bleep] "Where's Clark?"

And they, he says [bleep] was on the telephone.

Jim: I wonder who he was on the telephone with?

Deputy: Ain't no telling. It could have been the [00:01:00] detectives. It could have been a legitimate call, but at the same time it could have been, God knows who, and then they ran inside and that's when they saw the guy. What had happened.

Jim: If you were to have been watching Clark that night, what would you have done?

Deputy: He'd been in handcuffs in the back of my car.

Jim: Not hanging out on the front porch?

Deputy: Not at all. He would've been handcuffed regardless—in my sight.

Jim: So they, as I understand it, they get there. It's clearly a murder scene, right? And this is, I'm not a sheriff, I've no experience in law enforcement at all. And even if you would have known, I had known Clark for 20 years, he would...

If you ever... there's a dead body there, right? Why is he just allowed to go in his house and mill about and...

Deputy: I have no idea. Like I said, if I'd have been there, if I would've been [bleep], it would've been two people detained, behind the back handcuffs and probably sitting in the back of two different cars, and then I would've made phone calls or doing whatever I was going to do then until both of them were safe per se, [00:02:00] wouldn't been any doing anything else.

Jim: And again, it's not that it's not like to say anything bad about the Sheriff's department or anything because I mentioned a while back that someone, that Clark could have shot one of the Sheriffs.

Deputy: Yeah. He could have, instead of his self, or he could have shot both of them and then his self; he was a suicide mission that's at that point, so whatever he did, there would've been no consequences for it, for him.

Jim: Did you know him?

Deputy: Clark? I'd heard of him. I didn't never, I didn't know him, I've had some, some dealings with Marcus and I think we've talked about that previously and they...

Jim: just through the years.

Deputy: Yeah. Nothing specific. I can remember. I just know that he...

Jim: Did he sell drugs?

Deputy: At one time. I know he did.

Jim: I think it, from what I understand, he been in and out of probation.

Deputy: Yeah. In and out of rehabs.

Jim: Yeah.

Deputy: Too, so. He had history there, so I'm sure there's Clark probably had some history there as well.

Jim: Is it possible that that the Sheriff who was watching Clark could have known him?

Deputy: It's very possible [00:03:00

Jim: and just felt that

Deputy: comfortable, at ease around him? I don't know.

Yeah, it's possible, but the procedure he used that night, it was nothing that anybody would have taught him or been okay with. Then when I got there, it was two naked dudes doing CPR on her or trying to revive her, per se.

Jim: As I understand, there was a, there was, I think Sheriff Masee said it was a bizarre scene.

Deputy: Right, and he put it nicely [laughs].

Jim: And I think that Sheriff Masee says that it's the most, but one of the more bizarre scenes that he's ever seen and that's in Milledgeville

Deputy: Right.

Jim: That's saying something.

Deputy: It is.

Jim: You've seen some bizarre things, haven't you?

Deputy: I have. Nothing like that, though.

Jim: I was getting some gas not too long ago and talked to an active-duty Sheriff, and he was telling me how, how dangerous Milledgeville really is.

Deputy: It is. It's comparable to, well, back when I was there, it was comparable to Macon statistic-wise, crime, through a population ratio was right there with Macon.

Jim: Yeah. What was it like to be a [00:04:00] Sheriff here?

Deputy: It was fun, but at the same time... you get a lot of adrenaline rush.

A lot of adrenaline rushes. It was always something we were on, but I can't say what shift I were on, but the shift we were on had a nickname and it was tombstone

Jim: Tombstone.

Deputy: Tombstone, because our shifts seem to always get in the thick of it. No matter what it was.

Jim: Would that be like late at night, or?

Deputy: it was, we were six-to-six nightshift.

Jim: Six-to-six?

Deputy: Yeah. And then it never failed. If something was going to happen, it was gonna happen when we were working, shootings we had. I can't even tell you how many chases we got into. Seems like it was just about an every-night thing one summer.

Jim: The way that [bleep], he was watching Clark or supposed to be watching Clark?

Deputy: Yeah.

Jim: Prior you said he had a...he had a nickname?

Deputy: Yeah.

Jim: Can you tell us about that?

Deputy: Yeah. He was notorious for getting into stuff, for arresting and people pulling people over. And when he turned in any kind of paperwork, his badge number was 10, so they would say status 10; He status 10'd me, which was [00:05:00] actually a real status for turned over to

Jim: turned over to

Deputy: turned over to, like, say for instance, if you got a DUI and then you wanted to let GSP work it, it'd be status 10 to GSP and badge number.

And he got just to kind of a thing. It was 10, status 10 me. So, it kind of worked.

Jim: You said he was kind of, kind of a nefarious,

Deputy: He was dirty, dirty; he violated more civil rights than the Ku Klux Klan has.

Jim: Really?

Deputy: Yeah. In my opinion.

Jim: That's horrifying.

Deputy: It is. I've seen him, I've seen him abruptly trip and bump into doors real hard to try to see if the front doors of houses would open and he was trying to go in through and stuff like that.

And I've actually seen him go in, you know, fiddle with stuff, fidget with the doorknob, and it would open, and then they would call it in "We had an insecure door." And once you had that, you had to go in and clear the residence to make sure there was nobody there, there was nobody in there that wasn't supposed to be in there to secure the residence. He would purposely try to open doors [00:06:00] to make that happen so he could go in there.

Jim: And I think it says a lot that you and I have been talking for several years and up until he's no longer on the force, you weren't saying anything about it.

Deputy: I wasn't going to. He'd be camped out...

Jim: He'd be camped out?

Deputy: He'd be camped out waiting on me.

Jim: what, like, you know, what he's capable of.

Deputy: Right. I've seen it firsthand.

Jim: But what could you have seen him do? Just, you said put something on the back of the vehicle or...

Deputy: I've never actually seen it, but I've suspected. One time there was a person that he really disliked, and I don't even know why he really disliked him, but he, he found some drugs in their car one time and I was sitting there.

I was with him, on that stop when he found some drugs and I don't think the person had ever had a drug charge or was even a drug user. And he just happens to find a joint, which is possible that it was theirs, but at the same time, and I never thought it was; I thought that was something he pulled out his pocket and said it was theirs.

[00:07:00] It's possible.

Jim: It just may have may or may not have been walking around with evidence to plant.

Deputy: Yeah, it wouldn't surprise me. It wouldn't surprise me at all. And I'm sure 50% of the Sheriff's office deputies that had been there any amount of time or worked any kind of time with him, probably know the same thing or at least as, or at least suspect the same thing.

Jim: So, it's not, it's not, it wouldn't be just a, you aren't really have a personal issue. It's just the way he is.

Deputy: No, it was just his demeanor and his integrity. He has none. He does what [bleep] wants to do, and if it benefits him, then... he used to have a saying, and this was a notorious, his saying, "you might beat the rap, but you won't beat the ride."

Meaning he was going to take you to jail, whether he was right or wrong.

Jim: Wow.

Deputy: Yeah. That was his saying, you might beat the rap, but you won't beat the ride. Meaning you're going to jail that night. You might not get prosecuted or charged for it, but you're going to jail.

Jim: It's just very curious that a guy like that, knowing that he's at a, he's got to know he's at a murder scene,

Deputy: Right. Also, there's somebody dead there and we don't know what happened. So yeah,

Jim: A suspect he's [00:08:00] supposed to be watching, and he wasn't even, I don't think Clark was a suspect, but, and that's where I get kind of like, was he a witness or a suspect, a person of interest?

Deputy: Well, until I knew more, both of them were and the other one was in handcuffs in the back of a car.

Jim: OK, wouldn't that be just common sense?

Deputy: Yeah.

Jim: I wouldn't even have to be a sheriff to be like, okay, there's a dead person here. There's two people here who were naked. They're suspects until I know.

Deputy: Both of them are, yeah.

Jim: Okay.

Deputy: Yeah.

Jim: But, so, one of the guys who we just should have been an obvious suspect, it's just

Deputy: Freelancin'. Roamin'.

Jim: But he's in his house for near an hour. That's wild.

Deputy: I haven't heard any timelines, so I don't know how long it was, but I know it was long enough to go in there and get a gun and shoot his self. And nobody knew where he was at when the gunshot happened. They had to go find him.

Jim: Even if you had 10 minutes, that's too long.

Deputy: Well, it only takes 10 seconds.

Jim: Yeah. So, this, you know, so he, [bleep] would've had to been like, well, Clark's cool.

Deputy: I guess.

Jim: Right?

[00:09:00] **Deputy:** I don't know anybody that's that cool. If I walk up to my brother standing over his wife doing CPR and she's done been strangled around the, I don't know how the, or remember how the call came in, but under the circumstances of what they were doing to her, my brother's probably going in handcuffs in the back of my car until I know.

Jim: Until you know different, right? I think you said once there wouldn't be anybody, but perhaps your wife, you would give the benefit of the doubt.

Deputy: Yeah.

Jim: I mean, that's what every citizen.

Deputy: Yeah. It's just common sense. Common sense in my opinion,

Jim: And not the like good old, good old buddy system. Hey, I've known you for 20 years and you didn't do it because I just know better. So, you just hang out.

Deputy: and it's possible [bleep] had that buddy system with this guy. I don't know. He would be the one that would have that mindset. If anybody did, though. I know you, you didn't do it or you're okay or whatever.

Jim: I mean, you, not being from here. I know that Clark sold drugs,

Deputy: right?

Jim: I don't, I don't smoke dope, but I know he sold it.

Deputy: Yeah.

[00:10:00] **Jim:** So, if I know he sold it,

Deputy: Apparently, he sold it in large quantities. Or a lot of it, I guess, I don't know about the quantities, but

Jim: Do you know how he lost his license?

Deputy: I don't.

Jim: He was a psychiatrist or a psychologist or whatever at Central State and was caught drugging patients and then having sex with them.

Deputy: Wow.

Jim: That's just public record. If you just go look for it hard enough, there it is.

Deputy: I didn't have any idea.

Jim: To me, it's possible that he might've drugged them that night.

Deputy: He could have done that too.

Jim: That's just speculation, but, you know, here's Marcus Lillard with a pretty, seems like he would be a pretty good slate or a pretty good mark to drug. If you wanted to do something.

Deputy: Right.

Jim: I think Marcus liked his drugs.

Deputy: It probably wouldn't take much convincing; Hey, try this.

Jim: Okay, let me ask you this. Being a Sheriff, you have to be able to read people pretty well,

Deputy: if you [00:11:00] want to do it. Yeah.

Jim: Do you think Marcus is a violent person?

Deputy: I've never heard anything about him being violent. I know he liked drugs

Jim: He liked drugs.

Deputy: He liked drugs. I knew that. He liked to party. I don't know how the drugs affected him. Cause I've never been around him when he was under the influence of 'em.

Jim: What about Clark? Think he would be violent?

Deputy: I don't know.

Jim: I don't either. I don't. I don't know.

Deputy: I've never seen, I don't know Clark good enough. I mean, I've just heard the story, I've just heard people talk about, he sold drugs. A lot of the college kids I think, were getting it from him and he had the place, you know, things are sold out of his business. That was kind of a known spot to go.

Jim: Good Karma?

Deputy: Yeah. That it was one of the normal spots to go if you wanted something, go in there and see him.

And I said, I've never been around Marcus when he was under the influence. It's always after, or before.

Jim: Did you ever arrest him?

Deputy: I don't think I've ever put cuffs on him myself. I've been with others when they did, but as far as me personally, having a case against him though,

Jim: what was, [00:12:00] I mean, I don't want to implicate, but how, how many times would you say any, say personally run ins with the law, with him.

Deputy: I think two or three that I can remember. Not every time going to jail. So, you know, sometimes just a traffic stop, but if he got stopped, you know, they were going to search his car.

Jim: Yeah.

Deputy: So, you had to have somebody else. So, if I was another, if I was a free one in the righthand area, whoever got him, You know, I would've went and watched him while they did what they were going to do.

Jim: Yeah. So, if you would have had this, you think [bleep] would have had this history with Marcus?

Deputy: Yeah. He's been, he was at the Sheriff's office. Yeah. What, 20, 25 years probably.

Jim: You think it is possible that [bleep] would have had a personal dig against Marcus?

Deputy: He could have. There's others, like I told you before when I suspected he planted stuff on people he strongly disliked, so it's possible that him and Marcus, weren't friends, on a friendly term, friendly basis, whatever you want to call it.

Jim: Surely Marcus would have known all this.

Deputy: Yeah, they know which ones like them and which ones don't

Jim: Wouldn't you, I mean, I would want, you know, and especially if I had run ins [00:13:00] that many times with the situation.

Yeah. I don't know. I could get, and again, it's not to, it's not to try to, it's just really...try to find what happened to Marianne Shockley.

Deputy: Right.

Jim: And it it's, it's like the evidence all washed away because it was pouring rain that night, and now we have some very bizarre details. I got this Clark who could be telling us what happened, but yeah, because [bleep]

Deputy: We'll never know. Yeah. There's only, what, out of the three, only one living? Yep. Very one-sided story that way.

Penny: In Blood Town, Clark Heindel consulted with Central State Hospital and Oconee Child and Adolescent Center working primarily with juvenile sex offenders. He also had his own practice.

Clark Heindel was a Psychologist at the time the following article was published in 1998. He consulted with the Legacy Program of Project Adventure, which was a residential [00:14:00] program that used adventure-based counseling and a total mind body experience with juvenile sex offenders in Georgia. He advised the program, which closed in 2010 and met regularly with staff and clients for ongoing training and support.

This is "Awkward Silence" by Clark Heindel [Read by an Actor]

Clark Heindel: When I tell people that I work with sex offenders, there's a guaranteed moment of awkward silence. We struggle to maintain the conversation. Even bona-fide liberal-humanist-new-age optimists have a hard time with this one. The inability to change sex offenders is one of the old sacred cows. "Is there really anything you can do for those... people?" "You mean short of castration or execution?" Actually, I reply kindly and try to provide some educational facts, but it's often a case of "my mind is made up, so don't confuse me with the facts."

I have spoken at several victim awareness seminars teeming with budding young therapists who initially [00:15:00] view me as the enemy. Usually the best I can do is to challenge the precepts. "Where and how did this person become such a monster?" "Where were his parents when he needed help?" "Is a parent who allows his or her child to be abused guilty of child abuse?" and "Just, why is it that these individuals are not worthy of the same compassion that we so readily advocate for all others?" The traditional dichotomy of "victims equal good" and "offenders equal bad" is seriously flawed. It's never that simple.

What makes this work worthwhile are the successes. Seeing those who have been consigned to society's junk pile emerge transformed with a good chance of not re-offending gives a warm feeling. Of course, I've always been a bit of a radical and proving conventional wisdom wrong is one of the joys of life; after all, sacred cows make the best hamburger.

Penny: On April 17, 2015 Clark Heindel opened Good Karma yoga studio. [00:16:00] Two weeks later on May 5th, the Georgia State Board of Examiners of Psychologists suspended Clark's license to practice Psychology. Clark is referred to as respondent in this case. "The Board has received reliable information and evidence indicating that respondent engaged in a sexual relationship with a married female patient, that respondent provided drugs to the female patient who had a history of substance abuse, that respondent provided alcohol to the female patient, and that respondent engaged in numerous communications by various means with the female patient that involves sexual content and descriptions of drug use."

On June 27th, 2014, the husband of Clark's patient filed a complaint with the Board. He is referred in the court documents as M H, and his [00:17:00] wife is referred to as E H. M H stated that his wife E H was a patient of Clark's for five years, and that they were having an affair. The husband discovered sexually explicit messages, including one that proposed sex in the respondent's office. MH claimed that there were more than 900 text messages and phone calls from the respondent to his wife in May alone.

Is that a lot of text messages, Jim?

Jim: That's sounds like a lot,

Penny: So, that spending a significant amount of your time talking to one person that is not your spouse.

Jim: Yeah. It's pretty, pretty consistent relationship.

Penny: On August his 21st, 2014. Clark's patient E H, M H's wife also filed a complaint with the Board. She first sought treatment with Clark on January 7th, 2010 for depression and anxiety.

In over half of the 40 treatment [00:18:00] sessions, EH mentioned her relationship problems with her husband and her substance abuse. So that's a pretty consistent treatment regimen, I would say. 40 sessions.

Jim: Yeah. I mean that she first sought help in 2010 and by 2015, there's a civil suit against Dr. Heindel from the family. That's a lot to go down in five years.

Penny: Right. Clark administered the Personality Assessment Inventory about 18 months into therapy. He suggested that E H was exaggerating her psychological issues in order to continue to receive social security disability. So, in order to get SSD, you have to be significantly impaired and unable to function in your life. So, we could [00:19:00] say her issues were significant.

Jim: It seems so.

Penny: The disagreement comes into play as to exactly when therapy terminated. The respondent maintained that EH's last treatment had occurred on March 28th, 2012. However, EH claimed that she sent the respondent Facebook messages to discuss her daughter's body image issues.

So, why is it important to establish when therapy terminated.?

Jim: What I think the law is, the parameters are that a relationship can only really legally occur two years after therapy ends. I want to be clear that we're not sitting here trying to put pass judgment just on Dr. Heindel, just trying to see, well, perhaps he did fall in love with [00:20:00] his former patient and had a genuine caring relationship and nothing bad happened here. Or it did. And really the, the audience or the listeners that's for them to, to decide. But, I guess two questions I really, really have that I can give my opinion on is, if it was a genuine relationship with this woman and she was in a bad marriage, what, whatever that she shared with Clark and the, or Dr. Heindel in the early 2010, 2011, 2012. You know, maybe they fell in love, but it also seems that Clark is and has multiple former patient sexual relationships.

Penny: There was evidence introduced at the Board hearing that Clark had initiated relationships with [00:21:00] another former patient and a patient's mother.

And actually at the time when he began his sexual relationship with E H he was still in a relationship with that former patient.

Jim: I don't want to feel that we're sitting here passing judgment on this fellow, but the night of Marianne Shockley's death, or the early morning of it, was drugs and sex seems to have been part of the scene. Back to the scene being inappropriate and what have you, and the narrative has been given that Clark was a witness, wasn't a suspect. Find some information that, that drugging patients and providing drugs. If someone seeks your help in 2010, and through a relationship where you are therapist, and someone comes to you in a vulnerable [00:22:00] state and says, I have alcohol problems, depression. So, and so forth, and then within the course of the next four years, you're supplying them.

Penny: Yeah. I mean, let's talk about the details of what that looks like as far as what he supplied her. In therapy, she revealed to Clark that she was an alcoholic and an addict and had marital issues. And so then, we find in the report information that on several occasions, he provided her with various forms of marijuana, either as candy or in baggies. He talked about his own marijuana use and his hallucinogenic drug use, including ayahuasca in Peru. And then also, you know, provided [00:23:00] alcohol to a person who says that she was an alcoholic, bloody Mary's, Prosecco, wine, and all of this was centered around their sexual encounters, which we are not saying anything about anyone who likes to drink or whatever it is that they like to engage in for their own purposes. But the question is, is there a breach of duty as a psychologist to have that knowledge of her addiction and tendencies, and then to supply her with substances; is that appropriate?

Jim: And I don't think the Board found that it was in any, in any case whatsoever.

Penny: The Board even pointed out that Clark did not discuss her current medication use such as Xanax that he knew she had previously been prescribed and that alcohol and drugs and prescription [00:24:00] medications can combine in a dangerous way.

Jim: And then the patient reaches back out, I think, via social media, whatever, for body image issues. And then the next thing you know, he's suggesting sex in the office and taking marijuana candy and sounds somewhat predatory to me.

Penny: Well, let's put it this way. On May 14th, Clark texted her 58 times.

And on May 20th, he texted her 87 times. And when MH, the husband, discovered the messages between them and understood that they were having an affair, he met with Clark

Jim: On the 16th of June 2014. The husband guess requested lunch meeting and he said, what's going on gives off the impression of predatory behavior and to stop.

Penny: Did he stop?

Jim: No, I think that's the problem

Penny: Right.

[00:25:00] **Jim:** Something happened between the 16th of June of 2014 and the 27th of June, 2014. When the husband said he went and filed an official complaint against Dr. Clark Heindel.

Penny: And then as soon as MH filed that complaint, he went to Spain to do some study abroad. And at that point, Clark was aware that MH did not want him to engage in sexual relations with his wife, and then he continued to do so.

While the husband was in Spain, Clark went to her house where her children were sleeping and they drank two bottles of wine, smoked marijuana, and had sex. The date after that, on July 7th, Clark broke off their affair due to concerns about losing his license because he was well aware of the threats by MH to file a complaint with the board [00:26:00] and then Clark still remained in contact with E H to find out if that had happened. And, during that time he told her if, if her husband filed a board complaint, he was planning to retire and open a yoga studio, which is what he did.

Jim: And interestingly, two months after the husband files the complaint, the patient then files a complaint with the Board against Dr. Clark Heindel. So, 2 months later it seems that she had a, a major change of heart.

Penny: Yeah. I don't know what her thoughts or her motivations are, or anyone's are, in the situation. I think all we can do is from the outside, provide the findings of the board and the findings of fact and the evidence and it's up to everyone to decide for themselves whether they think it was appropriate or not.

[00:27:00] **Jim:** So, in June of 2014, the husband files the complaint. Two months later, the patient files the complaint. And half a year later, decisions are made, and Dr. Handel was ordered to submit a mental, physical, and psychosexual test to be administered one for, I guess, for evaluation that he refused. Four or five months later, Heindel opens up a yoga studio called Good Karma. Just the timing of that, it seems like a Heindel would have known that his license would be being revoked.

Penny: Two weeks later on May 5th, 2015, the Georgia State Board of Examiners of Psychologists suspended Clark's license to practice psychology. Then what happened is on April 7th, 2017, the Board sought final disciplinary action against respondent's license to practice Psychology.

So, first it was suspended, and then time passed. He's [00:28:00] running his yoga studio. He can't practice psychology, but it hasn't been revoked yet.

Jim: Okay. So, it was revoked, and it was suspended in 2015.

Penny: Right. And then a four-day hearing was held concluding on August 29th, 2017. The board issued a decision on October 3rd, 2017. "Based on the evidence presented at the hearing, the board recommends that the order of summary suspension be affirmed and the respondent's license be revoked." There was an agency review. And on December 15th, 2017, the final decision of the board revoked the respondent's license to practice psychology in the state of Georgia. It's a long process to have it revoked after that much time has passed.

Jim: When the, in the middle of that, you have a civil suit filed against Dr. Heindel by the patient and her husband.

Penny: On December 28th, 2015. [00:29:00] E H and M H filed a civil suit against Clark for professional negligence, breach of fiduciary duty, negligent infliction of emotional distress, and loss of consortium.

They sought punitive damages and attorney fees. At that time, the court granted summary judgment to Clark Heindel for all of these claims. As you know, when there's a court proceeding, there's always going to be an appeal. So, on October 26, 2018, the Court of Appeals of Georgia further affirmed that summary judgment was improperly granted on the claim for loss of consortium.

However, the court upheld summary judgment for professional negligence and negligent infliction of emotional distress.

Jim: And there's a, a word that's kind of maybe skipped over is the word Fiduciary. And I just wanted, I just Googled the definition to read it. It's involving [00:30:00] trust, especially with regard to the relationship between a trustee and a beneficiary.

Although there's lots of ways to look at this, when you're someone's doctor or you're someone's teacher or you're someone's employer, you have a certain role to play, which is depends on how you look at it, but you have a responsibility to your, you're entrusted with a certain amount of power.

If someone comments to you and says, I need help because I have depression, I turned to drugs and alcohol to self-medicate for these things. Two years later, when that person who is to help you is supplying you with those. That seems to be problematic.

Penny: And that's ultimately what the Court of Appeals found.

I have this statement from [00:31:00] Cornell law: "Fiduciary duty is imposed whenever confidence is reposed on one side in a contractual relationship so as to allow that side to exert influence and dominance over the other." So, if Clark is found to have breached that duty of trust to help and exert influence, and he cannot account for his deceptively obtained gains, then EH could be owed damages for that breach of fiduciary duty.

That's a tough word.

Jim: That is a tough word.

Penny: E H and M H claimed that Clark "used the intimate knowledge of her history of addiction to his advantage to lower her inhibitions and entice her to have sex with him."

Testimony to the board indicates that "providing a former patient who has a history of substance abuse with [00:32:00] alcohol or marijuana falls below the minimal standards of acceptable and prevailing practice even after termination of treatment and is totally inexcusable." The Board's statement of matters asserted claims that "the respondent's own testimony and evidence demonstrates that it was irresponsible, reckless, and ultimately exploitative to engage in sexual intimacies with E H."

Dr. Spears testified and the respondent agreed that the code of ethics is to ensure that a Psychologist does no harm. However, Clark argued this was valid only with current and not former patients. Clark also remarked in an email to a friend that relationships with former patients need not be undertaken with serious consideration of the [00:33:00] circumstances surrounding the termination of therapy but could be viewed as entertainment.

"The evidence presented proves that the respondent violated multiple provisions of the Board's code of ethics by engaging in unprofessional, immoral, unethical and deceptive practices."

Jim: Did I just hear entertainment?

Penny: Yes.

Jim: Can you read that again?

Penny: Sure. He wrote an email to a friend and he said relationships with former patients need not be undertaken with serious consideration of the circumstances surrounding the termination of therapy but could be viewed as entertainment.

Jim: Wow.

Penny: It appears by that remark from that email, that it was something that he enjoyed doing and found no problem with.

Jim: Could he mean entertainment for the patient?

[00:34:00] **Penny:** Okay. In what way?

Jim: I don't know. I'm just trying to find a silver lining in some way. Is there one?

Penny: I don't think there is one.

Jim: Okay. So, this is Blood Town.

This is the kind of thing that happens, I'm sure, everywhere in the world, everywhere in the country.

Penny: Coming up on Blood Town:

Jim: So, a Psychologist at Central State Hospital in Milledgeville, Georgia, views relationships with patients, sexual relationships with patients, as entertainment? How many patients could have been mistreated there, but Central State Hospital has been open or had been opened since 1847.

An interesting purchase this year was that of several thousand new cast iron headboards to replace the wooden ones that [00:35:00] mark the anonymous graves and the white and colored cemeteries. They gave a different touch to the most gruesome and depressing site in Georgia.

These are the words of Dr. Peter G. Cranford, who was hired by Central State Hospital, and was there only a brief time because he was fired for telling the truth about Central State Hospital. What I'd like to make clear is that for a long, long time, anyone who has tried to tell the truth about Central State Hospital, and in part, Milledgeville and the surrounding area, has been silenced.

Penny: Pursuant to the Georgia Open Records Act, we requested the 911 call placed on Mother's Day by Clark Heindel. Our request was denied due to pending prosecution.

Thanks for listening, please [00:36:00] rate and subscribe. You can follow us on Facebook and Insta @bloodtownpodcast and Twitter @bloodtownpod.