

SEP 21 2026

FILED

9/18/26

JAMES W. GIACOMINO

Deputy

CASE NO. CR20251060-001
CR20251454-001

ARIZONA SUPERIOR COURT, PIMA COUNTY

HON. D. DOUGLAS METCALF

COURT REPORTER: Autumn Grant Person
Courtroom - 386

DATE: September 16, 2026

STATE OF ARIZONA

Rachel L Stiles, Esq. counsel for State

VS.

LANE JEFFERY MYERS
Defendant

Mark R. Resnick, Esq. counsel for Defendant

MINUTE ENTRY

VIOLATION HEARING (CONTINUED)

Hearing begins at 10:41 AM; hearing was originally scheduled to commence at 10:30 AM.

Defendant present, in custody.

Victim is present.

The Court admonishes everyone present that there shall be no video or audio recording of any kind made of the court proceedings by anyone present in the courtroom.

Ms. Stiles had intended to move for admission of State's Exhibit 4; however, she had inadvertently failed to do so and requests that the exhibit be admitted today.

There being no objection, State's Exhibit 4 is admitted.

The Court and counsel confer regarding the requirements of the Court ruling; the Court informs counsel the ruling will be made from the bench at the conclusion of the hearing.

Counsel make closing arguments to the Court.

Concerning the Petition to Revoke Probation filed by the Adult Probation Department on July 9, 2026, and the State's Second Amended Petition to Revoke Defendant's Probation filed on August 10, 2026:

In CR20251060-001, the Defendant was convicted of Amended Count Fourteen: Stalking Distress/Fear, a Class Five Felony, occurring between September 12, 2024, and February 22, 2025; and in CR20251454-001, the Defendant was convicted of Amended Count One: Aggravated Harassment-Court Order in Place, a Class Six Felony, occurring on or about March 16, 2025.

The Court placed the Defendant on probation as to each cause number with the probationary terms to run concurrently. It was a condition of probation, condition fifteen (15), which is the basis of this hearing.

K. H.

Deputy Clerk

MINUTE ENTRY

The Court makes the following findings by a preponderance of the evidence, which is the standard that applies in petition to revoke probation cases.

THE COURT FINDS as follows:

1. The Adult Probation Department had met with the Defendant to review the conditions of probation with him, and they met with him subsequently to remove the videos that had been posted that concern this case. In imposing these conditions, the Court did so because they were rationally related to protecting the victim but limited to protecting the victim without restricting the Defendant's ability to speak as to other matters and without restricting his constitutionally protected right to speak freely. The Court attempted to condition the probation terms to protect the victim and her family.
2. The Defendant was able to follow the conditions of probation for a long period of time. He did well on probation without issue and then, for some reason unknown to the Court, the Defendant decided to challenge the probationary conditions by beginning a campaign of discussing and disparaging the victim in statements broadcast on YouTube.
3. The Defendant's discussion of the victim caused others to start contacting and harassing the victim via email at her office; this conduct by other individuals had stopped after Defendant was sentenced while he was complying with the conditions of probation. However, when the conduct was resumed by the Defendant, the harassment of the victim by other individuals also resumed.
4. A reasonable person, trying in good faith to follow their conditions of probation, would not allow themselves to get into a situation where their words disparaging the victim and her family could be broadcast on YouTube; however, that is exactly what the Defendant did in these matters. The Defendant put himself in a position that allowed others as well as himself to start harassing the victim, which is exactly the conduct in which he was not supposed to be engaging.
5. When the activity came to a head, the probation officers began watching the new videos that had come out which had the victim's name and her husband's name on them, and they were increasingly concerned. Mr. Ketaily and Mr. Wheeler with the Adult Probation Department were very believable witnesses and the Court finds them to be credible witnesses. Mr. Wheeler credibly testified that the Defendant's conduct on the new videos and jailhouse interviews became increasingly agitated and more disdainful towards the victim. This put the Adult Probation Department, who is in the business of dealing with people who can engage in activities that escalate that can result in violence against

K. H.
Deputy Clerk

MINUTE ENTRY

victims, in a position to be very concerned by the activity, as it fit a pattern that they were very familiar with; this being that increased activity by the Defendant of being agitated and more disdainful towards the victim can lead to violence.

6. The Adult Probation Department has discretion as to whether to change the level of supervision, impose new restrictions, or file a petition to revoke probation. Whether the Defendant violated probation is reviewed *de novo* by the Court; the Court does not review the decision-making by the Adult Probation Department as to whether to file a petition to revoke probation or not.
7. The videos that the State played in court violate the conditions of probation; for example, in the "Better Not Miss It" video of on or about June 30, 2026, the Defendant has the victim's name on the screen continuously while discussing the case, referencing the case numbers. The defense argument that this is not a violation of probation is just too cute by half; the fact that it happened to be the name of a rugby star and an astronaut and arguing that that is what the Defendant is talking about does not pass the smell test. The Defendant is obviously trying to knowingly get around the conditions of probation by doing that; however, he is broadcasting the victim's name for long periods of time in very clear letters, while he is talking about the case.
8. One video with the victim's name prominently displayed showed the Defendant with a vegetable erect penis, which is a very harassing image towards the victim and would incite others to hate the victim and want to take action against her. The image of the Defendant having a foot on the back of the County Attorney is obviously a threat towards the County Attorney and enforcement of the law in general; it is another threat indicating that he is out for the victim in this case because of this case. The video "War on My Speech", shows the phrase "Delay, Deny, Depose" a reasonable person could find relates to shell casings from the case in New York City. The Defendant is also discussing war while he displays the victim's name up on the screen.
9. In jailhouse interviews the Defendant discusses that the victim is a professional victim and is disparaging her; again, people are starting to contact her because of that and leaving hateful email messages for her. All of this is done to harass the victim and allow others to harass the victim based upon his actions; the Defendant is rolling the ball down the court which is then causing others to react. The Defendant knew he was not supposed to engage in this behavior yet continued to do so.

//

//

K. H.
Deputy Clerk

MINUTE ENTRY

10. In a jailhouse interview with Liberty Troll, the Defendant identifies the victim's place of employment and where her office is located; in a second clip, he admits that he understands that this is being put on YouTube and acknowledges that the proprietor of the Liberty Troll YouTube channel is going to show the victim's name while this is playing. The video "Free Lane Myers" contains the Defendant again discussing the victim. People in the chat are discussing the victim, so they obviously know what the Defendant is talking about, and the Defendant discusses how he is going to continue to harass the victim in the future and that no one can stop him. In another Bedtime Stories video, the Defendant is calling the victim a liar.
11. Those videos, as shown, violate the conditions of probation in both cases that the Defendant not engage in activities that would have been reasonably expected to cause others to harass or contact the victim or her family, and to not post information about the victim, her husband, or two (2) minor children on YouTube or other social media.
12. The videos span the period referenced in both the conditions in the Petition to Revoke Probation filed by the Adult Probation Department as well as the Second Amended Petition to Revoke Defendant's Probation filed by the State.
13. The Defendant also violated the condition that he does not associate or communicate with Joshua Gray, as Joshua Gray had access to non-public information about the case, which he posted before it was publicly available; he would have gotten that information from the Defendant or through others that originated with the Defendant.
14. For all these reasons, the Defendant has violated his probation as to both cause numbers, and these matters will be set for Disposition.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED as follows:

1. Setting both matters for Disposition Hearing on October 6, 2026, at 11:00 AM, in Division 16. Estimated length of hearing is one (1) hour.
2. A supplemental presentence report be prepared as to both matters by the Adult Probation Department.
3. Affirming that the Defendant shall continue to be held without bond as to both cause numbers pending Disposition.

K. H.
Deputy Clerk

MINUTE ENTRY

Page 5

Date: September 16, 2026

Case No.: CR20251060-001
CR20251454-001

IT IS ORDERED that all exhibits that have been marked for identification and not offered for admission into evidence are to be released by the clerk to respective counsel.

Hearing ends at 12:12 PM.

FILED IN COURT: Stipulation and/or Order re: Release of Exhibits

cc: Hon. D. Douglas Metcalf
Mark R. Resnick, Esq.
Rachel L Stiles, Esq.
Adult Probation

K. H.
Deputy Clerk