

①

THE TRUTH

WHILE NOT BLAMING THE VICTIM, BLAMING THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM. I DON'T KNOW FOR SURE WHAT THE ALLEGED MOTIVES WERE FOR THIS FROM THE VICTIM I CAN ONLY SPECULATE.

SPECULATION ~~PROOF~~ THE VICTIM TRYING SEVERAL TIMES TO BE PUT ON SOCIAL SECURITY INCOME INSTEAD OF WORKING. TO THINKING I HAD MONEY AND SUIING ME FOR RAPE. OR THAT FACT FROM SEVERAL PRIOR STAYS IN MENTAL INSTITUTIONS FOR PAST SEXUAL PHYSICAL & EMOTIONAL ABUSE, VERIFIED BY NEWS ARTICLE IN THE APPLETON POST CRESCENT MARCH 12, 1995 TITLED "BREAKING NOR SILENCE" THAT THE VICTIM IS JUST VERY MENTALLY ILL OR THE REAL CRIMINAL WORE.

THESE ATTEMPTS FOR ATTAINING SOCIAL SECURITY BY THESE STORIES OF PAST ABUSE, WHICH BY THE WAY WERE NEVER PROVEN. TO THEN SUIING ME FOR RAPE THEN APPLYING AGAIN FOR SOCIAL SECURITY ONLY TO AGAIN BE TURNED DOWN BECAUSE SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION DID NOT BELIEVE NOR STORIES. BUT THE COURTS AID.

SO, THE COURTS WOULD NOT ALLOW ME TO DEFEND MY SELF. BY USING ANY OF THESE FACTS. THE JURY DID NOT KNOW ANY OF THIS. THE NEWS ARTICLE WAS DONE AFTER I WAS CONVICTED. SO ALL THE DECISIONS AS FAR AS THE VICTIMS

(2)

MENTAL SITUATIONS WERE CONTROLLED BY THE COURT. THE JURY WHICH WERE TO MAKE THE CHOICE OF WHO WAS TELLING THE TRUTH THE VICTIM OR MYSELF DID NOT HAVE ALL THE FACTS. THEY WERE NOT AWARE THE VICTIM HAD MADE CLAIMS OF UNPROVEN ABUSE IN THE PAST THE ATTEMPTS OF FINANCIAL GAINS IN THE PAST. I DID NOT RECEIVE A FAIR TRIAL NOR A FAIR APPEAL.

WHEN I MENTIONED THESE THEORIES I WAS TOLD I WAS EITHER AN OUT + OUT LIAR OR DELUSIONED

THE VICTIM TOLD 6 DIFFERENT VERSIONS OF THE INCIDENT. VICTIM DID NOT APPEAR AT ALL TRAUMATIZED VICTIM GOT INTO A SEXUAL RELATIONSHIP 2 WEEKS AFTER MY ALLEGED ASSAULT. THE COURTS SAW NOTHING MYSTERIOUS ABOUT ANY OF THIS. CONTINUED TO PROSECUTE

THE COURTS CHARGED ME AS A HABITUAL CRIMINAL WITH 30 COUNTS OF SEXUAL + PHYSICAL ASSAULT WITH VIRTUALLY NO EVIDENCE OTHER THAN THE VICTIM'S SAY-SO FACING 396 YEARS FOR A CRIME I DID NOT COMMIT. MY PRIOR CRIMES WERE BURGLARY TO A BAR STEALING BEER AND ALCOHOL AND SHOPLIFTING ALCOHOL

I WAS DRUNK THAT DAY. THE VICTIM THOUGHT I WOULD NOT REMEMBER. OH, I REMEMBER. I'M AN ALCOHOLIC NOT A RAPIST!! I RECEIVED

MEMORANDUM

OJE

To: Randy Behnke 113946
Ozaukee unit

From: Dr. Buhs
Psychological Services *Dr Buhs*

Date: 10/20/2016

Re: Your 10/16/16 letter

I received your letter and reviewed the DOC-2464 (Sex Offender Treatment Interview Decision). If you would like to clarify any of the information or specifically address the context under which you made the statements noted on the form, please write and I will place your request/letter in your PSU file.

SEX OFFENDER TREATMENT INTERVIEW DECISION

Check One: Offender was interviewed for SO2 SO4

INTERVIEW DATE: 09/02/2016 INSTITUTION NAME: RCI

OFFENDER NAME (Last, First, MI)	DOC NUMBER	DATE OF BIRTH	MR / PMR / ES DATE	DISCHARGE DATE
Behnke, Randy	113946	1/8/1961	10/06/2018	6/8/2029

NOTE: THIS FORM IS NOT TO BE USED FOR OFFENDERS WHO ARE REFUSING TREATMENT.
For offenders who refuse sex offender treatment, the DOC-2439 should be completed. The DOC-2464 is only to be used for those offenders who are willing to participate in SOT but who are turned down by the program provider(s) due to clinical judgment that the offender is an inappropriate treatment candidate.

The above offender, while not refusing treatment, was found to not be an appropriate treatment candidate at the present time for the following reason(s):

- The offender is appealing his or her sexually-related case (current offense).
- On interview, the offender denied major, relevant details of the current sexually-related offense.
- On interview, the offender denied the need for sex offender treatment (while still agreeing to participate), and the likelihood of effecting a change in the offender's attitude via clinical intervention appeared to be low.
- Other (describe):

Mr. Behnke stated he has been trying to get into the program and does not see the point in taking the program at this time. Additionally, he stated he refuses to comply with living on the Jefferson housing unit, which is a requirement of the program.

Additional comments/details/offender interview notes:

Action:

Retain on Waiting List Remove from Waiting List

Refer to Special Needs Program (specify which, below, and ATTACH THE 2464 TO THE EXISTING 1577;

NOTE: You may only refer the offender to the same level of Special Needs programming [i.e., SO2 or SO4] that was recommended in the existing 1577, in which case DORP is not needed. Changes to recommended level of treatment cannot be made without going through the Differing Opinion Resolution Process:

SO2 Spanish-speaking SO2 Lighthouse SO4 GOALS

Comments/Rationale for Indicated Action:

Mr. Behnke does not appear motivated for treatment.

PRINTED or TYPED CLINICIAN'S NAME C. Sharp, APSW	CLINICIAN'S SIGNATURE <i>C Sharp, APSW</i>	DATE 10/10/2016
PRINTED or TYPED SUPERVISOR'S NAME L. Buhs, Ph.D.	SUPERVISOR'S SIGNATURE <i>L Buhs, Ph.D.</i>	DATE 10/10/16