



IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF GARFIELD COUNTY  
STATE OF OKLAHOMA

FILED  
GARFIELD COUNTY, OKLA

AUG 01 2025

STATE OF OKLAHOMA, )  
Plaintiff, )  
v. )  
BRIAN LOVELL, )  
Defendant. )

Case No. CF-2024-111

JANELLE M. SHARP  
COURT CLERK  
BY *[Signature]*  
DEPUTY COURT CLERK

**DEFENDANT’S SUPPLEMENT TO DEFENDANT’S RESPONSE AND OBJECTION TO  
STATE’S MOTION FOR EVALUATION OF DEFENDANT FOR MENTAL ILLNESS  
AND MOTION TO COMPEL THE ENFORCEMENT OF THE DEFERRED  
PROSECUTION AGREEMENT ENTERED INTO APRIL 17, 2025 BETWEEN THE  
ATTORNEY GENERAL, GENTNER DRUMMOND, AND DEFENSE COUNSEL,  
STEPHEN JONES**

COMES NOW, the Defendant, Brian Lovell, by and through his attorneys of record, Stephen Jones, William Jewell, and Blake Trezell, of JONES, OTJEN & JEWELL, and provides the following supplement to the facts section of Defendant’s June 6 Response, Objection, and Motion to Compel, and in support thereof asserts as follows:

**SUPPLEMENTAL FACTS**

1. Defendant filed a motion on June 6 to compel the enforcement of the deferred prosecution agreement entered into April 17, 2025 between the Attorney General and Defense Counsel.
2. On April 17, 2025 the Attorney General called Defense Counsel and the two had a conversation. The call took place from 5:10 to 5:27 P.M. Present with Defense Counsel during the call were his two associates, William Jewell and Blake Trezell. They are also both attorneys of record for the Defendant in this case. Mr. Jewell took handwritten notes of the call. Attached as Exhibits 1-3 are affidavits of the attorneys for the Defendant present in the room when the call occurred. Attached as Ex. 4 are the notes from the call taken by Mr. Jewell. Attached as Ex. 5 is

a screenshot from counsel's phone with the incoming phone number redacted which shows that the call did occur.

3. The parties reached an agreement to resolve the criminal case during this April 17 telephone call. The Attorney General personally called from his cell phone to Counsel's cell phone. The Attorney General stated he was familiar with the case. The Attorney General offered a deferred prosecution agreement. Plaintiff, through counsel, immediately agreed to resolve the criminal case by a deferred prosecution agreement. The Attorney General stated that he had a considerable amount of respect for Dr. Beaman and that he did not want to challenge his diagnosis, *and no further evaluation of Plaintiff would be necessary by an expert retained by the State*, as Dr. Beaman is the Chief Medical Officer of the Oklahoma Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services. The Attorney General also agreed with counsel that a deferred prosecution agreement could be based on the public policy of promoting compassionate treatment in the criminal justice process to defendants with conditions like Alzheimer's and dementia. After Plaintiff accepted the State's offer, the Attorney General expressed that he would have his Assistant Attorneys General prepare the paperwork to effect the deferred prosecution agreement.

4. Defendant waited patiently for the paperwork to be provided to him to reduce to writing the deferred prosecution agreement that the parties entered into on April 17.

5. Defense Counsel advised the Attorney General's office that Defendant had an agreement with the duly elected Attorney General to resolve the case with the deferred prosecution agreement.

6. The Assistant Attorneys General did not provide Defendant with the paperwork.

7. On May 23, 2025 the Assistant Attorneys General assigned to this matter filed a motion to evaluate Defendant for mental illness in direct contravention of the agreement reached between Defense Counsel and the Attorney General on April 17.

8. On Monday, June 2, 2025, Defendant, through counsel, sent word to the Attorney General that he would be filing a response to the State's May 23rd motion combined with a motion to compel the enforcement of the deferred prosecution agreement on Friday, June 6, if the paperwork had not been provided to Defendant.

9. On Friday, June 6, having received no word from the Attorney General by around 3:00 P.M., sent a courier to the courthouse to file the response and objection to the State's motion for evaluation of Plaintiff for mental illness and motion to compel the enforcement of the deferred prosecution agreement entered into April 17, 2025 between the Attorney General, the Hon. Gentner Drummond and Defense Counsel, Stephen Jones.

10. Almost immediately after filing the response and motion to compel the Attorney General placed a second telephone call to Defense Counsel on counsel's private cell phone.

11. During this call the Attorney General and Defense Counsel reaffirmed that the parties had resolved this case by entering into a deferred prosecution agreement. A two-page single spaced memorandum from Defense counsel's associate was produced from notes taken during the telephone call. An affidavit based on that memorandum is attached hereto as Exhibit 6.

12. The Attorney General and Defense counsel discussed the particulars of the deferred prosecution agreement. Roughly, the parties agreed that while the agreement was in effect the Defendant: (1) would not possess a firearm; (2) would not purchase a firearm; (3) would not drive; (4) would surrender his drivers license; (5) would continue medical treatment

including psychiatric treatment and therapeutic intervention; and (6) the Defendant would not violate city, state, or federal law. Ex. 6.

13. Defense Counsel stated “I don’t think that’s a problem for him. I think he will do that and I think his wife wants him to do that.” Counsel then described how he recently had become aware that Defendant’s condition is becoming worse. *Id.*

14. The Attorney General asked if Defendant had “emotional outbursts”. Defense Counsel responded that he did not when he came into his office, that his condition is stabilized by medical intervention, and that the Defense could provide the State a list of his medications. *Id.*

15. The Attorney General commented “I want to do the right thing by my state.” *Id.*

16. Defense Counsel then discussed two alternative provisions for the deferred prosecution agreement. “First, the charge remains pending for 5 years and the agreement is the State will not call it up unless he violates it. The other is dismissal without prejudice subject to ‘if there’s a violation of the agreement this comes back up’. It’s a little more attractive to our purposes that our client waives the statute of limitations, waives speedy trial, signs the agreement, and the case remains ‘stayed’ until either side brings it up. Then if it’s a 5 year agreement, which is the figure I think you talked about before but that’s not a magic number for me, it’s whatever you want. It seems to me that if we adopt that approach we put this to bed and say there was a miscommunication to the news.” The Attorney General accepted the first alternative which was to leave the charges pending subject to conditions and then dismissed at the end of five years. The parties then discussed the terms as outlined above. *Id.*

17. The Attorney General commented that he was skeptical that any jury or judge would convict Defendant. He did not think that justice would be advanced by continuing to fight

toward a conviction. And “I would say it is my opinion that the judge is deteriorating and we want to affirm him the dignity that he deserves” or words to that effect. The Attorney General then reaffirmed that the parties were still entering into a deferred prosecution agreement. *Id.*

18. The Attorney General described a conference he had with his criminal prosecutors. Counsel had previously sent a letter to the Attorney General with a draft of Defendant’s Response and Objection. In that letter Defense counsel explained that he was going to file Defendant’s Response and Objection on June 6 if the Assistant Attorneys General assigned to this case had not transmitted the paperwork for the Defendant to formalize the valid deferred prosecution agreement. After this letter was sent it was reviewed either by the Attorney General himself or one of his close associates. The Attorney General apparently had a meeting with his criminal team on Tuesday, June 3rd, where he told his criminal team that his “respect for [Mr. Jones] has no equivalent...” and that the Attorney General’s office was honoring the agreement. He then commented about the nature of his prosecutors to the effect that his prosecutors are hammers that are always looking for a nail. *Id.*

19. At the end of the call Defense Counsel informed the Attorney General that the defense had, around 20 minutes before, filed Defendant’s Response and Objection. Defense Counsel informed the Attorney General that “if the media comes to me I’ll tell them that we’ve talked, come to an agreement, etc...” *Id.*

20. Defense Counsel then informed the Attorney General that they would seal the June 6 response and motion to compel because the allegations contained therein had been overtaken by the telephone call after it was filed. The allegations contained therein had been overtaken by the reaffirmation of the agreement from the second telephone call with Attorney General Drummond shortly after the motion had been filed. *Id.*

21. Defendant and counsel again waited, patiently, for the Attorney General's office to transmit the paperwork needed to formalize the terms of the valid deferred prosecution agreement the parties had entered into.

22. The Attorney General's office again went silent.

23. On Sunday, June 22, Defense Counsel advised the Assistant Attorney General who had appeared at preliminary hearing that the Attorney General's office was taking too long to send the paperwork and that Defendant was going to move to unseal the June 6 response and motion to compel.

24. On June 30, Defendant filed a motion to unseal the June 6 response and motion to compel.

25. On July 2, 2025 the Attorney General placed a third telephone call to Defense Counsel. The call occurred between 8:00 A.M. and 9:00 A.M. as Defense Counsel was driving to Oklahoma City for an appearance in the Western District federal court. Mr. Jones was in the car with two paralegals. In that phone call the Attorney General discussed with Defense Counsel the need for the General to have political cover to support the decision of his office to resolve the case with a deferred prosecution agreement. This telephone call was recorded by one of Defense Counsel's paralegals who was in the car. The recording was then transcribed by the paralegal. This paralegal is not a certified court reporter but her transcription of the call is accurate. The transcription of the July 2 telephone call is attached as Exhibit 7.

26. The Attorney General is presently the presumptive Republican Nominee for the office of Governor of the State of Oklahoma.

27. Counsel advised the General in that call that he would attempt to secure additional reports from Defendant's other doctors, but was concerned that with the short interval,

approximately 30 days before the August 8 hearing, it may not be possible to get subsequent evaluations and a written report timely scheduled. Counsel agreed to attempt to do this to provide the General with “political cover” by attempting to provide him with additional reports from Defendant’s other doctors. The Attorney General commented that he wanted the criminal matter to be resolved by the date of the motion hearing, August 8. Counsel did not agree that the General’s offer of a deferred prosecution agreement was contingent upon receiving additional reports because the deferred prosecution agreement had been entered into on April 17. The Attorney General conceded Counsel’s position was that there was an offer, acceptance, and consideration for the deferred prosecution agreement entered into April 17. The Attorney General and Defense Counsel specifically agreed to a “cease-fire”, where neither party would make any effort to publicize this matter before the August 8, 2025 motion hearing in the Garfield County case. The Attorney General violated, without notice, this agreement by giving an interview to Channel 4 discussing this case and the deferred prosecution agreement’s status only seven days after entering the “cease-fire<sup>3</sup>” agreement. The interview aired July 18. Ex. 7.

28. A common theme in all of these conversations between the Attorney General and Defense Counsel is that the calls were initiated by the Attorney General. Defense Counsel did seek to have a meeting with the Attorney General to resolve the case before the April 17 phone call, but after that call no formal meeting was necessary because the criminal case had been resolved. In the second telephone call on June 6, General Drummond made the specific claim

---


<sup>3</sup> The Attorney General would perhaps have been better served professionally and politically if he had remembered the advice of another successful political leader. “Nothing more enhances authority than silence. It is the crowning virtue of the strong, the refuge of the weak, the modesty of the proud, and pride of the humble, the prudence of the wise, and the sense of fools. The man who is moved by desire or fear is naturally led to seek relief in words. If he yields to the temptation it is because by externalizing his passion or his terror he can come to terms with them. To speak is to dilute one’s thoughts, to give vent to one’s ardor, in short, to dissipate one’s strength, whereas, what action demands is concentration.” DeGaulle, Charles, The Edge of the Sword, 1960, p. 59.

that Nolan Clay had called the Attorney General's office on several occasions inquiring about the Brian Lovell case and the Attorney General had not realized the likely media interest in a resolution. At that time the Attorney General had announced his intention to seek the Republican nomination for Governor of Oklahoma in 2026. The third telephone call, again initiated by the Attorney General, on July 2 was a conversation between two experienced political activists, one the elected Attorney General and candidate for Governor, and the other Brian Lovell's attorney who had been the Republican nominee for Attorney General in 1974, the United States Senate in 1990, and briefly Republican State Chairman in 1981, a member of the Republican State Finance Committee for a number of years, and in 2006 the largest donor to Republican candidates as documented by the Tulsa World. This conversation was about providing political cover for an agreement already reached but which someone in the Attorney General's organization, perhaps the Attorney General himself, was concerned about the political impact of a deferred prosecution agreement. The agreement had already been made. What the Attorney General was addressing was the political cosmetic effect of the agreement with, in his words, an "ally, supporter, and donor." This conversation and the subject was to remain confidential until the Attorney General unilaterally and without notice gave an interview to KFOR News Channel 4 seven days later in which he claimed the question of a deferred prosecution agreement was unresolved. This statement not only breached the cease-fire agreement but was also factually inaccurate.

Unfortunately this is one of a pattern of criminal cases initiated by the Attorney General's office in which his veracity may be challenged and there may possibly be a violation of the special duties of prosecutors as outlined in the Oklahoma Rules of Professional Conduct, as promulgated by the Oklahoma Supreme Court and binding on all lawyers, including the Attorney General. The Attorney General has been ill-advised and ill-served, and public confidence in his veracity

has been repeatedly challenged and his credibility weakened. This court should enter an order compelling the Attorney General to comply with the agreement that he initiated. It may not have been reduced to writing, but the agreement and its terms are specific, and have been agreed upon in conversations between the Attorney General and Mr. Lovell's defense counsel. The Attorney General's attempts to distance himself from an agreement that he initiated strains credulity and is deeply disappointing.

Respectfully submitted,




Stephen Jones, OBA #4805  
William Jewell, OBA #34376  
Blake Trekell, OBA #36282  
JONES, OTJEN & JEWELL  
214-A N. Independence St.  
Post Office Box 472  
Enid, OK 73702  
(580) 242-5500  
(580) 242-4556 (fax)  
sjones@stephenjoneslaw.com  
wjewell@stephenjoneslaw.com  
btrekell@stephenjoneslaw.com  
*Attorneys for the Defendant,  
Brian Lovell*

**CERTIFICATE OF DELIVERY**

This is to certify that on the 1st day of August, 2025, a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing was mailed, postage prepaid, and emailed upon the following:

Jimmy Harmon  
Colleen Galaviz  
Office of the Attorney General  
313 NE 21st St.,  
Oklahoma City, OK 73105



**TABLE OF EXHIBITS**

1	Affidavit of Defense Counsel, Stephen Jones
2	Affidavit of Defense Counsel, William Jewell
3	Affidavit of Defense Counsel, Blake Trezell
4	Notes taken by Mr. Jewell
5	Redacted screenshot from Defense Counsel's cell phone
6	Affidavit describing the June 6 call between Defense Counsel and the Attorney General
7	Uncertified transcript of July 2 call between Defense Counsel and the Attorney General

**EXHIBIT 1 BEGINS ON NEXT PAGE**

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF GARFIELD COUNTY  
STATE OF OKLAHOMA

STATE OF OKLAHOMA, )  
Plaintiff, )  
v. ) Case No. CF-2024-111  
BRIAN LOVELL, )  
Defendant. )

**AFFIDAVIT OF DEFENSE COUNSEL STEPHEN JONES**

STATE OF OKLAHOMA )  
 ) SS:  
COUNTY OF GARFIELD )

I, the undersigned Stephen Jones, being first duly sworn upon my oath state as follows:

1. I, Stephen Jones, make this Affidavit in support of an objection to a psychological evaluation of my client, Brian Lovell, and a motion to compel the State to honor an agreement made between myself and Gentner Drummond, the Attorney General of Oklahoma in which we agreed to resolve the indictment against Brian Lovell by a deferred prosecution agreement of five years under two conditions, that Brian Lovell continue his treatment under psychiatric care or other appropriate therapeutic intervention and to refrain from violating any federal or state law.

2. This agreement was made on April 17, 2025 on a telephone call that lasted seventeen minutes, which commenced at 5:10 P.M. Present in my office during the entire conversation were myself and two associate attorneys, William Jewell and Blake Trezell. Mr. Jewell made contemporaneous notes during the entire conversation.

3. The Attorney General called me from his personal cell phone to my personal cell phone. There were other subjects discussed between the two of us after we ended the conversation

concerning Mr. Lovell's case. The subject of those conversations were generally political in nature and not relevant, except possibly one.

4. During the conversation, in which the Attorney General initiated the subject of Brian Lovell, the following statements summarize accurately the conversation about Brian Lovell:

5. The Attorney General initiated the telephone call on April 17, 2025 at 5:10 PM from his personal cell phone to my personal cell phone;

6. He acknowledged that I had requested a meeting with him to discuss the Lovell case but the meeting had been cancelled because of a medical issue but the meeting was to be rescheduled;

7. The Attorney General asked me how I thought the Lovell case should be resolved. I replied that it should be resolved by a dismissal because (a) Dr. Beaman's diagnosis of frontotemporal dementia which was the underlying cause for the alleged facts of the indictment and (b) the case was a circumstantial one;

8. I mentioned that such action would show the Attorney General's awareness to mental health issues and I noted that I thought the Oklahoma Bar Association did not handle those issues appropriately and referred to a case I recently had with the Bar Association. I thought that there were dozens of older lawyers in Oklahoma, mostly in small towns, who were grappling with these issues and that this could be an example of how to handle them;

9. The Attorney General asked me if myself and my client would agree to a deferred prosecution agreement and I made it clear we were talking about a deferred prosecution agreement and not a deferred sentence because that would negatively impact my client possibly at the Bar Association although he had changed his status to associate member and could not practice law;

10. There was a brief discussion of the terms in which the Attorney General mentioned five years and I believe I stated that I was not sure my client would live that long because frontotemporal dementia is not curable, it is progressive but it can be treated;

11. The Attorney General subsequently said in the conversation that he would instruct his staff to prepare the necessary paperwork, to which I agreed. This statement wrapped up the conversation and occurred after we had discussed other matters;

12. In early May, I received a telephone call on my cell phone from Assistant Attorney General, Jimmy Harmon. I have known Mr. Harmon for approximately a quarter of a century;

13. Mr. Harmon told me that the Attorney General denied that the conversation was as I stated in the letters I had written to the Attorney General's office following up the conversation. He said General Drummond told him that I had "segwayed into the discussion about Mr. Lovell." I knew those statements to be false. I paused for a second or two and then told Mr. Harmon that I was "disappointed and shocked" that the Attorney General would tell him such a thing because it was not true. The conversation was as I had reported it. Mr. Harmon then altered his approach and told me in words to the effect of: we can't do this, a little girl might have been killed. I believe I told him that no little girl was killed, a little girl was not involved, and no one was injured;


14. I had told the Attorney General in the conversation that his office had sought to secure an agreed order for a psychological examination and it had not been acted upon. I specifically mentioned Dr. Beaman's name who had already performed an evaluation. The Attorney General said that the State's request was not necessary because he knew Dr. Beaman personally and professionally and could not challenge him. The Attorney General made a reference to the fact that Dr. Beaman was the Chief Medical Officer of the Department of Mental Health.

15. I inferred from that filing that the Attorney General's office was taking the position that there was no such deferred prosecution agreement to resolve the case. Such conversation and agreement did occur between myself and Attorney General on April 17, 2025 beginning at 5:10 P.M. No motion or request has been filed, complying with the statutes about withdrawing from a deferred prosecution agreement to which we would object as there are no valid grounds to withdraw from it. The agreement was made by the Attorney General with duly constituted authority to make the decision in the prosecution of this case and myself acting on behalf of my client, Brian Lovell;


16. Any statement that no such agreement was made is false;

17. Finally, I have summarized accurately the substance of the conversation with General Drummond, the agreement, and the conversation with Mr. Harmon.

Further affiant sayeth not.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Stephen Jones

Subscribed and sworn to before me on this 6 day of June, 2025.



(Seal)

My Commission No. 24008771  
My Commission Expires: 7/15/28

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public

**EXHIBIT 2 BEGINS ON NEXT PAGE**

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF GARFIELD COUNTY  
STATE OF OKLAHOMA

STATE OF OKLAHOMA, )  
Plaintiff, )  
v. ) Case No. CF-2024-111  
BRIAN LOVELL, )  
Defendant. )

**AFFIDAVIT OF DEFENSE COUNSEL WILLIAM JEWELL**

STATE OF OKLAHOMA )  
 ) SS:  
COUNTY OF GARFIELD )

I, the undersigned William Jewell, being first duly sworn upon my oath state as follows:

1. I am William Jewell, an attorney of record representing Brian Lovell in Garfield County Case No. CF-2024-111. I have been a member of the Oklahoma Bar in good standing since September 22, 2020. My Oklahoma Bar Association number is 34376. I am employed by Mr. Stephen Jones, the lead defense counsel for Brian Lovell, and our firm does business as JONES, OTJEN & JEWELL.
2. On Thursday, April 17, 2025 at around 5:00 P.M. I was sitting in Mr. Jones' office with Mr. Jones and the other associate attorney at the firm, Mr. Blake Trekell. We were discussing cases.
3. At 5:10 P.M. I was sitting in Mr. Jones office when he received a call from the Attorney General, the Honorable Getner Drummond. Blake Trekell was also present for the call.
4. Mr. Jones took the call on speaker phone so that I could take notes in case the call was in relation to Mr. Lovell's case.

5. The Attorney General first commented that Mr. Jones had sought to have an in-person meeting with him to discuss this prosecution.

6. The Attorney General asked Mr. Jones what he thought a fair resolution to the case would be and Mr. Jones explains that because of Mr. Lovell's recent diagnosis with fronto-temporal dementia that it would be in the best interest of justice if the case was dismissed.

7. The two discussed the diagnosis reached by Dr. Jason Beaman. The Attorney General commented that he has "a lot of respect for Dr. Beaman". They discussed the complexities of the disease, fronto-temporal dementia. They discussed Mr. Lovell's criminal prosecution in Austin, Texas and Mr. Jones informed him that his understanding was that the Austin case was going to be resolved with a probationary sentence.

8. In response to Mr. Jones suggestion of dismissal the Attorney General said "I'm inclined to agree with you without the necessity of having a face to face meeting".

9. The Attorney General then offered a deferred prosecution agreement. He also stated that he did not think there was any need to have Mr. Lovell psychologically evaluated by an expert hired by the State. Mr. Jones commented that a deferred prosecution agreement in this case would send a positive message to the growing number of Oklahomans who suffer from cognitive decline disorders.


10. Mr. Jones immediately accepted the deferred prosecution agreement on behalf of Mr. Lovell and he was authorized to do so.

11. I took contemporaneous notes on a legal pad of the conversation. I usually take notes on a laptop computer and, for me, it is much slower to take notes by hand. When I do have to take handwritten notes I generally do not write down every word that's said, but instead note important points of a conversation. I swear that the conversation between the Attorney General


and Mr. Jones occurred as I have outlined it in this affidavit, my contemporaneous notes notwithstanding.

12. The Attorney General concluded the conversation by saying that he will cause his prosecutors to make a recommendation for a deferred prosecution agreement to Mr. Jones. Other matters were discussed for a few minutes and the call ended at 5:27 P.M.

Affiant further sayeth not.

  
William Jewell

Subscribed and sworn to before me on this 6 day of June, 2025.



  
Notary Public

(Seal)

My Commission No. 24008771

My Commission Expires: 7/15/28

**EXHIBIT 3 BEGINS ON NEXT PAGE**

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF GARFIELD COUNTY  
STATE OF OKLAHOMA

STATE OF OKLAHOMA, )  
Plaintiff, )  
v. ) Case No. CF-2024-111  
BRIAN LOVELL, )  
Defendant. )

**AFFIDAVIT OF BLAKE TREKELL**

STATE OF OKLAHOMA )  
 ) SS:  
COUNTY OF GARFIELD )

I, the undersigned Blake Trekell, being first duly sworn upon my oath state as follows:

1. I am an attorney licensed in good standing in the State of Oklahoma. I am an attorney of record on Brian Lovell's behalf in Garfield County case number CF-2024-111.
2. I was present in Attorney Stephen Jones' office on Thursday, April 17, 2025, when he received a phone call on his personal cell phone sometime shortly after 5:00 p.m., after the close of the workday. The person calling Mr. Jones was Oklahoma Attorney General Getner Drummond.
3. Mr. Jones answered the phone on speaker phone. I and my colleague and fellow associate, Attorney William Jewell, who is also an attorney of record in Mr. Lovell's case, overheard the phone conversation. It is my belief that Mr. Jewell took some measure of handwritten notes as the conversation took place.
4. Mr. Drummond spoke to Mr. Jones about an anticipated meeting that the two had previously arranged to discuss a possible resolution to the above-mentioned case. Apparently, the meeting had been postponed for one reason or another and it did not occur. Mr. Drummond indicated to Mr. Jones concerning a future meeting that he thought the two may be able to


resolve the matter without the need for a future in-person meeting. As I recall, Mr. Drummond asked Mr. Jones what he felt would be a reasonable resolution of the matter. Mr. Jones spoke of Mr. Lovell's condition, frontotemporal dementia, and the circumstances surrounding it, such as the doctor who performed the evaluation of Mr. Lovell and made the diagnosis, Doctor Jason Beamon. I believe Mr. Jones told Mr. Drummond of the resolution of some of the other matters concerning Mr. Lovell, which were resolved and the manner they had been resolved at that time. Mr. Jones told Mr. Drummond that he thought a reasonable resolution would be a dismissal based on the valid defense that Mr. Lovell had if he indeed acted as he was accused in the case.

5. Mr. Drummond then asked Mr. Jones if we could resolve the matter with a deferred prosecution agreement, for, as I recall, a term of five years. Mr. Jones responded to Mr. Drummond's offer that he was authorized by his client to accept that resolution. Mr. Drummond stated that he would make the recommendation and begin formalizing the agreement.

6. Mr. Drummond responded that he was not really in a position to question the resume and diagnosis of Dr. Beaman, as he was the State's chief medical officer for the Oklahoma Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse.


7. The conversation then shifted to unrelated conversation about other matters. The entirety of the phone call, as I recall, lasted about fifteen minutes.

Affiant further sayeth not.



Blake Trezell

Subscribed and sworn to before me on this 6 day of June, 2025.



Tamorah Paulette Church  
Notary Public

(Seal)

My Commission No. 24008771  
My Commission Expires: 7/15/28

**EXHIBIT 4 BEGINS ON NEXT PAGE**

SJ call w/ Getner Drummond

- SJ explains what he thinks would be a fair resolution
- GD: I have a lot of respect for Dr. Beaman  
- I'm inclined to agree w/ you w/ the necessity of a meeting.
- SJ explains FTD.
- Texas is going to offer probatives.
- DPA!
- SJ: I would agree to the DPA.
- GD: I will make a recommendation to my prosecutors that I talked to you and we will recommend a DPA.

**EXHIBIT 5 BEGINS ON NEXT PAGE**



April 17, 2025

5:10 PM **Incoming Call** 

17 minutes

Calls with a checkmark have been verified by the carrier.

 **Contact Photo & Poster**

mobile



**EXHIBIT 6 BEGINS ON NEXT PAGE**

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF GARFIELD COUNTY  
STATE OF OKLAHOMA

STATE OF OKLAHOMA, )  
Plaintiff, )  
v. ) Case No. CF-2024-111  
BRIAN LOVELL, )  
Defendant. )

**AFFIDAVIT OF WILLIAM JEWELL**

STATE OF OKLAHOMA )  
 ) SS:  
COUNTY OF GARFIELD )

I, the undersigned William Jewell, being first duly sworn upon my oath do state as follows:

1. I am William Jewell, affiant herein. I have been a member of the Oklahoma Bar Association since September of 2020. My OBA number is 34376.
2. I am an associate attorney of Mr. Stephen Jones. I represent the Defendant in the above captioned case Brian Lovell.
3. I am familiar with the criminal prosecution against Brian Lovell.
4. On April 17, 2025 the Attorney General and lead Defense Counsel, Stephen Jones, entered into a deferred prosecution agreement to resolve this matter.
5. The Attorney General's office did not supply the paperwork necessary to memorialize the valid deferred prosecution agreement.
6. Defense Counsel advised the Attorney General's office that if the paperwork was not received by June 6, 2025 that the Defendant would file a motion to compel the agreement. Counsel also transmitted a draft of the motion to the Attorney General's office before it was filed.

7. On June 6, having received no word from the Attorney General's office by around 3:00 P.M., Defense Counsel asked me to file the motion to compel. I did file the motion to compel and returned to the office at around 3:30.

8. As soon as I returned Mr. Jones received a telephone call from the Attorney General, Gentner Drummond, on his personal cell phone.

9. I wrote a two-page single spaced memorandum of the conversation. This affidavit is based on that memorandum.

10. During this call the Attorney General and Defense Counsel reaffirmed that the parties had resolved this case by entering into a deferred prosecution agreement.

11. The Attorney General and Defense counsel discussed the particulars of the deferred prosecution agreement. Roughly, the parties agreed that while the agreement was in effect the Defendant: (1) would not possess a firearm; (2) would not purchase a firearm; (3) would not drive; (4) would surrender his drivers license; (5) would continue medical treatment including psychiatric treatment and therapeutic intervention; and (6) the Defendant would not violate city, state, or federal law.

12. Defense Counsel stated "I don't think that's a problem for him. I think he will do that and I think his wife wants him to do that." Counsel then described how he recently had become aware that Defendant's condition is becoming worse.

13. The Attorney General asked if Defendant had "emotional outbursts". Defense Counsel responded that he did not when he came into his office, that his condition is stabilized by medical intervention, and that the Defense could provide the State a list of his medications.

14. The Attorney General commented "I want to do the right thing by my state."

15. Defense Counsel then discussed two alternative provisions for the deferred prosecution agreement. “First, the charge remains pending for 5 years and the agreement is the State will not call it up unless he violates it. The other is dismissal without prejudice subject to ‘if there’s a violation of the agreement this comes back up’. It’s a little more attractive to our purposes that our client waives the statute of limitations, waives speedy trial, signs the agreement, and the case remains ‘stayed’ until either side brings it up. Then if it’s a 5 year agreement, which is the figure I think you talked about before but that’s not a magic number for me, it’s whatever you want. It seems to me that if we adopt that approach we put this to bed and say there was a miscommunication to the news.” The Attorney General accepted the first alternative which was to leave the charges pending subject to conditions and then dismissed at the end of five years. The parties then discussed the terms as outlined above.


16. The Attorney General commented that he was skeptical that any jury or judge would convict Defendant. He did not think that justice would be advanced by continuing to fight toward a conviction. And “I would say it is my opinion that the judge is deteriorating and we want to affirm him the dignity that he deserves” or words to that effect. The Attorney General then reaffirmed that the parties were still entering into a deferred prosecution agreement.

17. The Attorney General described a conference he had with his criminal prosecutors on a Tuesday, and I believe that to be Tuesday June 3rd. The Attorney General advised Defense Counsel that he had told his criminal team that his “respect for [Mr. Jones] has no equivalent...” and that the Attorney General’s office was honoring the agreement. He then commented about the nature of his prosecutors to the effect that his prosecutors are hammers that are always looking for a nail.


18. At the end of the call Defense Counsel informed the Attorney General that the defense had, around 20 minutes before, filed Defendant's Response and Objection. Defense Counsel informed the Attorney General that "if the media comes to me I'll tell them that we've talked, come to an agreement, etc..."


19. Defense Counsel then informed the Attorney General that they would seal the June 6 response and motion to compel because the allegations contained therein had been overtaken by the telephone call after it was filed. The allegations contained therein had been overtaken by the reaffirmation of the agreement from the second telephone call with Attorney General Drummond shortly after the motion had been filed.

Affiant Further Sayeth Not,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
William Jewell

Subscribed and sworn to before me on this 1 day of August, 2025.



  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Caitlyn Bengé  
Notary Public

(Seal)  
My Commission No. 25007031  
My Commission Expires: 6/12/2029

**EXHIBIT 7 BEGINS ON NEXT PAGE**

**TRANSCRIPT OF RECORDED PHONE CALL BETWEEN STEPEHN JONES AND  
ATTORNEY GENERAL GENTNER DRUMMOND ON JULY 2, 2025.**

**GD:** ...Looking for a path that would accommodate your expectation, um and you know, you suggested the DPA.<sup>1</sup> Uh, in my – in all candor, in my mind, I was going – my thought was what is acceptable to Stephen, and then I would go back to my team and say this is what I would like to do, *[inaudible]*. Uh, clearly in that conversation, you walked away going hey he offered, I accepted. We've got a deal. I just, I didn't think – and I'm respectful of you, but in all candor, I was trying to find a path that worked for you, and then get my team *[inaudible]* an offer they accept. So, I go back to my team, and they're like, you know Gentner, he – the Judge he shoots in Austin, he shoots the gun in Oklahoma, you know, you cannot possibly just let him walk. And, unless there is truly a mental *[inaudible]*, and we do not see that in Beaman's report. So, that's where my office is, is like how can we possibly do this to him. It looks as though you're just simply doing Stephen a favor because he's a donor. That's the words from my staff to me, and that's the narrative that the media is waiting to see play out. So, I'm in an awkward position, and I don't have a solution. I hold you in the highest regard, have immense amount of respect for you, don't want to be crosswires (?) with you, but at the same time, I know you don't intend for me to look as though I'm doing a political favor to a mentor, ally, friend, donor. And, that's where I am, so... But that is a predicate. Do you see a path that I can go forward, that meets your expectations that doesn't do significant political injury to me?

**SJ:** Um.. General, I – uhh – without conceding your premise, I will try to find one. Um...

---

<sup>1</sup> 1 Gentner Drummond previously offered the DPA in a phone call that he made to Mr. Jones' personal cell phone. Mr. Jones did not suggest the DPA first.

**GD:** One path – and, and, and, and as I think this through, one path could be – could I, listen I – When you tell me that he is suffering from a degenerative mental capacity, I accept that. Um... It would be VERY nice if I had some position that would give me ANYTHING to hang my hat on, and Beaman's report is too equivocal. It doesn't give me that. What — So — A – a suggestion... If you would permit him to be evaluated by a third party, and – and I would be — I — would visit with that physician, in that I want – this is my objective. If I can find umm – something in that report to hang a hat on, I'm going to proceed, and not ask that the Judge have any kind of a sentence, and have a deferred prosecution. That would be an elegant solution. And then I – That's defensible. You know, he's served honorably, our state for decades. Um... He is – you know... He now is aware that he's got a — some sort of a degenerative mental capacity, although he is still competent and still can do things. I'm not asking for incompetency, um.. But you know, I don't — I'm not afraid to make hard decisions, I just don't want it to look as patently obvious as it presently looks.

**SJ:** The [clears throat] he is regularly, and has regularly, been seeing a neurologist and a psychiatrist. And, he's taking a rather heavy load of medication. I suspect – uhh – that his – and those are two different doctors in two different places – I suspect that they would write a report – uhh – because of my conversations with them, I kind of know what their thinking is of him, and if they were to present a professional, objective report based on, what, a year and a half of treating him, I suspect that would meet your uhh —

**GD:** I bet that it would. And that – uh – Please – Please consider that, umm – and then, with that in hand, it's very defensible. It – It is consistent with my custom and practice that I am not punitive with somebody that should not be dealt with punitively. And, it would be consistent with your expectation. So –

**SJ:** Then, we'll — let's say we have a ceasefire, so to speak. Uhh — I'll see if I can get those reports, uhh — of course 4th of July weekend is coming up, so I don't know what their availability —

**GD:** No — I — I understand. I want to be respectful of our Judge who's got the August 8th out there — ummm — I'm happy to communicate, or — or I would invite you to communicate with him to say, umm, you know the Attorney General and you have ummm — I am seeking reports from his treating physician to better inform how we proceed. Uhh — does that make —

**SJ:** We — We — Uhhh — yes, I will try to get those.

**GD:** I would love — I would love for that to be in hand with sufficient time to look at and be satisfied, and then — you know — we can convert the August 8th setting into — you know — the deferred prosecution — uhh — docket

**SJ:** Alright. I — I will start to work on that as soon as I finish in Federal Court.

**GD:** Wonderful

**SJ:** And I will keep you—

**GD:** I appreciate you taking my call, and I appreciate —

**SJ:** Yes, sir.

**GD:** the *[inaudible]* in which we're dealing with this. I do value the relationship with you, and I

do –

**SJ:** Thank you

**GD:** I'm not – I'm not just saying these things. I - I've held you in the highest regard forever, and – and I don't want to be crosswired (?) with you, so this may be our path out.

**SJ:** Well, that's very generous and statesmanship of you, and ummm – I – I will uhh – put my shoulder to the wheel, as they say, and see what these medical experts say. They've seen him long enough and frequently enough, they should have an opinion and be willing to put it on paper, whatever it is.

**GD:** That'd be great. And we can hold that confidentially —

**SJ:** Yes.

**GD:** Umm – You know – You – You consider what expectations you and your client would have on those issues, and I can't – I would need to have the liberty to be able to say to the media when inquired that we've had, you know, independent verification – or verification of professionals that – you know – there's a – whatever that diagnosis might be.

**SJ:** I – I agree to that. My principle interest is to protect his retirement –

**GD:** Yea

**SJ:** Uhh – Given, and – and – perhaps more than the retirement, is the health benefit. Which would –

**GD:** No – No, and I do not want to do anything that prejudices *[inaudible]*.

**SJ:** Well, thank you for reaching out to me, and I will – uh – do what I said.

**GD:** Wonderful. Well, we will ceasefire then. So –

**SJ:** Yes, sir.

**GD:** Thank you, Stephen.

**SJ:** Thank you, General.

**GD:** You have a wonderful day, and good luck in court.

**SJ:** Thank you.

PHONE CALL ENDS.