

THE MURDER OF ASHLEY VILLARREAL

by E. H. Munro

"If they ran the red light to run the police over, I say, by all means pump that car full of lead. Which is what the DEA agents says what happened here."

"I wonder, who won't defend themselves if someone was attempting to run them over?"

"Well, that's what training is all about. I'm sure you are good at your job because you have experience, well, same for the DEA officer. Part of their job (same for the regular police) is constant training. They have to train to react instantously (sic) and accurately, otherwise they might be lying on the ground with their chalk outline."

When I wrote my jeremiad on the murder of Ashley Villarreal, one of my readers posted it to a normally libertarian tech industry web forum. The above comments were posted in response to young Ms. Villarreal's tragic tale, IT professionals decided that the DEA agent's shooting was justified. A true oddity considering I may be the ONLY IT professional alive that has never actually used drugs (yes, people, marijuana is illegal, so it IS a drug for these purposes). Now, I have read the account (<http://news.mysanantonio.com/story.cfm?xla=saen&xlb=180&xlc=947549&xld=180>) contained in the initial article, plus the only two others I could find, and let me post them so that you can see for yourselves, The first is entitled "*Teenager Shot By DEA Remains On Life Support*" and can be found here, <http://www.clickonsa.com/ant/news/stories/news-196991920030211-090239.html> (this has a link to a further blurb). The other is an article entitled, "*Teen Shot By Drug Agents, Father Was Their Suspect*" and can be found here, http://www.woai.com/news/local/story.aspx?content_id=D5A830CA-8C1D-43DB-B2A7-ED521AECC9EE. Now, here is what I didn't see in any of these four accounts:

- Any mention of a red light, anywhere
- Any reference to tinted windows
- Any reference to the girl's grandmother as a suspect
- Any reference to Ashley Villarreal as an accomplice to her father
- Any reference to any family member aside from the father as suspected drug trafficker
- Any reference to a DEA raid
- Any reference to the girl's father actually having custody of the child
- Any reference to a car "cloaked in black" (hey guys, they were Texicans, not Romulans, this isn't Star Trek)
- Any reference to any drugs found in the car or on the property (if there were the DEA would have held a press conference to trumpet it)
- Any reference to any damage done to DEA vehicles, or to said vehicles being rammed
- Any reference to a DEA agent being "smashed" by a car, this would imply injury (unlike the rest of you here, I have actually been clipped by car)

What do these points have in common? First they were given as statements of fact by people posting to the forum in question. Second, they appear in none of the four pieces that I have seen on this story to date, and none of those offering these statements of fact has a source to cite. Third, they were all alibis that people invented to excuse the acts of an armed officer, who appears to live by the old police axiom, *shoot first, ask questions later*. Most disturbing of all, why do so many of you feel the need to justify the actions of an armed thug whose job is to rule you? It is the same sort of thing that battered spouses/partners (as it happens in the les/bi/gay community too) do when they have reached the nadir, the point where they have lost any semblance of control of the relationship. Though beaten by their abusive partner, who tells them that they are to blame, they excuse their oppressor's worst abuses. There is **NO** excuse for what happened. None. Why?

Well, here is what I do see, specifically stated:

- The girl lived in the house that DEA had staked out
- The home belonged to the grandmother
- The father did *not* live in the home where the shooting occurred
- The father had vanished from his house
- Daniel Robles is referred to variously as "family friend and housemate" and "caretaker for the girl's grandmother"
- Specific references to Ashley's father, grandmother, and sister, but there is *no* reference at all to her mother, the mother is, in fact, conspicuous by her absence
- The DEA officer suffered *no injury* despite being "clipped" by a "speeding" car
- The car in question was a Mitsubishi Eclipse
- The DEA conducted its interception at the intersection of South San Joaquin Street and Motes Street
- The DEA agents claimed the car was without headlights (this was really a no win lie)
- The DEA spokesperson claimed that the agents presumed the passenger to be the suspect
- According to Mr. Robles, when the DEA vehicles came charging in, the girl tried to turn right
- According to the DEA she tried to speed off while being obstructed (this makes it sound as if there were a high speed chase going on within the DEA vehicle, and though their SUVs tend to be large, and Eclipses quite small, I find it hard to believe the one large enough or the other tiny enough)
- The DEA followed standard procedure by surrounding the vehicle for a stop, part of that involves driving the prey into the setup by *tailgating* the suspect vehicle
- The DEA has conflictingly confessed to there being three shots fired and four shots fired. One of the bullets lodged in the girl's head, two hit the house across the way, lodging, fortunately, in the exterior wall.

Now, what can be logically derived from above? First, that Joey Angel Villarreal (said father) did *not* live with his daughters, and neither did their mother. Given that Joey Angel Villarreal is credited with multiple convictions, and it is Texas, it is safe to presume that some jail time was involved and that, in all likelihood, the grandmother was granted custody, be it temporary or permanent. Is that last conjecture? Yes. Is it a safe logical presumption? Yes. In other words, I really don't want to hear "You can't say that because you don't know" from the very crowd of people that offered up all those faux alibis I listed above. If people can invent facts to justify the shooting of an adolescent girl, I am within propriety to make logical guesses based on the facts I *do* have. Now, here we have something that *is* pure conjecture, it seems to me, from this distance, that the grandmother did what she could to protect her grandchildren from Joey Villarreal's life (as there is no indication that said grandmother was paternal I won't presume her the mother of Mr. Villarreal). Given the pains the DEA went to to publicize Mr. Villarreal's criminal record, were the mother incarcerated, they would probably have publicized that, as well (just so that we can all have that false sense of security that comes from knowing it can't happen to us, because we're not like "*them*"), so it is probably safe to presume that their mother was either dead or absent. Many people have posited that the girl deserved to die because her father was a drug dealer, does this mean that if you're related to a criminal policing authorities are justified shooting you simply because they didn't like the way you drove into their trap?

Daniel Robles described a very typical federal police authority stop in traffic, attempt to surround the vehicle in traffic to cut off routes of escape followed by (presumably) the agents removing people from the vehicle. The DEA officers, interestingly enough, didn't give such a description. The shooting occurs at the first intersection, and the DEA admits to following procedure by obstructing, yet insists that the car was speeding off, and "clipped" an officer. Having once been clipped by a car going 20mph (hardly speeding off) I can tell you that I was, in fact, injured, whereas the DEA agent wasn't, yet their insistence on the use of the vague and amorphous "speeding" rather than a guesstimate of speed rate looks to be equivocation, especially in light of the fact that the tailing officer's job is flush the prey to the point of ambush. One of two things occurred here, either the vehicles that ran the obstruction were parked on Motes Street waiting or they were parked on the South San Joaquin Street when she pulled out of the driveway. If they were parked on Motes Street, what were they doing

there? How did they know she would turn that direction out of the driveway? If they were parked on Motes Street it was because they had seen the car moved around back before while watching the house, and knew that the car tended to go that way when pulling out at night. If the vehicles were parked on South San Joaquin Street, this would have meant a mass of movement preceding the stop. The DEA admits to using a tailing vehicle (so it is not just the testimony of Mr. Robles), either the tailing vehicle was parked facing the correct direction (to pull out and tail) or in the opposing direction, meaning that as the Eclipse passed by the tailing vehicle pulled out, turned around, and jumped directly on the tail of the Eclipse (which is a small vehicle, go look at one sometime). The other vehicles, would have had to scramble to get in position, what is certain is that they were parked between her driveway and Motes street (if they were on South San Joaquin Street) as they were able to conduct an obstruction (by the DEA's own admission).

Now, how many of you here remember learning to drive? I certainly remember my experiences driving at sixteen, one incident I remember in particular, while out driving (with my father in the passenger's seat) down a side street. A vehicle ran a stop sign and pulled out, cutting me off in traffic, my response? At sixteen, never having been cut off in traffic before, and having zero experience in such driving, reflexive action took over and I swerved right while trying to break (and managing to further depress the gas pedal before getting the brake). My guess, and this is conjecture, when the DEA attempted the surround and capture Ms. Villarreal panicked and swerved right. Now, if her headlights were indeed off, the officer in front of the vehicle would have been able to see inside the car as the only lights would be the ones shining into the vehicle. If he were indeed hit (which I highly doubt), he would be no more than five feet from the Eclipse's passengers (look at the front end of the Eclipse), with headlights shining into the vehicle and not from the vehicle (which would have obstructed his vision), in other words, if there were no headlights, he saw the driver and he saw the passenger, and knew just who he was filling full of lead. Now, if the headlights were on, he probably couldn't see the passengers of the car as the light in his eyes would prevent him from focusing (pupils close to account for the light, making it difficult to see in dim lights beyond). Why not tell the story that way then? Because a car traveling slowly around the block with the headlights on *isn't* behaving suspiciously, which makes the whole assault seem like overkill. Further supporting the conclusion that the headlights were on is the bullets lodged in the house across the street, the agent couldn't see what he was shooting at, the lights were in his eyes.

The person monitoring the house saw an adult man and an adolescent female climbing into the vehicle, as *DEA admits* that they presumed the passenger to be their suspect, if they couldn't see into the car at all (as the bootlickers amongst you contend) how the hell did they "*know*" their suspect was in the passenger's seat? Someone saw the two people getting in, and knew that the daughters were fourteen and sixteen, rather than stopping the car at the end of the drive, or simply pulling it over, they elected for the surround and capture, why? Because they decided Joey Villarreal was the passenger and would order his daughter to flee, they decided on the more risky procedure because they knew the occupants were an adolescent female driver and an adult male passenger, the agent in charge on the spot decided that Ashley or Adriana Villarreal was an acceptable casualty before the shooting occurred.

Ultimately, all this is beside the point. They ought never have been there in the first place. This country survived a long long time without drug laws, the drug prohibition is relatively recent invention (as in the last century), we could survive perfectly well without it. What makes the drug situation a mess is the belief in the mythical right "*People have a right to have the government look out for them if they can't do it themselves*" There are no rights, just responsibilities, OK, here, let's make it simple, there is one right and two responsibilities. You have the right to tell any busybody who is making plans for your life or property to go fuck themselves with a firehose. You have two responsibilities, to mind your own bloody business and to take care of yourself and family so that the rest of us aren't forced to pay your bills. For those of you that smugly assert that 51% of voters have the right to rule everyone else as they see fit, allow me to say that the Italian fascisti and the German Nazis were all on your side. Democracy in action? I'll show you democracy in action, have a look at the Rodney King video, that's democracy in action, four cops and a black man voting on who gets to be the piñata. You can keep it, I'll take individual autonomy and individual responsibility every time.

Hey, if the price of drug abuse were a horrible death suffered slowly, people wouldn't abuse, it's that simple. It is the continuous government subsidy of self destructive behavior that reduces the assumed risk. Stop subsidizing bad behavior and watch how quickly those behaviors stop becoming a societal problem. As a side benefit, if there were no ridiculous drug laws, and no subsidies for addicts, there would be no need of having armed gangs of thugs (we're talking of the federal agents here) roaming the streets firing at will.

2003 E.H. Munro. This article may be freely redistributed with proper attribution.