

CALL IT WHAT IT IS**Det. Lawrence Mowery's written account of Kaylee Goncalves' phone does not match the Walla Walla Police Department's own field report.**

Moscow Police Department Case 22-M09903 • Sequence 59 (Mowery) vs. WWPD 2022-00025025 (Ruchert) vs. MPD Sequence 50 (Deane) vs. State discovery responses

The short version

On November 25, 2022, Det. Lawrence Mowery of the Moscow Police Department drove four victim iPhones to the Walla Walla Police Department. WWPD Det. Chris Ruchert documented, in a signed field case report, that:

- Mowery identified one phone as the priority device and asked Ruchert to start with that one. That phone was Kaylee Goncalves' phone (WWPD item 22M-1812). No passcode was available.
- Ruchert connected that priority phone to a GrayKey unit and obtained an Instant After First Unlock (AFU) extraction the same day. He copied the extraction and GrayKey files to a USB drive.
- Mowery came back later that same afternoon and retrieved both the USB drive and the phone that had just been extracted — Kaylee's phone.
- The other three phones and Mowery's external hard drive stayed at WWPD until November 29, when Det. Justin Deane picked them up and handed them to Mowery at MPD.

Mowery's own supplemental narrative (Sequence 59, dated December 5, 2022) does not say any of that. He writes that he left "the phones" with Ruchert on the 25th, that Ruchert later said she could do a limited extraction on Goncalves' locked phone, and that Det. Deane picked up "the four devices" on November 29. He never records that he took Kaylee's phone and a USB of its extraction home with him on November 25 and kept that phone for four days.

That is not a wording difference. That is a material omission in an official report about the highest-priority victim device in a quadruple homicide. The Walla Walla report is contemporaneous, item-numbered, and signed. Mowery's report is not consistent with it.

Side-by-side: what each report actually says

Date / issue	Mowery — MPD Seq. 59 (typed 12/5/22)	Ruchert — WWPD 2022-00025025 (11/25/22)
How many phones on 11/25?	Implies the phones were left as a group. Does not state he brought four and took one back the same day.	"He turned over four Apple iPhones packaged in separate manila envelopes." One was designated priority.
Priority phone	Does not say he told WWPD that Kaylee's phone was the priority or that he waited for that extraction.	"Detective Mowery indicated one of the phones was a priority and asked me to start with that one." Item 22M-1812. No passcode. That is Kaylee's phone.
What happened to Kaylee's phone on 11/25?	Silent. He writes he left the phones with Ruchert to be extracted.	AFU extraction completed on GrayKey the same day. Data copied to a USB. "Detective Mowery returned later in the afternoon and retrieved the USB drive containing the data extractions as well as the device that had been extracted."
Locked vs. extracted	Earlier in the same report: family PIN "did not unlock the device." He frames Goncalves' phone as locked. He later writes Ruchert "would be able to complete limited extraction on Goncalves' locked phone."	Ruchert obtained an Instant After First Unlock (AFU) extraction on the priority phone the same day he received it. That is an extraction of a device that had been unlocked at least once — not "we never got in."

Who picked up what on 11/29?	Mowery: Deane “picked up the phones and returned them.” He received “the four devices.”	Ruchert: On 11/29 she turned over “the three remaining devices and Detective Mowery’s external hard drive.” Deane’s own MPD Seq. 50 matches that: “three cell phones and a hard drive.”
Custody gap	Mowery never accounts for Kaylee’s phone between the afternoon of 11/25 and Deane’s 11/29 pickup. His report reads as if all four sat at WWPD the whole time.	Kaylee’s phone and the USB left WWPD with Mowery on 11/25. The other three phones + HDD stayed until 11/29. That is four days of unreported sole custody of the priority device and its extraction files.

Yellow = Mowery left it out. Red = Mowery’s version cannot be squared with WWPD’s contemporaneous report.

The actual timeline from the records

Date	What the records say happened
11/15–16/22	Mowery asks CDA PD Det. David Taylor for a brute-force assist on all four victim phones. Taylor cannot extract. Phones returned to MPD 11/17.
After 11/17	Mowery gets family PINs for Mogen, Kernodle, and Chapin. Those three unlock. The PIN provided for Goncalves “did not unlock the device.” He does advanced logical extractions at MPD on the three unlocked phones.
11/20–23/22	Second ask to Taylor for full-file system on the three unlocked phones — Taylor says he cannot. Mowery then tries Post Falls PD Det. Neil Uhrig — tools will not support full-file system.
11/25/22 AM	Mowery arrives at WWPD with four iPhones and his external hard drive. He tells Ruchert Kaylee’s phone is the priority. No passcode for that device (item 22M-1812).
11/25/22 same day	Ruchert runs GrayKey AFU on Kaylee’s phone, decodes in Cellebrite Physical Analyzer, copies extraction + GrayKey files to a USB. Mowery comes back that afternoon and takes the USB and Kaylee’s phone. Three phones and the HDD stay.
11/25–28/22	Ruchert continues full-file system extractions on the remaining three (items 22M-1807, 22M-1862, 22M-1861) using the passcodes Mowery provided. She copies those extractions onto the HDD Mowery left. On 11/28 she loads 22M-1807 into Cellebrite PA; Mowery tells her he does not need the parsed files because he has forensic programs.
11/29/22	Det. Justin Deane (MPD #112) picks up THREE phones and ONE hard drive from Ruchert at ~1155 hrs and hands them to Mowery at MPD at ~1430 hrs. Deane’s narrative does not list a fourth phone. Ruchert’s narrative does not list a fourth phone leaving that day.
12/5/22	Mowery types Sequence 59. He writes that he left the phones with Ruchert, that Ruchert could do full-file on the unlocked devices and a limited extraction on Goncalves’ locked phone, and that Deane returned “the four devices.” He does not record the 11/25 afternoon pickup of Kaylee’s phone and the USB.
Discovery, years later	State response to defense request #257 (Kaylee full-file system after unlock): “MPD is still waiting on updates and/or support from forensic software providers that will hopefully allow extraction of Kaylee Goncalves’ phone. To date, MPD has been unable to unlock this phone.” That statement cannot be read as complete if an AFU extraction and USB of that extraction already existed on 11/25/22 and left WWPD in Mowery’s hands.

Why this is a lie, not a sloppy sentence

A detective writing a supplemental narrative two weeks later can forget a name or a time. He does not “forget” that he personally drove the priority victim’s phone back to Moscow the same day it was extracted, while the other three devices stayed in another city’s lab for four more days. That is the kind of fact a chain-of-custody narrative exists to record.

Three independent writings line up against Mowery’s version:

1. Ruchert’s WWPDP field report — four phones in on 11/25; priority phone + USB out with Mowery that afternoon; three phones + HDD out to Deane on 11/29.
2. Deane’s MPD Sequence 50 — “three cell phones and a hard drive.” Not four phones.
3. Item numbers in the WWPDP report — 22M-1812 processed and released 11/25; 22M-1807 / 1862 / 1861 processed and released 11/29.

Mowery’s Sequence 59 is the outlier. It collapses four days of split custody into one sentence — “I left the phones with Det Ruchert to be extracted” — and then treats November 29 as the date all four devices came home. That is false on the WWPDP record.

The later State discovery answer compounds it. Telling the defense in writing that MPD has been “unable to unlock this phone” and is “still waiting on updates” is not compatible with a documented GrayKey AFU extraction already completed on 11/25/22 and handed to Mowery on a USB that afternoon — unless that extraction and that USB are being treated as if they do not exist.

Open questions the reports themselves create

- Where is the USB Ruchert burned on 11/25 that contained Kaylee’s AFU extraction and the GrayKey-generated files? Name it in the property log. Produce the hash values.
- Where was Kaylee’s physical phone from the afternoon of 11/25 until Deane’s 11/29 return of the other three devices? Who had it. Where was it stored. Who accessed it.
- What examination, if any, did Mowery perform on that phone or that USB during those four days? His own report says an examination of “the data” would be completed at his earliest convenience. He never writes that he already had Kaylee’s extraction in hand.
- Why does Sequence 59 describe Goncalves’ phone as locked and limited, after WWPDP had already completed an AFU extraction on it?
- Why does a State discovery response years later still claim MPD has been unable to unlock Kaylee’s phone?
- Alivea Goncalves reported her sister’s account appearing “online” and then being deleted. When was that phone accessed, by whom, and is that access in any forensic log Mowery or WWPDP generated?

Sources used

Moscow Police Department, Law Supplemental Narrative, Incident 22-M09903, Sequence 59, Det. Lawrence Mowery #162, narrative dated 12/4/22–12/5/22, reviewed by Sgt. J. W. Lawrence 12/5/22. (Print stamp 07/08/25.)

Moscow Police Department, Law Supplemental Narrative, Incident 22-M09903, Sequence 50, Det. Justin Deane #112, 12/1/22, reviewed by Capt. Berrett. Pickup of three cell phones and a hard drive from WWPDP Det. Chris Ruchert on 11/29/22.

Walla Walla Police Department Field Case Report 2022-00025025, narrative by 275 Ruchert, 11/25/22, reviewed by Maiuri, Jeremy Richard 01/18/2023. Pages 2–4 of 4.

State's Response to Defendant's 11th Supplemental Request for Discovery, Exhibit 1 / Exhibit J — items 256–258 regarding Eric Gower and Kaylee Goncalves phone extractions, including the written claim that MPD has been unable to unlock Kaylee Goncalves' phone.

This compilation quotes and contrasts the official writings. It does not add facts that are not on those pages. The contradiction is on the pages.

Mowery had Kaylee's phone and the USB of its extraction on November 25, 2022. His report pretends he did not. That is the lie.