

Lindsay Clancy ‘had no memory’ of killing her children, lawyer says

By [Shelley Murphy](#) Globe Staff, Updated September 29, 2026, 6:42 p.m.



Lindsay Clancy in court on Tuesday. GREG DERR/POOL

PLYMOUTH — Lindsay Clancy’s lawyer argued Tuesday that there was a “complete lack of evidence” showing she killed her three children —despite her admission at trial that she did —and urged a judge to order a [directed verdict of not guilty](#) in her case.

“She was told what happened, she had no memory of what happened,” Clancy’s attorney, Kevin Reddington said during the status hearing in Plymouth Superior Court, marking Clancy’s first appearance since her murder trial ended [in a mistrial](#) several weeks ago.

Assistant District Attorney Shanan Buckingham called Reddington’s claims “laughable,” noting the defense repeatedly stipulated at trial to physical evidence showing she killed her three children in the basement of their Duxbury home in 2023.

But, Reddington argued that Clancy [was required to admit](#) to the slayings while asserting an insanity defense because the judge “created a conundrum” by denying the defense request for a bifurcated trial. The defense wanted jurors to decide whether Clancy was guilty during the first phase of the trial, then, if she was, move on to a second phase to decide whether she was criminally responsible.

On Tuesday, Judge William F. Sullivan took the motion to acquit Clancy under advisement. He set a Nov. 2 hearing to discuss a flurry of additional [motions](#) from Clancy’s lawyers and prosecutors. He said he hopes to set a date then for a new trial, if prosecutors move to retry her.

“I don’t want this thing to kind of get kicked down the road,” said Sullivan, urging lawyers to set a retrial date as soon as possible.

On his way out of the courthouse Tuesday, Plymouth District Attorney Timothy Cruz told the media he has yet to decide whether to retry Clancy on first-degree murder charges, which would require the empanelment of another jury. If he reduces the charges to second-degree murder, Clancy could waive her right to a jury trial and let a judge decide her fate.

“No determination has been made as to anything,” said Cruz, adding that the case “is about those children and making sure they get justice.”



Defense Attorney Kevin Reddington arrived at Plymouth Superior Court on Tuesday. JONATHAN WIGGS/GLOBE STAFF

The case has captured international attention and cast a spotlight on women’s postpartum mental health, as Clancy’s lawyer asserted that she was failed by the medical system after seeking help for depression and anxiety following the birth of her third child.

Clancy, 36, admitted to strangling 5-year-old Cora, 3-year-old Dawson, and 8-month-old Callan with exercise bands on Jan. 24, 2023, after sending her husband, Patrick, out to pick up medication and takeout for dinner. However, she asserted she suffered a psychotic episode and couldn't resist a man's voice she hallucinated commanding her to kill them and herself. Afterward, she slashed her neck and wrists and jumped out of a second-story window, leaving her paralyzed from the waist down.

Prosecutors allege the murders were premeditated by Clancy, who was deeply depressed and wanted to kill herself and take her children with her.

On Sept. 4, Sullivan declared a mistrial after the jury announced it was deadlocked following a six-week trial and about 39 hours of deliberations over seven days. In a note to the judge, the jury asserted that a single holdout opposed acquitting her based on insanity; though he had expressed doubt about her guilt, he refused to follow the law related to reasonable doubt, the note said.

Sullivan denied a request by Reddington to excuse the juror and replace him with one of the alternates, or delve deeper into allegations that he wasn't following the law. Sullivan ruled it would be improper to interfere with jury deliberations. And a single justice of the state's highest court denied an emergency appeal by Reddington to intervene.

In a motion now pending before Sullivan and slated for argument Nov. 2, Reddington urged him to conduct "a limited inquiry" into the holdout juror and to scrutinize a wide array of material, including: the confidential questionnaire the juror filled out prior to

being seated on the jury; cell phone records showing how much time he spent texting and calling people during deliberations; and court records related to his criminal history and a civil restraining order.

The jury questionnaire and interview during the selection process would resolve questions that arose after the mistrial. Those include whether the juror disclosed that he had an active civil restraining order against him when he was seated on the Clancy jury and had previously been accused of domestic violence, though that charge was ultimately dismissed.

In the motion, Reddington urged the judge to examine the juror about [“the truthfulness of the questionnaire” and his answers when questioned during jury selection](#): his assurance that he was following the law when each juror was questioned under oath the day before the mistrial was granted; and “the use of a mobile telephone or receipt of outside information during deliberations.”

The holdout juror is not named in court filings, but the Globe identified him earlier this month as [Michael Desronvil](#), 48, of Bridgewater, after his name and photograph first surfaced on social media.

In a statement released by a lawyer claiming to represent him, Desronvil said he [“didn’t have any doubts”](#) prosecutors had proved Clancy was criminally responsible for killing her children.

During Tuesday's hearing, the judge granted a request by Desronvil's attorney, Heather O'Connor, to postpone arguments on the motion until Nov. 2 to give her time to review the filings.

Speaking to reporters outside the courthouse afterwards, O'Connor said her client believes he accurately filled out the jury questionnaire and is now "the only one being targeted" because of his vote.

"This case was extremely divisive," O'Connor said. "There are people that believe heavily one way or another. What that has done is created a situation where somebody that has that minority vote is being attacked. And that is not how the system should work."

Sullivan will also hear arguments during the Nov. 2 hearing on a motion filed by Reddington and another prominent defense attorney, Martin G. Weinberg, urging him to drop murder charges against Clancy on double jeopardy grounds. They argue that she should not be subjected to another trial because 11 jurors were poised to find her not guilty by reason of insanity and the lone holdout juror was accused of refusing to follow the judge's instructions regarding reasonable doubt.

During Tuesday's hearing, Weinberg argued that juror notes sent during deliberations and sidebar discussions relating to them should not be impounded by the judge since they are crucial to preserving a complete and accurate record about what led to the

mistrial. He cited the constitutional right to a public trial and said jurors' names could be redacted to protect their privacy.

Prosecutors opposed the request, citing concerns about “the sanctity of our judicial system.”

Sullivan took the motion under advisement.

Travis Andersen of the Globe Staff contributed to this report.

Shelley Murphy can be reached at shelley.murphy@globe.com. Follow her [@shelleymurph](https://twitter.com/shelleymurph).

[Show 193 comments](#)
