1	YAMPOLSKY & MARGOLIS		
2	MACE J. YAMPOLSKY, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 001945		
3	JASON R. MARGOLIS, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 012439 625 South Sixth Street		
4	Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 (702) 385-9777; Fax: (702) 385-3001		Electronically Filed Sep 01 2022 09:17 a.m
5	Attorney for Appellant		Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Cour
6			Cloth of Supromo Soul
7	IN THE SUPREME COU	ORT OF THE STATE O	F NEVADA
8	ANDREW YOUNG,		
9	Appellant,	Case No.	84412
10	vs.		
11	THE STATE OF NEVADA,		
12	Respondent.		
13		•	
14	APPELLANT'S	APPENDIX VOLUMI	E III
15			
16			
17	JASON R. MARGOLIS, ESQ. 625 South Sixth Street	ALEXANDER C District Attorney	HEN
18	Las Vegas. Nevada	<i>Biolitot i iliotilo</i>	
19		AARON FORD	
20		Attorney General	for the State of Nevada
21			
22			
23	ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT ANDREW YOUNG	ATTORNEYS FO THE STATE OF	OR RESPONDENT ' NEVADA
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
1		1	

ALPHABETIC APPENDIX FOR APPELLANT'S APPENDIX

2	DOCUMENT	VOLUME	PAGE NOS.
3	DOCUMENT	VOLUME	11021102
4 5	Amended Judgment of Conviction (Jury Trial) filed March 8, 2022	I	AA 001-AA 008
6	Indictment filed September 10, 2020	I	AA 009-AA 011
7	Motion to Sever Counts filed February 28, 2021	I	AA 012-AA 022
8	Notice of Appeal filed March 15, 2022	I	AA 023-AA 024
9	Opposition to the State's Motion in Limine to		
10	Admit Evidence Under Res Gestae or Evidence Related to Other Crimes	I	AA 025-AA 037
11	filed April 8, 2021	1	AA 025-AA 037
12	Order Granting Defendant's Motion to Sever Counts	I	AA 038-AA 041
13	filed April 6, 2021	1	AA 036-AA 041
14	Order Granting State's Motion in Limine to		
15	Admit Evidence Under Res Gestae or Evidence Related to Other Crimes	I	AA 042-AA 045
16	filed April 23, 2021	1	AA 042-AA 043
17	Recorder's Transcript of Jury Trial - Day 1	I	AA 046-AA 205
18	filed April 18, 2022	1	AA 040-AA 203
19	Recorder's Transcript of Jury Trial - Day 2	П	AA 206-AA 393
20	filed April 18, 2022	п	AA 200-AA 373
21	Recorder's Transcript of Jury Trial - Day 3	Ш	AA 394-AA 543
22	filed April 18, 2022	111	AA 374-AA 343
23	Recorder's Transcript of Proceeding: State's Motion in Limine to Admit Evidence Under Res Gestae or		
24	Evidence Related to Other Crimes filed August 15, 2022	Ш	AA 544-AA 549
25	The August 13, 2022	ш	1M1 57771M1 577
26			
27			
28			

ŀ			
1	Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings Superseding Indictment filed October 13, 2020	IV .	AA 550-AA 657
2			
3	Second Superseding Indictment filed April 26, 2021	IV	AA 658-AA 663
4			
5	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Sever filed March 11, 2021	IV	AA 664-AA 709
6	State's Notice of Motion and Motion in		
7	Limine to Admit Evidence Under Res Gestae or Evidence Related to Other Crimes		
8	filed March 29, 2021	IV	AA 710-AA 730
9			
10	Superseding Indictment filed October 1, 2020	IV	AA 731-AA 738
11	Third Amended Superseding Indictment filed February 2, 2022	IV	AA 739-AA 747
12			
13	Verdict filed February 10, 2022	IV	AA 748-AA 749
14	Video Excerpts: Trial Exhibits 1-34, 36, 37 and 44 ¹		
15	Video Execipis. That Exhibits 1-54, 56, 57 and 11		
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27	1371 6	4: C C 1	- Directing Productic

Videos referenced herein are/were trial exhibits, and a Motion for an Order Directing Production by the district court below is pending before this Court.

INDEX FOR APPELLANT'S APPENDIX

2	DOCUMENT	VOLUME	PAGE NOS.
3	Indictment filed September 10, 2020	I	AA 009-AA 011
4	Superseding Indictment filed October 1, 2020	IV	AA 731-AA 738
5 6	Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings Superseding Indictment filed October 13, 2020	IV	AA 550-AA 657
7	Motion to Sever Counts filed February 28, 2021	I	AA 012-AA 022
8 9	State's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Sever filed March 11, 2021	IV	AA 664-AA 709
10	State's Notice of Motion and Motion in Limine to Admit Evidence Under Res Gestae or		
11	Evidence Related to Other Crimes filed March 29, 2021	IV	AA 710-AA 730
12	11100 111011 27, 2021		
13	Order Granting Defendant's Motion to Sever Counts filed April 6, 2021	I	AA 038-AA 041
14			
15	Opposition to the State's Motion in Limine to Admit Evidence Under Res Gestae or		
16	Evidence Related to Other Crimes filed April 8, 2021	I	AA 025-AA 037
17			
18	Order Granting State's Motion in Limine to Admit Evidence Under Res Gestae or		
19	Evidence Related to Other Crimes filed April 23, 2021	I	AA 042-AA 045
20			
21	Second Superseding Indictment filed April 26, 2021	IV	AA 658-AA 663
22	Third Amended Superseding Indictment		500 545
23	filed February 2, 2022	IV	AA 739-AA 747
24	Verdict filed February 10, 2022	IV	AA 748-AA749
25	Amended Judgment of Conviction (Jury Trial)		
26	filed March 8, 2022	I	AA 001-AA 008
27	Notice of Appeal filed March 15, 2022	I	AA 023-AA 024
28			

1 2	filed April 18, 2022 I	AA 046-AA 205
3	Recorder's Transcript of Jury Trial - Day 2 filed April 18, 2022	AA 206-AA 393
4		
5	filed April 18, 2022 III	AA 394-AA 543
6		
7	Limine to Admit Evidence Under Res Gestae or	
8	filed August 15, 2022	AA 544-AA 549
9		
10	Video Excerpts: Trial Exhibits 1-34, 36, 37 and 44 ²	
11	11	
12	12	
13	13	
14	14	
15	15	
16	16	
17	17	
18	18	
19	19	
20	20	
21	21	
22	22	
23	23	
24	24	
25		
26	26	
27	27	
28	Videos referenced herein are/were trial exhibits, and a Motion for an	Order Directing Production

Electronically Filed 4/18/2022 9:33 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

RTRAN 1 2 3 4 DISTRICT COURT 5 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 6 7 CASE#: C-20-350623-1 STATE OF NEVADA, 8 DEPT. VI Plaintiff, 9 VS. 10 ANDREW YOUNG, 11 Defendant. 12 BEFORE THE HONORABLE JACQUELINE M. BLUTH 13 **DISTRICT COURT JUDGE** THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2022 14 15 **RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL - DAY 3** 16 17 **APPEARANCES** 18 For the Plaintiff: PARKER BROOKS, ESQ. SKYLER SULLIVAN, ESQ. 19 For the Defendant: JASON MARGOLIS, ESQ. 20 21 22 23 24 RECORDED BY: DELORIS SCOTT, COURT RECORDER 25

- 1 -

1	<u>INDEX</u>
2	
3	Testimony5
4	
5	
6	WITNESSES FOR THE STATE
7	NOELLE HERRING
8	Direct Examination by Ms. Sullivan5
9	Cross-Examination by Mr. Margolis9
10	
11	TRENT BYRD
12	Direct Examination by Mr. Brooks11
13	Cross-Examination by Mr. Margolis 52
14	Redirect Examination by Mr. Brooks 73
15	Recross Examination by Mr. Margolis74
16	
17	
18	State Rests 81
19	Defendant Rests 81
20	State Closing Argument 106
21	Defendant Closing Argument
22	State Rebuttal Closing Argument
23	Verdict 147
24	
25	

1		INDEX OF EXHIBITS	
2		INDEX OF EXHIBITO	
3			
4	FOR THE STATE	MARKED	RECEIVED
5	40 to 42		8
6	43, 45		19
7	91		27
8	80 to 84		37
9	79		39
10	72 to 78		45
11	90A		50
12			
13			
14			
15	FOR THE DEFENDANT	MARKED	<u>RECEIVED</u>
16	None		
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
		- 3 -	
		- J -	

1	Las Vegas, Nevada, Thursday, February 10, 2022
2	
3	[Case called at 9:03 a.m.]
4	THE COURT: All right. Let's bring them in.
5	THE MARSHAL: All rise.
6	[Jury in at 9:04 a.m.]
7	THE COURT: All right. Good morning, everybody. Welcome
8	back. We are on the record in State of Nevada v. Andrew Young, C-
9	350623. Mr. Young is present with counsel, Mr. Margolis, both chief or
10	both Deputy District Attorneys, Ms. Sullivan as well as Mr. Brooks are
11	present on behalf of the State
12	Will the attorneys stipulate to the presence of the jury?
13	MS. SULLIVAN: Yes, Your Honor.
14	MR. MARGOLIS: Yes, Your Honor.
15	THE COURT: All right. State, next witness, please.
16	MS. SULLIVAN: State calls Nolle Herring.
17	THE MARSHAL: You want to take a place up there, remain
18	standing, raise your right hand so she can swear you in.
19	NOELLE HERRING, STATE'S WITNESS, SWORN
20	THE CLERK: Thank you. Be seated. Will you please state
21	your name and spell it for the record.
22	THE WITNESS: Noelle Herring, it's N-O-E-L-L-E H-E-R-R-I-N-
23	G.
24	THE CLERK: Thank you.
25	<u>DIRECT EXAMINATION</u>

BY MS. SULLIVAN:

- Q Ms. Herring, how are you employed?
- A I am a senior crime scene analyst with the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department.
 - Q And what is a senior crime scene analyst?
- A AS a crime scene analyst some of our responsibilities includes responding to crime scene, we document crime scenes through photography, report writing, evidence collection, note taking. We respond to property crimes as well as personal crimes.
- Q And you talk about responding to crime scenes, is there ever an occasion where your response was as a secondary scene
 - A Yes.
 - Q And what is a secondary scene?
- A A secondary scene can include anything from, like the hospital, the coroner's office, a location where they're doing a search warrant, things like that. Basically anything other than the primary crime scene.
- Q And what sort of training and experience do you have that allows you to be a CSA?
- A I do have a bachelor's degree as well as master's degree in criminal Justice. Upon being hired for the crime scene analyst position, we go through a 12-week crime scene investigation academy -- I'm sorry, I misspoke, 8-week academy. Followed by 12 weeks of field training, as well as continual quarterly training on various topics that we handle.
 - Q Now, Ms. Herring, I want to draw your attention to August

1	1st, 2020.	Were you working that day?
2	A	Yes, I was.
3	Q	And at some point in the day were you dispatched to Sunrise
4	Hospital t	rauma unit?
5	A	Sunrise ICU section, yes.
6	Q	And was that to photograph an individual by the name of
7	Robert We	ell?
8	Α	That's correct.
9	Q	And so did you go to Sunrise Hospital?
10	А	I did.
11	a	And at any point were you able to make contact with Robert
12	Well?	
13	А	I did go to the room that was indicated that he was in, yes.
14	Q	And what is your typical procedure when you're going to
15	photograp	oh an individual?
16	Α	Usually when we are requested to go photograph an
17	individual	at the hospital there's usually a police officer or a detective. I
18	remember	r specifically in this incident, the detective had just requested
19	that we go	o. So I arrived to Sunrise Hospital staff the victim's name, and
20	they direc	ted me as to which room he was in.
21	a	And were you able to speak with Robert Well at all?
22	А	I did not speak to him or when I went into the room I
23	explained	to him who I was and what I was going to do to photograph
24	his injurie	s. However, he did not respond to me.
25	a	Were you aware if he was able to respond to you?
	_	

1	A	l am not aware.
2	a	Ms. Herring, I'm showing you what's been previously
3	admitted a	s State's Exhibit 38, is that the individual you encountered in
4	the hospita	al?
5	A	Yes, it is.
6	Q	Who you know as Robert Well?
7	A	Correct.
8	α	And did you take this photograph?
9	A	I did.
10	Ω	And when you encountered Robert Well in the hospital, can
11	you explai	n a little bit about his physical condition?
12	Α	He was in a hospital bed, he had numerous medical devices
13	attached to	him. Again, I introduced myself to him, and he appeared
14	awake, but	when I explained to him what I was going to do, photograph
15	his injuries	and such, he did not make any sort of response or motion to
16	me.	
17	Q	Was he able to look at you, anything like that?
18	А	I don't recall him making direct eye contact with me, no.
19	α	I'm showing you what's been previously admitted as State's
20	Exhibit 39.	Did you take this photograph as well?
21	A	I did, yes.
22	Q	And is this Robert Well?
23	Α	That's correct.
24	a	Were there any other things you noticed about his physical
25	condition t	hat caused you to take this photograph?

1	A	He had stapled injury to the left side of his head.
2	Q	Ms. Herring, did you take additional photographs of Mr.
3	Well?	
4	Α	I did, yes.
5		MS. SULLIVAN: Your Honor, I'm showing Defense Counsel
6	what's bee	en marked State's Proposed Exhibits 40 through 42. May I
7	approach?	
8		THE COURT: Yes.
9		[State's Exhibits 40 through 42 marked for identification]
10	BY MR. M	ARGOLIS:
11	Ω	Ms. Herring, I'm showing you a few additional photographs.
12	If you coul	d just look at those and let me know when you're finished.
13	А	Okay.
14	α	Do you recognize these photographs?
15	Α	l do.
16	α	Do they appear to be the photographs you took in the
17	hospital?	
18	А	They are, yes.
19		MS. SULLIVAN: And Your Honor, at this point move to admit
20	State's Pro	posed Exhibits 40 to 42.
21		THE COURT: Mr. Margolis?
22		MR. MARGOLIS: No objection, Your Honor.
23		THE COURT: All right, those will be admitted.
24		[State's Exhibit 40 through42 admitted into evidence]
25	BY MS. SU	JLLIVAN:

	ŀ	
1	Q	And those additional photographs you took of Mr. Will, why
2	did you ta	ke these additional photographs?
3	Α	Those additional photographs show the hospital wrist band
4	that was i	n place on his wrist, as well as some hospital paperwork that
5	was in the	e same room bearing his name.
6	a	And did you take those photographs because he wasn't able
7	to speak to	o you?
8	А	Correct. And there was no detective at the hospital when I
9	arrived.	
10	a	Showing you State's Exhibit 40. Do you see the hospital
11	bracelet th	nat you were discussing in this photograph?
12	Α	l do. It's in place on his left wrist.
13	a	And Exhibit 41 is just a closer up view of that hospital
14	bracelet?	
15	Α	That's correct, yes.
16	a	And on the hospital bracelet do you see a date of birth?
17	А	Date of birth shows to be 7-19 or '67, yes.
18	a	And Exhibit 42, what is that?
19	А	That would be some hospital documentation that was in that
20	same roor	m, bearing his name and the same date of birth.
21		MS. SULLIVAN: Pass the witness.
22		THE COURT: Mr. Margolis?
23		MR. MARGOLIS: A couple of questions, Your Honor.
24	Thanks.	
25		CROSS-EXAMINATION

1			
1	BY MR. MARGOLIS:		
2	Ω	Good morning, Ms. Herring.	
3	A	Good morning.	
4	Ω	You were initially involved in this case well after the incident;	
5	is that right?		
6	А	That's correct. I responded in August.	
7	Ω	So you had no opportunity to view the crime scene on or	
8	about July 26th on the Strip?		
9	А	No, sir.	
10	α	And your only contact was to go to the hospital to	
11	photograph Mr. Will?		
12	А	That's correct.	
13		MR. MARGOLIS: Thank you. No further questions.	
14		THE COURT: Anything else from the State?	
15		MS. SULLIVAN: No further questions, Your Honor.	
16		THE COURT: Okay. Anything from the jury?	
17		All right. Now, please don't share your testimony with	
18	anyone else involved in the case. Thank you for coming, you are		
19	excused.		
20		THE WITNESS: Thank you.	
21		MR. BROOKS: Your Honor, the State's next witness would	
22	be Detective Byrd.		
23		THE COURT: Okay.	
24		THE MARSHAL: If you could just remain standing, raise your	
25	right hand and face the clerk so she can swear you in.		

1		TRENT BYRD, STATE'S WITNESS, SWORN		
2		THE CLERK: Please be seated. Will you please state your		
3	name and	name and spell it for the record?		
4		THE WITNESS: Trent Byrd, T-R-E-N-T B-Y-R-D.		
5		THE CLERK: Thank you.		
6		DIRECT EXAMINATION		
7	BY MR. BROOKS:			
8	٥	Detective Byrd, how are you employed?		
9	А	With the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department.		
10	ο	And in what capacity?		
11	A	A detective in Convention Center Area Command.		
12	Q	And prior to being a detective in Convention Area		
13	Convention Center Area Command, what were you?			
14	А	A patrol officer for the Police Department.		
15	Q	In what area command?		
16	А	Northwest Area Command.		
17	α	What's the difference between those two, could you just		
18	generally describe the difference for us?			
19	А	Yes. The Police Department's broken up between ten		
20	different area commands around the Valley. It makes it that way so it's			
21	easier for o	easier for officers to interact with the public, know witnesses, know		
22	citizens, know businesses, it's easier for the cases to be assigned to			
23	detectives and for patrol response as well. It's a lot faster for them to			
24	respond to calls.			
25	Q	And is there a name that occurred to basically cause the		

patrol detectives to be stationed in each area command?

A Yes. There was. In 2015, there was a decentralization, which broke up a lot of the centralized bureaus to such as like violent crimes and gangs, they went to area commands instead of working out of headquarters.

- Q And the only ones that stayed in headquarters, is it fair, were homicide, sex assault and some other ones, but those are the main?
 - A That's correct.
- Q Does decentralization allow you to have very familiarity with, you know, the people you need video surveillance with, or just people that you might get tips or speak to?
 - A Yes, it does.
- Q Do you recall an investigation back in July 26 of 2020 that brings us here to court today?
 - A Yes, I do.
- Q Could you tell us a little bit, I guess, first just generally, how does a patrol detective get assigned a case when they're just on a regular situation, and then explain the difference with the way you got this case?

A Okay. So our area command is broken up between different properties. There's 18 detectives that work at our station. Each detective has certain properties that they are assigned to so we can build relationships with the security directors, know the people that work in and out of the hotels, and it's easier and quicker for us to get follow-up on certain cases.

In this case, it was -- occurred on a Sunday, my regular work days are Wednesday through Saturday. I work the Paris, Bally's, Planet Hollywood -- kind of the Harmon corridor right here on Las Vegas Boulevard on the Strip. Just because I work those properties, doesn't mean I don't work other properties and have associations with those other properties.

This event happened on a Sunday. I was next up for the Paris area for a call to come in. When my day came on Wednesday, this case came up and was assigned to me.

- Q And tell us sometimes would a detective be deployed in dispatch right to an event while it's a live primary scene?
 - A Yes, they would.
- Q What made -- what about this event made it so no detective was dispatched to the scene?

A This event here, the patrol officers arrived on scene, they initially made contact with a couple of witnesses, determined they didn't think they needed the detective at that time; therefore, they didn't notify their chain of command to be their sergeant or another supervisor to request a patrol detective or any other detective to respond to the scene at that time.

- Q Is there something also about, I guess, generally the location where this occurred as opposed to a home or a store that makes it a little different also?
- A Yeah, this happened right in the middle of Las Vegas

 Boulevard, right in front of the Paris Hotel, hundreds of people walking

around during the time, and it was a little chaotic at first for the patrol officers that arrived on scene first.

Q Would the victim have been still at the scene? Do you hold the victim at a scene so the detectives can arrive, or do you transport a victim?

A If they're in medical crisis and need immediately medical attention they will be transported. They will not be held by police officers if determined they need to go to the hospital.

Q So let's move then to the Wednesday when you get assigned the case. Is your sergeant who --

- A Yes.
- Q So you get assigned primary or lead detective?
- A That's correct.

Q When you do, what are some of the -- what's the couple of first things that you would review or look at to start your investigation?

A To start the investigation, I want to know all the people that were first on scene, any other witnesses that were there. Any witnesses that were on scene that weren't spoken to, or maybe didn't give a full recollection of what happened, so I can contact them later.

I also review like the 911 calls to find out who the first person that called in, what their initial details were. If there's any other information from that call that I could learn later on in the investigation. I also review some of the officer's body cam to see how the scene was when they first arrived. Why they didn't call a detective at first, and kind of what the situation is at that point.

Q And could you give us generally some of the information that you gleaned to start your investigation from those sources?

A From the start I could see the incident occurred right in front of the Paris Hotel at a bus stop. The victim, he was kind of not talking to anybody. Was obviously in pain holding his head. And there were a couple of witnesses on the bus bench as well. The person that called 911 was right next to the bus bench. She had given some details saying that it was a black male, in his 50s or 60s, walking in a southbound direction, wearing like a blue and white shirt.

Also, the other witness that was on scene gave a similar description of a black male adult walking southbound wearing a gray shirt. It's not uncommon for witnesses on scene in a chaotic event like that to give differing descriptions of a suspect. They did give a general description of the same suspect, though.

So once you had that information, let's take me through, and we'll start with the 911 call. Do you have the ability to look up what phone number or who called 911?

- Q Yes, I do.
- Q In this particular case, did you end up having some difficulty with that person who was reporting or at least determining who that was?
 - A Yes, I did.
 - Q Why? Tell us what happened.
- A The person did not want to initially stick around on scene.

 She gave a false name to the police officers when they first arrived. It's

not uncommon for people not to want to get involved with law enforcement when they show up. It sounded like from this she just wanted this victim to get help. She wanted the person to get to the hospital. I guess he was bleeding. He was bleeding obviously very bad. When the officers arrived, they spoke with her briefly, and she just kind of walked off. There was never a statement taken from her, a written statement, just verbal, and like I said, she had also given a fake name.

Q What, if you recall, was the name that she gave, and then what do you later on determine to be her actual name?

A I believe the name she gave was a Kenesha Moore and her actual name was Laresha Moore.

- Q Now, in order to try to -- did you want to speak to her?
- A Yes.
- Q Now, in order to try to speak to her what did you do that first day that you take over the case?

A Attempted to call the phone number trying to reach out to her. No contact with her. Tried to further the investigation by locating an address with that phone number.

Q Do you also cause two different administrative subpoenas to be issued?

A Yes, I do. They were to the phone companies that the phone number that was provided by the victim when she called 911. By the witness, I'm sorry.

Q So explain to us what that means. Because I said administrative subpoena, just take us through what that thought process

was.

A So an administrative subpoena is a form through our department that we can send to any kind of utility company -- phone, power, water, sewer -- to get the names on record for who that number or service belongs to. In this case, it was a phone number, I believe two different admin subpoenas were sent -- administrative subpoenas were sent to two different phone companies for that same phone number.

- Q Were you ever able to get any results back?
- A No.
- Q Eventually, later on, do you end up finding out the Laresha Moore name that you gave us and then following up with her later on?
 - A Yes, I did.
- Q So that first -- also that first day, when watching the body cam we talked about the person who said the gray comment, when viewing it, is that someone who appeared familiar to you based on your time on the Strip?
 - A Yes, it was.
 - Q Did you have a pretty good idea who that person was?
 - A Yes, I did.
 - O Do you end up speaking to him?
 - A What's his name and when do you talk to him?
- A His name was Sergei, and I'm sorry I don't recall his last name, it's a Russian name -- and I spoke with him, I believe it was a few days later on the Strip again, on an ambulance.
 - Q And so you end up tracking him down as well?

A Yes.

Q Fair to say he doesn't really provide anything that assists your investigation further?

A Nothing more than what he had told the previous patrol officers on the scene.

Q Is it fair to say Sergei's usually in a certain condition when you encounter him on the Strip

A Yes, he is. He's usually intoxicated when I speak with him.

Q When you get assigned a case, do you also learn something about the victim's condition?

A Yes, I did.

Q Tell me essentially what you learned, what was happening -- whether the victim was improving, declining, anything like that.

A So initially when he gets to the hospital he didn't -- had a severe head injury. After a few days go by I call to contact the hospital to see what his condition is.

I knew it was deteriorating pretty rapidly. He was losing a lot of motor function, wasn't able to talk. Just looking at his eyes at the hospital, too, he just had a blank stare in his eyes. He didn't really know what was going on. He was transported to a couple of other rehab facilities eventually with no improvement at all.

Q So when you first learn of this deteriorating condition, is that around the kind of time when you get assigned lead agent of this?

A Yes, it is.

O Do you cause something to occur, or someone to go

1	somewhere to do something with this victim?		
2	А	Yeah. I contacted our CSA Noelle to respond to the hospital	
3	so she cai	n take some better photos of his condition and the injuries that	
4	he had to his head.		
5	Q	Were you ever able to interview Mr. Robert Will?	
6	A	No, I was not.	
7	α	Was it because you didn't try?	
8	A	I tried and there was he was never able to speak to	
9	anybody.	I spoke with his mom multiple times, and he was never even	
10	really able to talk to his mom.		
11	Q	And Detective I show you State's Proposed Exhibits 43 and	
12	45, do you recognize the people depicted in these photographs?		
13	A	Yes, Laresha Moore and Sergei.	
14	a	Do they fairly and accurately depict the two people that we	
15	were just discussing from the bench of Paris that you contacted during		
16	your investigation?		
17	А	Yes, they do.	
18		MR. BROOKS: Your Honor, State moves for admission of 43	
19	and 45.		
20		THE COURT: Mr. Margolis?	
21		MR. MARGOLIS: No objection, Your Honor.	
22		THE COURT: Okay. Those will be admitted, and you can	
23	publish if needed.		
24		[State's Exhibit 43, 45 admitted into evidence]	
25	BY MR. BROOKS:		

1	Ω	Detective Byrd, who is this?	
2	А	That's Sergei.	
3	Q	Fair to say it's a pretty good photo for Sergei?	
4	Α	Yes, it is.	
5	Q	And who is this	
6	A	That's Laresha.	
7	Q	in 43?	
8	A	Yes.	
9	Ω	So we kind of took you through some of the steps that you	
10	were doing. I want to, I guess, move back. The first night did you		
11	were you ever able to learn whether there was any Fusion Watch camera		
12	that was able to pick up the bench where this occurred?		
13	А	There was Fusion cameras, but there was no coverage of the	
14	actual bench from Fusion.		
15	Q	Eventually, do you go to Paris and meet with someone to	
16	collect everything they have on surveillance?		
17	А	Yes. I met with Francisco who is one of the security	
18	investigators over at Paris to assist with video surveillance.		
19	a	And when looking at that do you get Paris and another hotel?	
20	А	Paris and we also get Planet Hollywood and	
21	Q	And so when you get to Planet Hollywood, do you also	
22	contact someone from Fusion Watch and I don't know if it was before		
23	or after, you tell us to do more looking through photos?		
24	Α	Yes. It was after that. I recontacted Fusion to try and locate	
- 1	1		

where the suspect had gone from the bench. Not to say that they didn't

cover the bench, but there's hundreds of cameras on the Strip that are Fusion cameras do cover multiple areas of high tourist areas -- walkways, bridges, stuff like that.

Q So I guess, explain to us, you said recontacted Fusion Watch. What would Fusion Watch have been contacted about the first night and then what do you have that contact them about following?

A Fusion Watch would have been contacted the first night by the patrol officers to see if there was video coverage from the Fusion cameras of the actual incident.

Since there was no coverage from that, we learned the direction of travel of the subject and the mode of travel, walking southbound on foot. The Fusion cameras do cover most of that side of the strip to go all the way down to Tropicana on the east side of Las Vegas Boulevard, over to the westside and then up north. The cameras are very scattered, though, so it doesn't pinpoint an exact location, but there are hundreds of cameras on the strip.

Q When, after speaking with Ms. Stringer and getting all that video footage, what do you learn about the end of the Fusion Watch video surveillance?

A The video coverage showed the suspect walking up from southbound Las Vegas Boulevard, over to the Cosmo Hotel and the coverage loses him walking towards the Cosmopolitan Hotel.

Q Were you able to confirm, just from Fusion Watch, whether he went into Cosmo or went somewhere else?

A From Fusion, they just kind of lose him walking into the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

Cosmopolitan Hotel.

- Now, you previously said that your relationship or your kind \mathbf{Q} of properties are designated as parish and valleys, is someone else the designated patrol detective for Cosmo?
 - Α Yes, there are.
- Do you during the course of an investigation have someone Q go to Cosmo once Fusion Watch gives you that information?
 - Α Yes, Detective Mildebrandt and Jacobitz.
- Q When Detective Mildebrandt and Jacobitz go there, what are they looking for? What are you --

They met with William Roed, the security investigator there, who was able to pick up video coverage of the suspect walking into the Cosmopolitan Hotel from the bridge where Fusion Watch cameras lose him.

He walks through the hotel, doesn't really stop anywhere for anything. He goes out the -- down the escalator and out the north doors. In between Bellagio and Cosmo there's a little alley right there. When he walks out of those doors he kind of looks back towards the north where the incident had occurred. It's probably only a couple of hundred yards right across the street. From there the camera covers him walking back into the Cosmopolitan Hotel, briefly meets with a cocktail waitress. From there he exits the Cosmopolitan Hotel, and he was last seen on the top of the bridge, east of the Cosmo, in between Planet Hollywood and Cosmopolitan.

Q And Detective, kind of jumping back a bit, Exhibit 33. Do you

recognize kind of what's depicted in this photograph?

- A Yes. That's the bus bench where the attack occurred.
- Q So when you reviewed the body cam, what did you learn or see as far as the way this scene was kind of handled? Explain to us what we wouldn't know from watching that.

A So the scene there, after going back and watching the body camera, the -- when the patrol officers arrived there're several people around the bus bench. The victim is obviously, he's sitting right here and there are other people sitting next to him. There's a lot of people walking back and forth behind the scene. There's two Paris security guards that were directly behind the bench where the flashlight is indicating here, standing directly over what the weapon was here, the rock. The officer is trying to get some information from the people, and from there they collect the rock and put it into the car.

- Q So see the mouse in front of you?
- A Yes.
- Occasionally -- you don't have to do it now --
- A Yes.
- Q -- but occasionally I might have you use that in coming questions. Were the patrol, the initial responding officers, did they impound the rock?
 - A Yes, they did.
 - Q And how do you know they impounded the rock?
- A From the property report that they generated, and I picked it up in evidence here.

- Q Oh, so did I cause you to bring something to court?
- A Yes.
- Q And how does that occur? How do you get that and what do you have to do to get that?

A I was ordered by you, on a subpoena, to respond to court or to the evidence vault where the evidence had been impounded by the patrol officers. With that, I collected the evidence form that officer that impounded it and brought it here.

Q So can you just go on your own and just take evidence at will kind of thing?

A No, there's a chain of custody that is signed on the form here. Any time property is taken out, opened, or reviewed at the evidence vault.

Q Explain to us, when you watched the body cam, what it was that the first responding officers did with the rock that you ideally would have liked handled different?

A They kind of surround the area. They don't really contain the area at all. There's while they're conducting their investigation there's still people walking back and forth behind the scene, kind of around. They don't ever, like, put police tape up, if you will, to block the scene out from anybody going in and out.

The officers see the rock, they talk to a couple of witnesses that told them that the victim was smashed in the head with a rock. At that point they walk over, they take one photo -- I think two photos of the rock. One officer picks it up, and then takes it over to his patrol car and

places it in the floorboard where his feet go in the patrol car.

Q So you kind of mentioned crime scene tape, you mentioned that Paris security guards were the first ones there, so ideally you kind of told us ideally what you'd like, in reality explain how a situation or crime scene occurs on the Strip and what can and can't happen feasibly.

A As you can imagine, the Strip, hundreds of people walking up and down the Strip, both sides. You can't just block off an entire walkway. It's not safe for people to not be able to travel.

And in this case, it's right next to the street, right next to the bus bench, it could have been handled a little better. However, it's just -- it's tough with limited resources, there's only four officers out there at the scene, and you can imagine with all the people coming up and talking to him, it just wasn't manageable.

- Q Approximately how many people had walked over, around or hear the rock prior to even Paris security getting there, let alone Metro?
 - A Oh, from reviewing the video, probably hundred people.

MR. BROOKS: So Your Honor, can we approach the officer with some scissors to open what would be State's Proposed 91?

THE COURT: Yes.

BY MR. BROOKS:

- Q So Detective Byrd, while you do this, could you explain to the jury what an evidence seal is, what color this tape is, and what that tells you about certain things?
- A So this is the evidence label here, it describes what date and time the evidence was impounded. It has the event number which the

event occurred under. It has it's in evidence, a felony case, the officer who impounded it, his signature, the type of crime, and the address the property was located at or the evidence here. It's indicated here it's Item No. 1, and it's listed as a rock. This is one package, total number of packages of two.

Q And is the seal in -- is secure?

A Yes. On the back here, the red evidence tape is sealed all the way across. The bag is also stapled on top, both seals are not broken.

The officer here dates and signs when he seals the evidence bag up.

Q Let's pretend this had been tampered with and/or you looked through it previously to show someone. How would we know that that would have occurred?

A Per our policy procedure, if this was to be opened by myself or any other officer, detective, employee of the Department, it would be cut at a separate location and resealed, signed and dated to show that it was opened and viewed by somebody else. Also on the bottom here is a chain of custody to show if anybody does open it, they sign, place their personnel number, the date and time it was sealed again.

O Officer, could you now cut open the bag and [indiscernible] the chain of custody is intact?

A Yes, it is. There is no signature at all on the chain of custody. It will just be mine after I open this.

MR. BROOKS: Your Honor, at this point in time, the State would move for admission of Exhibit 91.

THE COURT: Mr. Margolis?

	4		
1	Α	It would be blood or and swabbed for the DNA.	
2	Q	Is it possible that someone holding the rock could have left	
3	trace or skin cells on there, DNA?		
4	Α	Yes, it is possible.	
5	a	Do you know would you have submitted testing on that,	
6	would the lab have accepted it had it been handled differently?		
7	A	Had it been handled differently, not likely.	
8	α	Okay, so not likely, quote possible	
9	Α	Possibly, but not likely.	
10		THE COURT: Sorry. Is he answering your question not	
11	likely, but the lab would have accepted it for testing? Is that		
12		MR. BROOKS: That's correct.	
13		THE COURT: Okay.	
14		MR. BROOKS: The lab would not have accepted it for	
15	testing.		
16		THE COURT: Okay.	
17	BY MR. BROOKS:		
18	a	Still did you do a couple of things just in case with regard to	
19	the DNA testing of that?		
20	Α	Yes, I did. I applied for and was granted a search warrants	
21	for the victim's DNA as well as the suspect's DNA. In that case it was no		
22	only for potentially the rock, but if there was other evidence I had locate		
23	later in video surveillance toward the victim or the suspect had gone		
24	afterwards, I may have located other evidence that DNA may have been		
25	tested on as well.		

Q Would you have latent print tested the bench or DNA tested the bench?

A No, there's too many people that have been in and around that bench and it would come back inconclusive more than likely.

Q What was it about the floorboard, I guess, of the patrol vehicle that essentially would cause you not to pursue the testing of the rock?

A So our patrol vehicles are shared between the entire station. So our station has over 250 officers, any one of those officers could have been driving that vehicle at any time. The floorboard itself, as you can imagine, the bottom of your shoes touching the floorboard is very dirty, very contaminated.

These officers are out walking the strip every night. The surface itself is not suitable to get any kind of evidence at that point off of the rock. After it's just kind of tossed, it wasn't bagged at that point, it was just kind of thrown in the bottom of the floorboard.

Q Is there something similar, I guess, to the floorboard, something about that rock's condition as where it was put that would also have made what you said, testing difficult?

A Yeah. And again, as you can imagine, the sidewalk of the Ls Vegas Boulevard Strip is walked by thousands of people every day.

People spit, and I'm sure you see people vomit, people urine, I mean this scene is very contaminated to start with.

Q Detective, do you see up at the top of this screen shot of the body cam, there's this number 0756 and then there's that Z. I thought

the event occurred at, you know, 12:50 a.m. Could you explain to us what that is?

A That's the -- it's a timestamp from the body cam. Body camera worn by the police officers. A lot of times the timestamp on the actual video is not correct. However, when it is uploaded, it is shown with a time that it was recorded on on our system.

- Q Is one of the reasons because Axon [phonetic] states that the UTC time?
 - A That's correct.
 - Q And is that what that Z designation means?
 - A Correct.
- Q Okay. So it is seven hours back which would be that 12:56 a.m.
 - A That's correct.
- Q All right. Is there something -- I've read the timestamp -- that a timestamp on video whether it be this or Paris or Cosmo that is different inherently than, let's say, finding DNA on a rock?

A Well, the timestamp is obviously going to show exactly what is placed at this time here. If you were to process a rock or any kind of surface, it's not going to tell you when that print or when that DNA was left on that surface. It will just tell you exactly that, that person's print is on that surface, or that DNA is on that surface. It doesn't tell you exactly when that's been placed there.

Q Is it the most recent person to touch a table or anything like that?

A No, it's not.

Q Now, showing you Exhibit 4. If you could use the mouse, and I'll zoom in -- so if you could use the mouse, trace for us the path of the suspect for the video that you compiled and tell us what cameras look at what?

A Okay. This is the bus bench over here. If you can see a little blue symbol where the attack occurred, right in front of the Eiffel Tower. The Paris cameras captured that. The suspect then walks southbound, this is across Paris, coming up to Planet Hollywood here, he walks all the way down the boulevard here to an escalator where Planet Hollywood cameras capture him going up here. And then off the scene or off the screen here is a bridge on this side that connects Harmon over to Cosmopolitan. It's a pedestrian bridge that walks over the top.

From there, the suspect travels through the Cosmopolitan, and he comes out near these doors right here, and he's seen on video looking back this direction, which is where the attack happened. After that, he walks back through the hotel, up again to this bridge, and he's last seen on this bridge walking east.

- Q So Detective, when you said that the suspect walks out of the Cosmo and is looking towards the Paris, would the timeframe that he does that and the kind of lights and sirens, would they be visible from that angle?
- A Yes, absolutely. It's only, as you can see, a couple hundred yards to the north of where that door is.
 - Q So that's statue that we see the suspect stand by from there

1	could you see essentially what was going on at the Paris?
2	A Yes, absolutely.
3	Q Does the suspect conduct any business inside Cosmo?
4	A No business at all. Like I said, he makes contact briefly with
5	a cocktail waitress. Appears to get maybe a water, and then walks back
6	out of the hotel, So never stops for the restroom or to gamble or
7	anything like that.
8	Q Detective, I'm going to show you a few different parts of
9	various video clips. And while doing it, I guess I'll start with the Cosmo
10	because we were talking about that. Showing you Exhibit 46.
11	[Whereupon, a video recording, State Exhibit 46 was played in
12	open court at 9:42 a.m., and not transcribed]
13	BY MR. BROOKS:
14	Q Detective, kind of while it plays, I want to, I guess, ask you a
15	few things. When you had gathered all the video, did you have a strong
16	inclination or opinion, or did you think you knew who the suspect was?
17	A Yes, I did.
18	Q Did you immediately proceed, or did you do other things
19	before you proceeded with an arrest warrant?
20	A I did several other things before I proceeded.
21	Q What was kind of one of the first things you did in order to
22	confirm or deny what you believed?
23	A From watching this video here, his clothing's very distinct.
24	Bald black male wearing a grayish colored shirt, dark shorts, dark socks,
25	white and black shoes. He's carrying a black jacket. He's got a very

1	α	Now, before I ask you so Detective, where is who's
2	depicted in this video?	
3	Α	That's Andrew Young.
4	α	When Andrew Young goes outside of the Cosmo here, could
5	you tell us	s essentially what you explain what you were saying earlier.
6	Α	So that's the area in that alleyway just to the north, between
7	Bellagio a	nd Cosmopolitan, he walks out there and just to the right of
8	where you	a can see on that camera, over to this side here, is a direct view
9	over to wl	nere the Paris is. So on this picture it would be over here.
10	a	And which way is Mr. Young looking there?
11	Α	Right there you can see he's walking back now. He was just
12	walking	looking northeast towards where the Paris was.
13	Q	I'm going to pause it here when we enter the elevator. What
14	is sorry,	the double doors. What just occurred?
15	A	The attack just occurred minutes prior.
16	Q	Oh, sorry. When Mr. Young walks in back from outside, does
17	he immed	iately go back into the hotel?
18	A	When he walks I'm sorry. Say that again.
19	α	Here, I'II it's a bad question.
20		What do we see right here?
21	Α	He's walking back into the Cosmopolitan Hotel.
22	a	Does he proceed in, or does he do something first?
23	Α	He looks back again before he enters back into the
24	Cosmopo	litan Hotel.
25	a	And from that vantage point, can you still see the Paris area?

- A Yes, you can.
- Q Do you recognize anything in the still frame that I have here at 12:55:19?
- A Yes, on that picture right there, is these very distinct white with black striped shoes.
- Q Now, you said you got various video surveillance prior to moving forward. Do you do something else or show that video surveillance to anyone else before proceeding with an arrest warrant?
 - A Other detectives, yes.
- Q After showing that video surveillance to other detectives, what do you then cause to be issued?
- A An arrest warrant based on the other detectives' thoughts; it was determined it was Andrew Young.
 - Q And right here, is there something you see in this?
- A Yeah, on here you can see those ear buds again right around his neck, the two white ear buds right here.
- Q Now, we're not as familiar with Mr. Andrew Young, can you explain anything with regard to his head or shape or build?
- A Black male adult, bald hair -- or bald head, a little bit of a stockier build.
- Q And Detective, I'm going to back up just briefly. You mentioned the clothing that Mr. Young is wearing here in the Cosmo video on the night of the incident on July 26th, 2020 is the same clothing as the July 8th, 2020 footage that he identifies himself. There's something in this kind of still frame at 12:53 a.m. that could help us.

A You can see that very similar shirt. At the top of the collar as well, the shirt seems to, like, buckle. Or to cause sort of a U-shape up at the top. Again, the white shoes with the black stripe, the black socks and the black shorts. He's also carrying this black jacket as well.

Q So to me this looks like a gray shirt. Can you explain is it gray, what does the shirt look like?

A It's a white and grayish checkered pattern if you will. A lot of times different cameras at different properties, or even on the same time, based on the lighting from what's coming in, colors can appear different. Grays can look blues, greens, different colors. Even on some of the video I watched from the same day, same time, two different cameras show that shirt almost two different colors.

[Video ended at 9:49 a.m.]

BY MR. BROOKS:

- O Detective, I want to show you State's Proposed Exhibits 80 through 84. Could you look through these and tell me if you recognize them?
 - A Yes.
- Q And do they fairly and accurately depict Andrew Young on July 8th, 2020, the event that you were discussing?
 - A Yes, they do.
 - MR. BROOKS: State moves for admission of 80 to 84.
- 3 | THE COURT: Mr. Margolis?
 - MR. MARGOLIS: No objection, Your Honor.
 - THE COURT: Those will be admitted. You can publish if

1	A	Yes, I have.
2		MR. BROOKS: And, Your Honor, at this point, State would
3	move for a	admission of the rest of Exhibit 79, some of it was played
4	yesterday.	
5		THE COURT: Mr. Margolis?
6		MR. MARGOLIS: No objection.
7		THE COURT: It will be admitted, and you can publish.
8		[State's Exhibit 79 admitted in evidence]
9	Į۷	Vhereupon, a video recording, State Exhibit 79 was played in
10		open court at 9:55 a.m., and not transcribed]
11	BY MR. BF	ROOKS:
12	Ω	Detective I want to show you a clip from July 8th, 2020. Is
13	this the sa	me date and time as the video that you just took us through
14	the shirt?	
15	А	Yes, it is.
16	Q	So in this surveillance does the shirt look the same as those
17	photos we	just looked at?
18	А	From this distance, it looks just like a gray shirt.
19	Q	Okay. And who's that right there?
20	А	That's Andrew Young.
21	Q	Showing you a clip from July and August, tell me if you
22	recognize	anyone here.
23	Α	Mr. Andrew Young on the right here.
24	Q	I want to show you a clip from June 29th, 2020, tell us if you
25	see anyon	e here?

1	Α	Mr. Andrew Young, right here. Same shoes, shorts, socks,
2	he's got th	nat same walk again, you can see the little hitch in his step.
3	α	Describe for me is there anything else unique about his walk
4	on occasio	on?
5	A	The way he kind of switches the jacket back and forth and
6	kind of the	e way he's swinging his arm. Again, Mr. Andrew Young there,
7	gray shirt,	same shoes.
8	a	Can you see anything with this photograph?
9	Α	Yeah, Mr. Andrew Young just getting on the elevator there.
10	He's got th	nose earphones again around his neck, same shoes, shirt,
11	glasses.	
12	Q	Do you see the shoes here?
13	А	Yes, I do.
14	a	All right. And is this the same outfit?
15	A	Yes, it is. The gray shirt, black shorts, black socks, white and
16	black shoe	9 S.
17	Q	Is this also on footage from July 8th, just later that night?
18	A	Yes, it is. Mr. Andrew Young again Same outfit, same
19	shoes. Again that earbuds around his neck, the glasses on the front of	
20	the shirt.	The jacket.
21	α	Detective, I'm just going to show you one angle of some
22	Fusion Wa	tch video, which is Exhibit 35.
23		Tell me what we see here roughly what time it is and what
24	has just o	ccurred.
25	А	Well, it's around just before one. The attack just occurred,

and this is Mr. Andrew Young walking southbound. You can see Paris right here, the driveway, he's walking toward Planet Hollywood right now.

- Q Last I'm going to show you some of the Paris surveillance, it's fair to say you spent more time looking at this Paris surveillance than any of us.
 - A yes.
 - Q Could you -- it's not very clear --
 - A It's not clear.
- Q Could you explain to us kind of what it is we need to be looking at here and focusing our attention on?
- A So the Paris video shows Mr. Young approaching prior to the attack. Just depending on which time.
- O Okay. So I've skipped ahead. Let me show you roughly 12:44. Tell us if you see anyone here.
- A Mr. Andrew Young right here. You can see the white shoes, the black jacket, the lighter color shirt and dark shorts walking southbound. Again this is Mr. -- you can see him right here, you pick up a jacket, the lighter colored shoes, the dark shorts and the lighter colored shirt. It's hard to see.
- Q Here, I'll rewind it. Oh, you've actually got to give me the mouse.
 - A I'm so sorry.
- Q So I'll rewind to right here to when it switches over. Tell us where to focus our eyes.

A Just from the video, it looks like there's some kind of verbal altercation, they were arguing about something. None of the witnesses on scene knew what the argument was about. Mr. Young walks away from the scene and then that's when he reappears just then.

Q I'm going to show you a different -- so this is 12:34 a.m. and I'm going to jump forward to roughly 12 -- let's say 12:37. Do you see anyone in this photograph or video?

A Here's Andrew Young, right here walking southbound away from the bus bench. Again, here's the bus bench right here where the attack happened.

Q I'm going to jump forward to that 12:43-ish, 12:44 time frame.

Tell us -- put the mouse where to put our eyes.

A Here's our victim still here. I don't recall again where -- here's --

Q So do you see anyone top screen kind of walking with anything in their hands that was --

A Mr. Andrew Young is right here. It's hard to see. It's hard to pick up, but he's got the black jacket in his left hand and he's walking back southbound towards the bus bench right here. There's one strike. Victim stands up. Here's where Mr. Andrew Young grabs the food. They're having some kind of verbal altercation there, food goes in the trash can. Looks like there's one or two more strikes right there. Again, the victim doubled over and then Andrew Young walking southbound away.

O Do you see the person who attacked the victim and walked

1	southbour	nd away here in court today?
2	A	Yes, I do.
3	a	Would you please point to him and identify an article of
4	clothing he	e's wearing?
5	А	He's over to my left wearing a white shirt, blue mask, and
6	brownish o	colored tie.
7		MR. BROOKS: Your Honor, let the record reflect
8	identificati	on of the Defendant.
9		THE COURT: It shall.
10		[Video ended at 10:04 a.m.]
11	BY MR. BR	OOKS:
12	Q	So we talked earlier about you causing an arrest warrant to
13	be issued.	Eventually on August 19th, 2020 was Mr. Andrew Young
14	taken into	custody?
15	A	Yes, he was.
16	a	When he was taken into custody, did he have anything on
17	him of evid	dentiary significance?
18	A	The same white and black Jordan shoes, plus carrying a
19	black jacke	rt.
20	a	Do you know whether it was the same exact black jacket?
21	Α	I can't say for certain if it was the same exact black jacket.
22	However, i	t resembled the same jacket.
23	a	Showing you State's Proposed Exhibit 72 through 78. Could
24	you please	look through those and let me know if you recognize them?
25	Α	The shoes he was wearing the night he was taken into

1	custody, a	s well as the jacket he had with him.
2		MR. BROOKS: Your Honor, the State moves for admission o
3	72 throug	h 78.
4		THE COURT: Mr. Margolis?
5		MR. MARGOLIS: No objection, Your Honor.
6		THE COURT: Okay. Those will be admitted, you can publish
7		[State's Exhibit 72 to 78 admitted into evidence]
8	BY MR. BI	ROOKS:
9	Q	Detective, do you know if they're the same exact shoes?
10	Α	I don't know if they were the same exact shoes.
11	a	The jacket specifically, is there something was there ever
12	anything a	as far as, I guess, identifiable about the jacket? Was it a Canada
13	Goose, or	Moncler, or anything?
14	А	Just black jacket is all you can in the video surveillance.
15	a	Showing you Exhibit 72, 73, Exhibit 74, Exhibit 75. Is there
16	something	about this angle that sometimes you can see?
17	A	On the toe you can see the Jordan logo again, and as well as
18	on the hee	el you can see the black stripe. Obviously in the video you
19	can't see e	exactly what it shows, but there is a black stripe in between the
20	white on t	he heel of the toe or the shoe.
21	a	And Exhibit 76, is that kind of hold on. Oh, Detective, see
22	the arrow,	could you double click that for me? No, that arrow down
23	there can	you double click it?
24	А	This one?
25	α	Yeah.

	1	
1		THE COURT: Hit trash for me for a second. Down,
2	everything	g's down on that black bar. Oh, wait. That one, I'm sorry. The
3	trash thing	g only works if it's on the ELMO.
4		MR. BROOKS: Something's here I'll steal it and pull it back.
5		THE COURT: Okay.
6	BY MR. BI	ROOKS:
7	α	Okay. Showing you Exhibit 76. Is that another view of kind
8	of like tha	t toe thing
9	А	Yes.
10	a	you were talking about?
11	А	Yes, it is. You can see the logo there.
12	a	What is some of the video surveillance that the, I guess, the
13	best angle	e of straight down on the toe?
14	А	Yeah, you can see the Jordon symbol as well as some of the
15	letters in t	he video surveillance. You can see the J-O-R.
16	a	Oh, I meant as far as is it Paris or Fusion Watch or Cosmo
17	that would	d give us the best angle for that?
18	А	Cosmopolitan had the best angle.
19	a	Exhibit 77 and then 78.
20	А	That black jacket that he had with him.
21	a	So why would be DNA test the black jacket?
22	Α	He was carrying it when he was stopped. It's reasonable to
23	believe th	at his DNA would be found on that jacket when he was taken
24	into custo	dy.
25	a	What about the food that was thrown in the trans can?

Would you ever DNA, test or collect that food?

A No, I would not. It's a trash can on the Strip, there is going to be thousands of articles that can be found on that food.

- Q Lastly, I want to skip forward to April 21st, 2020, does that date have significance to you?
 - A April 21st, 2020?
- Q Give me -- sorry. On April 24th, 2021, do you meet with somebody?
 - A Yes, I did.
 - Q Who do you meet with?
 - A Laresha Moore.
- Q What was kind of your goal or what were you going to meet with her for? What's it called?
- A A photo lineup, which is a six-pack group of photographs to see if she was able to identify anybody from the photographs that she remembered from the night of the attack.
- Q So explain to us what's the difference between a photo lineup, a show up, a, you know, physical lineup, what's the different kind of situations?
- A A photo lineup is a group of photographs, it could be individual or placed on one piece of paper with six different pictures.

 The pictures are all similarly looking people with similar descriptions.

 Obviously the witness saw what she saw that night, she would be able to pick out her own details from that person. A live photo lineup would be somebody that's standing here with us right now that the victim could ---

victim or witness could say yes or no to a person.

- Q You see that in movies a lot. Does that happen in real life?
- A It does not happen in real life.
- Q And then what's a -- so what's a -- what scenarios would a show up occur under?

A A show up would be conducted if a patrol officer had stopped a potential suspect or a person of interest on -- right after the altercation had happened. Say the patrol officer stopped a person, some of the witnesses could be taken to where that person is stopped to see if that is the person that they saw commit the crime that night. However, on this that did not happen.

- Q You kind of mentioned patrol officers. Is there something about patrol officers and six-pack lineups?
- A Patrol officers don't typically conduct a photo lineup. That would be something a detective follows up with at a later time.
- Q And so when compiling a six-pack lineup and showing it to a witness, this was, what, over a year, almost a year?
 - A Almost a year.
 - Q Ideally would you have liked to do it sooner, later, what?
- A Absolutely. I would have liked to find her sooner to conduct that. Because as time goes on, you know, your memory isn't the best. But, however, it was very difficult for me to locate her. That was my issue.
- Q When you showed her the photo lineup, did she make an identification?

1	А	She did.
2	٥	What did she say anything prior to making the identification
3	about wh	y she's making it or anything that she saw?
4	A	She did. She did mention, I think in her own words, the
5	suspect h	ad jacked up teeth, that there was something with his teeth that
6	didn't loo	k right.
7	۵	And was that before or after making an identification?
8	A	That was before making identification.
9	۵	After making identification did she give any other details?
10	A	She does. She also recognizes his eyes. His eyes are very
11	distinct as	s well.
12	۵	Is that true?
13	A	Yes, it is.
14	Q	Okay. Could you have is there a way to kind of screen six-
15	pack lineu	ips to put six people with distinctive eyes?
16	A	There is not a search option or a filter if you can if you
17	would in	our system to isolate that.
18	Q	Is there a way for you to go through and isolate so the teeth
19	aren't sho	owing up?
20	А	Yes, there is.
21	Q	Okay. Did you do that?
22	Α	It was randomly generated that way.
23	Q	Was were teeth showing in the photo app?
24	A	No, they were not.
25	Q	Showing you State's Proposed Exhibit 90A. Do you

	11	
1	recognize	what's depicted here?
2	А	Yes, that's the photo lineup that I'd shown to Laresha.
3	Q	And so the jury had already seen 90, what's different about
4	90A, what	is this?
5	Α	90A, I'm so sorry.
6	Q	Oh, sorry. This thing that I'm holding.
7	Α	Yes, this has this is the photo lineup that has subjects with
8	their nam	es and numbers attached to their name. The victim would
9	not or th	ne witness would not have seen this copy that has the names
10	on it.	
11	α	Okay. So when you pull these from DMV or just various
12	record sou	urces and they have the names and the numbers of the lineup
13	and stuff,	you don't show them this, do you?
14	А	No, I do not show them that.
15	a	Okay. Is this a fair and accurate depiction of the key to the
16	photo line	up Laresha Moore was shown?
17	Α	Yes, it is.
18		MR. BROOKS: State moves for admission of 90A.
19		THE COURT: Mr. Margolis?
20		MR. MARGOLIS: No objection, Your Honor.
21		THE COURT: Those will be admitted, you can publish if you
22	need to.	
23		[State's Exhibit 90A admitted into evidence]
24	BY MR. BF	ROOKS:
25	Q	The last thing, I'm just going to go to 90 I'm showing you

	1	
1	the secon	d page of Exhibit 90. Are anyone's mouth showing, Detective?
2	А	No.
3	a	When Laresha was looking at the photos, does she give any
4	other deta	ils with regard to number two that she may or may not have
5	thought si	milar?
6	А	She did mention the beard, she said, I don't think he had a
7	beard.	
8	a	At that point in time?
9	Α	At that point.
10	α	However, fair to say this was the photo that you could pull of
11	Mr. Andre	w Young?
12	А	Correct.
13	α	And at that point in time he had a beard?
14	А	He did.
15	Q	Do you then do you alter the photos of Andrew Young to
16	make it sir	milar to who she would have seen that day?
17	А	No. There is no manipulation of the photos. That can either
18	be printed	in color or black and white, that's the only manipulation I can
19	make.	
20	Q	Okay. What color shirt is Mr. Young wearing in this?
21	А	Looks like a black collar with a black and white stripe shirt.
22	Q	Okay. So not the
23	А	Not the same shirt that he was wearing that night.
24	Q	Would are you familiar with a what a CDR is?
25	Α	Yes.

	B.	
1	a	What's a CDR?
2	А	It's a recovery of phone numbers from a phone.
3	a	So
4	А	Call data records is what the CDR is.
5	a	As a detective do you sometimes have the ability to issue a
6	search wa	rrant for call detail records for my phone or
7	А	Yes, I would. Had I known a particular phone number of a
8	suspect, I	could apply for a search warrant to get CDRs for that phone
9	number.	
10	α	When Andrew Young was taken into custody, did he have a
11	phone on	him at that point in time?
12	A	No. He did not.
13	a	So
14	A	I did not apply for any search warrant for CDRs for Mr.
15	Young. 1 d	didn't have a phone or a phone number to attach to him.
16	α	So you couldn't do a digital forensic download of the phone,
17	or a call de	etail records?
18	А	No, I could not.
19	α	Thank you.
20		MR. BROOKS: At this point in time the State would pass the
21	witness, Y	our Honor.
22		THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Margolis.
23		MR. MARGOLIS: Thank you, Your Honor.
24		CROSS-EXAMINATION
25	BY MR. M	ARGOLIS:

1	α	Morning, Detective Byrd.
2	A	Morning, sir.
3	α	How are you?
4	Α	I'm good, how about yourself?
5	a	Not too shabby. I'm Jason Margolis. I'm pretty sure you're
6	familiar w	ith my client Andrew Young.
7	А	Yes, sir.
8	α	Fair to say you're the architect of this case, would you argue
9	with that?	
10	A	No.
11	a	Okay. Would you disagree with me if I counted
12	approxima	ately a half dozen times on direct examination where you said,
13	hard to se	e or hard to pick up?
14	А	Yeah.
15	a	It's a fair statement?
16	A	Yes.
17	a	Okay. Taking you back to July 26th, 2020. You didn't get the
18	case until	a couple days after that; is that right?
19	A	Correct. It occurred on a Sunday, and I don't come back until
20	Wednesda	ay.
21	a	Perfect. Thank you. And between that Sunday and
22	Wednesday fair to say the only people that had any involvement with the	
23	case were	the responding officers Shin and Henry the like?
24	A	And I believe one of the detectives that had talk to Cosmo
25	about vide	2 0.

1	a	Fair enough. Okay. You didn't seek this case out?
2	А	No. I did not seek it out.
3	α	Okay. But you did conduct the investigation once it came
4	into your h	nands, so
5	А	Yes, I did.
6	α	from that day on it's your baby, for lack of a better word?
7	А	Yes.
8	a	Okay. I think you testified, and they effectively testified the
9	same way,	Officer Shin. They didn't think they had any evidence on
10	scene; is th	nat accurate?
11	А	Other than the rock, yes.
12	α	Okay. First of all, is that that officer's play to call, is that
13	Officer Shi	n's responsibility to make that determination?
14	А	At that time it is. He's on scene, he's the one that sees
15	everything	
16	a	Do you agree with that determination?
17	А	No, I don't.
18	a	Okay. You we talked about, and I've talked about the crime
19	scene and the fact that it wasn't secured. And then you spoke a little	
20	about that	on the record, so I want to talk about that for a few minutes.
21	Α	Okay.
22	a	Okay. One of the things you said, and I'm going to quarrel
23	with it a lit	tle bit, is that because of the nature of the location in the
24	middle of Las Vegas strip in front of the Paris Hotel a heavily trafficked	
25	area, no di	spute about that, okay. That no one's going to shut down the

strip, okay. Correct me if I'm wrong. In the last 10 days, two weeks didn't we have like a NHL All Star event on the middle of the Las Vegas strip where the strip was in fact shut down?

A I wouldn't say the strip was shut down, but they do direct traffic if you will or pedestrian traffic.

- Q Okay. This event that Officer Shin responded to occurred at approximately a quarter to 1:00 in the morning?
 - A Yes.
- Q The NHL event that we're somewhat agreeing to disagree about, right? It occurred at a more heavily trafficked period of the day; fair to say?
 - A Yes.
- Q Okay. Now I'm certainly not going to say that the commercial advantages, okay, of inconveniencing Las Vegas Boulevard traffic were the same here. But given what I've just demonstrated, if they wanted to secure this scene they could have, yes?
 - A Yes. They could have.
- O Okay. Thank you. Now the rock, the rock was secured in a matter of speaking, right?
 - A Yes.
- Q As you say the rock was in fact taken into their police custody. Was it immediately seen?
 - A No. It was not.
- O Okay. And to your credit you testified that Officer Shin put it on the floorboard of the front seat of his car?

1	Α	Yes, he did.
2	α	Not in a bag, not even secured by heavy objects, right?
3	A	That's correct.
4	α	So the rock for evidentiary purposes is not of much value,
5	you'd say?	
6	А	Other than the weapon that was used seen by the witnesses.
7	Q	Forensic value
8	А	Forensic value.
9	α	let me rephrase my question. The forensic value of the
10	rock to the	extent it could have existed, we will never know today, right?
11	Α	Not today.
12	a	Okay. And that's not the fault of the defense and Mr. Young,
13	is it?	
14	A	No. It's not.
15	a	To the extent that's anyone's fault, whose fault is it?
16	Α	The department's.
17	Q	Okay. Law enforcement, right?
18	Α	Law enforcement.
19	a	So ultimately the State had the responsibility to do those
20	things corr	rectly and they didn't; would you agree?
21	Α	Short of our policies and procedures, yes. That's where
22	we're at.	
23	Q	Fair enough. No crime scene analyst at the scene?
24	Α	Correct.
25	a	No detectives at the scene until you become aware of the
	1	

1	case?	
2	A	Correct.
3	a	Okay. We already talked about the crime scene wasn't
4	secured.	How about witnesses? What witnesses did you become aware
5	were the	re at the time of the incident?
6	Α	Laresha Moore and Sergei were the two that I was able to
7	identify f	rom this case.
8	a	Okay. Now I want to pick up a little bit on your wording
9	because it's interesting to me and I think it's interesting to the jury. Tha	
10	you were able to become aware of or identify, okay. Now you spoke to	
11	Laresha	Moore. Laresha Moore was with a companion, correct?
12	Α	She was.
13	a	She wouldn't tell you who she was with?
14	Α	She would not.
15	Q	She would not provide you contact information for who she
16	was with?	
17	Α	No.
18	Q	You tried?
19	Α	Yes.
20	a	More than once I assume?
21	Α	Yes.
22	Q	Okay. And ultimately you really wanted to talk to this
23	companion. What evidentiary purpose would talking to Laresha's	
24	companion serve?	
25	A	Nothing more than what I have seen on the video at that

1	point.	
2	α	Corroboration?
3	A	It would corroborate, however what the witnesses, I
4	reviewed t	the video and corroborated what was referred to me already.
5	Q	Okay. You spoke to Sergei?
6	Α	l did.
7	Q	Fair to say Sergei probably doesn't remember his name on
8	Sunday, co	orrect?
9	Α	Sergei knows what's going on a lot of times. He may be
10	intoxicated	d, but he's a functioning alcoholic
11	Ω	He's a functioning
12	А	is what I would say.
13	Q	alcoholic, fair enough. I'll agree with you on that. For
14	evidentiar	y purposes, he couldn't give you much more than a black man
15	and it happened fast, right?	
16	Α	And the direction he traveled and the color shirt he was
17	wearing.	
18	Q	Southbound on Las Vegas Boulevard and a
19	Α	Gray shirt.
20	Q	gray shirt?
21	Α	Correct.
22	Q	Which we now know is a black and white fleck shirt, if you
23	will, that appears gray the further away you get from it, right?	
24	Α	Correct.
25	Q	Okay. Sure. Let's see. So is it your testimony that the
l l	I .	

1	right?	
2	A	That's correct.
3	α	You'd agree? So if I told you tens of thousands if not
4	hundreds	of thousands of pairs of that shoe are manufactured in the
5	United Sta	ates every year, would you disagree with me?
6	A	Not at all.
7	α	Okay. If I told you that an African American man aged 50 to
8	60 like Nik	ke Jordan's, would you disagree with that assessment?
9	Α	Not at all.
10	a	Okay. So fair to say
11	i	MR. BROOKS: Objection, Judge. For the record we white
12	people like the Jordan's too.	
13		MR. MARGOLIS: They do. I remember my first pair very
14	well, and	will we can take judicial notice of that fact at this point.
15		THE COURT: I think that's fair.
16		MR. MARGOLIS: All right.
17		THE COURT: Yeah.
18		MR. MARGOLIS: Thank you.
19	BY MR. MARGOLIS:	
20	a	So the shoes, I understand you consider them to be
21	distinctive and identifiable because of their appearance in many of these	
22	videos, right?	
23	А	Correct.
24	a	But you would also agree with my assessment that these
25	shoes are not particularly rare or uncommon?	

	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
	1
	2
	- 3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
_	4

1

A Yes.

Q Thank you. Now you talked about Mr. Will. You went and tried to communicate with Mr. Will?

A Yes, I did.

Q Fair to say that was a dead end?

A He was in no state to talk. He couldn't talk at all.

Q What prompted you to go and see Mr. Will? Because I'll be honest, Office Shin seemed to think Mr. Will is just hammered. What made -- what changed this case because initially it's kind of like no big deal, bum fight on the bus bench. I mean, I'll be honest that's what it appears to me.

A So --

Q What changed?

A So as a detective we review every case that we get assigned to us. Within those there are details obviously written by the patrol officer. Every case that we're assigned that's a felony case, battery substantial, which this case was when it came to me.

Q Uh-huh.

A I take those cases very seriously. The victim -- and within my experience victims with head injuries could appear intoxicated, they could just appear they don't want to cooperate. They could have a serve brain injury on scene, it's unknown. The police officers aren't doctors at that point. With that information I attempted to try and go speak with Mr. Will to find out if it was just a bum fight, if you would --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- at the bus bench. When I responded to the hospital and spoke with the hospital they said he is -- he can't speak, he's not responding to any commands. Obliviously this was more than what Officer Shin saw at the scene. Officer Shin I believe was only on for maybe a year at the time. I had I think 10 years' experience at this point working these types of cases. There was more to this case from what I saw initially.

Q No. And I get it and I understand. I mean, I'm sure I'm better today than I was on, you know, my first trial. God I hope so. I want to talk about September 3rd. September 3rd, I'll get you the exact date, 2020. I think that's the date that we have an application and affidavit and search warrant for Mr. Young --

- A Yes.
- Q -- do you recall that?
- A Yes.
 - Q You authored this application that day, correct?
- A Yes, I did.
- O Okay. And it's your signature that's borne on it?
- A Yes.
- Q And you, at least at this point in time, still had some belief of the possibility of obtaining useable forensic evidence from that rock, yes?
 - A Potentially.
 - Okay. And you saw the fingerprints of my client Mr. Young?
 - A Yes.

a	Okay.
А	Well, not
a	Or, sorry. You took a swab?
А	Yes.
Q	I correct the record, I apologize. You took a swab, okay.
A	Yes.
a	For his DNA because ultimately touch DNA could in fact be
on that roo	k?
A	It could.
a	Okay. And I'm not going to quarrel with the idea that a rock
is a little bit different than let's say my personal cell phone, okay. I	
understand a rock is out there, it's exposed to the elements, it's going to	
be touched this person, that person and their cousins, okay. However, at	
the time that you obtained you believed that there was a potential for	
obtaining that evidence?	
А	Potentially.
a	Okay. And did you know then that the scene had not been
secured?	
А	Yes.
a	And you knew then that the crime scene analyst had not
been called out?	
А	Yes.
a	And you knew then that a patrol detective had not gone to
the scene?	
	A Q A Q on that roc A Q is a little bi understand be touched the time th obtaining t A Q secured? A Q been called A

Q So you were aware of all of the mistakes that were made on the night of July 26th, or the early morning as the case may be, and yet you still felt compelled to do this, right?

A Yes. Had there been other evidence later obtained as well that I may be able to forensically compare as well.

Q Sure, sure. If a rock is difficult to get touch DNA off of, the man in the video appears to take the food containers belonging to Mr. Will that were on the bench, kind of the origin of this dispute. And he, you know, quite flamboyantly appears to throw them around, right? Would that -- had things been conducted differently in the initial hours responding to the scene, could those items have been tested?

A Could they, yes.

Q Okay. I mean, let's say, you know, Celine Dion is shot outside the casino she used to perform her residency at. Pretty fair we're going to secure that scene. We're going to secure that trash can. We're going to secure those bar benches -- bus benches. And we're going to swab everything, fair?

A Yeah. I would say the same for anybody else in here. And a shooting would be investigated a lot differently.

Q Okay. Let's say Celine was hit with a rock, because I appreciate what you did there. I'm an attorney I can appreciate that. But let's say Celine was bashed over the head with a rock instead, are you -- is your testimony that we conduct that crime scene differently --

A No.

Q -- because it was a rock?

1	А	No.
2	a	Okay. So the ability to collect forensic evidence would have
3	been cons	iderably improved if various mistakes were not made in the
4	investigati	on?
5	А	That's correct.
6	a	Thank you. If you recall, and I don't know if you do, okay.
7	Did you te	II Mr. Young that if his material wasn't there that he'd be
8	excluded?	Was this an exclusion
9		MR. BROOKS: Objection, Judge.
10		MR. MARGOLIS: I'll withdraw the question.
11		THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
12		MR. MARGOLIS: I'll withdraw the question.
13	BY MR. M.	ARGOLIS:
14	α	You obtained Mr. Young's genetic material?
15	А	Yes.
16	α	You never tested any of the items for it?
17	A	That's correct.
18	a	What ultimately was the purpose of obtaining his genetic
19	material?	
20	A	Had there been any other evidence that I had located after
21	the fact, I could have tested compared to.	
22	Q	Did you look for any?
23	Α	Did I look for who?
24	Q	Did you look for any additional evidence with which to test
25	against the	e genetic material you collected from my client?

	l I	
1	Α	Yeah. The case was still ongoing, yes.
2	a	What'd you test for?
3	А	I didn't
4		MR. BROOKS: Judge, can we approach?
5		THE COURT: Sure.
6		[Sidebar begins at 10:30 a.m.]
7	i	MR. BROOKS: I just don't want him to
8		MR. MARGOLIS: Yeah, yeah.
9		MR. BROOKS: answer that he was also
10		MR. MARGOLIS: Yeah, yeah,
11		MR. BROOKS: the lead detective
12		MR. MARGOLIS: Yeah.
13		MR. BROOKS: and combining all the other cases. I
14		MR. MARGOLIS: I want to talk about this case, evidence
15	from this o	ase.
16		THE COURT: Well, I think that the
17		MR. MARGOLIS: Am I is that not implicit?
18		THE COURT: The warrant
19		MR. BROOKS: I just don't know. That's all, I'm just saying.
20		THE COURT: The warrant specifically does talk about, you
21	know, the	rock that we read yesterday. So I would just keep it very fine
22	tuned to th	e case and the facts we're here on today. I don't I mean
23		MR. MARGOLIS: I mean, is that how I should (indiscernible)?
24	I'm talking	about other evidence related to this investigation.
25		THE COURT: Yeah, yeah. So

1		MR. MARGOLIS: I understand what he's saying and	
2	obviously I don't want that to happen.		
3		THE COURT: Yeah, yeah, yeah. I think, you know, his	
4	response t	hough to your question is, the case is ongoing. I didn't know	
5	where else	el could leave	
6		MR. MARGOLIS: Leave it lie, I'm not getting anywhere?	
7		THE COURT: No. I'm not implying that. But I'm just saying I	
8	think his		
9		MR. BROOKS: I didn't	
10		THE COURT: I don't think you will get anywhere.	
11		MR. BROOKS: That's why I [indiscernible]	
12		MR. MARGOLIS: Fair enough, okay.	
13		MR. BROOKS: I don't know what's coming.	
14		MR. MARGOLIS: Okay.	
15		MR. BROOKS: That's what he was saying.	
16		THE COURT: Okay.	
17		MR. MARGOLIS: Yeah, I know.	
18		[Sidebar ends at 10:31 a.m.]	
19	BY MR. MA	ARGOLIS:	
20	a	All right. So your investigation of this battery with	
21	substantia	l bodily harm with a rock was on going?	
22	Α	Yes.	
23	a	You could have found additional items of evidence?	
24	Α	Correct.	
25	a	Maybe the mysterious witness alongside Laresha Moore	
	I		

suddenly surfaces and she collected something, for instance, right?

- A Correct.
- Q And in that vein, having my client's material would have enabled you to test, right? Would have enabled you to potentially gain additional evidence to know -- you know, identify the perpetrator?
 - A Correct.
- Q Okay. We've seen lots of video in this case. Lots of video. I'm sure you've watched even more than us, so I'm not going to belabor it. But I want to focus solely on the period between say 12:40 and 1:00 o'clock a.m. on that little strip of Las Vegas Boulevard in front of the Paris, okay. For me that's what matters, okay. And specifically even further, I guess we're talking about 12:44 to say 12:48ish when the incident, the attack on Mr. Will happens. I mean, that's real difficult to see for me. Is it difficult to see for you?

A It is difficult to see on the video. However, you can see what -- there is an altercation.

Q I don't discount that there's altercation, okay. I've worn glasses and contact lenses my entire life, clearly I'm blind as a bat and over 40 it's getting worse, okay. So I'll admit part of it might be my inability to focus to the degree necessary, okay. But I think the images of the actual altercation are grainy. Would you disagree with that assessment?

- A No.
- Q Can you see details of the upper body of facial expressions of the individuals involved in the altercation?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Q Okay. But -- I mean, I'll help you out here. I mean, the distinct part about it I guess is that it appears different in different lighting, right?

A Yes.

Q The check pattern, right? It's not -- you've got a plain blue dress shirt I think from this distance, right? And I've got the little stripes, right?

A Yes.

Q Okay. And I'll grant you this, that shirt's got a little more going on than our two shirts arguable, right?

A Yes.

O Okay. But when you say distinctive shirt or distinctive article of clothing, I'm thinking like homeboys on camera doing a crime wearing a big Blackhawks sweater, not jersey because we're talking hockey, right? And that to me is distinctive, okay. It's distinctive and that it's obviously a trademark insignia and all that good stuff. It's distinctive in that there are probably very -- a finite, but a certain amount of variations of it, right? Did you attempt to trace the shirt to see what manufacturer, where it's sold --

A No.

Q -- any of that stuff?

A No. I did not.

Q Okay. So it is your testimony that there's -- that that shirt is so distinctive that there's like one in Las Vegas?

A No. It's distinct in the fact that I was able to track him

wearing that shirt and the other clothing he had.

- Q Now -- and I don't know if you're aware. Throughout the course of your investigation of this case, did you come to find that Mr. Young may have been homeless at some period during the summer of 2020?
 - A Yes.
- Q Okay. And, you know, for better or for worse in your experience as a law enforcement officer and as a detective, is it more likely for a homeless person to wear the same article of clothing multiple times than it would be for say you, or I, or Mr. Brooks, or Ms. Sullivan?
- A Honestly with the homeless I've interacted with it depends on how homeless they may be.
- Q Okay. Fair. It's a matter of degree, right? There's some fashion plates, you know, in the arena. The shorts, do you think those are distinct too?
 - A They're black colored shorts.
- Q Seems to me that your answer suggests that they are not particularly distinct, right?
- A Black colored shorts I would say are not distinct by themselves.
- Q Fair enough. The jacket, again, we don't got a big
 Blackhawks logo or a Vegas Knights stripe or anything like that, right?
 - A Correct.
- Q It's a nondescript black jacket, presumably sold at department stores and sporting goods stores and I'm sure Walmart's got

1	20 version	s of it, fair?
2	А	Correct.
3	a	All right. So ultimately this case relies upon you to a large
4	degree, w	ould you is that fair?
5	А	Yes.
6	a	And it relies a lot upon Laresha Moore?
7	Α	Yes.
8	a	Laresha Moore's a felon?
9	А	Yes.
10	a	Laresha Moore lied?
11	А	She did.
12	a	More than once?
13	А	She did.
14	a	Why should this jury trust someone who lied to law
15	enforceme	ent repeatedly about things never mind, scratch that. Recall
16	the questi	on. Do you find Laresha Moore credible?
17		MR. BROOKS: Objection.
18		THE COURT: Sustained.
19		MR. MARGOLIS: Withdrawn. Brief indulgence, Your Honor.
20		THE COURT: Yeah.
21	BY MR. MARGOLIS:	
22	Q	Thank you for your cooperation, Detective Byrd.
23	Α	Yes, sir.
24		MR. MARGOLIS: Pass the witness.
25		THE COURT: Redirect.
	I	

1 REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. BROOKS: 2 3 Q Detective, do you remember the questions about you still 4 submitted for a buccal and got a buccal even though you were aware 5 that the crime scene was possibly contaminated? 6 Yes. 7 Q After getting the buccal and prior to the lab going forward 8 with testing, do you subsequently learn from the lab whether or not they 9 would have accepted it for testing? 10 Α I did learn. And speaking with the lab and the captain that 11 runs that bureau this item was not collected in the manner to be tested. 12 It was too contaminated at the scene; therefore it was not tested. 13 \mathbf{Q} And without telling us what was said, do you also learn as to 14 whether even if it had been preserved perfectly it would have been 15 tested? 16 Α It probably would not have. 17 \mathbf{Q} Remember the question this case relies on you and Laresha 18 Moore that was just asked? 19 Α Yes. 20 Q What does the case rely on? Why'd you submit the arrest 21 warrant? What's the one thing? 22 Α The victim's condition and what happened to him. 23 Q All right. Well, I mean --24 And he --Α

-- if someone was just had a victim really bad, would you

25

Q

submit an	arrest report just on the victim? Like what's the piece of
evidence?	
А	Everything collectively based on the they want to say
distinct clo	othing, however, the clothing he's wearing the entire time. The
video surv	veillance I located prior to and after the fact with him wearing
the same	exact clothing, as far as the clothing goes. When he's arrested
he has ver	ry similar shoes, identical shoes. Not to say they are the same
pair. With	all of that together that's what this case weighs on.
a	And although we've shown you and just the jury a handful of
video surv	veillance and/or still photos of Mr. Young in other months in
2020 sui	mmer 2020. Fair to say you had additional photos and/or
videos, no	t just the ones we provided?
Α	Yes, I did. Several.
Q	Fair to say that you had roughly 12 different times, dates,
angles, ca	meras, places of video footage?
А	That's correct.
α	Of Mr. Andrew Young?
А	Yes.
α	Thank you.
	MR. BROOKS: Pass the witness.
	THE COURT: Redirect re-cross.
	MR. MARGOLIS: Very briefly.
	RECROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. M	ARGOLIS:
	evidence? A distinct clavideo survithe same the has verified pair. With Q video survideos, no A Q angles, ca A Q A

So any failures to collect evidence at the scene or preserve

25

1	the scene	or otherwise bag, tag, police tape, all that good stuff, okay.
2	Any of those failures, they might have caused you to miss evidence tha	
3	could hav	e helped your case, correct?
4	Α	Correct.
5	Q	But it very clearly could have also caused you to miss
6	evidence	that would have helped to exculpate or exonerate Mr. Young,
7	right?	
8	A	Yeah, fair.
9	۵	Okay. And we're not in a position to conduct that
10	investigat	ion, correct? Myself and Mr. Young.
11	A	Correct.
12	۵	In fact this trial was continued because I wanted to test the
13	rock. It w	asn't
14		MR. BROOKS: Objection, Judge. Facts not in evidence.
15		MR. MARGOLIS: Withdrawn.
16		MR. BROOKS: I'd ask you to
17		THE COURT: So you can rephrase it. So that's sustained and
18	stricken.	If you want to rephrase it a different way
19		MR. MARGOLIS: Yeah. Let me rephrase it briefly.
20	ļ	THE COURT: If the detective knows.
21	BY MR. MARGOLIS:	
22	Ω	If I wanted to test the rock, I wouldn't really be able to do it
23	anyway, r	ight?
24	A	That's correct.
25	Q	Okay. And that's not through any fault of mine or Mr.

Young's?	
Α	No. It's not.
Q	Thank you, Detective.
	MR. BROOKS: Nothing further, Judge.
	THE COURT: Questions for the detective? Okay. Go ahead.
One question	on per page, please. Parties approach, please.
	[Sidebar begins at 10:42 a.m.]
	MS. SULLIVAN: Any knowledge if they knew each other.
	MR. BROOKS: Well, yeah. I asked him (indiscernible).
	MR. MARGOLIS: [Indiscernible]
	MS. SULLIVAN: It's up to you.
	MR. MARGOLIS: I don't care.
	MS. SULLIVAN: No objection. Has the victim's medical
condition [ir	ndiscernible].
	MR. MARGOLIS: I'm not aware.
1	MR. BROOKS: Are you aware, it's phrased properly.
ļ	[Indiscernible]
	MS. SULLIVAN: No objection. The mother said she found
out from Wi	Il that he was in the hospital two days after the incident
[indiscernib	le] after the incident.
1	MR. MARGOLIS: I'm fine with that, yeah, sure.
[Indiscernib	le].
1	MS. SULLIVAN: No objection.
	MR. MARGOLIS: I think mom was just mistaken.
	MS. SULLIVAN: [Indiscernible] brain surgery rather than
	A Q One question out from Wi [indiscernib]

1	[indiscernible]]
2	[Indiscernible]
3	MR. MARGOLIS: Medical malpractice, yeah, sure.
4	MS. SULLIVAN: No objection. When did he have surgery?
5	Before or after Byrd saw him?
6	[Indiscernible]
7	MS. SULLIVAN: No objection. How does Detective Byrd
8	know if there is mental delay and how much was his mental delay before
9	he was [indiscernible]?
10	MR. MARGOLIS: Isn't that kind of consumed by the other
11	one?
12	THE COURT: [Indiscernible] number I don't I think it
13	she's Chris. She's got to sign this.
14	THE MARSHAL: Okay.
15	MS. SULLIVAN: So don't ask this one?
16	MR. MARGOLIS: Yeah, object. Repetitive. [Indiscernible].
17	MS. SULLIVAN: Judge, no for this one. Were any of the
18	detectives [indiscernible].
19	MR. BROOKS: Say it again.
20	MS. SULLIVAN: Were any of the detectives [indiscernible].
21	MR. BROOKS: Say it again.
22	MS. SULLIVAN: Were any of the detectives [indiscernible]
23	asked to confirm the identity [indiscernible].
24	MR. MARGOLIS: I have no objection to that.
25	[Indiscernible]
l l	

MS. SULLIVAN: Yeah.
MR. BROOKS: That's
MR. MARGOLIS: Legal [indiscernible].
MR. BROOKS: Yeah.
MS. SULLIVAN: Objection to this one. Because Mr. Will was
being unresponsive what is proper procedure police are supposed to do
once they arrive on scene?
MR. BROOKS: Sure.
MR. MARGOLIS: I think they're saying, what is.
MR. BROOKS: Yes.
MR. MARGOLIS: What is, what were they supposed to be
MS. SULLIVAN: No objection. Did you discover any prior
relationship. We already asked this.
MR. BROOKS: [Indiscernible].
MS. SULLIVAN: No objection to this. Could mental
problems observed be a result oh, we already did this one.
MR. BROOKS: It's the same one.
MR. MARGOLIS: [Indiscernible]
MS. SULLIVAN: It's the same question, so we said no
objection.
MR. MARGOLIS: Yeah, yeah.
MS. SULLIVAN: No objection to this.
[Sidebar ends at 10:46 a.m.]
THE COURT: All right. Detective Byrd, a few questions from
the jury for you.

THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Number one, the rock, is there any blood stain on it?

THE WITNESS: You can see it's just a multicolored rock. It does not appear there is any blood stain on the rock.

THE COURT: The mother had said that she found out from Mr. Will that he was in the hospital two days after the incident, which would be Tuesday questionably. Wouldn't this mean that he was at least a little bit aware after the incident?

THE WITNESS: He may have been. When I spoke with her I believe the hospital had contacted her.

THE COURT: The hospital had contacted her? Okay. When did he have surgery, was it before or after the Wednesday when you saw him?

THE WITNESS: I don't recall when that surgery was. I know when he initially went to the hospital. When the CSA responded and took those photos on the first he had a huge scar with staples around his head. So he would have either been closed up, I don't know if it was surgery at that time though.

THE COURT: Because Mr. Will was bleeding and unresponsive on scene with medics present, what is the proper procedure that police are supposed to do once they arrive on the scene?

THE WITNESS: Once police arrive on scene, try and contain whatever they can. Obviously, they call for medical immediately and this guy's condition is very bad. We're obviously trained for first aid,

first responder first aid. If there's say a gunshot wound or a stab wound and we know medical's going to be a little ways out, we can try and administer first aid. However, the fire departments on the strip usually respond within a couple minutes. And in this case I think the video showed the fire department responded very quickly. So at that point the victim would just be transported to the hospital. There'd be no reason to keep that victim on the scene.

THE COURT: Any knowledge if the Plaintiff and Defendant knew each other prior to the attack?

THE WITNESS: That I do not know.

THE COURT: Could the mental problems that he now has be a result of the brain surgery?

THE WITNESS: Could you repeat that? I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Basically the mental issues that the victim now has, could that be a result from the brain surgery rather than the incident?

THE WITNESS: The incident would have caused the brain surgery, so the injury -- you know, the mental status now could be from a multitude of factors. But the altercation is what led him to have that surgery.

THE COURT: Because of the victim's medical condition, are you aware if the victim had had any existing medical conditions before the incident?

THE WITNESS: No. I do not know.

THE COURT: State, follow up?

MR. BROOKS: No, Judge.

THE COURT: Mr. Margolis?

MR. MARGOLIS: Nothing, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Please don't share your testimony with anyone else involved in the trial, but you are excused. Thank you for being here.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor. Thank you, jury.

THE COURT: State?

MR. BROOKS: Your Honor, at this point the State rests.

STATE RESTS

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Margolis?

MR. MARGOLIS: Defense rests, Your Honor.

DEFENDANT RESTS

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So ladies and gentlemen, what we're going to do at this point is we are going to settle what's referred to as jury instructions, so that when you guys come back in here you'll have a full packet of the instructions on the law that apply to the facts of this case. That takes a little bit. So I'm going to give you an hour break right now. So if you want to go to Starbucks or do something like that while prepare those. And then we'll have lunch for you once you go back to deliberate.

So right now we'll settle jury instructions, you'll have your hour break, we'll come in. I'll read those instructions to you, we'll do the arguments and then I'll send you back into the deliberation room where hopefully lunch will be delivered at that time.

Also, effective immediately, Govern Sisolak just listed -- lifted the mask mandate, so you no longer have to wear masks, if you want to and you feel more comfortable, please do. But you're no longer required by law, okay?

All right. So during this recess you must not discuss or communicate with anyone including fellow jurors in any way regarding the case or its merits, either by voice, phone, email, text, internet or other means of communication or social media. Please do not read, watch or listen to any news or media accounts, or commentary about the case. Do any research such as consulting dictionaries, using the internet or using any other reference materials on your own. Please do not make any investigation, test a theory of the case, recreate any aspect of the case or any other way attempt to learn or investigate the case on your own. And please do not form or express any opinion on this matter until it's formally submitted to you.

I will see you at 10 to 12:00, please. See you in one hour.

THE MARSHAL: All rise.

THE COURT: Thank you.

[Jury out at 10:51 a.m.]

[Outside the presence of the jury]

THE COURT: All right. We're outside the presence of the jury. All parties present. Yes, Mr. Brooks?

MR. BROOKS: Judge, are we at all concerned, and I can't believe I'm about to say this out loud, that some people accepted jury duty under the guise of a wearing a mask with the person the sitting next

1	to them, that now they're going to lose their shit if someone, you know,
2	next
3	THE COURT: Well, considering that's every single one of
4	them ripped it off.
5	MR. BROOKS: Except for the two middle row, far left, Ms
6	the voice and Ms
7	THE COURT: Oh far right?
8	MR. BROOKS: Over there. Seven and eight. So I just look
9	I can't believe I'm saying it, but what if all of a sudden they're like, hey, I
10	accepted this under this guise. I told you they were
11	immunocompromised dot, dot, dot and now you ripped it off and I
12	would have gotten out.
13	THE COURT: No.
14	MR. BROOKS: Okay.
15	THE COURT: All right. Okay, guys. So jury instructions,
16	were you able to find any that you wanted to add, Mr. Margolis, on
17	behalf of defense?
18	MR. MARGOLIS: Just that you said that Mr. Orum
19	[phonetic] used a mere presence one.
20	MR. BROOKS: Yeah. Like a mere presence
21	MR. MARGOLIS: All I was able to find was the 9th Circuit
22	one. That's the only one I would propose and then I want to argue with
23	Mr. Brooks about the flight instruction.
24	THE COURT: All right. Well, then let's start with you have
25	the do you have the State's in front of you, Mr. Margolis?

1	MR. MARGOLIS: Yeah.
2	THE COURT: All right. So let's just do these sequentially
3	right now.
4	MR. MARGOLIS: Okay.
5	THE COURT: All right. So okay. I'm just going to say the
6	first few words on each of the pages just to let so we're all on the same
7	page in regards to what I'm looking at. You let me know if you have an
8	objection.
9	Page 1, it is now my duty as judge. Number 2, if in these
10	instructions. Three, a third amended superseding incitement. So let's
11	look at this one.
12	MR. MARGOLIS: Yeah. This is kind of tricky.
13	THE COURT: Let's do what if we just did it as Count A?
14	Does anybody care?
15	MR. BROOKS: No.
16	THE COURT: It just looks weird, and it probably only looks
17	weird because we've been doing it, you know, one way forever. But
18	MR. MARGOLIS: I guess if we make them A and B then
19	there's less confusion with the previous
20	THE COURT: Yeah.
21	MR. MARGOLIS: Right.
22	THE COURT: So Count B. So I just made them Count A and
23	Count B.
24	MR. MARGOLIS: Okay.
25	THE COURT: All right. To constitute the crime charged, four.
- 1	

Five is, a specific intent. Six is, general intent. Seven is, attempt murder. Eight is, expressed malice. Nine is, battery means. 10 is, you are instructed. 11 is, a deadly weapon. 12 -- do you want, the State is not required to have recovered the deadly weapon?

MR. BROOKS: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: 13, you are instructed if you find the Defendant guilty of the crime of battery. 14 is -- or 15, I can't remember what we're on. Substantial bodily harm. And then next is the flight, which we'll talk about in one moment. It is a constitutional right of a defendant. The Defendant is presumed innocent. You are to determine whether or not the Defendant is guilty. The evidence which you are to consider. The Tavares instruction is next. The credibility or believability of a witness. The fact that a witness has been convicted of a felony.

The commonsense instruction. Subject of punishment instruction. Deliberation -- during the course of the trial or deliberations you are not to. I'm going to change this one just a little bit, guys, because this gets confusing and I'm going to use the stock one, which I would -- I'm going to ask the State to put in their stock because this confuses them when they say, you're not allowed to communicate with anyone in any way regarding the case. There's an instruction, and I'll email it to each of you right now, that says, other than your fellow jurors. So, yeah.

When you retire to consider your verdict. Foreperson. If during your deliberations you should decide to be further informed. And now you'll listen to arguments of counsel.

And then we have the verdict form. We have battery with use of a deadly weapon resulting is SBH. And then attempt murder with use of a deadly weapon. All right. Minus the argument on the flight instruction, do you have any objections to the instructions as just read by the Court, Mr. Margolis?

MR. MARGOLIS: No, Your Honor. I do not.

THE COURT: And have you had an opportunity to look at the verdict form, which I will add to Count A and Count B? So, okay. I've added Count A and Count B. All right.

Flight, Mr. Margolis, your opening regards to why it shouldn't be given?

MR. MARGOLIS: I mean, I don't believe we've heard a whole lot of testimony about flight. We saw a lot of surveillance video of a guy purported to be Mr. Young walking around. We had one witness testify, honestly it seemed kind of off the cuff that, oh, and there's he's looking over his shoulder because he's clearly looking to see if somebody followed him. I should have objected and jumped, but I didn't because I kind of wanted to talk about it in closing more and just say, really.

So every time someone looks over their shoulder their obviously fleeing the scene of a crime. I'm a paranoid android, I look over -- I got my head on a swivel all the time, it doesn't mean I'm fleeing from a crime. And that's literally the only thing that I can remember specifically hearing about fleeing from the crime.

Now today we heard a little about going into the Cosmo and coming out of the Cosmo, okay. And Mr. Reed [phonetic] was the

Cosmo guy and honestly Mr. Brooks told me if I asked him one question he'd talk for 10 minutes, so I really didn't want to ask him a question. But he said something along the lines of he went into the Cosmo, and he conducted no business. I didn't know that it was like indicative of criminal activity to go into a building and not conduct business there. I'd also point out that Mr. Young appeared to get a water from a cocktail waitress, so maybe he did conduct some business. But those are the two pieces of testimony that I specifically recall relating to Mr. Young fleeing.

Mr. -- or Detective Byrd also tied a nice little bow on it today where he said that, you know, you can see him on I believe it was the Cosmo camera go out some double doors, stop like right in between here and the outer doors, see that there's still like police activity in front of the Paris and then go back in. That I would also characterize as testimony indicative of trying to fit that flight in. But, I mean, those are three very discrete pieces of evidence amongst -- I mean, it wasn't in my opinion testified to in such a way that flight was proven or was demonstrated really. I mean --

THE COURT: What would be your argument thought to -- I mean, we can all agree right that he doesn't stay on the scene, right?

THE COURT: That happens and then he, you know, walks away. I don't -- you -- he's definitely not running. I would say he's walking at a quick pace --

MR. MARGOLIS: He's -- I mean --

MR. MARGOLIS: Sure.

THE COURT: But -- so what's your argument though? Listen, he didn't stay, he didn't wait to see if the guy was okay, he didn't wait to say to the police this is self-defense, or he came at me or anything like that.

MR. MARGOLIS: Well, seeing as how I'm not admitting that it's him. Why would he stay? Why would anybody there stay? Okay. On the one hand, and I commended Laresha Moore for it on the stand. As much as I didn't want to commend Laresha Moore for anything, I commended her for it because it's true. A guy gets bashed across the head, everybody goes about their business, drinking, smoking, doing whatever they feel. Completely oblivious to the fact that this guy's going to like bleed on this bench if she doesn't call. It's sad. I said it in my opening. It's sad, I feel for him and his mother, you know. And she did the right thing.

But the idea that leaving the scene is indicative of flight, then everybody there -- I understand from the prospective that, oh well, he's the guy. Of course. But my defense is that they haven't proven that he's the guy. They've proven that some big bald black dude is walking around. That's my argument. They haven't proven that he's the guy, so how can they prove he's fleeing.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Brooks. On behalf of State.

MR. BROOKS: The flight -- the man in video in the gray, whoever that might be who leaves the incident, because an incident occurs where a man gets hit in the head with a rock by that guy in gray and then that gray -- guy in gray walks away.

Now I can go into detail about he walks away, but that's the flight is that person. Now if Mr. Margolis wants to say, yeah. That guy who did it. Because in opening I think I remember him saying, yeah.

This guy was hit. Robert Will was hit --

MR. MARGOLIS: 1 did.

MR. BROOKS: -- it just wasn't Andrew Young, that's fine.

But now I guess I'm confused because the man who hit walks away at the Cosmo -- into the Cosmo, does nothing in the Cosmo, but goes out, peeks, back in. Now if we're going to say -- if he wants to argue that's not Mr. Andrew Young, I have no doubt that he's going to argue that and that's fine, but the person who did the hitting flees. Now he might not run, he might not get in a car, but he leaves the scene.

THE COURT: I think he's arguing both that that guy isn't Mr. Young and that that guy even though he's not Mr. Young, he didn't flee, right? So --

MR. MARGOLIS: Agreed.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. MARGOLIS: Agree. I don't want to foreclose either one of those. I mean, the primary theme is it's not Mr. Young.

THE COURT: Of course.

MR. MARGOLIS: But ultimately even if the guy in the shirt that hits Mr. Will, I mean, is walking away and admittedly maybe in a slightly more rapid pace, but I probably walk faster than that. I'm a fast walker. But I don't know. I mean, flight to me is like (indiscernible), right? I mean --

THE COURT: Yeah. I mean, I think flight can be vary in degree, right? Like we see all the time like drive by shooting and then someone drives off.

MR. MARGOLIS: Right.

THE COURT: Or you've seen a knifing, and someone gets in a car or runs off. But I think that the -- I don't think that the State has to meet this evidentiary bar for a flight instruction to come in. I think they have to show someone was there and then after the crime someone left. And then I think that there has been certain pieces of evidence as well as videotape that we see.

Now what weight the jurors choose to give, how fast was this individual walking. Did the individual look over their shoulder? Are they looking over the shoulder because that's what they do or are they looking over the shoulder because something just happened and they're trying to see if they got caught? Do they peek out the doors to see what's going on? Those are all things that I think that the jury can take into consideration, but I think that the State has definitely met -- excuse me. Has definitely displayed enough evidence to argue to the jury that the flight instruction more than appropriate.

So your -- or excuse me. Your objection's noted for the record, but overruled. It's going to come in. And then -- so guys, I don't have the -- like the mere presence you want --

MR. MARGOLIS: I'll find it, hold on.

THE COURT: Okay. And then I can just type it in and add it. MR. MARGOLIS: Okay. This is the Model 9th Circuit one, is

1	that okay?
2	THE COURT: Well, just read it to me.
3	MR. MARGOLIS: All right. Mere presence. Mere presence at
4	the scene of a crime or mere knowledge that a crime is being committed
5	is not sufficient to establish that the defendant committed the crime, and
6	then you specify the crime.
7	THE COURT: Right.
8	MR. MARGOLIS: The defendant must be a participant and
9	not merely a knowing spectator. The defendant's presence may be
10	considered by the jury along with other evidence in the case.
11	THE COURT: So let me ask you a question.
12	MR. MARGOLIS: Uh-huh.
13	THE COURT: Because your position is that Mr. Young wasn't
14	there
15	MR. MARGOLIS: Sure.
16	THE COURT: right?
17	MR. MARGOLIS: Sure.
18	THE COURT: So the relevance of the mere presence is when
19	my guy is there, he's just not an active participant.
20	MR. MARGOLIS: Exactly right.
21	THE COURT: So how do those two things come together?
22	MR. MARGOLIS: Because you can they're I mean, I tried
23	to argue about the videos discretely on that evening and that time period
24	vis-a-vis the Tavares ones for identification purposes.
25	THE COURT: Right.

1	MR. MARGOLIS: And if they believe that those are the same
2	person, which obviously I really would prefer they didn't. But if they do,
3	can they still believe that they have evidence sufficient that places him
4	there, as in, in the vicinity but not actually seeing the altercation well
5	enough to indicate that he's the active participant. Do you think I'm
6	gilding the lily too far? I can tell by your
7	THE COURT: No.
8	MR. MARGOLIS: But I'm trying to have it both ways to the
9	degree I'm able.
10	THE COURT: Understood. State?
11	MR. BROOKS: No objection.
12	THE COURT: Okay.
13	MR. BROOKS: I mean, if you if Mr. Margolis wants you
14	can theoretically craft some way to add it to the flight, so that you
15	know, I mean, if you're just merely there or if you flee, I don't care
16	THE COURT: Let's just I can read them back to back, but
17	MR. BROOKS: Yeah. Let's put it back to back.
18	THE COURT: let's have them be two second. May I have
19	your phone to read it though, so I can type it out?
20	MR. MARGOLIS: Yeah, of course. I'm sorry. Yeah.
21	THE COURT: No. That's okay. I'm a pretty quick
22	MR. MARGOLIS: I thought you were just feverishly typing as
23	I was speaking.
24	THE COURT: I'm a pretty quick typer, but I'm not that quick.
25	Okay. Thank you.

- 1	
1	MR. MARGOLIS: Yeah.
2	THE CLERK: Are we off the record now, Your Honor?
3	THE COURT: Yes, we are.
4	THE CLERK: Thank you.
5	[Recess taken from 11:07 a.m. to 11:58 a.m.]
6	[Outside the presence of the jury]
7	THE CLERK: We're on the record, Your Honor.
8	THE COURT: All right. We're back on the record in State of
9	Nevada v. Andrew Young, C-350623. Mr. Young is present in custody
10	with Mr. Margolis. Both of the district attorneys, Ms. Sullivan as well as
11	Mr. Brooks are present on behalf of the State.
12	All right. Mr. Brooks, have you received a full and complete
13	copy of the instructions that are to be given to the jury?
14	MR. BROOKS: Yes, Judge.
15	THE COURT: And have you had the opportunity to review
16	those?
17	MR. BROOKS: Yes, Judge.
18	THE COURT: Do you believe those to be a full and correct
19	copy of the law that the jury should receive in this case?
20	MR. BROOKS: Yes, Judge.
21	THE COURT: Have you also had the opportunity to look at
22	the verdict form?
23	MR. BROOKS: Yes, Judge.
24	THE COURT: And does that appear to be a fair and accurate
25	and correct copy of the verdict form that should go forth to the jury?

1	MR. BROOKS: Yes, Judge.
2	THE COURT: Any objections to the jury instructions as they
3	are now?
4	MR. BROOKS: No, Judge.
5	THE COURT: Mr. Margolis, have you had the opportunity to
6	read the instructions go through the instructions to the jury?
7	MR. MARGOLIS: I have, Your Honor.
8	THE COURT: Besides the objection that you had in regards
9	to flight, do you have any further objections?
10	MR. MARGOLIS: No. I do not.
11	THE COURT: Do you believe this to be a fair, accurate, and
12	complete copy of the law that should be given to the jury in regard to
13	this case?
14	MR. MARGOLIS: Yes, I do.
15	THE COURT: And have you had the opportunity to look at
16	the verdict form?
17	MR. MARGOLIS: I have.
18	THE COURT: Do you believe that to be a fair and accurate
19	form that should go forth to the jury in regards to the proper verdicts?
20	MR. MARGOLIS: I do.
21	THE COURT: All right. That should be it guys. So I will read
22	these and then we'll go into argument.
23	We're good. Bring them in please. Thank you.
24	THE MARSHAL: All rise.
25	[Jury in at 12:00 p.m.]
l	

THE COURT: All right. Thank you everybody. Welcome back. Please be seated. We are on the record in State of Nevada v. Andrew Young, C-350623. Mr. Young is present with Mr. Margolis. Both deputy district attorneys Mr. Brooks as well as Ms. Sullivan are present on behalf of the State.

So ladies and gentlemen, when you sat down there is a copy of the instructions to the jury. These will go back to you -- back with you in the jury deliberation room. So you'll have these to consult with and go through with one another, if you need further direction on the law that applies to the facts of this case, okay. You can also write on them and take notes on them if need be. I'm sure counsel at some point or another may point to the jury instructions as well.

I will now go through them and read them to you, but just keep in mind, you'll have the opportunity to read them fully in the back if you choose to, okay. Instructions to the jury instructions.

Instruction number 1. Members of the jury, it is now by duty as judge to instruct you in the law that applies to this case. It is your duty as jurors to follow these instructions and to apply the rules of law to the facts as you find them from the evidence. You must not be concerned with the wisdom with any rule of law stated in these instructions, regardless of any opinion you may have as to what the law ought to be. It will be a violation of your oath to base a verdict upon any other view of the law than that given in the instructions of the Court.

Number 2. If in these instructions, any rule, direction or idea is repeated or stated in different ways, no emphasis thereon is intended

by me, and none may be inferred by you. For that reason, you are not to single out any certain sentence or any individual point or instruction and ignore the others, but you are to consider all the instructions as a whole and regard each in the light of all of the others. The order in which the instructions are given has no significance as to their relative importance.

Number 3. A third amendment superseding indictment is but a formal method of accusing a person of a crime and is not of itself any evidence of his guilt. In this case, it is charged in the third amended superseding indictment that on or about July 26th of 2020, the Defendant committed the offenses of battery with use of a deadly weapon resulting in substantial bodily harm, and attempt murder with use of a deadly weapon.

Count A is battery with use of a deadly weapon resulting in substantial bodily harm. Did willfully, unlawfully, feloniously use force or violence upon the person of another to wit Robert Will with use of a deadly weapon to wit a rock by striking the said Robert Will on the head with said rock, resulting in substantial bodily harm to Robert Will.

Count B, attempt murder with use of a deadly weapon. Did willfully, unlawfully, feloniously and with malice aforethought, attempt to kill Robert Will, a human being with use of a deadly weapon, to wit a rock, by striking the said Robert Will on the head with the said rock.

It is the duty of the jurors to apply the rules of law contained in these instructions to the facts of the case and determine whether or not the Defendant is guilty of one or more of the offenses charged. Each charge and the evidence pertaining to it should be considered

separately. The fact that you may find the Defendant guilty or not as to one of the offenses charged should not control your verdict as to any of the other offenses charge.

Number 4. To constitute the crime charged there must exist in union or joint operation of an act forbidden by law and an intent to do the act. The intent with which an act is done is shown by the facts and circumstances surrounding the case. Do not confuse intent with motive. Motive is what prompts a person to act; intent refers only to the state of mind with which the act is done. Motive is not an element of the crime charged, and the State is not required to prove a motive on the part of the Defendant in order to convict. However, you may consider evidence of a motive or lack of motive as a circumstance in the case.

Number 5. A specific intent as the term implies, means more than a general intent to commit the act. To establish specific intent, the State must prove that the Defendant knowingly did the act, which the law forbids, purposefully intending to violate the law. And act is knowingly done if done voluntarily and intentionally, and not because of mistake or accident or other innocent reason. The intention may be inferred from the Defendant's conduct under the circumstances. You are instructed that attempt murder with use of a deadly weapon is a specific intent crime.

Number 6. General intent is the intent to do that which the law prohibits. It is not necessary for the prosecution to prove that the Defendant intended the precise harm or the precise result, which eventuated if a crime is a general intent crime.

As used in these instructions, the term willful means an act done intentionally, not accidentally. The word willfully does not require any intent to violate law or to injure another or to acquire any advantage. You are instructed that battery with use of a deadly weapon resulting in substantial bodily harm is a general intent crime.

Number 7. Attempted murder is the performance of an act or acts which tend, but fail, to kill a human being. When such acts are done with express malice, namely with the deliberate intention unlawfully to kill. It is not necessary to prove the element of premeditation and deliberation in order to prove attempt murder.

Number 8. Express malice means an evil intent to injure another person and may be inferred from an act done in willful disregard of the rights of another or an act wrongfully done without just cause or excuse, or an act or omission of duty betraying a willful disregard of social duty.

Number 9. Battery means any willful and unlawfully use of force or violence upon a person of another. If that force is accomplished with use of a deadly weapon, the person is guilty of battery with use of a deadly weapon. If that force results in substantial bodily harm to the victim, the person is guilty of battery resulting in substantial bodily harm. If that force is accomplished with use of a deadly weapon with substantial bodily harm results to the victim, the person is guilty of battery with use of a deadly weapon resulting in substantial bodily harm.

Number 10. You are instructed, if you find the Defendant guilty of attempt murder and/or battery, you must also determine

whether or not a deadly weapon was used in the commission of this crime. If you find beyond a reasonable doubt that the Defendant committed attempt murder and/or battery with use of a deadly weapon, then you are instructed that the verdict reflecting with use of a deadly weapon is the appropriate verdict.

If however you find that a deadly weapon was not used in the commission of the crimes, then you are instructed that the verdict reflecting that no weapon was used is the appropriate verdict.

Number 11. As used in these instructions a deadly weapons means; 1) any instrument, which if used in the ordinary manner, contemplated by its design and construction will or is likely to cause substantial bodily harm or death, or; 2) any weapon, device, instrument, material, or substance switch under the circumstances is -- in which it is used, attempted to be used or threatened to be used is readily capable of causing substantial bodily harm or death.

Number 12. The State is not required to have recovered the deadly weapon used in an alleged crime or to produce the deadly weapon in court at trial to establish that a deadly weapon was used in the commission of that crime.

Number 13. You are instructed that if you find the Defendant guilty of the crime of battery you must also determine whether or not substantial body harm resulted. If you find beyond reasonable doubt that a deadly weapon was used in the commission of the crime of battery and that substantial bodily harm did result, then you are instructed that a verdict of battery with use of a deadly weapon resulting

in substantial bodily harm is the appropriate verdict. If however, you find that a deadly weapon was used in the commission of the battery and that substantial bodily harm did not result, then you are instructed that the verdict of battery with a deadly weapon is the appropriate verdict.

If however, you find that a deadly weapon was not used in the commission of the battery, but that substantial bodily harm did result, then you are instructed that the verdict of battery with substantial bodily harm is the appropriate verdict. If however, you find that a deadly weapon was not used in the commission of the battery and that substantial bodily harm did not result, but you find that the battery was committed, then you are instructed that the verdict of battery is appropriate verdict.

Number 14. As you see in these instructions substantial bodily harm means; 1) bodily injury, which creates a substantial risk of death, or which causes serious permanent disfigurement or protracted loss or impairment of function of any bodily member or organ, or; 2) prolonged physical pain. Prolonged physical pain necessarily encompasses some physical suffering or injury that lasted longer than the pain immediately resulting from the wrongful act.

Number 15. The flight of a person after the commission of a crime is not sufficient in itself to establish guilt. However, if flight is proved, it is circumstantial evidence in determining guilt or innocence. The essence of flight embodies the idea of deliberately going away with consciousness of guilt and for the purpose of avoiding apprehension or

prosecution. The weight to which such circumstance is entitled is a matter for the jury to determine.

Number 16. Mere presence at the scene of the crime or mere knowledge that a crime is being committed is not sufficient to establish that the Defendant committed the crime of attempt murder with use of a deadly weapon and/or battery with substantial bodily harm with use of a deadly weapon. The Defendant must be a participant and not merely a knowing spectator. The Defendant's presence may be considered by the jury, along with other evidence in the case.

Number 17. It is a constitutional right of a Defendant in a criminal trial that he may not be compelled to testify. Thus, the decision as to whether he should testify is left with the Defendant on the advice and counsel of his attorney. You must not draw any inference or guilt from the fact he does not testify, nor should this fact be discussed by you or enter into your deliberations in any way.

Number 18. The Defendant is presumed innocent until the contrary is proved. This presumption places upon the State, the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt every element of the crime charged and that the Defendant is the person who committed the offense. A reasonable doubt is one based on reason. It is not mere possible doubt but is such a doubt as would govern or control a person in the more weighty affairs of life. If the minds of the jurors after the entire comparison and consideration of all the evidence are in such a condition that they can say that they feel an abiding conviction of the truth of the charge, there is not a reasonable doubt. Doubt to be

reasonable must be actual, not mere possibility or speculation.

If you have a reasonable doubt as to the guilt of the Defendant, he is entitled to a verdict of not guilty.

19. You are going to determine whether or not the Defendant is guilty from the evidence in this case. You are not called upon to return a verdict as to the guilt of any other person. So if the evidence in the case convinces you beyond a reasonable doubt of the guilt of the Defendant, you should so find, even though you may believe one or more persons are also guilty.

Number 20. The evidence which you are to consider in this case consist of the testimony of the witnesses, the exhibits, and any facts admitted or agreed to by counsel. There are two types of evidence, direct and circumstantial. Direct evidence is the testimony of a person who claims to have personal knowledge of the commission of the crime, which has been charged such as an eyewitness. Circumstantial evidence is the proof of a chain of facts and circumstances, which tend to show whether the Defendant is guilty or not guilty. The law makes no distinction between the weight to be given either direct or circumstantial evidence. Therefore, all of the evidence in the case, including the circumstantial evidence should be considered by you in arriving at your verdict.

Statements, arguments and opinions of counsel are not evidence in the case. However, if the attorneys stipulate to the existence of a fact, you must accept the stipulation as evidence and regard that fact as proven. You must not speculate to be true any insinuations

suggested by a question, asked a witness. A question is not evidence and may be considered only as it applies meaning to the answer. You must disregard any evidence to which an objection was sustained by the Court and any evidence ordered stricken by the Court. Anything you may have seen or heard outside the courtroom is not evidence and must also be disregarded.

- 21. Evidence such as video surveillance and photographs of the Defendant other than that for which he is on trial, if believed, was not received and may not be considered by you to prove that he is a person of bad character, or to prove that he has a disposition to commit crimes. Such evidence was received and may be considered by you only for the limited purpose of proving the Defendant's identity, appearance and/or likeness during the summer of 2020. You must weigh this evidence in the same manner as you do all other evidence in the case.
- 22. The credibility or believability of a witness should be determined by his manner upon the stand, his relationship to the parties, his fears, motives, interests, or feelings, his opportunity to observe the matter to which he testified, the reasonableness of his statements at the strength or weakness of his recollections. If you believe that a witness has lied about any material fact in the case, you may disregard the entire testimony of that witness or any portion of his testimony, which is not proved by other evidence.
- 23. The fact that a witness has been convicted of a felony, if such be a fact, may be considered by you only for the purpose of determining the credibility of that witness. The fact that such a

conviction does not necessarily destroy or impair the witness's credibility. It is one of the circumstances that you may take into consideration in weighing the testimony of such a witness.

24. Although you are to consider only the evidence in the case in reaching a verdict, you must bring to the consideration of the evidence, your everyday common sense and judgment as reasonable men and women. Thus, you are not limited solely to what you see and hear as the witnesses testify. You may draw reasonable inferences from the evidence which you feel are justified in the light of common experience, keeping in mind that such inferences should not be based on speculation or guess.

A verdict may never be influenced by sympathy, prejudice, or public opinion. Your decision should be the product of sincere judgment and sound discretion in accordance with these rules of law.

25. In your deliberation you may not discuss or consider the subject of punishment as that is a matter which lies solely with the Court. Your duty is confined to the determination of the guilt or innocence of the Defendant.

Number 26. During your deliberations you are not to communicate with anyone other than your fellow jurors in the jury deliberation room, in any matter regarding the facts and circumstances of this case or its merits either by phone, email, text messaging, internet, or other means. You are admonished not to read, watch or listen to any news or media accounts or commentary about the case. You are not permitted to do any independent research, such as consulting

dictionaries, using the internet or any other reference materials. You are further admonished to not conduct any investigation, test a theory of the case, recreate any aspect of the case or in any other way investigate, or learn about the case on your own.

27. When you retire to consider your verdict, you must select one of your members to act as foreperson who will preside over your deliberation and will be your spokesperson here in court. During your deliberation you will have all of the exhibits, which are admitted into evidence, these written instructions and forms of verdicts, which have been prepared for your convenience and your verdict must be unanimous. As soon as you have agreed upon a verdict, have it signed and dated by your foreperson and then return with it to this courtroom.

Number 28. If during your deliberation you should desire to be further informed on any point of law or hear again portions of the testimony, you must reduce your request to writing signed by the foreperson. The officer will then return you to court where the information sought will be given to you in the presence of an after notice to the district attorney and the Defendant and his counsel.

Playbacks of testimony are time consuming and are not encouraged unless you deem it a necessity. Should you require a playback you must carefully describe the testimony to be read back so that the court reporter can arrange her notes. Remember, the Court is not at liberty to supplement the evidence.

Now you will listen to the arguments of counsel who will endeavor to aid you to reach a proper verdict by refreshing in your

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

it.

minds, the evidence and by showing the application thereof to the law. But whatever counsel may say, you will bear in mind that it is your duty to be governed in your deliberation by the evidence as you understand it and remember it to be, and by the law as given to you in these instructions with the sole, fixed and steadfast purpose of doing equal and exact justice between the Defendant and the State of Nevada. Given by District Court Judge Jacqueline M. Bluth.

State, you are ready to give your opening?

MS. SULLIVAN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Your opening close is rather how I should say

STATE'S CLOSING ARGUMENTS

MS. SULLIVAN: You're all here because on July 26th, 2020, around 12:40 a.m. at this bus stop in front of the Paris hotel, the Defendant Andrew Young, approached Robert Will sitting at this bench and beat him over the head with a rock. You just heard the instructions from the Judge. And I want to break them down a little bit for you. I know you've heard a lot about attempt murder, battery, things like that. I want to sort of explain a little bit what that means.

So let's start with the attempt murder. Attempt murder is the performance of an act or acts which tend, but fail, to kill a human being. Now when such acts are done with express malice, namely with the deliberate intention unlawfully to kill. This is what attempt murder means. And you saw on the video several times, the Defendant approached the victim and hit him over the head with a rock. That's

what we're talking about here. That's the act that the Defendant did in which he attempted to kill Robert Will.

For attempt murder it's important to note that it's not necessary for the State to prove any premeditation or deliberation in order to prove that the Defendant tried to kill Robert Will.

Express malice is an evil intent to injure another person.

Now you're hearing a lot of evil intent, deliberate intent. Let's sort of break down the intent requirement for attempt murder. Attempt murder as you were told is a specific intent crime. So what is specific intent? It means that the Defendant knowingly did the act, which the law forbids. That they were purposefully intending to violate the law. It's something done voluntarily, intentionally, it's not a mistake, not an accident, and it's not some other innocent reason. Sounds like something that happens on the inside, right?

So how do we know what someone's intent is? And the law tells you, it's a question of fact that you can infer from the Defendant's conduct and all other evidence disclosed in the case. So you can look at the Defendant's actions and determine what his intent was when he committed certain acts.

[Whereupon, a video recording was played in open court at 12:16 p.m., and not transcribed]

MS. SULLIVAN: This is the first encounter in front of the Paris hotel. This is where you can see the Defendant's in front of the bus stop near the street. And he walks around behind the bus stop. He follows the black line on the screen. And at that point, we have an initial

encounter with the victim, Robert Will. You can see the Defendant standing behind him. At one point, he leans over and shoves him sitting on the bus stop. Here's where he shoves him. And now you can see at 12:37, the Defendant starting to walk away.

And this interaction is important because it goes to the Defendant's intent, because as we've seen at 12:44 a.m., the Defendant starts to come back. And you can see him in this video. Look at the pace he's walking. He's walking with a purpose. He's walking directly in one straight path, back to the bus stop. You can see him appear here in this video. He is specifically walking towards this bus stop, and you see him approach from behind. He gets right behind Robert Will sitting at that bus stop and you can see him in the circle here on the screen. And I want you to pay attention. I know you've seen it quite a few times, when he hits Robert Will. There's no additional interaction. It's immediate. He walks directly behind him and immediately strikes Robert Will. And there's that first strike. But it doesn't stop there. You can see here; Robert gets up from the bench. There's some more verbal interaction between the two and the Defendant hits the victim two more times in the head before he walks away.

I want you to think about that. From behind, Robert sitting on the bench and the Defendant immediately comes strikes in the head. Now that's really important. Because think about it. We've all ridden a bike, played a sport. You wear a helmet to protect your head because it's something very vulnerable on your body. If you get hit in the head that causes a lot of damage. And that shows the Defendant's intent

because he didn't hit him in the arm. He didn't hit him in the back, hits him directly in his head.

And if you are to find, as you were instructed that the Defendant did commit attempt murder, you also need to determine if he used a deadly weapon. The deadly weapon we've been talking about is the rock. But first I kind of want to get into what a deadly weapon is. A deadly weapon is any weapon, device, et cetera, which under the circumstances in which it is used is readily capable of causing bodily harm or death. Think about the way the rock was used here. The rock swung quickly with great force right at Robert's head. The rock in this instance is a deadly weapon.

Now you were also instructed that the State's not required to recover the deadly weapon. However, in this case you saw the rock brought to court today. You also saw photographs of the rock behind the bench and the rock in Officer Shin's hand. Think of the size of that rock. Think of how much damage could be caused by a rock that size and was caused by a rock that size. Ladies and gentlemen, the rock in this case was a deadly weapon and the Defendant has committed attempt murder with use of a deadly weapon.

We've also heard that he's charged with battery result -- with use of a deadly weapon resulting in substantial bodily harm. So we kind of want to break that down just so we're kind of clear on what we're talking about. So first we need to show there was a battery, that that battery was committed with a deadly weapon and that substantial bodily harm resulted.

Before I get into sort of what we're talking about, we talked about specific intent with the attempt murder. Battery with use of a deadly weapon resulting in substantial body harm is a general intent crime. So that's different than the specific intent we talked about, the specific intent to try and kill. This general intent, the Defendant just needs to intend to commit the act, intend to hit him with the rock. Very simple and this is different than the intention unlawfully to kill.

So first we'll talk about battery. Battery is using force or violence upon another person. And that force doesn't even need to cause pain or harm. It's just intentional and unwanted touching. I'm going to direct your attention to the video again. This is 12:44. This is when the initial strike occurs. And you can see in this video, and you'll be able to review it, that the Defendant in a downward motion strikes the victim, which causes him to get up. That's a battery, but again, here's that first strike. It doesn't end there because as we know, and as you've seen in this video, the altercation continues behind the bus stop, where you see the Defendant hit the victim two more times. And you can see the victim is now bent over and the Defendant is exiting.

[Video paused at 12:25 p.m.]

MS. SULLIVAN: The video shows that the Defendant battered Robert Will. He struck him. He struck him with a rock. He struck him at least three times. And so I've got into with a deadly weapon. I won't belabor the point. The rock is the deadly weapon we are discussing in this count. Now I want to talk to you about substantial bodily harm because that's also an element. Substantial bodily harm is

bodily injury, which creates a substantial risk of death or causes serious, permanent disfigurement, or protracted laws or impairment of the function of any bodily member or organ, or prolonged physical pain, which just means that it's longer than the immediate pain from the wrongful act.

So I want to draw your attention to a few points. I want to draw your attention to cause a serious, permanent disfigurement. You heard the victim's mom, Gloria come in and testify that he still has a scar on the left side of his head. It's covered with hair now. However, it's still there. She told you it's right here on the left side of his head. That is serious, permanent disfigurement. A scar is enough. However, you also heard more information about the victim. This is Robert Will as he's sitting on the bench. You can see the injury to his head, the blood in the bottom left hand corner dripping down his arm and you can see it going down the left side of his face in the picture on the right hand side.

This is Robert in the hospital. You can see that scar I was talking about on the left side of his head in the photo on the bottom right. And you heard from the victim's mom, she talked to you about his condition prior to, and after the incident. She talked to you about listen, prior to this incident, he could walk, he could talk, he could live on his own. And now she told you he lives in a rehab facility. He can't talk. You heard her say, he doesn't know she's his mom. These are all indicative of the substantial bodily harm caused by the Defendant.

You also heard from Detective Byrd. Detective Byrd told you that in the days following the incident, even though we could see him

sort of communicating with officers on the body cam, he was unable to communicate any information to Detective Byrd. That is substantial bodily harm.

The Defendant committed a battery with use of a deadly weapon resulting in substantial body harm when he hit Robert Will in the head with that rock.

The Judge also talked to you a little bit, there's an instruction in your packet for flight. So I just want to talk a little bit about what flight means. The essence of flight embodies the idea of deliberately going away with consciousness of guilt and for the purpose of avoiding apprehension or prosecution. This is important. This is something like intent. We can only infer this from seeing what the Defendant's actions are following the incident.

So here is the bus stop in front of the Paris. And from all the video surveillance, we see that after the incident, the Defendant walked southbound on Las Vegas Boulevard. As he's walking southbound, he crosses the street towards the Planet Hollywood. And while he's crossing the street towards the Planet Hollywood, we notice in the surveillance video, and you can see the Defendant in that second crosswalk, he's turning around. He's looking back at the Paris. He's looking to see if anyone's following him. And here's a view from the front side. You can see him in that closer crosswalk when his face is turned. And you know his face is turned because you can't see his mask.

He then makes his way up the escalator from -- at the Planet Hollywood to get to that pedestrian bridge. And you can see as he's

walking towards the escalator, he turns again to look back towards the Paris. And it's small, but you'll have an opportunity to review the surveillance back in the jury room. You can see at the bottom of the escalator, you can see his mask, his gray shirt and his mask. He's again, looking back to the Paris.

Then he crosses over the bridge to the other side of the street, away from where this occurred. And we know he enters the Cosmopolitan. But what's important about the Cosmopolitan surveillance video for flight purposes is on the left hand side you can see the Defendant is standing near a statue outside the Cosmopolitan. These were the northeast doors. William Roed testified; these were the northeast doors. He also told you that a person standing near that statue could see across the street to the Paris hotel. Would have a view of the front of the Paris. And you can see the Defendant in that video, leaning over, looking down the street towards the Paris. And not only that, he walks in, back into the Cosmopolitan and stops. He doesn't immediately enter into the Cosmopolitan. He stops and he walks back to the front doors and looks again. He's looking to see if anyone's coming. He's looking to see if there are police at the bus stop. He's checking out the scene he just left.

Now you've heard a lot of different things about the description of the suspect, because we also need to show that Andrew Young is the person who committed these crimes, right? We heard a lot of things. We heard it was a black male, bald, headed southbound on Las Vegas Boulevard in a light colored shirt with black pants. It's the

general description we heard. And you heard Officer Henry say it was a vague description. I drove up and down the street. I didn't -- nobody was flagging me down. I didn't want to just stop a random person. I wanted to make sure I was stopping the right person. And based off this description, there was nobody for me to stop. But what the description does help Metro do is go back through the surveillance video later and find who we're talking about.

Now you heard Francisco Alemar from the Paris talk about how he was able to find where medical responds in the video and sort of backtrack it to the incident. The incident where Andrew Young strikes Robert Will on his head.

Now after that moment, we follow the Defendant. You see on surveillance and Amber Stringer from Fusion Watch told you, the time stamps match up.

[Video resumed at 12:32 p.m.]

MS. SULLIVAN: We follow the Defendant on that same path I showed you in the maps, past the Hexx restaurant towards the Planet Hollywood. Walking southbound on Las Vegas Boulevard. And then here he is crossing the street towards the Planet Hollywood.

And turning around back towards the Paris. And then we pick him up again from the other side of the street crossing that same crosswalk. And again, you can see him turn back and look towards the Paris. And we continue to see his movements through the Planet Hollywood to the Miracle Mile Shops where this escalator goes up to that pedestrian bridge. Where we then pick him up on the pedestrian

bridge headed west towards the Cosmopolitan. And we know he entered the Cosmopolitan because we see him enter and on the Cosmo surveillance, which is the picture on the left, we can pick up his face for the first time and we see the same subject, same clothing items, same shoes.

Now the two photos in the middle and the right those are Andrew Young, and you can see in those two photos he's facing sort of the same direction he is in that surveillance video. And see the same shape of his head, that he's also bald. And then the photo on the right he's wearing the same shirt and the same shorts and has the same jacket and a shopping cart.

But again, how we do really know, right? Well, there's more on this surveillance video. You can see on the Cosmo surveillance on the left and on the right the back of his shirt. That distinct, it was described as buckling or a U, some sort of bend in the shirt that you can see. And in the middle, that's from a -- that's a photo where Andrew Young self-identified himself on July 8th. You can see the same folding, the same U, the same color. And again, we've heard it changes in the light, but you can see it's the same shirt.

What else can we see in this surveillance video? We see the shoes. And on the top in all those surveillance stills you can see the shoes that the suspect is wearing, the Defendant is wearing as he's walking from the Paris through the Cosmo. You also saw a photograph from July 8th where Andrew Young is pictured wearing the same shoe and again on July 29 in video surveillance captured wearing the same

shoes. And you heard Detective Byrd tell you that on August 19th when he was arrested he's wearing those shoes in the bottom left corner, the same shoes. You can see the black stripe. You can see the black on the toe and in certain portions of the video you can see the black on the heel. These are the same shoes; they are Andrew Young's shoes.

Also in the video we've heard a lot of talk about these headphones that Andrew Young wears frequently and you can see in the bigger photo those white buds near the collar of his shirt, those are the headphones we're talking about. And on the right hand side video surveillance showing those white headphones. Now the two photos on the top left and right corners, those are surveillance stills from this incident and you can see underneath his mask and in the V of his shirt, those white headphones. The same white headphones.

We also have the individual's carrying a jacket. This black jacket you can see in all these surveillance stills. This was June 29th, 2020, and this is a video of Andrew Young carrying a black jacket, wearing those same shoes. And he often switches the jacket from the left to the right hand, but you can see he's carrying the jacket. And here you can see the same shoes.

This is July 8th, and you can see Andrew Young entering the elevator carrying that black jacket wearing the same clothing shown throughout the incident at the Paris on July 26th, 2020. And on July 29th, carrying that black jacket.

You see in the surveillance video that individual who strikes the victim at the Paris move from the Paris through the Cosmopolitan.

That is the individual who committed the crimes and that individual as you've seen through surveillance video is Andrew Young. You've seen him wear the same outfit, the same shirt, the same shoes numerous times, carry the same jacket, wear the same headphones.

[Video ended at 12:41 p.m.]

MS. SULLIVAN: And you saw in the picture of him in the Cosmopolitan, bald, same head shape.

Now I want to talk about Laresha Moore. I believe -- I can't remember exactly, but I believe Mr. Margolis characterized Laresha as unreliable. And you saw, she had to be brought here from CCDC. She told you, she didn't want to be here, she didn't want to be involved. She just wanted to call the paramedics. She told you she gave a different name because again, she didn't want to be involved. She just wanted to make sure the paramedics came for the victim and move on.

But what else did Laresha tell you? What else can -- did Laresha tell you that can be corroborated through the video surveillance? She told you on the 911 call, there's a black male walking south towards the Cosmopolitan. And she told you on the stand she was only two to three feet away from the incident. She told you that the guy was missing teeth. She said something to the effect of his mouth was jacked up, he had bad dental. And the word I believe she used was cocked eyed. We've heard lazy eye, things like that.

This is Andrew Young, and you can see his mouth is visible under his -- above his mask and you can see he's missing teeth. You can see in this photograph a view of his eyes. And not only that, in April of

2021 almost a year after the incident Laresha picked Andrew Young out of a line up. She told the detective this is who it was.

Ladies and gentlemen, you've reviewed the video surveillance in this case, you've heard all the testimony, seen all the evidence. The State has proven beyond a reasonable doubt that the Defendant Andrew Young is the individual who struck Robert Will on the head with a rock on July 26th, 2020.

And so at the end of this case I'm asking that you return a verdict of guilty for attempt murder with use of a deadly weapon and guilty for battery with use of a deadly weapon resulting in substantial bodily harm.

THE COURT: Mr. Margolis, whenever you're ready, sir.

<u>DEFENDANT CLOSING ARGUMENT</u>

MR. MARGOLIS: Thank you. All right. Last time I'm going to talk to you. I'm sure you are thrilled, and I am too. So I told you at the start of this trial they had the wrong guy, okay. I represent Andrew Young. He is a black bald man, this much is true, okay. But in order to convict him of these serious crimes we're going to need the State to prove his guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. And you guys are the finders of fact, I'm going to ask you to put their feet to the fire and ensure that this happens.

They've showed you hours upon hours, I mean, most of the time we spent in court over the course of the last three days has been watching surveillance video and still images taken from that surveillance video of a man purported to be the perpetrator of this crime walking up

and down Las Vegas Boulevard, in and out of the Cosmopolitan, in and out of this place and that place. Even if for the sake of argument you believe that that is Andrew Young, then you've seen a lot of footage of Andrew Young walking up and down Las Vegas Boulevard and into and out of locations, that's not against the law. So you know, specifically, the most important of all of the video footage that we saw, the most important of all the surveillance video that we were shown is what purports to show the actual attack on Mr. Will.

Mr. Will was hit -- I told you in the very beginning in opening Mr. Will was hit and a crime was committed, okay. But proof beyond a reasonable doubt requires every single element of every single offense charged to be proven and that includes the identity of the perpetrator.

And we've traced a lot of lines on a lot of videos, okay.

Every time I watch the video of that attack and I've watched it ad nauseum and I'm sure you're going to watch it a few more times before you render a verdict. I'm thinking of Dave Matthews band as the ants marching, I can't see, okay. I can't see. I can see two figures. I can see two figures. I see Mr. Will get off of the bench. Certainly seems to be in response to something done to him. There's an exchange.

When Detective Byrd was on the stand I particularly asked, did we capture every single step. Every single image from the time of the strike or strikes, the last strike throughout. And he admitted, probably not every step. There are holes here. The State has not proven this case beyond a reasonable doubt. They showed you a lot of video of

a black man purported to be the perpetrator of this crime walking about, because that's all they had.

They called Laresha Moore to the stand despite the fact that she was in jail getup to testify, despite the fact that she'd given a false name, despite the fact that she lied to law enforcement officers. Pardon my inability to speak. You know, captured enemy combatants provide name, rank and serial number, okay. There are some honesty deficits for Laresha Moore. I also applauded the fact that of all of the people that seem to be inebriated and enjoying themselves and milling about on that street that evening or in the early morning hours, she at least called 911 and sought to get the victim some help. I gave her credit for that, you know, but in terms of trusting the accuracy of her identification, I don't. I don't think you should, okay.

Let's talk about the evidence that was presented. You know, we've heard from police officers, the first ones on the scene. We heard from Officer Henry; I believe he was on the scene inside of five minutes of that attack of Mr. Will, okay. And he told you he had to flip a U-turn I think was his exact testimony, because he couldn't immediately just go south because of the orientation as he approached. But he immediately did. And he searched. He did not find him. Or maybe he did but the description was too vague for him in his judgement as a law enforcement officer to start harassing every bald black guy in Jordan's that he saw because that might be a little bit of a violation of some peoples' rights if he did that. Might also not get him any closer to solving the crime.

You know, Ms. Moore is the only person that saw this, and we know she's a liar, we know she's a felon. We also know she has a decent heart because she wanted to get Mr. Will help. She can't be trusted though. And despite the ample footage we've seen of a man purported to be Mr. Young committing no crimes while walking up and down the street and in and out of the Cosmopolitan, you know. I don't know that you can be convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that they don't have the wrong man because I don't believe it's been proven, and I don't think she can be trusted. She's demonstrated that she can't be trusted.

To her credit on the stand she admitted that she lied, which from my perspective, from our perspective and my defense of Mr. Young that makes it tough. I have to acknowledge. She didn't allow me to impeach her and throw her conviction at her. She owned up. Doesn't make her honest though, the fact that she did here today under oath when transported to the courtroom for the expressed purpose. She's in the custody of the State of Nevada. I'm not surprised that she showed up.

This was a sloppy investigation, mistakes were made. And depending on how your verdict is rendered it's entirely likely that we and specifically Mr. Young, my client, are going to suffer as a result of mistakes that were made that were in no way within his or our control. There might have been evidence that could have secured -- could have been secured, pardon me, that may well have given you more to work with in analyzing what happened. Forensic evidence would probably be

1 helpful here.

l understand that every law enforcement officer that came up here to varying degrees told you, it's Las Vegas Boulevard, we couldn't secure the scene. Come on, it's Las Vegas Boulevard. Party time, midnight, okay. Oh it's a rock. Even if I did do everything right and I bagged and tagged it and I didn't put it on the floorboard of my squad car to roam about the vehicle on the way to the station. Even if I did everything right, if I took it to the lab promptly they'd have told me we can't find anything anyway. Well, that's awfully convenient. From where I'm sitting, I'm not in a position to now challenge that. And you're now in a position where you have to take the word of an admitted liar as the only eyewitness to this crime.

I don't think that's enough. Obviously my orientation is that I'm on one side of this aisle, right. So your opinions are the only ones that matter. You're the finders of fact. You're empowered to say what's what. Whether you can actually see Mr. Will get struck by Mr. Young on that video or collection of videos. I can't see it, they can. Doesn't matter what myself or Mr. Brooks and Mr. Sullivan see. Matters is what you see, okay. And I guess my solemn wish and hope is that you require yourself see it to the degree necessary to give us a fair shake because, I think it's him, or my gut says it's him, or it's probably him. That's not enough.

You know, you're going to have an instruction that's going to tell you exactly what reasonable doubt is and how to appraise the evidence to determine whether or not you've seen proof beyond a

reasonable doubt sufficient to convict him of these crimes. It's going to be up to you and gut instinct, or come on that's the same shirt, or come on look at those white Jordan's with the distinctive black stripe. I mean, what do we know about Nikes, guys? They use a swoosh. I mean, granted logo you step further you've got the little Jordan decal on the back, right. And all that good stuff. Look Nike Jordan shoes are not particularly rarified items of apparel, okay. We had a little joke in the courtroom during the testimony about that. I recall buying my first pair of Jordan's, they weren't white with a black stripe they were black, but beside that, okay. A lot of those shoes out there, okay.

We saw a lot of footage of a guy stalking about. Most of it was of the back of his head or in profile and almost all of it was from a distance farther then many of us would like to make any large bets on what we saw, okay.

Laresha Moore's it. I was standing here; she was sitting there. I asked her, how close were you to this when it happened? She said, two or three feet. It's in their closing because it's accurate. It's directly from the testimony. She was closer to this event than I was to any witness or that I have been to any of you in this courtroom, okay. And her description, I'm sorry, I didn't find it terribly persuasive. There is a coat of a hundred colors put together with all of this surveillance video that shows innocuous footage of a bald black man, you know. But Laresha Moore, she's pretty important. I don't think you can convict my client if you don't believe her, and I don't think you should. They got the wrong man.

Now burden of proof, okay. Defense lawyers are notorious for talking about the burden of proof and reasonable doubt, presumption of innocents. You're the arbiters, okay. But the fact is, and Mr. Brooks admitted this in his opening I believe, I could have sat there doing crossword puzzles, drinking my diet coke and eating my mints. I didn't have to cross-examine any witnesses. I could have not made an opening if I didn't want to. I'm not -- we're not required to do anything. We're not required to prove Mr. Young's innocence. They are required to carry that burden all the way up the hill. And we're presumed innocent. Mr. Young is innocent until you conclude that they've proven every element of the two charges here beyond a reasonable doubt.

So use your power. You're the ones who get to make the call. You'll notice I think there were more than one witness, I said, so that's your play to call. You know, a variation of that kind of theme is like stay in your lane, right.

You know, Officer Shin was very sure on the stand that, you know, even if I did literally make every possible mistake with respect to policy of securing the scene, securing the evidence. Even if I did, wouldn't have gotten anything from the rock. Well, we'll never know, okay. Wouldn't have gotten anything from the trash. Well, we'll never know. Wouldn't have been able to get any shoe prints. Wouldn't have been able to get any other forensic material from the area surrounding that bench, we'll never know. And Mr. Young, the defense can't be punished for that which we can't control, you know.

Proof beyond a reasonable doubt is their burden. They have

the resources. They could have adequately investigated this. A patrol detective could have gone. A crime scene analyst could have gone to the scene. She took the stand, there was very little for me to do. There was very little for me to ask. The one crime scene analyst that was on the State's witness list in this case. Because her role in this case consisted of going to take pictures of the victim Robert Will to demonstrate that he was Robert Will. I would have loved to have had her do a lot of other crime scene analysis that might have told us a lot more about the instrumentalities of the crime, the crime scene itself. Maybe we would have had more evidence if that were the way it went.

It's a heavy burden. You know, I have never gotten to sit in your shoes and I'm never going to get to sit in your shoes in all likelihood at this point given the occupation that I have chosen. I would love to be a fly on the wall in the room, you know. For our part, we will be thrilled. We will be satisfied, elated beyond belief if you painstakingly apply the law to the facts that you have received in evidence here. Whatever the verdict is, if we have gotten a fair shake and you have gone through your paces, we'll feel content with that.

Now I want to talk a little bit about jury instructions. I want to highlight a couple of them. Obviously, you are to follow them all.

Obviously they work with buttress support one another, okay. But there are some that I would imagine are probably pretty significant to the State that they want you to think about in your analysis of the case. And there are contrarily some that I find more important. Specifically if you would turn to instruction number 17.

And I believe instruction 17 in front of you is about the constitutional right of the Defendant not to be compelled to testify. I didn't call any witnesses. It is very natural when the defense doesn't call any witnesses and you see the Defendant sitting next to me. You know, common sense, human curiosity begs the question, what the heck, why isn't this guy up here, right? I can't count the number of times I have heard lay people, even my close friends and family members. My older brother comes to mind immediately.

You know, if someone accused me of a crime, and I didn't do it, I'd immediately stand up and protest my innocence and this, that and the other and if they wanted me to come and give my side I would. And despite the fact that my brother is five years older than me, that expresses a certain naiveté that concerns me okay. It concerns me. And it also displays to me a little bit of a lack of understanding of the justice system and the way that it works, okay.

Any of us that have ever been pulled over for even a traffic offense, and when I was a young man I would speed a lot, you know. And if you've ever been pulled over for a traffic offense and maybe a little bit bigger traffic offense like a Nate Hobbs 110 in a 65 traffic offense, right, that just happened the other day. The officer's going to treat like you're danger to other people because in that instance, in that moment you are, okay. And some people they're able to be impractical and naive. And some people like Mr. Young there, they're not entitled to that luxury. They're not entitled to it. I am. Sometimes I've been painfully aware of how entitled to it I am or how much I get that benefit

and someone else doesn't. You know, part of it by where I grew up, part of it by the occupations I've chosen, you know. But most important part of this for me is, you're not allowed to discuss this, you're not allowed to bandy it about in the way that I think most juries want to. So analyze the evidence that was put in front of you. Analyze the evidence; DNA, forensics, fingerprints, crime scene stuff that wasn't.

Next instruction I want to talk about briefly, 18. Told you in the beginning, I'm not going to change my tune now, you can't change horses midstream. It certainly seems like a crime was committed. Mr. Will was hit with a rock. We've seen the pictures. I saw the ring of staples in his head. He sustained substantial bodily harm, I'm not going to sit here and claim that whatever that is, is not substantial bodily harm, it certainly is, okay. But the presumption and beyond a reasonable doubt means you've got to prove every element. You have to prove that Mr. Young did it, you know. And you're being asked to do that largely based on other evidence identifying and then comparing to the unknown assailant between 12:44, and we'll call it 1:00 o'clock on July 26th.

Pay special attention to that instruction. Like I said before, we think it's him, certainly seems like it's him, I didn't see any other bald black guy, you know. That's not enough. You have to make that determination.

A lot of the videos we saw, they're not from July 26th.

Obviously, we saw footage from the Paris camera. We saw footage from the Fusion Watch camera. And we saw the limited footage from the Cosmopolitan camera. But a lot of the footage you saw, and I would

submit much of the footage that showed a recognizable version of my client Mr. Young's face was other footage from other days, okay. And that was so heavily used again because they can tell you until they're blue in the face that they see Mr. Young strike Mr. Will. I don't see it. And I don't think you should convict Mr. Young if you don't see it. I think it's pretty hard to see. I might be blind, that's fair.

Instruction number 22, I promise I'm almost done. I see the fatigue creeping in. Credibility or believability of a witness. Laresha Moore. I was hoping she'd get up and fight me about every question that I asked, it didn't happen. She acknowledge almost every lie I asked her about, so it wasn't nearly as much fun as I had planned on it being, okay. That being said, if a witness admits to a half dozen lies on the stand, several of them to law enforcement officers, many of them repeated more than once as Detective Byrd told you on the stand today. I mean, you obviously don't get to disregard her credibility entirely, but I'd really like you too. And I don't know a good reason to believe her today when we couldn't necessarily have believed her about this, that and the other thing on that day or that day.

But pay close attention to everything she said on the stand. Is it believable? Did she -- I mean, I'll say this for Ms. Moore, and I don't know the life Ms. Moore leads and I don't know how her daily existence is. I believe she said at some point she may have been homeless as well, so she may have seen somethings on the day to day that I don't. But if I'm two to three feet away from somebody getting bashed over the head with a rock, I'm going to remember an awful lot about that incident,

okay. I remember an awful lot about a lot less traumatic and striking things I see.

So the idea that being two to three feet away she didn't really know if she had a beard or not, she didn't really -- I mean, that's tough for me, okay. We talked a lot about the shirt, was it blue and white, was it gray, was it black, were they pants, were they shorts. I give a lot of folks a pass on that. I don't know that I can give Laresha Moore a pass on that, okay. If I'm two to three feet away, I know what the shirt is. I know what the shoes are. I know whether or not the individual had a beard.

So fine tooth comb. Was she telling the truth? My client's life depends on it. Our case entirely depends upon her telling the truth and you're buying it and your believing it in spite of any lies she might have told. So she's important.

I mean, in sum, they put together a case against Mr. Young. They put it together with almost entirely piecemeal surveillance footage. Footage that admittedly they might not be able to have of you or I. I said in my opening Mr. Young has struggle with homelessness, he's struggled with addiction, you know. The fact that he could be found on public cameras that often is kind of crazy to me. Makes me feel like George Orwell 1984. But realistically he's there to be found because he's homeless.

And Detective Byrd had some familiarity with Mr. Young. He know to recognize -- he had recognized Mr. Young from that flyer, was his testimony. Because he had familiarity with him prior. And I asked

Detective Byrd on the stand, fair to call you the architect of this investigation, you know. I mean if this is an omelet he's the eggs. Laresha Moore might be the milk and cheese, right.

But for Detective Byrd this case doesn't exist. And for a couple days it didn't appear that this case was going to exist, okay. The investigation initially on the scene was drunken bum fight. You know, bless Officer Shin and his youth because it apparently made him infallible in terms of what he knew and did not know. And maybe he's right. Maybe if he had bagged and tagged the rock, maybe if he had taped down the scene, maybe if he had collected the trash that seemingly everyone saw the assailant throw, that could have been fingerprinted. If the rock couldn't have been, maybe that could have been.

I understand that three days later it's in a trash can on Las Vegas Boulevard and all hope is lost. But whose fault is it that all hope is lost? Is it our fault? Is it Mr. Young who gets punished because the investigation was shotty at best? And, you know, credit to the State's witnesses. They didn't hide that things were not done according to protocol. Things were not done the way that they ought to have been done, you know.

And I guess my lasting thought is, you know, I would like to think that on evidence presented to you in this case proof beyond a reasonable doubt is going to be illusive.

MR. BROOKS: Objection, Judge. What defense counsel thinks is irrelevant.

2

THE COURT: Sustained.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MARGOLIS: I'm going to ask you to hold the State to their burden. I'm going to ask you to painstakingly examine every element of the charge defenses. And I'm going to ask you to determine which facts in evidence prove those elements and to have a vigorous discussion about it. And if that happens I'll feel thoroughly satisfied. I will feel that Mr. Young has enjoyed his fair share of justice. The same fair of justice that you, or I, or Mr. Brooks, or Ms. Sullivan would be entitled to. I thank you very kindly for your attention.

THE COURT: Mr. Brooks.

STATE'S REBUTTAL CLOSING ARGUMENT

MR. BROOKS: We're logging in now. So this is one of the weird things, I've never done this before. But one of the first things I'm going to do is explain how to work the disks, because we keep saying oh, you're going to have the videos back there to watch, but no one's told you how to kind of operate them.

So I put some screenshots up there of what it would look like let's say if you put the top one, if you put the Paris surveillance in. And have two options, both of those top ones. That top one that says LVMPD A and B, A is going to be the static camera that is on the leg of the Eiffel tower aiming at the bus stop bench for that hour time period. B is going to be that kind of compilation that you see at 12:44 a.m. of the Defendant starting his come back and going to the bus stop.

And then the ones that say SIU Paris, those two clips are the same. If you notice the 102 right there, is the exact same it just -- they

were both on the disk, so only one of them works now -- or they both work, only one needs to be watched.

What you would do is you double click on the player, so the player icon on either of those, and then another box is going to open up. You are then going to get to choose between LVMPD A, B or SIU Paris. So that's kind of how you do it.

Now as for the Fusion Watch cameras, they're labeled A, B, C, D, E, F, G. That is kind of in order of the time sequence and you can see the name of the various camera.

And then down there at the bottom, that's going to be the Cosmo. You would double click on the player again. That LVMPD assist is going to be the continuous walk all the way through the Cosmo, out and then back through on the bridge.

And then those two 360s, that's going to be that one static camera that had the 360 move capability. One of them is going to be the first time walking through and the other's going to be the next time walk through. That's how you work the disk, if you want to look at them.

Now one of the reasons you're probably sitting there and saying, why do you guys keep showing the video? Because sometimes we know that you guys don't like to go back there and look at it. It's easier on the big screen rather than on the laptop that you guys have, so that's why we keep embedding the video here.

Judge, I think I lost this connection.

THE COURT: Okay. We'll just be at ease for a second until you get that back up.

MR. BROOKS: Now first couple of slides I'm going to show you is kind of that timeline because you kept hearing a lot of stuff about, hey, do we have footage, continuous footage. I'll just show you a few of the still shots from prior to the incident. So prior to the incident we have that 12:09 a.m. of Andrew Young walking towards the Paris. And then -- so he's right about where the arrow would be.

Judge, I think the [indiscernible] kicking me off here.

THE COURT: I don't know if there's anything we can do, is there?

MR. BROOKS: It's saying I'm being kicked off by the moderator.

THE COURT: You're not.

MR. BROOKS: I know, but I just kind of got excited that maybe I could blame you.

The next one is at 12:11 a.m. and that's just Andrew Young continuing to walk.

[Whereupon, a video recording was played in open court at 1:15 p.m., and not transcribed]

MR. BROOKS: Now this is the video of the timeline of walking to the Paris, so from 12:09 and 12:11 there he is, that's the first kind of time that he's picked up on the videos walking to Planet Hollywood. There's Andrew Young there. I'm going to ask you to notice his cadence too. Notice the cadence in the way he walks when he doesn't -- just kind of doesn't have a purpose right here, he's just kind of wondering. So you're going to see that change a little bit later. Just

walking. This is at roughly 12:10 a.m.

Now at 12:36 is the first kind interaction that he has at the bus stop with the people there. And then at 12:30 -- so that's just the first time at the bus stop. And then the second time is when he's walking off. That's 12:37.

Now I just heard, but for Detective Byrd this case doesn't exist. No, no, no, no. But for Andrew Young this case doesn't exist. I kept hearing that today as though he is some architect, like he planned this. No. Detective Byrd doesn't get penalized for knowing who was in the video. Andrew Young is the reason we're here.

You know, I heard Robert Will was hit, that's not in dispute. They've just got the wrong guy. A black guy in the video that's all they have. And then after that was said, if you -- I don't know if you caught it. It was, well, I guess that Laresha. You got Laresha, but I don't trust the accuracy of her identification, I don't think you should. That what was said. What were some other things that were said about Laresha? You just heard she can't be trusted. She lied about her name. She acknowledge every previous lie, you know, that I asked her.

And then you heard this early, this trust but verify. Did you ever think that it was weird how you heard trust but verify two days ago. And then today what did you hear? You heard, yeah. I know she acknowledge every previous lie I said and I'm going to talk about how she lied about her name. But her identification? There was nothing you just heard about when she sat here and told you about that six pack lineup. There's nothing. There was nothing you heard about her lying

about the guy with the jacked up the teeth, the grill, bad dental, the eye. I'm going to pick number two, but I didn't think he had a beard. So that's a photo of Andrew Young that wasn't even one that he had a clean face in. She says, I'm going to pick that one because it looks him, but I don't think he had a beard.

You know, you heard you shouldn't believe her either, it doesn't mean she's honest. What? And then you heard, I don't know if I can give her a pass or not. I don't think that's enough. I don't think you can convict based on her identification. Well, let me be real clear, what Mr. Margolis thinks about that is irrelevant. His thought on whether you can convict based on Laresha Moore is not relevant.

So what was really all that off about her testimony?

Because she lied about her name? Why? You never heard why did you during closing? Well, she told you, I had a warrant out. Oh okay. A year later she identifies Andrew Young in that lineup.

You heard about the first responding officers. I'm not going to sit here and tell you that Officer Shin was some beacon of Metro Police, and he's the best. He's not. Was he malicious? No. There's a reason he's a bike cop right now. There's a reason he's only been on a couple years. There was a difference between him, and then you saw the flex officer, Officer Henry who's a little more advanced. And then you saw Detective Byrd.

So you got to see the three tiers as people go along their career. Nowhere in your instruction is there going to be an instruction about the policies and procedures of Metro. And if you find that

something could have been done differently, then the case go away. It's not there, you're not going to find it.

Now do you notice the instruction there, the State's not required to recover the deadly weapon? Why might that be? There's a public policy reason for it and most of the time it's different than what I'm about to say. Most times it's, you know, a gun. We're sitting here talking about a gun. And what's the first thing you get rid of in a robbery case or a, you know, shooting case? You get rid of the gun. Now what does that tell you though? What's the policy that tells you? That tells you that robbery with use of deadly weapon, or whatever, murder with use of a deadly weapon can still be found even if that guns not found, recovered.

So all that we keep talking about with regard to the rock, could it have been tested? Think about the policy behind that instruction. A verdict can still be rendered on a deadly weapon, on attempt murder with use of a deadly weapon even if this had never been recovered. It was recovered, you can see it, you can hold it. And Mr. Margolis is right, and you heard questioning, would we have liked for it to be done differently? Yes. Could it have it been tested? You heard Detective Byrd, maybe, maybe not, probably not. That doesn't mean that Officer Shin should haven't done that differently.

But if you don't even have to recover it, then you can still look and say, well, yeah. I mean, could the DNA have been tested to one way or the other? But the rock was used, we heard Laresha say it. We see the rock; we see the video. And think about the kind of concept with

DNA or fingerprints. I've been touching that desk for the last couple days, right? Ms. Sullivan's touched the desk. It doesn't tell you when the fingerprint is lifted, when the DNA was taken. It's a rock. It's not your gun that you keep at home, personal kind of property. That's his gun. That's the one he keeps on him. It's a rock.

Now the video gives you a time stamp. So could, and you've heard that Mr. Andrew Young rode the bus. You've seen him get in a taxi. You heard about an incident on the bus with Laresha Moore earlier that day. Could he have been in that bus stop previously? And could he have been there that day walking past? And then his DNA would have been on the rock. It would have told you that he touched the rock. You have video to watch the timeframe.

Now when talking about intent and kind of talking about what has occurred, I want to you look at what the two different parties were doing at roughly 12:44. So let's look at the minute prior to the hit and just notice the difference. So now rather than always watching that hit, I just want you to watch this area, which would be just where the victim's sitting. Just the bench stop -- bus stop. He wasn't doing anything, just sitting there.

Okay. Let's look at what Mr. Andrew Young was doing at 12:44. See the difference in the way he's walking? Now is something in his hand, is it not? Was the rock at the bus stop already? Can't tell. I believe Laresha said the first hit was with his hand and then he picked up the rock at some point and that second and third one when the victim hunches over, that's when essentially the rock was used. And this is

Andrew Young in the minute prior walking right up and delivering the blow.

Let's look at the way in which Mr. Young walks when he's just kind of walking. And this clip won't be back there, I've strung two clips together here. Then you're going to watch the difference in the way he walks when he has this intent, this purpose. This is roughly 12:10 a.m. You see the pace. Look how the stride lengthened, the arm swing lengthened. He doesn't say anything to him when he comes up this same time. As soon as he gets to that bench he delivers the blow.

Now you kept hearing about, hey, I think it was today -- oh one second. Remember when Officer Henry said that he drove after to see if he could get flagged down. I thought that -- we all learned things during the course of trials. That's interesting, you drive down to see if anyone's following to wave. So earlier today I said, let me watch the video from a different angle. I want to watch the video seeing if I can see anything like that. That he was saying, oh sometimes you might get reactions out of other people.

So watch the couple here. I'm going to highlight someone else. I don't want you to watch Andrew Young. Now there's a couple who's just walked out of kind of the screen when the hit occurs. So I have no idea whether they saw it or not, but we're going to watch to see. Mr. Young's walking out of the scene, so he's already hit because it's 12:44. I want you to see the couple right there, keep your eyes on them. Grabs the guys she's with hand. Wasn't holding initially. Watch her walk off to the side and kind of stop right there. What's she looking back

at? Who's coming right now? Okay. Here's another angle of the same couple from just a different video. There's the couple. They're walking southbound. You have no idea, did they hear something, did they see it? But watch. She stops and she looks back. He looks back. Look who just walked by.

Now she's trying to take him the other way. Look what the guys about to turn and look at right and there. Just a random guy in a gray -- they just happened to be looking at that? Maybe, maybe. We have no idea. But now after Officer Henry's testimony, I said, oh, okay. Was there commotion? Did someone see that?

Now earlier today you heard, hey, do we have every single step after this hit? Officer -- Detective Byrd said, no. So what I've done here, and this is not going to back with you because I've taken various video clips and strung them together. Let's if we can trace through the various different video surveillance in the next two clips. So there's Andrew Young, this is the Fusion Watch camera. He's just exiting the screen. There he is entering the crosswalk. Let's switch to the view where we can see his face as he's walking this way. He's entering the crosswalk. He's about midway through. Looks back. Arm swinging in full effect. Jacket hanging. Pace is completely different than when he was going initially.

Okay. Now we pick it up at the Planet Hollywood. Do you see the person in the middle right there about to hit the steps on the top of the screen right now. So now we'd switch to Planet Hollywood because Fusion Watch didn't have one of these angles. Oh look who's in

the middle of the area there, I don't know what it's called, the promenade.

And let's switch to another Planet Hollywood view. There he is going back. Next camera. Passing these two. Passing P.F. Chang's. We're about to approach the walkway where that Chick-fil-A and kind of bigger opening is. Pace isn't quite as fast because we've crossed some distance. Oh let's look back one more time. Still going.

And we are to the point where Planet Hollywood would no longer kind of cover him because he's about to get on the area right where that escalator is. So what do we do? Well, we did Paris, we did some Fusion Watch, we did Planet Hollywood. At this point we move back to Fusion Watch to watch him, sorry, get on that escalator. Takes the ride up the escalator. Let's switch to the view where he starts going to Fusion Watch into Cosmo. Then you heard from Amber Stringer. I lose him. You guys should go check the Cosmo video. And low and behold there we go. And we're entering the Cosmo.

So I mean, I heard that we didn't have every step after the bus stop. I mean, sure, maybe we missed a few. But you can string together almost every single second. The times match. Did you ever think it was weird how he kept asking all these different times and the time stamps, is that accurate? Do it yourself. I did it for you in this compilation, but don't take my word for it, go and do it. I don't know that there isn't every single step covered. You guys go find it because it's -- I just showed it to you.

You heard this question, is there anything unique about

Andrew's clothing. Detective begins his answer and you heard, no, no, no, no, no. I mean on just this date and time. Well, so we're going to confine it to a vacuum. Like is there anything unique about your clothing today right here in this moment? Well, no. But instruction 21. The reason those other angles and photos and videos were shown is because that evidence was received and may be considered by you only for the limited purpose of proving the Defendant's identity, appearance and/or likeness during the summer of 2020.

So that you don't have to just take Detective Byrd's word for it, yeah. I know who that is. Or Detective Liske, yeah. I know who that is. It's so that you can look yourself. So that you can look, oh he was arrested wearing those shoes. Oh yeah, I see. Now I can see the shirt in a different kind of light, and it makes sense why sometimes it looks like this, sometimes it looks like that.

Now you're not going to have these next clips back there. I've taken various videos that you've seen that have been admitted and I just cut them randomly. Just put on after another. You watch this and see if it's a different person to you. Watch the walk. Watch the stature. Watch the movement. I'm just going to randomly choose days and times. Watch the arm swing. Right here as he's approaching that left side of your screen. Look at that rhythmic cadence. Oh It's the exact same as in June. Maybe from the front it'll look different. No, no. Still looks the same. And from the back still. And from the front again.

So this next one it's a shorter compilation of Andrew Young kind of standing. Watch the rhythmic way he moves side to side, the

movement. Look at this. Ready, side to side. Watch, notice the back bend that you've kind of seen previously in other videos. Shape of the head, the body. Side, to side, to side.

[Video ended at 1:36 p.m.]

MR. BROOKS: Now last thing I kind of want to talk about is a lot of times jurors get back there and attempt murder, that's kind of a one that a lot of arguing kind of occurs or this and that. I mean, the battery with substantial -- battery with a deadly weapon resulting in substantial bodily harm, people can get their mind around that because, you know, that's that general intent crime we talked about. The attempt murder, that's the one where, if I were guessing, that's where there's usually some contention.

So sitting here thinking today, you know it's a rock. It's easy when there's a gun or something sharp. But I want to just kind of use some different words just for a second. We keep calling it the rock. A rock is something that I take and skip it across the lake. Throw it. It's a stone. Would that be that same kind of thing? Or let me word it this way, let's pretend someone were -- story of David and Goliath. And David goes and finds a stone and it's a real nice one and he puts it in a sling shot and he's going to shoot it at this massive warrior who's amazing. He's going to fire it across this land and bam it hit him.

Let's say he wouldn't have hit him. You'd be like attempt murder, you just grabbed a little rock and through it via sling shot and you thought it was going to hit that guy and knock him down. That's a bad plan. That's a bad plan. All right. What if Goliath was sitting by the

riverbed and he's sitting there eating his food. And David says, hey guys, I got a different plan. I'm going to take this thing right there; I'm going to walk up from behind him either with it or without and sock him. I'm going to stun him from behind, not going to say anything. And then when he turns around you know what I'm going to do? I'm going to take it and I'm going to crack him in the skull a couple times and then I'm going to walk off. That sounds like a better plan. That's why it's charged as attempt murder with use of deadly weapon. That's why he aimed at the head. That's why that was picked up.

So it really doesn't matter if you think about it, think about it both ways. He either had it in his hand on the first hit and the second and the third. Or he punched him on the first one and then when he threw his food away -- and why did he throw his food away? Because he could. That's why. And then when Robert Will was pissed about that, think about that. He had already had the rock ready to go because at that point in time when the food's getting thrown away, pop, pop to the head. He had already had that. So either he had it when he walked up and delivered the blow to the head, or he had already picked it up after he socked him once and knew that he was going to do it.

He's guilty of attempt murder with use of deadly weapon and battery with a deadly weapon resulting in substantial bodily harm.

Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. I will have my clerk now swear in officers of the Court.

[The Marshal sworn to take charge of the jury]

THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, as you know a criminal jury is comprised of 12 individuals who actually go back into the room and deliberate. Generally we only have two alternates, but because of COVID we have four giving us 16 total jurors. Just because of COVID we've been extra careful with the amount of jurors that we have in case we lost anybody. The juror -- the alternate jurors in this case are Kevin Jeung, Chase Cupo, Samantha Jackson and Tamara --

JUROR 16: Desmarais.

THE COURT: Desmarais. I'm going to get it one of these times. Maybe the third trial I see you in. So this may be the last time that any of us see the four of you in case we don't need you for deliberations. So I just want to sincerely thank you for your time and energy this week and your willingness to serve on a jury. Not only just willingness to serve, but willingness to serve on a jury during a pandemic. I sincerely appreciate that.

We may need you, however, if one of our jurors can't deliberate for several of the reason that could occur, which has happened in a couple of my last trials. So I am going to maintain that admonition that I gave every single time in regards to no independent investigation, no trying to look into it, no talking to anybody about that. That will remain in effect until my jurors have come back with a verdict and we let know. So please don't speak about it with anyone else or do any of the things that I've been asking you not to do. And then as soon as you receive a call from my chambers letting you know that the case has come to a close, at that point in time that is lifted.

We did get lunch for all of you including the alternates. No deliberations can occur though until you guys are done with lunch just because my alternates will be in there. If you guys don't want to stay, of course you're free to go. If you want to grab lunch and go, you can do that. But just make sure that only deliberations happen amongst the 12 of you when you're in the deliberation room.

So that admonition that I've been giving you, for the admonition is for my jurors now. I can't remember, I think it's juror instruction maybe 26 that discusses you still can't do any of those things. The only thing you can do is now talk about the case amongst one another while in the deliberation room, okay.

So I will have Officer Kennis take all of you to the deliberations room. We'll make sure and get you guys your lunch, and you can proceed. Thank you very much.

THE MARSHAL: Make sure you bring all your belongings and the notebooks, please.

[Jury retires to deliberate at 1:42 p.m.]
[Recess taken from 1:42 p.m. to 1:43 p.m.]

THE CLERK: Back on the record, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. We are on the presence outside the jury. I just want to clarify the statement I just said to Ms. Desmarais, it's number 16. When I said maybe I'll see you on the third trial, I'm not talking about any like a third trial. I've already had two trials with Mr. Young --

MR. MARGOLIS: No. You were a prosecutor --

1	THE COURT: But she had
2	MR. MARGOLIS: in one, right. Yeah.
3	THE COURT: if you remember during questions
4	MR. MARGOLIS: Yeah.
5	THE COURT: she had stated that I had she had been on a
6	jury prior of mine and that I had used a preempt
7	MR. MARGOLIS: Right, right.
8	THE COURT: to kick her.
9	MR. MARGOLIS: Yeah.
10	THE COURT: So I just want to make sure it's clear on the
11	record what I was speaking about with her because I just had such a hard
12	time remember how to pronounce her last name. All right, you guys. So
13	make sure we have all your contact information, and we will call you if
14	the jury has a question or a verdict. Please stay within 20 minutes of the
15	courthouse, okay? Thank you.
16	[Recess taken from 1:44 p.m. to 4:32 p.m.]
17	THE COURT RECORDER: On the record, Your Honor.
18	THE COURT: Can we have the Defendant?
19	THE MARSHAL: Yup.
20	THE COURT: Thank you. All right. We are on the record in
21	State of Nevada v. Andrew Young C-350623. Mr. Young is being brought
22	in. We have Mr. Margolis on his behalf. Both deputy district attorneys
23	Ms. Sullivan as well as Mr. Brooks are present on behalf of the State. I
24	am told by the marshal that we have a verdict, so we will bring in the
25	jury now, please.

ŀ	
1	THE MARSHAL: All rise.
2	[Jury in at 4:34 p.m.]
3	THE COURT: All right. Welcome back, everybody. We are
4	on the record in State of Nevada v. Andrew Young C-350623. Mr. Young
5	is present with Mr. Margolis. Both deputy district attorneys Ms. Sullivan
6	as well as Mr. Brooks are present on behalf of the State. Do the parties
7	stipulate to the presence of the jury?
8	MS. SULLIVAN: Yes, Your Honor.
9	MR. MARGOLIS: Yes, Your Honor.
10	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Now has the jury
11	selected a foreperson?
12	JURY: Yes, it has.
13	THE COURT: Okay. Wonderful. And who's the foreperson?
14	Okay, Ms. Moon. Has the jury reached a verdict, ma'am?
15	JURY FOREPERSON: Yes, Your Honor.
16	THE COURT: All right. If you could please just hand over
17	that form, please, to my marshal. And if Mr. Margolis and Mr. Young
18	can please stand. Thank you, sir. All right. And at this point in time I
19	will now have the have Ms. Brown read the verdict out loud, please.
20	<u>VERDICT</u>
21	THE CLERK: District Court Clark County Nevada, State of
22	Nevada, Plaintiff v. Andrew Young, Defendant, case number C-20-
23	350623-1, Department Number 6. Verdict, we the jury in the above
24	entitled case find the Defendant Andrew Young as follows:

Count A, battery with use of a deadly weapon resulting in

25

substantial bodily harm. Guilty of battery with use of a deadly weapon resulting in substantial bodily harm.

Count B, attempt murder with use of a deadly weapon, not guilty.

Dated this 10th day of February, 2022. Signed by the foreperson, Juror Number 5.

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, is this your verdict, as read, so say you one, so say you all?

IN UNISON: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Do either parties wish to have the jury polled?

MR. BROOKS: No, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So Ms. Brown will now record the verdict in the minutes of the court.

So ladies and gentlemen, at this point in time that admonition that I've been reading every time you went to recess, it's now lifted. So you can speak to anyone you want to about the case, but that also means you don't have to speak to anyone if you don't want to about the case.

I can tell you that as a previous attorney that did trials, it was incredibly helpful for me to be able to speak to the jurors to know, hey, this is what I did right, and this is what worked, and this is what I did wrong, and this didn't work. Everyone who is in here as attorneys are trial attorneys, they're in this courtroom every week trying multiple cases a year, so it's very helpful to them to be able to hear from you. But that's

completely up to you.

Just like I was expressing my sentiments to the alternates before the break, before you guys went back to deliberate, I can't thank you enough for your willingness to serve on a jury especially during a pandemic. It's never easy to serve on a jury, but it's especially not easy to serve under these circumstances and I really can't thank you enough.

So at this point in time Chris is going to take you guys back into the jury deliberation room, get any of you letters that you need to get and then collect the badges and things like that. And so we'll do that now. So the jury can exit. Thank you.

THE MARSHAL: All rise.

[Jury excused at 4:38 p.m.]

THE CLERK: On the record or off?

THE COURT: On. All right, guys. So we have a PSI because we just got one whenever it was. So I can set this for sentencing whenever you guys want. Do you want me to just set it on my calendar next week, would you like more time than that?

MR. MARGOLIS: You can set it for next week.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So we'll -- let's set it on our Thursday calendar.

MR. MARGOLIS: That's a good question. Mr. Young wants to know is he going to hang down here at CCDC until then or is he going to be brought back?

THE COURT: So I'll -- you'll stay remanded until Thursday and then after Thursday you'll go up.

1	THE DEFENDANT: Okay, okay.
2	THE COURT: Okay?
3	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
4	THE COURT: All right. So thank you very much. We can
5	that date is what Chris?
6	THE CLERK: November 17th.
7	THE COURT: Or February.
8	THE CLERK: I'm sorry?
9	THE COURT: Or February. I mean, November's a little far
10	out.
11	THE CLERK: Why was I thinking November?
12	THE COURT: You're remanded until November.
13	MR. MARGOLIS: Yeah, yeah.
14	THE COURT: No.
15	THE CLERK: February 17th, try that again, at 11:00 o'clock.
16	THE COURT: All right.
17	MR. MARGOLIS: All right. Great. Thank you.
18	THE COURT: All right. Thanks guys, we can go off the
19	record.
20	[Proceedings concluded at 4:39 p.m.]
21	
22	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the audio-visual recording of the proceeding in the above entitled case to the
23	best of my ability.
24	Quina B Cakell
25	Maukele Transcribers, LLC Jessica B. Cahill, Transcriber, CER/CET-708
1	

Electronically Filed 8/15/2022 12:12 PM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

1 RTRAN

DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

7

9

10

3

4

5

6

8 | THE STATE OF NEVADA,

CASE NO. C-20-350623-1

Plaintiff,

DEPT. NO. III

∐ vs.

11 | ANDREW YOUNG,

Defendant.

13

14

12

BEFORE THE HONORABLE MONICA TRUJILLO, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

15

MONDAY, APRIL 12, 2021

16 17 RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDING:

18

STATE'S NOTICE OF MOTION IN LIMINE TO ADMIT CERTAIN EVIDENCE UNDER THE DOCTRINE OF RES GESTAE, OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE STATE'S MOTION TO ADMIT EVIDENCE RELATED TO OTHER CRIMES

19 20

APPEARANCES:

For the Defendant:

21

For the State: PARKER BROOKS, ESQ. Deputy District Attorney

22

21,21,211

23

DAVID R. FISCHER, ESQ.

24 25

RECORDED BY: REBECA GOMEZ, COURT RECORDER

AA 544

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

Las Vegas, Nevada; Monday, April 12, 2021 [Proceeding commenced at 9:21 a.m.]

THE COURT: Case number C20350623-1, State of Nevada

versus Andrew Young. Mr. Brooks on behalf of the State. Mr. Fischer

on behalf of defendant. Mr. Young --

THE DEFENDANT: Good morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good morning. Mr. Young is present in custody via blue jeans at CCDC. And this is on for State's Notice of Motion and Motion in Limine to Admit Certain Evidence Under the Doctrine of Res Gestae, or in the Alternative State's Motion to Admit Evidence Related to Other Crimes. And, State, I'm going to have to continue this to Wednesday. I know that you're on central calendar call I believe Wednesday. And again I apologize I didn't know you were here.

MR. BROOKS: Hey, Judge.

THE COURT: It's on at 2 p.m. so we shouldn't have an issue.

And just question as to the superseding indictment. It was filed after I ruled on the motion to sever, so when -- it's not set for arraignment or anything so I'm kind of confused procedurally as to what's happening.

MR. BROOKS: So yeah, Judge, I took this case over from Ms. DeMonte --

THE COURT: Mm-hmm.

MR. BROOKS: -- and I can kind of tell you that I filed this motion mostly because, you know, I've never done trial in front of Your Honor and so I was a little unsure. And so I took the attempt murder

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

and battery substantial bodily harm resulting in with deadly weapon --

THE COURT: Mm-hmm.

MR. BROOKS: -- and put them in 23 and 24 --

THE COURT: Mm-hmm.

MR. BROOKS: -- so that, you know, the jury doesn't think well why did we just skip from 15 to 18 --

THE COURT: Right.

MR. BROOKS: -- or whatever? In the event that which is the State's position that the 22 counts of burglary type stuff go first --

THE COURT: Mm-hmm.

MR. BROOKS: — then this motion really doesn't need to be argued until the attempt murder type case. Because the only thing that would be — the State would be asking or putting defense on notice with regard to those 22 counts is just that Detective Byrd would testify this is Andrew Young in these photographs and these videos because that — he's part of the entire squad that's been investigating and he's the detective that kind of links everything. He's the one who files the arrest report —

THE COURT: Right. Right.

MR. BROOKS: -- on the attempt murder. But I was just kind of letting Mr. Fischer and the Court know that although you see his name primarily connected with the attempt murder, he would be testifying in just the burglary case. Obviously not to the attempt murder, not to what he was investigating.

In fact, he kind of I think initially recognized Andrew Young

Page 3 AA 546

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

from something in 2016. And then ran his name and that's how Walmart thing event comes up. So I wasn't try to say anything from the attempt murder case would come into the burglaries. I was simply making a motion in the attempt murder when that goes about identity not about what was happening or the underlying facts of —

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BROOKS: So that's kind of — it's a little confusing because I didn't really know which one would go first and that's why when you're reading, you're like, what's this kid talking about, he's jumping, that's why.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Well thank you for the clarification. And then we'll set this over to Wednesday for a decision --

THE CLERK: April 14th --

THE COURT: -- and argument.

THE COURT CLERK: -- 8:30.

THE COURT: April 14th?

THE COURT CLERK: 8:30.

MR. FISCHER: And, Judge, my apologies.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. FISCHER: I did not realize Mr. Brooks was speaking.

There was an audio issue. I came in about the point where Mr. Brooks was talking about Detective Byrd. I assume it's essentially your argument from the opposition, is that right, or from your motion? Excuse me.

MR. BROOKS: Yeah. I was just saying that, you know,

1	Detective Byrd will testify in the burglary stuff. He's obviously not going
2	to say he was part of an investigation for attempt murder or anything like
3	that. Just that he's familiar with, you know, Andrew Young, what he
4	looks like, he's spoken to him, he's, you know, interacted with him in
5	person and that's him in the video.
6	MR. FISCHER: Right.
7	MR. BROOKS: You know.
8	MR. FISCHER: And if I may Your Honor that's he's
9	obviously part of our concern is quite frankly he's the one that sort of
10	puts this in the probable cause realm of the attempt murder which is part
11	of the concern
12	THE COURT: Hold on. Mr. Fischer
13	MR. FISCHER: that we have. He was
14	THE COURT: Mr. Fischer
15	MR. FISCHER: Yeah.
16	THE COURT: Sorry. I know you're having audio issues but
17	so we're not arguing it right now. I just continued it until Wednesday.
18	MR. FISCHER: Oh.
19	THE COURT: I was confused on a procedural issue
20	MR. FISCHER: Oh.
21	THE COURT: with the superseding indictment. So we'll
22	argue it you guys will argue it on Wednesday and I'll decide.
23	MR. FISCHER: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry, Judge.
24	THE COURT: Okay.
25	MR. FISCHER: Yeah. Understood. Set for Wednesday then.

1	Thank you.
2	THE COURT: Wednesday at 8:30. Thank you.
3	Thanks, Mr. Brooks.
4	MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Judge.
5	[Proceeding concluded at 9:25 a.m.]
6	
7	****
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed
21	the audio/video proceedings in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability.
22	
23	Charist Ward
24	Charisse Ward Court Recorder/Transcriber
25	Court (Coorder) Transcriber