### IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

LUIS A, HIDALGO, JR.

CASE NO.: 54209

Electronically Filed Feb 02 2011 01:32 p.m. Tracie K. Lindeman

Appellant,

VS.

On Appeal from a Final Judgment of Conviction entered by The Eighth Judicial District Court

THE STATE OF NEVADA

Respondent.

### APPELLANT'S APPENDIX

Volume 6 of 25

(Pages 1015 - 1172)

DOMINIC P. GENTILE Nevada Bar No. 1923 PAOLA M. ARMENI, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 8357 GORDON SILVER 3960 Howard Hughes Pkwy., 9th Floor Las Vegas, Nevada 89169 Telephone: (702) 796-5555

ATTORNEYS FOR THE APPELLANT LUIS A. HIDALGO, JR.

# ALPHABETICAL INDEX OF APPELLANT'S APPENDIX

Document	Date	Vol.	Page No.
A and add to distance of (III data a In.)	Filed	_	00026 00020
Amended Indictment (Hidalgo Jr.)	05/01/08	5	00836-00838
Amended Judgment of Conviction (Jury Trial)	08/18/09	25	04665-04666
(Hidalgo Jr.)	01/00/00	2	00520 00522
Amended Notice of Evidence in Support of	01/09/08	3	00530-00533
Aggravating Circumstances (Espindola)	0.6/1.0/00		00046 00040
Amended Notice of Intent to Seek Death Penalty	06/18/08	5	00846-00849
(Hidalgo Jr.)	00/04/00	1.5	027.10
CD: State's Exhibit 191 <sup>1</sup>	02/04/09	15	02749
CD: State's Exhibit 192A <sup>2</sup>	02/04/09	15	02750
CD: State's Exhibit 192B <sup>3</sup>	02/04/09	15	02751
CD: Defense Exhibit 1 <sup>4</sup>	02/11/09	22	04142
Court's Exhibit 2: Transcript of fBird CD	02/05/09	15	02912-02929
Court's Exhibit 3: Transcript of Hawk CD	02/05/09	15	02930-02933
Court's Exhibit 4: Transcript of Disc Marked as	02/05/09	15	02934-02938
Audio Enhancement, 050519-3516, Tracks 1 & 2,			
Track 2			
Court's Exhibit 5: Transcript of Disc Marked as	02/05/09	15	02939-02968
Audio Enhancement, 050519-3516, Tracks 1 & 2,			
Track 1			
Criminal Complaint (Hidalgo III)	05/31/05	1	00001-00003
Criminal Complaint (Hidalgo Jr.)	02/07/08	3	00574-00575
Emergency Motion for Stay of District Court	02/20/08	4	00775-00778
Proceedings (State)			
Fourth Amended Information (Hidalgo III)	01/26/09	5	01011-01014
Guilty Plea Agreement (Espindola)	02/04/08	3	00549-00557
Indictment (Hidalgo Jr.)	02/13/08	4	00724-00727
Information (Hidalgo III)	06/20/05	1	00005-00008
Instructions to the Jury	02/17/09	24	04445-04499
Judgment of Conviction (Jury Trial) (Hidalgo Jr.)	07/10/09	25	04656-04657
Minutes (Preliminary Hearing)	06/13/05	1	00004
Minutes (Change of Plea)	02/04/08	3	00558
Minutes (All Pending Motions)	02/05/08	3	00559
Timetos (Tim I chaing monons)	0 <i>2</i> /0 <i>3</i> /00	3	00557

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> This CD is a copy of the original. The copy was prepared by a Clark County employee at the Regional Justice Center in Las Vegas Nevada. Eight hard copies of the CD are being mailed to the Nevada Supreme Court.

² Id.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Id.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Id.

Document	Date	Vol.	Page No.
	Filed		
Minutes (Trial by Jury)	02/06/08	3	00576
Minutes (Sentencing)	02/12/08	3	00577
Minutes (All Pending Motions)	02/14/08	4	00728
Minutes (Arraignment)	02/20/08	4	00779
Minutes (Sentencing)	03/20/08	4	00787
Minutes (Sentencing)	03/25/08	4	00788
Minutes (Decision: Bail Amount)	04/01/08	4	00789
Minutes (All Pending Motions)	04/15/08	4	00799
Minutes (All Pending Motions)	04/17/08	5	00834-00835
Minutes (All Pending Motions)	05/01/08	5	00839-00840
Minutes (All Pending Motions)	06/17/08	5	00844-00845
Minutes (State's Request for Status Check on	11/20/08	5	00850
Motion to Consolidate)			
Minutes (All Pending Motions)	01/16/09	5	00916
Minutes (Calendar Call)	01/22/09	5	00973-00974
Minutes (Decision)	01/23/09	5	01009
Minutes (State's Request for Clarification)	01/26/09	5	01010
Minutes (Defendant's Motion for Own	02/24/09	24	04505
Recognizance Release for House Arrest)			
Minutes (Status Check re Sentencing)	06/02/09	24	04594
Minutes (Minute Order re Judgment of	08/11/09	25	04664
Conviction)			
Minutes (Sentencing)	10/07/09	25	04667
Motion for Judgment of Acquittal Or, In the	03/10/09	24	04506-04523
Alternative, a New Trial (Hidalgo III and Hidalgo			
Jr.)			
Motion in Limine to Exclude the Testimony of	01/13/09	5	00905-00915
Valerie Fridland (State)			
Motion to Conduct Videotaped Testimony of a	04/09/08	4	00792-00798
Cooperating Witness (State)			
Motion to Strike Notice of Intent to Seek Death	12/12/05	1	00026-00187
Penalty (Hidalgo III and Espindola)			
Motion to Strike the Amended Notice of Intent to	1/09/09	5	00851-00904
Seek Death Penalty (Hidalgo Jr.)			
Notice of Appeal (Hidalgo III and Hidalgo Jr.)	07/18/09	25	04658-04659
Notice of Intent to Seek Death Penalty (Hidalgo	07/06/05	1	00009-00013
III)			
Notice of Intent to Seek Death Penalty (Espindola)	07/06/05	1	00014-00018
Notice of Intent to Seek Death Penalty (Carroll)	07/06/05	1	00019-00023
Notice of Intent to Seek Death Penalty (Counts)	07/06/05	1	00024-00025
Notice of Intent to Seek Death Penalty (Hidalgo	03/07/08	4	00784-00786
Jr.)			
Jr.)			

Document	Date Filed	Vol.	Page No.
Opposition to Defendant Luis Hidalgo, Jr.'s Motion for Judgment of Acquittal Or, In the Alternative, a New Trial (State)	03/17/09	24	04524-04536
Opposition to State's Motion to Conduct Videotaped Testimony of a Cooperating Witness (Hidalgo III)	04/16/08	5	00800-00833
Opposition to State of Nevada's Motion in Limine to Exclude Testimony of Valerie Fridland (Hidalgo III and Hidalgo Jr.)	01/20/09	5	00919-00972
Order Denying Defendants Motion for Judgment of Acquittal Or, In the Alternative, Motion for New Trial	08/04/09	25	04660-04663
Order Denying Defendants Motion to Strike Notice of Intent to Seek Death Penalty	10/03/06	1	00188-00192
Order Directing Answer	10/20/06	3	00514-00515
Order Dismissing Petition	04/09/08	4	00790-00791
Order Granting Motion for Stay	02/21/08	4	00780-00781
Order Granting the State's Motion to Consolidate C241394 and C212667	01/16/09	5	00917-00918
Order Withdrawing Opinion, Recalling Writ, and Directing Answer to Petition for Rehearing	02/21/08	4	00782-00783
Opinion	12/27/07	3	00516-00529
Petition for Writ of Mandamus Or, In The Alternative, Writ of Prohibition (Hidalgo III and Espindola)	10/16/06	2-3	00193-00513
Proposed Jury Instructions Not Used	02/12/09	24	04389-04436
Proposed Verdict Forms Not Used	02/17/09	24	04502-04504
Reply to State's Opposition to Motion for Judgment of Acquittal Or, In the Alternative, a New Trial (Hidalgo III and Hidalgo Jr.)	04/17/09	24	04537-04557
Sentencing Memorandum (Hidalgo III and Hidalgo Jr.)	06/19/09	24	04595-04623
State Petition for Rehearing	01/23/08	3	00534-00548
Supplemental Points and Authorities to Defendant, Luis A. Hidalgo, Jr.'s Motion for Judgment of Acquittal Or, In the Alternative, a New Trial (Hidalgo III and Hidalgo Jr.)	04/27/09	24	04558-04566
Transcript (Defendant, Luis Hidalgo III's Motion for Acquittal Or, In the Alternative, a New Trial; Defendant Luis Hidalgo, Jr.'s Motion for Judgment of Acquittal)	05/01/09	24	04567-04593
Transcript (Defendant's Motion to Amend Record)	01/11/11	25	04668-04672
Transcript (Defendant's Motion for Audibility Hearing and Transcript Approval)	02/05/08	3	00560-00573

Document	Date Filed	Vol.	Page No.
Transcript (Motions)	02/14/08	4	00729-00774
Transcript (Sentencing)	06/23/09	25	04624-04655
Transcript (Calendar Call)	01/22/09	5	00975-01008
Transcript (Grand Jury)	02/12/08	4	00578-00723
Transcript (Jury Trial Day 1: Jury Voir Dire)	01/27/09	6	01015-01172
Transcript (Jury Trial Day 2)	01/28/09	7-8	01173-01440
Transcript (Jury Trial Day 3)	01/29/09	9	01495-01738
Transcript (Jury Trial Day 4)	01/30/09	10-11	01739-02078
Transcript (Jury Trial Day 5)	02/02/09	12	02079-02304
Transcript (Jury Trial Day 6)	02/03/09	13	02305-02489
Transcript (Jury Trial Day 7)	02/04/09	14-15	02490-02748
Transcript (Jury Trial Day 8)	02/05/09	15	02752-02911
Transcript (Jury Trial Day 9)	02/06/09	16	02969-03153
Transcript (Jury Trial Day 10)	02/09/09	17-18	03154-03494
Transcript (Jury Trial Day 11)	02/10/09	19-20	03495-03811
Transcript (Jury Trial Day 12)	02/11/09	21-22	03812-04141
Transcript (Jury Trial Day 13)	02/12/09	23	04143-04385
Transcript (Jury Trial Day 13 (Excerpt))	02/12/09	23	04386-04388
Transcript (Jury Trial Day 14: Verdict)	02/17/09	24	04437-04444
Trial Memorandum (Hidalgo Jr.)	01/29/09	8	01441-01494
Verdict (Hidalgo Jr.)	02/17/09	24	04500-04501
Writ of Mandamus (Hidalgo III)	06/03/08	5	00841-00843



# DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA



STATE OF NEVADA,	)
Plaintiff,	) CASE NO: C212667/C241394 ) DEPT NO: XXI
VS.	)
LUIS ALONSO HIDALGO, aka LUIS ALONSO HIDALGO, III, and LUIS ALONSO HIDALGO, JR.,	) ) Transcript of ) Proceedings
Defendants.	)

BEFORE THE HONORABLE VALERIE P. ADAIR, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

### JURY TRIAL - DAY 1 JURY VOIR DIRE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 27, 2009

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE STATE:

MARC DIGIACOMO, ESQ.

Chief Deputy District Attorney

GIANCARLO PESCI, ESQ. Deputy District Attorney

FOR LUIS ALONSO HIDALGO, JR.: DOMINIC P. GENTILE, ESQ.

PAOLA M. ARMENI, ESQ.

FOR LUIS ALONSO HIDALGO, III,: JOHN L. ARRASCADA, ESQ.

CHRISTOPHER ADAMS, ESQ.

RECORDED BY: JANIE OLSEN, COURT RECORDER

TRANSCRIBED BY: KARReporting and Transcription Services

KARReporting & Transcription Services

THE COURT: There's a little bit of an issue with the seating because of the COs. I'll see the COs at the bench.

(Conference at the bench.)

THE COURT: I need to clear the front row. The front row is going to be clear.

And, Jeff, don't sit anybody in the front row.

Now, before Jeff goes down to bring up the prospective jurors, does anyone have anything for me?

MR. DI GIACOMO: Not from the State, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. And I had requested proposed voir dire questions, and I got none. So I'm assuming neither side wants to conduct voir dire, and I'll be doing it all.

MR. GENTILE: Well, let me approach the bench.

THE COURT: I'm kidding. I mean, I could obviously do that since no one bothered to --

MR. GENTILE: You want to see it? I don't have a problem showing it.

THE COURT: -- give me proposed voir dire questions that I asked for in advance, but I won't be doing that. I'll still be allowing both sides to conduct voir dire although neither side gave me the proposed voir dire questions that I requested.

MR. DI GIACOMO: I apologize. I thought you wanted ones that we wanted you to ask. I didn't realize you wanted ones that we were going to ask.

THE COURT: No. No. I wanted ones that you guys were going to ask

so I could get a sense of how long it was going to take, number one, and number two, to hopefully streamline the process because sometimes I can do it faster than the lawyers can. But since both sides neglected to follow my order, I'm just going to give you a verbal reprimand. That's your verbal reprimand, and I'm going to allow -- now, my voir dire is going to be a lot shorter than it normally is because I know both sides will want to conduct extensive voir dire on their own.

So to sort of make this quicker, I'll probably just ask them all what we want to do, what they do for a living, husbands, kids, if they've ever been jurors before, and then you can cover everything else unless you'd like me to do the basics. You know, have you ever been arrested and charged with a crime; ever been the victim of a crime, that kind of thing. Do you prefer to do that?

MR. DI GIACOMO: I'd prefer that you do that.

THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. Any other questions you'd like the Court to ask other than arrested -- do you want me to ask, like, worked in law enforcement, any of that?

MR. DI GIACOMO: It would be the position of the State anyways, that those are the -- I don't anticipate the State having any lengthier jury selection in this case than we would in any other case. So I'd obviously -- those are the kind of questions the State would be looking to ask, and if it streamlines the procedure by you going through as kind of a group just saying, has anybody here been arrested before, has anybody here done law enforcement, we can actually move along that, and that will be very short questions from the State as to each juror.

THE COURT: Okay. I'll do that.

Anything the defense would like the Court to ask, just the sort of basic foundational questions?

MR. GENTILE: Just a moment.

THE COURT: And then obviously both sides can follow up on any answers a juror may have had.

MR. GENTILE: The only request that I have is give us enough time to write down the answers. Please.

MR. ADAMS: Judge, so the record is clear, our client came in in the middle. We will waive his presence.

THE COURT: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. ADAMS: Of us getting reprimanded, we don't need that to happen again. I'll fill him in on that. He's now present in the courtroom.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, and that was preliminary so I didn't - I could just of easily done it in chambers so that's why I didn't really feel his presence was necessary.

All right. Anything else we need to discuss? Jeff, go ahead and bring them up.

(Pause in the proceedings.)

THE COURT: I'll just say the lawyers' names. When you introduce yourselves, introduce Mr. Dibble and this other gal here whose name I don't know just in case some of the prospective jurors might know them.

MR. GENTILE: That's an issue. I am told by my new -- it's not new anymore; it's a year and a half ago, but apparently the bar association prefers that the names of all of the lawyers in a firm be read out. And it makes sense because most of -- most of -- the vast majority of the work that's done in my

Ŭ

law firm has nothing to do with court, and these people may have had a will or some sort of other kind of --

THE COURT: How many lawyers in your firm?

MR. GENTILE: There are 31, and I can go through it fast.

THE COURT: All right. Or you can say that you're affiliated with the law firm of --

MR. GENTILE: They won't know. See, we've had so many laterals in the last year that we kind of have to be there.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. GENTILE: And I wouldn't want to be accused later of --

THE COURT: That's fine.

MR. GENTILE: -- not having revealed a relationship.

(Jury panel entering 1:13 p.m.)

THE COURT: Court is now in session. This is the time for Case No. C241394 and Case No. C229522, Plaintiff, State of Nevada versus Luis Hidalgo Jr., Defendant, and Luis Hidalgo III, Defendant.

The record will reflect the presence of the State through the Deputy District Attorneys, Marc DiGiacomo and Giancarlo Pesci, the presence of the defendant, Luis Hidalgo Jr., along with his attorneys Dominic Gentile and Paola Armeni, the presence of Luis Hidalgo III, along with his attorneys, Chris Adams and John Arrascada, the officers of the court and the members of the prospective jury panel.

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. You are in Department 21 of the Eighth Judicial District Court for the State of Nevada. My name is Valerie Adair, and I am the presiding judge. You have been summoned here

today to serve as jurors in a criminal jury trial.

Let me first take this opportunity to introduce you to the staff members with whom you may be coming into contact. Seated next to me is Ms. Denise Husted. Ms. Husted is our official court clerk. It is her job to keep the official record in this case. She administers the oath to the witnesses, to the jurors, and keeps track of and marks all of the exhibits.

Seated next to her is Ms. Janie Olsen. Ms. Olsen is our official court recorder. It is Ms. Olsen's job to record everything that is said during these proceedings and to make sure that an accurate transcript is prepared. I tell you this because there will come a point in time when some of you will be asked questions. It's very important that you speak up so that you can be correctly recorded. Additionally, please, don't say uh-huh, huh-uh. Say yes or no because there's no way for us to accurately transcribe that.

You've already come into contact with our bailiff, Officer Jeff
Wooten. Should you need to contact the Court, meaning me, for any reason,
you would do so by contacting Officer Wooten.

Counsel for the State will now introduce themselves to you. They will briefly explain to you the nature of the State's case and give you the names of any witnesses which the State may be calling. Please listen carefully to the names of the witnesses as they are read to you.

Mr. DiGiacomo.

MR. DI GIACOMO: Thank you, Judge.

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Marc

DiGiacomo. I'm a Deputy District Attorney here in Clark County along with

Giancarlo Pesci who is a fellow Deputy District Attorney. We've been assigned

to prosecute the cases of State of Nevada versus Luis Hidalgo Jr., also known as Mr. H, and Luis Hidalgo III who is also known as Little Lu.

During the course of this case what they're accused of is on May 19<sup>th</sup> of 2005, they're accused of engaging in a conspiracy to commit murder of an individual by the name of Timothy Hadland, and thereafter they're also charged in his murder.

In addition to that, Luis Hidalgo III, Little Lu, is also charged with solicitation to commit murder for two individuals that were present during the time period of the murder.

Now, in addition to some of the names the State may call, there's certain individuals that you need to be aware of their name just in case you know them and certain locations that you're going to need to know about in case you either know about those locations or have some familiarity with that location.

The father in this particular case, Mr. H., is the owner or was at the time the owner of the Palomino Club which is on North Las Vegas -- or on Las Vegas Boulevard in North Las Vegas, right across the street from Jerry's Nugget. It is a strip club that has been in town for a very long time; although the evidence will show that he didn't own it for that long.

In addition to that, there is a location called Simone's Auto Body which is also owned by Mr. H. at the time, and that's at Bermuda just south of the airport, in that location of town.

Some of the people whose names you're going to hear in this particular case is an individual by the name of Deangelo Carroll, a former employee of the Palomino Club. There is an individual by the name of Anabel

Espindola who is the former general manager of the Palomino.

There's an individual by the name of Kenneth Counts that you're going to hear about. There's an individual by the name of Jayson Taoipu that you're going to hear about, and then some of the witnesses that you may hear during the course of this case are a crime scene analyst by the name of Louise Renhart, an FBI agent by the name of Scott Hendrix, a former homicide detective of the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department by the name of James Vacarro, a detective, Teresa Keiger, an FBI agent by the name of Steve D'Bor, a detective by the name of Dan Long.

There's a name of an attorney that you may hear, and so we're going to ask you to listen to the name, by the name of Jerome DePalma. You may hear the name of a Dr. Simon Stertser. You may hear the name of a Jack Perry. There's an FBI agent by the name of Scott Bakkin. There's an individual by the name of Israel Madrid, an Officer Lafreniere, a crime scene analyst by the name of Kristin Grammas, a Paijik Karlson, a Rontae Zone, a crime scene analyst by the name of Larry Morton, a medical examiner by the name of Dr. Gary Telgenhoff, a detective Mike McGrath, a fingerprint expert Fred Boyd, a cab driver by the name of Gary McWhorter, a Henderson police officer by the name of Zane Simpson, crime scene analyst Jeff Smink, a forensic document examiner, an expert by the name of Jan Seman Kelly, a firearm expert by the name of Jim Krylo and a detective by the name of Marty Wildeman.

Thank you very much.

THE COURT: All right, thank you, Mr. DiGiacomo.

Ladies and gentlemen, in a moment counsel for the defense will introduce themselves to you along with their clients.

An accused in a criminal case is never required to call any witnesses or present any evidence. However, if there are some witnesses which the defense may be calling, they will give you those names at this time.

Mr. Gentile.

MR. GENTILE: Thank you, Your Honor.

Good afternoon. My name is Dominic Gentile, and I'm going to be trying this case along with Paola Armeni. We work for the firm of Gordon and Silver, and I'm going to read for you the names of 31 other lawyers that are in that law firm in case any of you have ever had a will done or something like that or we've ever had any contact with you because you'll need to disclose that.

This is Luis Hidalgo Jr. He is charged in this case. You will be seeing him. He'll be walking outside among you later over the next week or so, and it's really important that you understand that he cannot speak with you. The Court has ordered that. That's the way it works in every trial not just this one. So we don't want you to think that somehow he doesn't like you or that he's, you know, trying to avoid you or anything like that.

You've heard Mr. DiGiacomo talk about the charges in this case. I want to talk to you only a little bit about the defense in this case. The defense in this case is that Luis Hidalgo Jr., didn't know anything at all about the death or anything bad even going to be happening to the victim in this case, Timothy Hadland, and you're going to hear a lot more about that if you're chosen as a juror, but we will wait until then to talk about it.

I am with a firm that has 31 lawyers in it. Let me read their names. Some of them I don't even know. Paola Armeni, I know her. Christine Bricker,

Randy Crayton, Louis Csoka, Lee Davis, Mark Dzarnoski, Thomas Fell, Richard Galin, Gregory Garman, Kristin Genc. It's spelled G-e-n-c, but it's pronounced Gets so in case you've had contact with her and you think her name's Genc, we want you to know it's Genc.

Me, Gerald Gordon, Talitha Gray, Karen Hanks, Brigid Higgins, Kenneth Hogan, Jeffrey Hulet, Joseph Kistler. He's also known as Sid Kistler. Joseph Kozolowski, William Noall, Eric Olsen, Bradley Richardson, Brad Richardson, Joel Schwarz, Mark Shipley, Jeff Silver, Carrie Sparks, Erica Pike Turner, Eric Van, John Witucki, and Matthew Zirzow.

Also in this courtroom for this period of time will be Donald Dibble.

Don is an investigator who works for Gordon and Silver, and he'll be assisting throughout this trial.

There are many witnesses on this witness list. Because I don't know at this moment how many will not be called, and I will promise you that the vast majority of them won't; so I don't want you to get scared that you're going to be here forever. I'm going to read their names.

Chris -- I probably can't even pronounce their names, but I'm going to do the best that I can. Chris Helzakos (phonetic), Janice -- it's actually Yanice, Vilyopos (phonetic), Timothy Hoy, Michael Gill, Jesus Hio, Sarkus Tomrus (phonetic), Danny Dalton, Anthony Nobile, Marshall Turner, Thomas Bissonet, Frank Bissaro, Eric Borst, Patrick Vance. A-y-a-I-e-w -- you figure it out, okay. Last name, Abebe. I can say that one; the first one I can't say.

Dwight Descher, Alfredo Oliva, Mode Ali, Jan Squiterro (phonetic),
Bela Racz -- and I know I didn't say that right. Fiaz Zarca (phonetic) Deraje
Kuwaly (phonetic), Devongelos Demosantos (phonetic), Armondo Romero,

Anbessaw, A-n-b-e-s-s-a-w, Gebre, G-e-b-r-e, Joseph Cutrello (phonetic), Tol Don, Victor Sagenas (phonetic), Michael Johns, Marsea Cleata (phonetic), Abde Amonmo (phonetic), Abebe Zwaedo (phonetic), Kevin Gibson, Ficadu Adem (phonetic), Sam Narobi (phonetic), Merdad Refqua (phonetic) Robert Turjon (phonetic), Ramine -- wow, I'll spell it -- A-s-a-d-i-e-i-s-k-a-n--d-a-r-l, common spelling. I can't say it.

Paul Nelson, Leon Lee, Juan Desoso, Kenneth Oh, Juan Robanes (phonetic), William Webster, Enoch Flowers, Yasushi Sakuma (phonetic), Ray Smith. Carlos Alfonso, Carlos Cordonne, Jessica Baraza, Jerry Barrone, Helen Brown, Michael Brown, Jennifer Carrigman, Cindy Caesar, Julie Chapman, Yvonne Cisneros, Geneva DelCampo, Jerome DePalma, Nava DelAngel, Joe DeMayo, Don Dibble, Nick D. Simone, Andrew Drath, Peter Illiades (phonetic) or Illiades, Sandra Eslinger, Veronica Faircloth, David Galley, Alexandrew Giergy (phonetic), Pee-Lar Kent Handley, Claudia Hernandez, Rosa Hidalgo, Sheena Hoffsted, John Hutcherson, Kathy Johnson, Terry Johnson, Margaret Johnson, Ben Kamaka (phonetic), Min Quak, John Lamberdor (phonetic), Scott Masonic, Wakaka McGee, Gary McWhorter, Jody Miles, Lou Misou (phonetic), Vivian Nells.

Natasha Newak, David Norris, Sam Norris, Mark Nicoleti, Russ Nikopolu (phonetic), William Ettinger, Saran Petty, Mark Quade, Sheryl Ray, Tony Reynolds, Julie Sandoval, Grant Schmick, Michelle Schwanderlik, Steve Stern, Andrew Shipman, Christina Slumbeck, Mary Thomas, Michael Thomas, Walter Turner, Carmen Villalta, Rudy Villalta, Stan Washington, Jim Warden, Andrew West, Leticia Williams, and Lacy DuPoi (phonetic).

There will also be David Gruber, Helda Becker, Thomas Dillard and

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Gentile.

Mr. Arrascada.

... ........

\_

 MR. ARRASCADA: Thank you, Your Honor.

Well, good morning -- afternoon. It seemed like morning but -- I guess we could all say just everything they said and sit down, but I won't do that. My name is John Arrascada. I have the great pleasure of being here today with my co-counsel, Christopher Adams, and our client is Luis Hidalgo III. He will probably be referred to throughout the trial --

Go ahead and sit down, Lu.

-- as Little Lu so we don't have any confusion. And one thing we all need to focus here today is that although we're sitting behind his father, this is a separate case, and we need to be able to keep everybody's minds separate between Luis Hidalgo Jr., and Luis Hidalgo III.

Again, I'm not going to speak about the prosecution's case, but I will tell you as far as Luis Hidalgo III is concerned the evidence you'll hear in this case is that he did not plan this event. He did not participate in this event, and he did not pay for anything that occurred.

And as far as our witnesses are concerned, I will sit down quickly and just tell you every witness I can think of in this case has already been named either by the State or by Mr. Gentile.

Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Arrascada.

Ladies and gentlemen, our court clerk, Ms. Husted, will now call the roll of the panel of prospective jurors. When your name is called, please answer

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 16: Here.

25

THE CLERK: 39, Michael Freeman.

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 39: Here.
2	THE CLERK: 41, Mark Rogol.
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 41: Present.
4	THE CLERK: 45, Julieto Vale.
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 45: Here.
6	THE CLERK: 46, Mark Habersack.
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 46: Here.
8	THE CLERK: 47, Michael Cannata.
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 47: Present.
10	THE CLERK: 48, Susan Dendiu.
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 48: Dendiu.
12	THE CLERK: Dendiu, sorry.
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 48: Here.
14	THE CLERK: 51, Steven Ricks.
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 51: Present.
16	THE CLERK: 52, Crystal Decorte.
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 52: Here.
18	THE CLERK: 54, William Hankins.
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 54: Here.
20	THE CLERK: 55, Austin
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 55: Present.
22	THE CLERK: Say it, please.
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 55: Guerrero.
24	THE CLERK: Guerrero, I couldn't say it, sorry.
25	56, Steve Escobedo.

21

22

23

24

25

THE CLERK: 90, Nicole U. Pezza.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 90: Present.

THE CLERK: 92, Christopher Lemke.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 92: Present.

THE CLERK: 93, Gary Urgola.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 93: Here.

THE CLERK: 94, D'Ann Sas.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 94: Yes, here.

THE CLERK: 95, Larry Klimes.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 95: Here.

THE CLERK: and 97, Ray Cordova.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 97: Here.

THE COURT: Is there anyone whose name was not called?

All right, ladies and gentlemen, the questioning of the jury at the beginning of the case is done under oath. The clerk will now administer the oath to the panel of prospective jurors. If everyone could please rise.

(Jury panel sworn.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we are about to commence examination of prospective jurors in this case. During this process, you will be asked questions bearing on your ability to sit as fair and impartial jurors. The Court, the lawyers, the parties and everyone involved in this case are all deeply interested in having this matter tried by a jury composed of 14 open-minded people who have no bias or prejudice toward or against either side.

In order for us to accomplish this, it is necessary for me to ask you some questions. The attorneys will also be given the opportunity to ask you

questions. It is not our desire to pry unnecessarily into your personal lives; although the questioning can at times become quite personal. Please know that our only objective is to ascertain whether there is any reason why any of you cannot sit as a completely fair and impartial juror in this case.

It is important that you know the significance of full, complete and honest answers to all of the questions we are about to ask you. I caution you not to try to hide or withhold anything which could indicate bias or prejudice of any sort by any of you.

I'm going to conduct a general examination of all of you, that's the 14 individuals in the jury box as well as the men and women seated out in the audience. Following that, I'm going to be asking more specific questions of the men and women in the jury box which will be followed up by questioning from the attorneys.

At some point during the process of selecting a jury, the attorneys for both sides have a right to ask that a particular person not serve as a juror. These are called challenges. There are two types of challenges, challenges for cause and peremptory challenges.

A challenge cause means that someone has indicated in his or her answer that he or she would have a difficult time sitting on this type of a jury. Both sides are given nine peremptory challenges which may be exercised for any reason. Should you be excused pursuant to one of these types of challenges, please do not be offended. They are simply part of the process designed to ensure that both sides have a completely fair and impartial jury. Additionally, there are 24 district court departments in this building -- now there's 25 -- all of which have jury trials going on. So should you be unable to

serve on this type of a jury there may be a civil case, a real estate dispute or something like that that you would be better suited to serve on.

Now, if you wish to respond to any of my questions in the affirmative, please raise your hand, and when I call on you, please stand and state your name and your badge number for the record.

All right. Is there anyone who is acquainted with either of the Deputy District Attorneys, either Mr. Marc DiGiacomo or Mr. Giancarlo Pesci?

All right. No one.

Is there anyone who believes they may be acquainted with either of the defendants, either Mr. Luis --

I'm sorry, did I see a hand? No.

-- either Mr. Luis Hidalgo Jr., or Mr. Luis Hidalgo III?

Is there anyone who believes they may be acquainted with Mr.

Hidalgo Jr.'s attorneys either Mr. Gentile or Ms. Armeni?

Yes, ma'am. Please stand and state your name and badge number for me.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 66: Judy Roscoe, No. 66. I know Mr. Gentile. I was involved with Mr. Lovell's case.

MR. GENTILE: I actually cross-examined her.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 66: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. So you were a witness for the State in a case that Mr. Gentile was an attorney on?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 66: That's correct.

THE COURT: All right. And has your only contact with Mr. Gentile been in the courtroom in connection with that case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 66: He also represented my son Darrin Roscoe many years ago.

THE COURT: Okay. And the case in which you were a witness, how long ago was that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 66: How long ago, Mr. Gentile?

THE COURT: I guess I could have just asked him if you don't remember.

MR. GENTILE: Not for nothing, you know, but this is going to give away

my age. It was 1988.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, ma'am. Have a seat for right now.

Is there anyone else who believes they may be acquainted with

either Mr. Gentile or Ms. Armeni?

Is there anyone who believes they may be acquainted with either of Mr. Hidalgo III's attorney, either Mr. Arrascada or Mr. Adams?

All right, no one.

Is there anyone who believes they may be acquainted with any of the attorneys who work at Gordon and Silver whose names were read by Mr. Gentile?

Two in the box. We'll start with the lady in the gray sweater.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: Hi, Linda Silber, and I believe that Jeff Silver is a resident at the community in which I live and is a club member at the club that I belong to.

THE COURT: Okay. And now, is it just that you recognize Mr. Silver's name, or do you think you know this person personally?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: I've seen him and I recognize the name.

Of course, it's a common name, but.

25

THE COURT: And this would be like a golf county club type situation? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. But other than maybe seeing him at the clubhouse you haven't had any contact with him; is that fair?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: Fair.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Have a seat.

And the lady in yellow, yes.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: Sharon Bennett, Badge No. 3. I do have acquaintance with several of the attorneys from your firm. I process worker's compensation claims, especially Leigh Davis.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, B. Davis?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: Leigh.

MR. GENTILE: Leigh, and that's by the way, it's L-e-i-g-h. It's not the common spelling.

THE COURT: Thank you.

So the attorney Leigh Davis you're familiar with that attorney through your processing worker's compensation claims?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. And you work for the State of Nevada?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: Employer's Insurance Company.

THE COURT: And have you ever had any direct contact -- is it a -- I'm assuming it's a woman, Ms. Davis?

MR. GENTILE: She is, yes.

THE COURT: Have you ever had any contact with Ms. Davis, or is it more you see her name in connection with case files or pleadings or that sort of

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: Well, over the past several years, I've actually attended cases. So it's not on a personal level, but I have been in the background at cases.

THE COURT: Okay. Other than seeing her presenting cases, have you had any direct contact with her?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: No.

THE COURT: So you don't have any kind of personal relationship or anything like that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: No.

THE COURT: Anything about that relationship that would impact your ability to be fair to both sides in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: No.

THE COURT: All right. Have a seat.

Anyone else who knows any of the lawyers at Gordon and Silver whose names were read by Mr. Gentile?

Is there anyone who believes that they're acquainted with any employees of the Clark County District Attorney's office?

Yes, sir, in the wine colored.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 46: Mark Habersack, Badge 46.

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 46: I work closely with Lee Thomson, District Attorney at the Clark County District Attorney's office.

THE COURT: Is Lee Thomson in the civil division; do you know?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 46: I'm not sure exactly what he does. He

THE COURT: Very close. Okay. Anything about that relationship that

THE COURT: All right. And is he a close friend or?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: Very close.

24

25

25

would impact your ability to be fair to both sides in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: I wouldn't think so.

THE COURT: All right. And you haven't had any -- well, have a seat for right now?

Anyone else?

Is there anyone who believes they may be acquainted with any of the witnesses whose names were read by Mr. DiGiacomo the Deputy District Attorney?

All right. I see one hand. Yes, the gentleman in the black jacket.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 37: Yes, I know Peter Iliades (Phonetic).

THE COURT: Okay. And your badge number, please, sir, and your name.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 37: I'm sorry. Rodger O'Neill, 37.

THE COURT: And how is it that you know Mr. Iliades?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 37: Mr. Iliades is a principal and the owner if the Olympic Gardens, and I manage a motel right over there.

THE COURT: Okay. So you're the manager of a motel that's located in close proximity to --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 37: Close proximity -- I was. The motel no longer exists, and the job no longer exists.

THE COURT: Okay. And did you know Mr. Iliades well, or you just kind of saw him occasionally, or what was your relationship?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 37: Well, a little more than casually. I wouldn't say well, but it would be Peter, Rodger.

THE COURT: Okay. Did you ever socialize with him or anything like

11 12

13 14

> 15 16

17 18

19 20

21 22

23 24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 37: No.

THE COURT: Okay. And did he ever talk to you about anything in -- I mean, do you have any idea why he's a witness in this case? Do you know anything about it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 37: Well, no. I know that -- I know the business he's in, and I know the business the gentlemen here were in.

THE COURT: Okay. Based on what was told to you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 37: Pardon me?

THE COURT: Based on what you heard the DA say?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 37: Yeah.

THE COURT: All right, sir. Thank you. Have a seat for right now.

Anyone else who believes they may know any of the witnesses whose names were read by the Deputy District Attorney?

The gentleman in the blue.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 17: Kevin Keegan, Badge 17. There was a Michael Brown named. I have a very good acquaintance named Michael Brown, but I'm sure it's not the same.

THE COURT: Okay. Let me just -- the Michael Brown that you know, what does he do for a living?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 17: He's a distributor of Arnold machinery.

THE COURT: Okay. And about how old is that Michael Brown?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 17: 58.

THE COURT: All right, sir, have a seat for right now. We'll find out if it's the same person.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 51: Stephen Ricks, Badge No. 51. The Pete Iliades, does he -- I don't know if he's the same owner of Yellow, Checker, Star Cab company which owns Olympic Gardens who my father has worked for for several years who I have worked for, James Burton and Pete Iliades. THE COURT: Okay. At Yellow, Checker, Star Cab? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 51: Yeah, Checker, Star Cab. THE COURT: So you previously worked for them? THE COURT: Okay. And what did you do? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 51: I was a TA safety inspector. I got the cabs ready for the TA actually to come and inspect them. THE COURT: Okay. And is that the Transportation Authority -- Taxicab PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 51: I'm sorry? THE COURT: TA is the Taxicab Authority? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 51: Yes, ma'am. THE COURT: And then your father, you said he was an employee. PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 51: My father is the general manager for 23 that company. He's been there for 36 years. 24 THE COURT: Okay. So fair to say that your father knows Mr. Iliades 25 fairly well?

THE COURT: Okay. We'll follow up on that a little bit later. We'll get there.

And that's it, I guess, for witnesses the State read.

Let's go to the witnesses whose names were read by Mr. Gentile.

Is there anyone who believes they may be acquainted with any of the witnesses whose names were read by Mr. Gentile?

Yes.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 28: Yeah, Andrew Grisnik, Badge 28. If it's the same Kevin Kelly that's in the same type of business, I know him.

THE COURT: From which business?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 28: The same type of club, the Palomino, he's in another club.

THE COURT: Okay. So you know a Mr. Kelly as being --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 28: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: And how is it that you know that Mr. Kelly?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 28: I work as an executive at one of the major hotels and take customers over to the club once in a while.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you know Mr. Kelly personally, or is it more that you're familiar with his name?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 28: Causally know him.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you have a business, a direct business relationship with him, or is it more you just bring customers to the --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 28: Bring customers over.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Have you ever had any business transaction with Mr. Kelly?

was said -- but kind of talk in the workplace, kind of scuttlebutt-type thing?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 27: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Have a seat for right now.

And I think that's it for the jury box. I saw a couple of hands on this side of the room, people who think they may have heard about this case prior to coming into court.

Yes, the gentleman in the black jacket.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 37: Rodger O'Neill, 37.

THE COURT: Yes.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 37: I saw it in the paper over a year ago or about a year ago, and was aware of it because of the long -- long-time bartender at the Palomino who I only know by first name.

THE COURT: Now, the long-time bartender, what is his first name? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 37: Mike.

THE COURT: Okay. And is that someone you know as a bartender at either the Palomino or another location?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 37: I know him as a manager of a Dotty's, of a Dotty's Casino.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, sir. Have a seat for right now.

And on that side of the room, did I see any other hands?

Yes, the gentleman in the brown in the back row.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 79: 79, Jim Matthews. I read it in the newspaper, RJ.

THE COURT: And, sir, about was that -- about how long ago do you recall seeing something?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 79: It's been, I would say, seven months,

24

25

black.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 69: It's all different colors, navy blue.

Sharon Garhardt, 69. I do recall reading it in the newspaper, in the

 RJ. I think a couple of articles but I don't remember much.

THE COURT: And about how long ago if you know?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 69: Eight months to a year. I truly don't remember.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Have a seat for right now.

Anyone else on that side of the room who thinks they may have read, seen, or heard anything about this case prior to coming into court today?

All right. This case is expected to last until next Friday, which would be February 6<sup>th</sup>. I know that sounds like a long period of time and a great inconvenience. Please know that in the spectrum of jury trials that is not a terribly long trial. Some of you may have watched television and seen some of the coverage on some of the high-profile trials that we've had in our jurisdiction, and you know that those can take weeks if not months to try. Also, we have a number of construction defect and other types of trials in this community that take months. So while that seems like a long time, it really is not.

I have both as a lawyer and as a judge spoken to literally thousands of people who have served as jurors, and I can tell you nearly to a person once they serve they are very glad they served, and they find it to be a very interesting and rewarding experience.

Unfortunately, my experience on the front end is that many people do not want to serve as jurors and find it to be a great inconvenience. I wish I had a room full of 60 people who were excited about the prospect of serving on a jury, but that has not been my experience.

It is my job to make sure that we have a good cross-section of our

community here and that we have enough people present in the room so that both sides can fully exercise all of their challenges and can be assured of having a completely fair and impartial jury. I cannot excuse everyone simply because it's an inconvenience. We live in a community where many, many people work in the service industry. Many people work in the casino business and other industries where they don't get paid if they are not going to be at work. I simply cannot excuse everyone because they're going to be missing their wages because if I did that, about 75 percent of you would get up and walk out of the room. So be mindful of all of that before you raise your hand for the next question I'm about to ask.

Is there anyone for whom serving this week and into possibly to the end of next week -- may finish a little bit sooner -- but possibly to the end of next week, is there anyone for whom that would constitute an extreme and undue hardship?

All right. We'll start with the lady in chair No. 2 in the gray sweater. Yes.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: I'm involved in the entertainment field, and my husband's van in flying in from Chicago. They're doing a show at the end of next week. It's like a once every year occurrence. It can't be rescheduled, and I'm in charge of it.

THE COURT: All right. And you may be eligible to be excused, but then you'll have to come back for service at another time. When is your husband -- you said he's performing when?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: The show is February 6<sup>th</sup>, and then there's a private party on February 7<sup>th</sup>.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. Thank you, Mr. Adams. I misheard that.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 59: Yes, drycleaner.

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: A drycleaner.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 59: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Have a seat for right now.

All right. Turning to the third row, the lady in the back corner.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 71: Badge No. 71, Shea Palluck. I'm a stayat-home mom with three kids, and so I have to find daycare. My husband works 12 hours a day. So I have to make sure my kids get picked up from school.

THE COURT: How many children do you have and what are their ages?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 71: I have three boys, 8, 6, and 5.

THE COURT: Okay. And then who's watching your boys today?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 71: My mom, and she took off today.

THE COURT: And then your husband, what does he do for a living?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 71: He works at Las Vegas Athletic Clubs.

He's the vice president of operations.

THE COURT: Okay. And do you work outside the home?

Is that no?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 71: No.

THE COURT: All right. Have a seat for right now.

And I saw a couple other hands on that side of the room. The next lady in the purple.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 77: 77.

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 77: I don't think I'd be able to. I would not get paid 'cause my husband just started working. He was unemployed for eight

22

23

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 78: My wife, she doesn't work. She just stay at home. We live just by income so --

THE COURT: What do you do for a living, sir?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 78: I work at the restaurant, and we have actually two other chef, but if I take full unto next week, then they don't have any day off.

THE COURT: Okay. You're a chef at a restaurant?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 78: Yes.

THE COURT: And do you work day shift or swing shift?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 78: It's kind of day shift.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, sir.

And I saw, yes, the gentleman at the end.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 95: Larry Klimes, Badge No. 95. I own a self-employed dba repair business, heavy equipment. My business works mostly at night and sometimes during the day. I don't have nobody else. There's no other employees.

THE COURT: Sir, I'm sorry, what was your badge again?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 95: 95.

THE COURT: Thank you. And you own your own business?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 95: Owner, self-employed, own a business plus I also have a sick wife that can't work.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Have a seat for right now.

And did I see any hands on this side of the room. Okay. The gentleman in the white.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 51: Stephen Ricks, Badge No. 51.

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

24

25

23

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 51: This is certainly tough times in the economy. My fiancé lost her job at the Ritz Carlton Lake Las Vegas who will then be in \$300 million in debt. What the court offers per day as pay in no way, shape or form compensate for what I earn, and I am currently the only one working.

THE COURT: And what do you do, sir?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 51: I was a glazier for 17 years. I am now office manager for Globe West Incorporated. I'm the only one working, and if I were to miss -- missing today no doubt is going to impact me. My boss does not pay.

THE COURT: Okay. Sir, do you have any children?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 51: I have one who is in Florida. I pay \$517 a month.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, sir. Have a seat.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 51: I also have student loans.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, sir.

Yes.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 30: Steven Avalone, Badge 30. I'm a single parent, two kids. As long as I'm out of here by 5 that's all right. I've got to pick them up from daycare.

THE COURT: And just for people who know, we --

Have a seat.

For those who are chosen, we make sure that people don't -- if people have to leave by 5 we let them leave by 5 because we recognize that

people have to pick up their kids from daycare, or if their children are in a safe key program, we know that they have to pick them up by a certain time. So as long as you let me or the bailiff know if you have a scheduling issue like that, I make sure that we accommodate that, and we won't make you stay past 5.

Also, before we get to this side of the room, in terms of start times, we do not start at 8 a.m. Some days we'll start at 9:30. some days we'll start at 10:30 or even after lunch. So for those people who may have business responsibilities, you will most days have some time in the morning to handle that. And then, like I said, if we need to break by 5 because of people's child care issues, we do do that.

So, yes, the lady in black.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 48: I am employed part time --

THE COURT: And your name and badge number is?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 48: 84, no, 48, sorry. And my job does require a minimum of 20 hours per week for medical benefits. So is it every day it's over at 5?

THE COURT: We can end at 5.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 48: As long as I get my 20 hours a week I have no problem.

THE COURT: And you are Ms. Dendiu?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 48: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. So as long as we break by 5 you're fine?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 48: Uh-huh.

THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. And then, I believe, the gentleman in the mustard.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 47: My name is Mike Cannata, and my badge number is 47, and I am a project manager for a medical business machine company, and we do medication dispensing machines in hospitals. I have seven projects going on right now in California and one in Vegas, and in order for me to make sure those are on time so the State can come in and do their inspections so they can open their ICU units, et cetera, I need to be on the site.

THE COURT: Okay. How many people -- what company do you work for?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 47: Cardinal Health.

THE COURT: And how many other project managers are there?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 47: Across the state there's quite a few.

THE COURT: And how many employees work under you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 47: Under me I have nine.

THE COURT: Okay. Have a seat.

The gentleman in the wine.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 46: Mark Habersack, Badge 46. This wasn't a problem. Next week Thursday and Friday I have carriers coming in from London and across the country. We're in the middle of our insurance renewal for construction liability program at the airport.

THE COURT: Okay. So you would be able to serve at some point, but next week is difficult due to some scheduling matters at the airport?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 46: Just that Thursday and Friday.

THE COURT: That's fine. Have a seat.

Anyone else on that side? Yes, the lady in the black.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 66: Right.

THE COURT: And you need to refresh my memory as to your name. I could just ask Mr. Gentile, but I'll ask you. Your name and badge number?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 66: Judy Roscoe, 66.

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 66: I'm in real estate, self-supporting. I have clients coming in on Friday, and trust me in this market I need the commission.

THE COURT: I was going to say, you know, you have clients coming in on Friday, that's good. All right. And are these clients in state? out of state?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 66: No, ma'am, they're from Prescott,

Arizona.

THE COURT: And do you sell residential, commercial or both?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 66: Primarily residential.

THE COURT: All right. Have a seat.

Anyone else on the second row?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 64: Badge No. 64.

THE COURT: Yes, sir. And you're Mr. Yancy?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 64: Yes.

THE COURT: All right.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 64: In my job I've been cut back hours. I've got a secondary job. My wife doesn't work. It's mandatory that I make all the money I can, and just as of last night there was a death in the family. So I'm sure I'll be attending a funeral.

THE COURT: And again, I don't mean to pry, but what was the family relationship to the person who --

my husband. He's my live-in boyfriend. His name is --

THE COURT: And you said you're going to Australia next week?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 93: No. No. This is -- we're -- the promoter from Australia has insisted that we have to get together promo material for this project. We're going to be in Australia for three weeks in July, possibly with an extra two-week option, but my immediate concern now is all this week we're scheduled to do recordings, videos, in preparation for this because he wants it within, like, a week or two.

THE COURT: Okay.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 93: My other concern is that on February 6<sup>th</sup>, I have a possible booking at the Venetian doing a Rat Pack show, and I'm waiting upon confirmation for that, but I'm definitely booked on February 12<sup>th</sup> through the 14<sup>th</sup> in Chicago.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, the booking for the 6<sup>th</sup>, wouldn't they need to give you a little more notice than just --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 93: I'm -- I'm sorry.

THE COURT: The booking for the 6<sup>th</sup>, wouldn't they need to give you a little more notice?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 93: Yeah, this is just -- what they do is the agents call and they ask if you're available. They ask for availability, and if we are available, we tell them yes, and they say they'll get back to us in a few days to confirm, by which they'll send us a contract.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Have a seat. And just to make sure you're telling the truth, how about a few bars on --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 93: I can do that.

THE COURT: All right. And the lady in the black, I think also raised her

3

1

4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 94: I'm Badge 94, D'Ann Sas.

THE COURT: Yes.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 94: I have travel plans out of town leaving February 5th for the weekend and also again February 11th for that weekend that are nonrefundable airplane tickets.

THE COURT: Okay. I think that was it for people who had an undue hardship.

Is there anyone who is not a United States citizen? Any of the prospective jurors who is not a United States citizen?

All right. Any of the prospective jurors who has been convicted of a felony crime?

In a moment, I'm going to see the attorneys in the hallway. Ladies and gentlemen, from time to time, I'll have conferences with the attorneys either in the hallway or up here at the bench. When I do that, I know the chairs can be uncomfortable. Feel free just to stand and stretch or get the bailiff's attention if you need a water or anything like that.

All right. I'll see the attorneys in the back.

(Pause in the proceedings.)

THE COURT: All right. At this time Badge No. 14, Ms. Nunez, you are excused. Officer Wooten will direct you from the courtroom.

At this time Badge No. 27, Ms. Avila, you are excused from these proceedings; however, you must report back for jury duty on April 6th at 8:30 to jury services, and Officer Wooten will write that down for you. Make sure you come back on that date.

At this time, Badge No. 29, Ms. Persse is excused, and Officer Wooten will direct you from the courtroom.

MR. GENTILE: May we approach just for a second?

THE COURT: Yes, approach.

(Conference at the bench.)

THE COURT: And, ladies and gentlemen, just so you know, the Court has given Mr. Hidalgo permission to have a protein bar because he is diabetic.

And for any of the jurors who may have health issues -- I know sometimes we go a long time -- feel free if you need to eat or drink something to do that or to let me know.

At this time Badge No. 46, Mr. Habersack is excused from these proceedings; however, you are directed to report back Monday, April 6<sup>th</sup> at 8:30, and Officer Wooten will write that down for you.

At this time Badge No. 54, Mr. Hankins, you are excused. Officer Wooten will direct you from the courtroom.

At this time Badge No. 66, Ms. Roscoe is excused from the proceedings. You are ordered to report back Monday, April 13<sup>th</sup> at 8:30, and Officer Wooten will write that down for you.

At this time Badge No. 77, Ms. Gaska is excused from these proceedings. You are directed to report back Monday, April 13<sup>th</sup> at 8:30.

At this time Badge No. 88, Ms. Olney is excused.

At this time Badge No. 94, Ms. Sas is excused from these proceedings. You are ordered to report back Monday, April 6<sup>th</sup> at 8:30, and Officer Wooten will write that down.

THE MARSHAL: What was that date, Your Honor?

And, Ms. Silber, do you work?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 17: No.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 32: Three.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: Probably five years ago.

crime? No.

before it was widely publicized and treated the way it was?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: Yes. It was the principal of my school exposed himself to me.

THE COURT: And was that here in Clark County or Chicago or where? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: Oh, it's got to be Cook County.

THE COURT: Now, did you consult an attorney, or did you report it to the police or school -- you know, I guess that was the school administrator -- PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: Yes.

THE COURT: -- you know, anyone on the school board?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: Therefore I did not report it 'cause it was just not politic.

THE COURT: Okay. Any other things like that that --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: That's quite enough.

THE COURT: And anything to a family member or anyone close to you? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: No.

THE COURT: All right. And did I see -- Ms. Bennett, did you raise your hand?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: Yes. I was involved in a malpractice suit which was against a health worker that came into the home to take care of my husband that ultimately caused his death sooner than it should have been.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you think it was deliberate or more medical negligence?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: No, it was negligence.

THE COURT: And did you -- you said you pursued a lawsuit based on that?

Anyone else in the box who's been the victim of a crime or had a family member or spouse or someone close to them?

Yes, sir, Mr. McLaughlin.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 9: My father -- somebody -- home invasion at my dad's house. My sister shot him so. . .

THE COURT: Okay. So someone broke into your father's house, and your sister shot the person who broke in?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 9: Yes.

THE COURT: And was your sister the only person that was home at the time or --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 9: No, my mother was there too.

THE COURT: Okay. And did the --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 9: Well, my dad was selling stuff through the newspaper, and the people that went there to purchase the stuff -- I guess they'd been doing it for a month -- and as my dad let them in they attacked him, and she shot him.

THE COURT: Okay. And did that person, did they die as a result of the

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 9: No.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Now, was -- I'm assuming, obviously the police were contacted?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 9: Yes. He's in prison and so's the woman actually.

THE COURT: Okay. Did that happen here in Clark County? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 9: Uh-huh.

you at the time about, I mean, do you feel like things were fair? Do you feel

24

25

like you were treated well by the police? Any opinion on any of that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: The police was really nice to me and everything, but the guy got away with it so that was it.

THE COURT: When you say he got away with it, was he found not guilty or was he found guilty but didn't get enough punishment?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: He was guilty, but he didn't get enough time.

THE COURT: Okay. So you feel like the judge or whoever sentenced him was too lenient?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Anyone else?

I'm going to ask you sort of the flip side of that. Is there anyone in the box who has ever been arrested or charged with a crime?

We'll start with Mr. Grisnik. Yes, sir.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 28: I had a DUI five years ago.

THE COURT: And that was here in Southern Nevada?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 28: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Was that a misdemeanor, I'm assuming?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 28: Yes.

THE COURT: And the agency, was it, like, Nevada Highway Patrol or --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 28: Metro.

THE COURT: Metro, okay. Did you hire a lawyer?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 28: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. And do you have any feelings or opinion about how you were treated in the system by the police, your attorney?

was charged with, but I was a registrar of voters in South Dakota. I registered people with their bar, the bars that they worked in with those addresses instead of their home addresses, and I was charged with some kind -- registration -- I'd have to look it up.

THE COURT: Okay. And how long ago was that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 32: That was about 1990.

THE COURT: Okay. Was it the kind of thing where you're working for a particular candidate or a particular political party and you're going into bars to get people registered?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 32: I had -- I wanted to see a certain person win. I was not working for him but I was going into bars to register people, yes, all the bars for the ones that had gaming.

THE COURT: Okay. And this was a pro-gaming candidate?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 32: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Were the original -- were the charges misdemeanor or felony charges; do you know?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 32: I think they were felony charges. The whole thing ended up being reduced to a misdemeanor, and I had a fine of \$150, I think. So it was a very political thing, small town.

THE COURT: Okay. And do you have any feelings about, again, how the system worked for you or didn't work for you in that situation?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 32: Absolutely. I think I was involved in small-town politics, and they wanted to stop the -- scare people from not voting.

THE COURT: Okay. And when you say, "they," who do you --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 32: The people who were endorsing the other candidate who worked in the municipality.

THE COURT: Okay. So is it more the police or the court system, the lawyers, what, that you sort of find fault with?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 32: It's a small town's political system.

THE COURT: All right. Anything else, Mr. Cook?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 32: That's all.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Now we can move on to Mr. Keegan.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 17: I had in 1977 in Henderson, Nevada, which I didn't know where Henderson, Nevada was; I was new in town, I was charged with, and it sounded serious, contributing to the delinquency of a minor and trespassing. They were misdemeanors, and when it was all said and done, I was fined \$35. And what happened is I was managing the Vineyard Restaurant in the Boulevard Mall, and a couple kids that worked in the kitchen were looking for extra money, and I said if you pick up some golf balls outs of the pond and sell them, you can make some extra money.

And we pulled into what is now the Wild Horse Golf Course, which is in Green Valley. In those days it was Paradise Valley, and it was in the middle of nowhere. When we pulled into the parking lot there, we got out of the car, and my friend and I got handcuffed.

And what had happened is there had been a greens-keeper strike, and people had been tearing up the golf course, and they thought we were them. And they handcuffed us and took my friend and I who was visiting from New York and took us to jail.

THE COURT: Okay. And what happened after that? Did you get charged with anything?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 17: We ended up getting charged with the misdemeanor and then wrongly I should have gone and got a lawyer because it's still on my record. We got fined \$35.

THE COURT: So you wound up not having a lawyer and pleading guilty? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 17: I think we pleaded no contest.

THE COURT: Or it was negotiated to a fine or something. Okay. And you feel like it was a case of mistaken identity? There was somebody else --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 17: No, they just -- what happened is we pulled in there just before dusk or right at dusk, and they thought we were going in there to do damage to the golf course. We did nothing. There were cops there that were just there staking it out just waiting for the culprits.

THE COURT: And do you find fault with the police in that situation, or do you think it was just sort of an unfortunate turn of events?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 17: It was an unfortunate turn of events that could have been handled better.

THE COURT: By?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 17: By the Henderson police.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Anyone else? Yes, Mr. --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 16: Williams.

THE COURT: Thank you. Yes, sir.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 16: I was charged with obstructing an police officer.

THE COURT: Okay. How long ago was that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 16: I didn't agree with that either.

25

11

12 13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20

22

21

2324

25

Yes, in chair No. 3, Ms. Bennett.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: My stepson was quite a rascal when he was younger, and he was arrested several times, a couple times for breaking and entering and another time for doing destructive things with his four-wheeler on a policeman's front yard. And needless to say that was probably about maybe 20 years ago.

THE COURT: Okay. And was your stepson living with you at the time? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: Yes, he was.

THE COURT: Okay. And when he was doing these things and having these problems, was he over 18 or under 18?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: No, he was under 18.

THE COURT: So he was a juvenile?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: Yes.

THE COURT: Did he go through the juvenile court system at all, the juvenile justice system?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: We lived in a very small town in New York, so it was just the judge in that particular town. He ended up with many hours of community service.

THE COURT: And did he kind of straighten up after that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: No.

THE COURT: Has he had contact in the adult system?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: No. Unfortunately, he passed away from an overdose about seven years ago.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm sorry.

And I saw some other hands in the front row. Yes.

ago.

ago

THE COURT: Okay. And what --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 10: Indiana.

THE COURT: In Indiana, okay. Were you living in Indiana at the time?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 10: I was not. I was living in (unintelligible).
THE COURT: Okay. And did you follow his case at all in the system?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 10: No.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 10: My nephew, grand auto theft, 22 years

THE COURT: Okay. Anyone else who's had anyone close to them charged with a serious offense?

All right. Of the 14 of you, have any of you ever worked in law enforcement?

Do any of you have any family members, spouses, anything like that that have worked in law enforcement?

All right. I'll see Officer Wooten up here at the bench.

(Conference at the bench.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, in a moment, we're going to take a brief recess. Just a couple of preliminary things I need to tell you before we take our recess. Obviously you haven't heard any evidence, but you've heard some brief discussion as to what the case is going to be about.

Please don't discuss anything you've heard in the courtroom, anything that's transpired in the courtroom with each other or with anyone else during our break. Anyone else would include members of your family and your friends. You may, of course, tell them that you are participating in jury selection in a criminal jury trial, but please don't discuss anything else relating

to the case or the lawyers or anything else with them.

Additionally, court personnel, the defendants and everyone other than the attorneys and everyone other than the bailiffs are prohibited from speaking directly with members of the jury. So should you see one of these people in the hallway on the break, please don't think that they're being unfriendly or anti-social. They are simply precluded from the rules of ethics from speaking directly with you.

I'm going to read a couple of names and ask that the following people remain in the courtroom. Badge No. 10, Ms. Urbanick. Badge No. 28, Mr. Grisnik. Badge No. 37, Mr. O'Neill, and the rest of you please follow Officer Wooten through the double doors, and we'll be in recess until 3:20.

(Jury panel recessed 3:05 p.m.)

THE COURT: I'll see counsel at the bench.

(Conference at the bench.)

THE COURT: Ms. Urbanick, I'd ask that you remain in the courtroom, and I'd ask that Mr. Grisnik and Mr. O'Neill follow Officer Wooten through the double doors.

All right. Ms. Urbanick, the reason I asked you to remain in the courtroom is I wanted to follow up with something you said earlier during jury selection, and you said that you recollected you read something about this case in the Review Journal; is that right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 10: Yes.

THE COURT: And you may have already said this, but how long ago do you recall seeing something in the Review Journal?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 10: I want to say a long time ago. I mean,

O

it wasn't -- people said a month or something, no. This was I think a long time.

THE COURT: Okay. What do you recall reading in the Review Journal?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 10: I recall I think a body and a truck by Lake Las Vegas, and if that doesn't have anything to do this I'm happy to say for senior moments. A father and a son and the Palomino, had I not heard that I would have never recollected. I couldn't have told you names, dates.

THE COURT: Okay. So something about a body and then something relating to the Palomino Club and a father and a son.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 10: That's it.

THE COURT: Okay. And that's all you remember.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 10: That's really all I remember.

THE COURT: All right. Now, obviously things the media -- are sometimes reported incompletely or incorrectly in the media. If you're selected to serve as a juror, even if you remember something else or think you may remember something else, can you set aside anything that you may have read or heard about this case and decide this case solely on the evidence that's presented during the trial, and by evidence I mean the testimony of the witnesses from the witness stand as well as exhibits that are admitted into evidence?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 10: Yes, I think I could because I don't know enough.

THE COURT: So there's nothing about what you --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 10: I don't even know where the Palomino Club is.

THE COURT: All right. So you don't feel that there's anything about

20

21

22

23

24

25

the fact that you may have read something in the paper that would impact your ability to keep an open mind and serve as a juror in this case; is that right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 10: That's right.

THE COURT: All right.

Does the State wish to follow up on any questions with Ms.

**Urbanick?** 

MR. DI GIACOMO: No, ma'am.

THE COURT: Mr. Gentile, Ms. Armeni, would you like to follow up on any questions with Ms. Urbanick on this topic only?

MS. ARMENI: No, Your Honor.

MR. GENTILE: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And, Mr. Arrascada, any follow-up questions?

MR. ARRASCADA: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right, Ms. Urbanick, in a moment I'm going to go ahead and have you exit the courtroom and take your break. Before I do that I must admonish you that you're obviously not to discuss anything you may have read in the newspaper relating to this case with the other fellow jurors. Additionally, please don't discuss what the questioning was just now or what's just transpired in the courtroom with any of your fellow jurors.

All right. Thank you, ma'am. Officer Wooten will escort you from the courtroom.

As soon as you do that -- and Ms. Urbanick is free to take her break now -- we'll see Mr. Grisnik.

Mr. Grisnik, just go ahead and have your seat there in the jury box, please, sir.

And, Mr. Grisnik, the reason I asked you to come back alone into the room is I wanted to follow up on something you had said earlier during jury selection, and you indicated that you think you may have read about this case in the Review Journal --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 28: Oh, I don't think; I followed it very close.

THE COURT: Okay. Tell me what you remember seeing in the Review Journal.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 28: Well, I remember the story that a really, I guess, a pretty decent guy was working the door. I guess he was thinking about changing clubs. He was sending people, and then they put a hit on him. I mean, I've read a lot -- I read a lot of it back then. I followed it. It's over three years. I followed it pretty close back then. Just 'cause of the business I'm in taking customers over to clubs it kind of made me leery of going over there because something had happened.

THE COURT: Okay. So how many articles do you recall seeing?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 28: Oh, it had to be over ten.

THE COURT: Over ten?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 28: Yeah.

THE COURT: And it sounds to me like you took sort of a special interest in this case as opposed to other cases; is that fair?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 28: Yeah, that's fair to say.

THE COURT: And that's because of your involvement with these kind of adult clubs?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 28: Yeah, definitely.

25

THE COURT: Okay. Anything else you remember reading in the paper PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 28: No, pretty much it was a father, son. THE COURT: Okay. Now, obviously, things are often misrepresented in the media, incompletely reported, inaccurately reported. Would you be able to set aside anything you may have read in the media and base your verdict if selected as a juror solely on the evidence that's presented during the trial? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 28: I don't truly say I could fairly say that. THE COURT: You're concerned about it? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 28: Yeah, I'm concerned about it. I'd like to say, yes, I can, but I -- to be honest with you I'm already -- have an opinion. Does the State want to follow up? MR. DI GIACOMO: No. Judge. We'll submit it. THE COURT: I'll see counsel up here, please. (Conference at the bench.) MR. GENTILE: Mr. Urbanik -- no, excuse me, Grisnik, Urbanik was the You ever have anything about you written in the newspaper? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 28: I don't think so. MR. GENTILE: Or any business that you were involved in? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 28: No. MR. GENTILE: How about other media?

THE COURT: I'm sorry, I didn't hear you?

MR. GENTILE: You do.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 28: I mean, I'm not saying they're a hundred percent always right, but I put some credibility to it.

MR. GENTILE: And so what is your opinion? Say it.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 28: Well, I think they're guilty.

MR. GENTILE: Okay. Why?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 28: I just from what I read and the way I interpret the story. From what they made it sound like he was a pretty decent guy that got whacked.

MR. GENTILE: Okay. Well, if you're going to start off with -- do you know what the presumption of innocence is?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 28: Yes, I do.

MR. GENTILE: You've heard about it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 28: Yes, I have.

MR. GENTILE: You've heard about proof?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 28: I'm just trying to be honest with you.

THE COURT: There's no right or wrong answer.

MR. GENTILE: There's no right or wrong answer. I'm not trying to argue with you. I'm trying to see if you could be a juror in this case because there are some things about you that make you a good juror, and that's the reason that I'm asking.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 28: No, if it was laid out to me in black and white that somebody was innocent I'd definitely say innocent. I'm not the kind of guy who's going to go he's wrong.

MR. GENTILE: Okay. Let's talk about innocent. Do you understand

4 5

6

7 8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25 that somebody doesn't have to be proven innocent?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 28: He has to be proven guilty.

MR. GENTILE: They have to be proven guilty, right. You buy into that, don't you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 28: Sure I do. I've had a DUI. So I buy into it.

MR. GENTILE: All right. And from time to time these newspapers that you read you see once in a while somebody's -- maybe more than once in a while somebody's found not guilty, and that's because of people that sit in that box.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 28: Right.

MR. GENTILE: Right.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 28: But I've not always agreed with that either.

MR. GENTILE: And you probably didn't know anything at all about those cases other than what you read in the paper.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 28: The OJ case was pretty popular.

MR. GENTILE: Okay. No, I understand. Let me ask you this. If you -- if the Judge were to tell you that -- well, let me ask you this. Can you set aside based on what you've just said now, these last couple of things, can you set aside, can you try your very best to set aside this opinion that you have that's based on something that you read and nothing that you've heard from a witness?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 28: I could try.

MR. GENTILE: Do you think you could do it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 28: I'd like to think I could. I just -- I think I just feel too close to this type of stuff. Tomorrow night I've got customers coming in. We're going to be at Spearmint Rhino tomorrow night from 11 o'clock at night to 3 in the morning entertaining customers, and I just think I'm too close to this type of stuff.

MR. GENTILE: What type of stuff? Homicides or strip clubs?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 28: Just that whole business.

MR. GENTILE: You think you're too close to the business?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 28: Yeah. I just, you know, I know a lot of these guys that work the doors, and, you know, I call up, I'm bringing guys over, you know, they meet us at the door, they walk us in. It's just -- I don't know. I just feel too close to this. Not that I know anybody. I don't know them. I've been to that club before; I've never seen either one of them. I don't know; I don't feel comfortable.

THE COURT: Okay. Is that it, Mr. Gentile?

MR. GENTILE: That's it.

THE COURT: Mr. Arrascada, any questions?

MR. ARRASCADA: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything from the State?

MR. DI GIACOMO: No. I'll submit it to the Court, Judge.

THE COURT: I'll see counsel up here.

(Conference at the bench.)

THE COURT: Mr. Grisnik, you know what, thank you for your candor. I'm going to go ahead and excuse you from this case because of the potential conflict. You probably could be fair, but out of an abundance of caution we'll

4

6

5

7

8

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

go ahead and excuse you, and Officer Wooten will direct you from the courtroom. Thank you, sir.

And then Mr. O'Neill will be next.

Mr. O'Neill, come on and just have a seat there in the jury box.

And, Mr. O'Neill, the reason I asked you to come in here by yourself is I wanted to follow up on something you had said earlier during jury selection. You indicated that you saw something in the paper about this case over a year ago or about a year ago; is that right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 37: In that range, yes.

THE COURT: Okay. And that would have been the Review Journal, you think?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 37: Yes.

THE COURT: Now tell me what you remember seeing in the paper.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 37: My memory's kind of sketchy because I wasn't all that interested; however, I believe that it was father, son, and I thought there was a woman involved in a murder conspiracy on a former employee or a manager, and that's about it. I thought there was another murder involved. I thought they were afraid of testimony of the victim in the murder that they were accused of in another case.

THE COURT: Okay. So you think there may have been something about two murders or possible murders?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 37: Yeah. It was either two murders -- it was another felony other than the murder of the individual.

THE COURT: Okay. And do you think you just saw one article, or do you think you may have seen more than one article?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 37: I look at the paper every day. I'm sure I saw more than one article, but it's not an area of -- I'm not a crime fan, okay. I'm not an aficionado of, hey, you know, did Sandy do it, you know.

THE COURT: Right. So you read it, but it wasn't something that was particularly interesting to you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 37: Exactly. I'm more interested in the Mets.

THE COURT: You're more interested in sports?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 37: Right.

THE COURT: Now, let me ask you this. I'm sure you can appreciate that very often the newspapers don't report things completely or they report things inaccurately; do you accept that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 37: Absolutely.

THE COURT: Now, would you if you're selected to serve as a juror be able to set aside anything you may have read in the paper and base your verdict solely on the evidence during the trial, and by evidence I mean the testimony from the witnesses coming from the stand and any physical exhibits that are admitted into evidence?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 37: You betcha.

THE COURT: Okay. And even if you're selected as a juror and maybe then you remember something else that you might have read or seen or heard about the case, can you also set that aside and keep an open mind?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 37: Yeah. I can definitely set aside any preconceptions and deal with those in front of me.

THE COURT: Okay. And you seem pretty confident that you can keep

an open --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 37: I know that I can.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, sir.

Does the State wish to follow up?

MR. DI GIACOMO: Just a couple questions.

Sir, also you mentioned that you knew a guy by the name of Mike who used to be a long-time bartender at the Palomino?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 37: Yeah. I met him after the fact. I met Mike when he was working for Dotty's. I don't know if you're familiar with Dotty's. They're a neighborhood --

THE COURT: Right. They have a bunch of them.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 37: And it was after what I had seen in the paper, and the fact that he had worked at the Palomino came up, and I said, you know --

MR. DI GIACOMO: I guess the question is did you have a conversation with Mike about the story you read in the paper?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 37: Not about the story at all, about the fact that the new people that came in he didn't like, but the reason being he'd worked there for 28 years and got the door. Nothing to do with the situation that this courtroom is concerned about.

MR. DI GIACOMO: Let me ask you this. Mike tells you he doesn't like the new owners when they came in --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 37: I'm not even sure it was them.

MR. DI GIACOMO: Well, that's my question. You don't know if it's these owners or --

okay, the information that was in there, okay, whatever it was, what was the

25

23

24

talk to Mike about any of this.

case, there's one thing that we're all going to ask you to not do and that's not

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 37: That's not a problem.

MR. GENTILE: Okay. All right. No problem.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Arrascada, do you have any questions?

MR. ARRASCADA: Possibly one. Court's indulgence.

No, Your Honor, we're fine.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Mr. O'Neill, a couple of things before I send you back out in the hallway. Obviously don't discuss anything you may have read or remember about the case with any of your fellow jurors or prospective jurors. Do you understand that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 37: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: And also, some of them may want to know what we talked about here when we brought you in. Please don't discuss the questions that I asked or the lawyers asked or anything that's transpired just now in the courtroom. Okay?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 37: Okay.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, sir. Go ahead and follow Officer Wooten through the double doors.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 37: Thank you very much.

THE COURT: And he'll just direct you where to just wait. Thank you, sir.

A couple things before Jeff brings in the panel I wanted to put on the record. Both sides were fine with Juror No. 10, Ms. Urbanick and Mr. O'Neill; is that right?

MR. GENTILE: That's correct for both --

THE COURT: Okay. And then the defense made a for cause challenge against Mr. Grisnik at the bench which was granted at the bench which was granted by the Court, and Mr. Grisnik was excused on a for-cause challenge. Is that correct, defense?

MR. GENTILE: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Does anybody need a two-minute break?

MR. PESCI: Judge, if I could make a record before we do that. Also in addition, I believe both sides had no objection to the ones that you kicked, if I could, that was 14, 27, 29, 46, 54, 66, 77, 88, 94. It's my understanding that neither sides had any problem with those being released.

MR. ADAMS: I believe that's correct.

THE COURT: All right. And just for the record, we met in the hallway to see if everyone agreed.

We may take a break. I'm going to go past 5, a housekeeping thing. On some of these people that were semi hardships that I put at the end, if they're going to have to come back tomorrow, which it's now looking like we're not going to finish today, does anyone have any objection to me just excusing those people so they don't have to come back tomorrow?

MR. GENTILE: I don't understand.

THE COURT: Well, the people I set in the back we put them at the end so we don't get to them --

MR. GENTILE: Oh, I see. Okay.

THE COURT: -- but I don't now want to -- since we probably are not going to get to them -- want to make them take off another day of work and come back. Does everyone understand?

MR. ADAMS: We have no problem.

MR. GENTILE: No, that's fine.

MR. ADAMS: Judge, before our hopefully short break, I have one question. You admonished them before they stepped out about talking with each other in the hall, have you heard back if that had been going on at the early break?

THE COURT: The only thing is my bailiff informed me he heard the juror in the wine colored shirt saying oh, I'm in a jury selection in this case. I don't see it as a problem since that juror was excused for hardship. That was the gentleman that was employed at the airport for the record. Other than that there's been no reports of anyone.

Typically I do do that just so they know. What had happened is they took a break when we were in the hall. So that's why they didn't get the admonishment prior. I always do that to avoid any possibilities.

Do you guys need a real quick break?

MR. ADAMS: That would be --

THE COURT: Okay. Let's take a real quick --

MR. DI GIACOMO: Judge --

THE COURT: Yes, Mr. DiGiacomo.

MR. DI GIACOMO: This doesn't need to be on the record.

(Recessed 3:31 p.m.)

(Jury entering 3:40 p.m.)

THE COURT: Court is now back in session. The record will reflect the presence of the State through the Deputy District Attorneys, the presence of the defendants and their attorneys, the officers of the court and the members

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: No.

MR. DI GIACOMO: What about law enforcement? Have you ever had a cop write you a ticket, anything like that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: Yes.

MR. DI GIACOMO: And the times that you've had interaction with a police officer, have you ever at any point had a bad experience with a police officer?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: No.

MR. DI GIACOMO: You thought they treated you fairly?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: Yes.

MR. DI GIACOMO: One of the things that's going to come out in the trial -- I've already said it once -- is there's going to be a lot of testimony about the Palomino Club. The Palomino Club is an adult cabaret. It's a gentlemen's club, and there's going to be testimony about the nature of that business. Some people who live in Vegas say, Hey, what happens in Vegas stays in Vegas, and some people have some very strong opinions about those types of business in general.

Are you one of those people that has those types of opinions? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: No.

MR. DI GIACOMO: So there's nothing about the fact that this case involves that type of business that should affect your judgment one way or the other?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: No.

MR. DI GIACOMO: In addition to that, you may hear -- let me rephrase that -- you will hear the testimony of somebody who used to be a defendant in this particular case, and while the Judge will instruct you on the law and

everything else like that, as you sit here today, merely because somebody previously was a defendant and is now testifying in this particular case, does that mean that you would automatically reject their testimony?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: No.

MR. DI GIACOMO: Have you ever in the time that you've done whatever, kids, whatever, you've ever had to work out the truth, what the truth people are saying, talking about the same incident but not telling the same story?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: My children.

MR. DI GIACOMO: Your children, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: Yes.

MR. DI GIACOMO: And how do you go about doing that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: I just talk to them, watch them and see which one's lying and which one's --

MR. DI GIACOMO: Right. You can kind of tell by their demeanor and kind of the sequencing of events they give you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: Yes.

MR. DI GIACOMO: You look at a lot of different things?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: Yes.

MR. DI GIACOMO: And there's times that people say things or you've seen your children tell you things, and they may have reasons for why they're not telling you the truth, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: Right.

MR. DI GIACOMO: And you can evaluate whether or not those reasons were good reasons or bad reasons?

MR. GENTILE: Why?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: Yes.

25

countries.

lives.

never testify. You understand about that?

25

22

23

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: Yes.

MR. ARRASCADA: And when I was asking you about what your verdict would be if we never said anything if our clients don't testify, would you require to hear from them in this case in order to find them not guilty?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: Yes.

MR. ARRASCADA: You would?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: Yes.

MR. ARRASCADA: Thank you, ma'am.

THE COURT: State?

MR. DI GIACOMO: Yeah, let me ask her a couple questions.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. DI GIACOMO: Ma'am, I honestly don't believe the Court asked this question. At the end of the case the Court's going to instruct you on what the law is, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: Right.

MR. DI GIACOMO: All of us sitting over here, we've all gone to law school, and then the Court finally tells what the law is. I assume you don't have any formal training on the law?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: Right.

MR. DI GIACOMO: You hear through TV shows and the news, all kinds of legal terminology, presumption of innocence, reasonable doubt, all those other things, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: Yes.

MR. DI GIACOMO: And I'm assuming before you walked in here today you didn't really think about what those concepts mean, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: Right.

MR. DI GIACOMO: If the Judge were to instruct you at the end of this case that a defendant never has a duty to take the stand and never has a duty to provide evidence and myself and Mr. Pesci just can't prove our case, if you have a reasonable doubt despite the fact they didn't take the stand, you have to return a verdict of not guilty, okay?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: Okay.

MR. DI GIACOMO: If the Judge instructs you that, can you follow that law?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: Yes.

MR. DI GIACOMO: So if the Judge teils you that they have an absolute right not to say anything, you are willing to follow that law and make a determination on the facts?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: Yes.

MR. DI GIACOMO: Thank you.

THE COURT: You've kind of said two different things, and again, there's no right or wrong answer because it's what people's thoughts are and their feelings so it's not like a test where one answer might be correct and another answer might be incorrect. There is no such thing as a right or wrong answer when we do this. It's just what people's thoughts and feelings are.

Now, you said previously when Mr. Arrascada was questioning you that you would want to hear from them. And then when Mr. DiGiacomo was questioning you you said, well, no, you understand. Now, again, we kind of ask you about concepts that you may not be familiar with. But an accused in a criminal case is never required to present any evidence.

So do you understand that Mr. Gentile and Ms. Armeni and Mr. Adams and Mr. Arrascada don't have to put on any witnesses or cross-examine anybody if they choose not to? Do you understand that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, if the State doesn't prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, even if you think the defense attorneys did nothing and did a bad job, would you be able to render a verdict of not guilty, or would you hold that against the men sitting at this table?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: I could probably render a not guilty.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, on the issue of a defendant testifying. You understand that there are many reasons why a defendant may choose not to testify?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. If a defendant chose or one of the defendants or both of the defendants chose not to testify, would you hold it against that defendant? Would you think, well, wait a minute. They should have testified, and I wanted to hear from them, and somehow hold that against them or their attorneys?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: No.

THE COURT: Okay. You'd be able to follow the law and just base your verdict on the evidence and not sort of think, well, if they didn't do it I'd want to hear from them? Any thoughts on that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: No.

THE COURT: Mr. Arrascada, any follow up with this potential juror? MR. ARRASCADA: Yes, Your Honor.

Ms. Espino, I'm just going to ask you in your heart of hearts do you need to hear Luis Hidalgo III say, I didn't do this, in order to find him not guilty? We hear your emotions. Not that we're all leading you around. I want to hear your true feelings, okay?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: No.

MR. ARRASCADA: I appreciate your honesty.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Arrascada.

The State may question Juror No. 2, Ms. Silber.

MR. PESCI: Thank you, Judge.

Ma'am, fine to correct me, teacher, rock and roll and an actress?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: Right.

MR. PESCI: Could you tell us a little more about that. What did you teach?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: I forgot to tell you I also sold Chryslers in Germany.

MR. PESCI: Was that between the acting or when was that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: I taught kindergarten through 8. I taught 6, 7 and 8 in the inner city. I taught army Gls how to type in a military correspondence. I counseled for the University of Maryland. I taught kindergarten through adults yoga.

MR. PESCI: All right. When was the rock and roll in all that? What did vou do in rock and roll?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: Rock and roll was '76 to I'm still involved.

MR. PESCI: What aspect though? Was it event planning that you're --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: Husband No. 2 was an entertainer. Husband No. 3 is also an entertainer. I also perform. I also sing and I also dance, and I book musicians and I book entertainers. I've booked comedy clubs.

MR. PESCI: What was the acting?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: I was the star of a children's show at Second City in Chicago.

MR. PESCI: When was that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: That was in 1971 to about '74.

MR. PESCI: We heard about some things that happened to you. I want to focus on the principal. I didn't follow it exactly. Were you teaching at --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: I don't want to focus on him either.

MR. PESCI: Were you a teacher at the time?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: Yes.

MR. PESCI: So it wasn't that you were a student then?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: Oh, no.

MR. PESCI: Nothing was followed up on?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: No. I was a new teacher. It was a school in an extremely dangerous neighborhood in Chicago, south side of Chicago, and I'd been at school one week teaching my class when the vice principal asked me down to his office to go over the reading curriculum, and I went down to his office. And he took me back in a back room and he started -

MR. PESCI: That's all right. You don't have to get into detail. We don't need to go there.

Now, did anything happen after that with that particular individual?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: No. Halfway into the year he got promoted to a principalship at another school in Chicago.

MR. PESCI: Okay. Do you have any problem sitting in judgment of another human being?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: I don't.

MR. PESCI: You somewhat paused before you gave me an answer. Sometimes it's religious, moral, personal or whatever. Is there some reason that you can't sit in judgment of these two individuals?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: I try not to be a judgmental person; however, my life experiences, and you're probably going to get to this in the questioning, you know, I mean, you know, I led that rock and roll life, and I was very much involved in things that I don't like to think about today. My life today is a lot different. But because of the way I live my life today, I have some prejudices about things like alcohol and drugs because they're not part of my life today.

MR. PESCI: Prejudice in the sense that you wish people didn't do that, or what do you mean by that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: Yes, I do. I think that they're at the root of a lot of crime.

MR. PESCI: Okay. If you were to hear testimony about drugs or drugs related to any aspect of this, how do you think that would affect your assessment of the evidence?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: I don't know if I could be -- I just really don't know, honestly, if I could be totally objective. I also I mentor or sponsor a girl that worked in a club similar to the Palomino, and she's kind of like

 leading a different kind of life today, a sober life, you know.

MR. PESCI: And did you help her in that process?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: Yes.

MR. PESCI: There's been some testimony, at least discussion about firearms. Some people have really strong feelings about firearms one way or the other. Are you an individual that has such strong feelings one way or the other that would affect the way you would assess the evidence?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: Absolutely. I'm very opposed to guns, very opposed to weapons.

MR. PESCI: Let me put it to you this way. Would you find -- or would you be inclined to find guilt because you're opposed to guns and there was allegedly guns used?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: I would try -- you know, because I like to think of myself as a person that's going to look beyond that, but also, I just know I am. I know that might enter into it. I just -- I can't say.

MR. PESCI: Okay. You know, we just had a big long discussion, and poor Ms. Espino was kind of put on the spot about the presumption of innocence and all that stuff. Really, we're not supposed to ask you hypotheticals, and the Judge gives the law at the end of the case, but we seem to have already had that come out.

So as far as the presumption of innocence, as far as the fact that an individual does not have to testify, do you have any problem with that concept?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: I don't have a problem with it, but I just I was listening to this whole explanation that you were giving, Judge, and this

whole thing about, like, remaining silent, and it seems to me that if the State painted such a good case and had so much evidence if I -- I put myself in that position if I were the defendant, why I wouldn't want to just sit there silent. I would want to talk about my not being guilty.

MR. PESCI: And if you were a defendant that would be your choice.

The question is whether --

THE COURT: But of course you've been a performer and an actress, and you can appreciate that other people may not have that same comfort level; is that fair?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: That's fair.

MR. PESCI: The question that we're trying to get at is would you hold that against a defendant if they choose not to for whatever reason, if they choose not to testify would that mean in your mind, here's the equation, didn't testify, I'll find him guilty?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: No, but here's the question that I -- sorry to throw the question back at you, but here's the question I had when you were talking about that. If someone decides to just remain silent and no matter how the case someone paints against that person, then doesn't that case that's been painted, isn't that just one of those circumstantial evidence things? So, I mean, no one would ever get convicted of a crime, would they, if they just decided, well, they're the defendant so I'll just sit silent?

MR. PESCI: Well, Her Honor is going to explain the difference between direct evidence and circumstantial evidence and what weight you give that.

We'll go with kind of what Mr. DiGiacomo stated. Whatever Her Honor gives as the law are you willing to follow it?

 PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: Of course.

MR. PESCI: Can you be fair to both sides?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: I would think so.

MR. PESCI: We're going to pass for cause, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Gentile.

MR. GENTILE: Okay. When you were Second City other than the corner of Clark and Webster, so I want to know what was your maiden name, or in those years, let's put it that way?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: My maiden name was Cramer. I acted with Tim Kaserinsky (phonetic) if you remember him, and John Belushi was there at the time --

MR. GENTILE: I lived across the hall from David Memic.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: All right.

MR. GENTILE: Anyhow, the Judge brought up a good point. You know how to project. You're comfortable speaking to a group of people, and I'll tell you what, everybody in this box is not. Some people can do it. Some people train to do it as you have, although my guess is you could do it before the training. And some people just can't do it. And so would you take that into consideration not only if somebody doesn't testify but if somebody does? Do you understand what I'm talking about?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: Uh-huh.

MR. GENTILE: I'm talking affect. I'm talking about the ability to project. I'm talking about the ability to feel comfortable talking essentially to people that are strangers about something really important to your life. It's not easy. Would you agree?

MR. GENTILE: You ever drive a cab?

25

very -- I have a hunch you have some feelings about the nature of the industry that are general; am I right or am I wrong?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: You're right.

MR. GENTILE: What are they?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: Well, they're not the most stable, I mean, you know, I hear strip club I think seedy, snarly. You know, I don't think good adjectives, and I am a very open-minded individual and far from prudish. I mean, it doesn't offend my sensibilities.

MR. GENTILE: You ever been to one?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: Glitter Glutch, does that count?

MR. GENTILE: That's a strip club. All right.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: One time. I didn't think it was very pleasant.

MR. GENTILE: So it's not your cup of tea?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: No.

MR. GENTILE: Any other general reactions that you have when you learned that somebody who works at or is the owner of a strip club?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: I usually would think that person is somehow involved with alcohol and drugs.

MR. GENTILE: Well, you're going to learn --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: That's just my prejudice.

MR. GENTILE: I understand. You're going to learn that at least with respect to the allegations in this case alcohol goes (unintelligible) but you will hear something about people who drink alcohol and take drugs and that's the reason why I brought up the question. I'm going to ask you the same question.

MR. GENTILE: Let's look beyond that.

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: An ongoing relationship with a lawyer?

MR. GENTILE: Right. In other words, like you're suddenly --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: I have a trust attorney.

MR. GENTILE: If you thought you needed a lawyer, who would you call? That's a lame question the way I phrased it, but here's what I'm trying to say. Let's say that you had a legal problem come up. You live in Chicago; you live here. My guess is you've lived in Chicago longer than here, and so your relationships are in Chicago. You needed a lawyer here, would you call a lawyer in Chicago for a referral?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: No, I'd probably talk to some friend out here.

MR. GENTILE: Friends out here?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: Uh-huh.

MR. GENTILE: And in the past have you had a relationship with a lawyer other than a trust lawyer, would you go to that same one for several different types of problems?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: (No audible response.)

MR. GENTILE: Have you ever been in business for yourself?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: Yes.

MR. GENTILE: Let me change that just a little bit. Have you ever had a brick and mortar business? You know what I mean by a brick and mortar business? It's a place that's like a building that has maybe a retail store or even a theatre really, I mean, anything that --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: No.

MR. GENTILE: No. Have you ever been in a cash business?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: Yes.

MR. GENTILE: No doubt about it.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: I'd be a good juror. I'm just -- my concern is as I told you my personal baggage that I'd bring into it, which of course you've got to be concerned with.

MR. GENTILE: That's called wisdom. What you just called personal baggage is called wisdom if you can set the bias aside, and we want people on this jury that have life experience. Now, do you think you could do that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: My answer is do what I think it is.

MR. GENTILE: Well, it's your choice. That means that Mr. DiGiacomo, Ms. Armeni and myself, Mr. Arrascada and Mr. Adams have passed you for cause. That means all six of us agree. Now, there's a responsibility that comes with that. No one wants you to state but what you really think.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: What I really think is I would love not to do it, if you want to know what I'm really thinking, yeah, I would like to not do it. I have this big show coming up next week that I'm worried about. I don't want to have to postpone all the things I've got set up for the next couple weeks, but if I'm asked to do it, I will do my civic duty and do it. So there you go and try not to bear a grudge.

THE COURT: Well, as long as you bear the grudge equally against all of us.

MR. GENTILE: Yeah, spread the grudge around at least, would you do that. Thank you.

May I have a moment, please?

THE COURT: You may.

MR. GENTILE: Pass for cause.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Arrascada.

MR. ARRASCADA: Thank you, Your Honor.

Ms. Silber, how are you. I really appreciate your honesty. There's no right answer or wrong answers. As the Judge said, there's only honest answers.

Ma'am, you mentioned when the prosecutor was talking to you I believe they asked you a question in regards if could you be fair to both sides, and I think you said, I think so is your honest answer. Can you explain that for me.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: I just want to reiterate what I said. I mean, my concern is how very much against drugs and alcohol I am. It doesn't fit into my life, and, of course, I don't like strip clubs either. So, I mean, those things make me a little queasy about this trial.

MR. ARRASCADA: Those are your personal feelings and emotions.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: Uh-huh.

MR. ARRASCADA: And with the same regard for crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: Yeah, same regard for that.

MR. ARRASCADA: You have a very strong bias then regarding guns?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: Yes. I think I mentioned that I was raped at gunpoint.

MR. ARRASCADA: You did. Thank you for that honesty. And obviously violent crime?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: Yes.

MR. ARRASCADA: And also strip clubs?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: Yes.

MR. ARRASCADA: There's really not much I can say to ask you to change those opinions that you have, is there?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: Well, no. I mean, my opinion is based on what happened. What is is, what was was, and that's a fact, Jack.

MR. ARRASCADA: That's a fact, Jack, and my name's John, but there's nothing I can say and there's nothing the prosecutors can say to change that, is there?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: No.

MR. ARRASCADA: You can say that's the fact, Jack, and that's --

THE COURT: Except they're Mark and Giancarlo.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: That's the fact.

MR. ARRASCADA: There's nothing we can say. There's nothing the Judge can say to you that's going to change those opinions and biases, is there?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: My mind is my mind.

MR. ARRASCADA: As you probably guessed, this case involves drugs. It involves some alcohol. It involves a strip club. Do you think it might be best -- as the Judge said, there's 21 other trials going on. Do you mind if we ask the Judge if it might be best if you could serve on a different jury that doesn't have those type of issues?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: Probably wouldn't be bad idea.

THE COURT: All right. But the issue is, you know, there are certain things that nobody's going to say, yes, I like violent crime. And nobody's going to say, you know, another type of case, you know, yes, I like shoddy

` 17

construction work, or yes, I like doctors who don't do what they're supposed to do or, you know, whatever. So everyone no matter what kind of a trial it is comes with attitude, and you recognize as you sit here what the State said those are just allegations. There's been no evidence. There's been no proof. They haven't shown you anything.

Fair?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: Yeah.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, can you -- I guess the issue is, can you set aside, you know, whatever the case may be people are going to have opinions and attitudes, and like I said, if the allegation is a doctor didn't do what he was supposed to do, nobody is going to sit in the jury box and say, oh, yeah, doctors that are negligent, yeah, I'm all about that. You know what I'm saying. Everyone's going to say, no, I'm opposed to that.

But can you set aside whatever negative feelings you have about the industry or about drugs and alcohol and just listen to the evidence with an open mind? That's all we want.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: Of course. But also just bear in mind I'm coming with attitude. I am about attitude.

THE COURT: I can see that. And I say that that's a good thing. And can you just at least keep an open mind and base your verdict just on the evidence that's presented during this trial, the testimony and the exhibits?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. I'll see counsel up here at the bench.

(Conference at the bench.)

THE COURT: Let's see. State, you may question Ms. Bennett.

MR. DI GIACOMO: Guess I won't even go back and sit down.

How are you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: Good.

MR. DI GIACOMO: I guess I could jump into everything, but actually, I want to back up to you have probably a unique experience from the people that's sitting on this jury in the nature of your job. And I know the Judge asked you some questions about what do you do for a living and asked you a little bit about the investigator techniques that you use.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: Yes.

MR. DI GIACOMO: How many years have you been actually investigating claims to determine the veracity of the claim?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: Probably about 24, 25 years.

MR. DI GIACOMO: And during that time period how many workers comp claims do you think you've had to deal with?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: Well, average case load is about 220, and they rotate. So I would say well over probably 2- or 3,000.

MR. DI GIACOMO: So you've had to look into 2- or 3,000 allegations that someone got injured on the job and that they should be compensated for it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: Yes.

MR. DI GIACOMO: And in some of those occasions when you talk to the witnesses, you ultimately made a determination that definitely the person got injured on the job and then there was compensation?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: Yes.

MR. DI GIACOMO: And then sometimes you say this person's lying? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: Yes.

MR. DI GIACOMO: At any point during the time that you do the investigation, have you ever come across the case where there are multiple different people that you talk to and while their stories are all slightly different ultimately you can ferret out the truth?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: Yes.

MR. DI GIACOMO: And merely because in the time that you've talked to those people the fact that their versions of events might be slightly different doesn't necessarily mean to you that they're lying?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: True.

MR. DI GIACOMO: There's different reasons people have memories about different things, correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: Uh-hum.

MR. DI GIACOMO: And you're asking them to think back to a time period an event may have happened it didn't seem memorable at the time it happened?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: Right.

MR. DI GIACOMO: And ultimately at the end of the day though you can look through and say, I'm pretty confident this guy got injured at work and he deserves to get paid?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: Probably in about 95 of them, 95 percent of the cases.

MR. DI GIACOMO: And so every once in a while you're able to say this is clearly somebody who that didn't happen?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: Right.

MR. DI GIACOMO: Just because it's been talked about, drugs, I can't imagine anybody up here -- well, actually maybe some people will raise their hand and say marijuana should be legalized or something like that, and you're going to hear testimony about individuals or at least one individual who may or may not have been under the influence of a particular drug at the time he witnessed some pretty important things.

You would agree with me that you'd prefer an individual who was completely sober when he witnessed something, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: Yes.

MR. DI GIACOMO: The mere fact that he may have been under the influence of something doesn't necessarily mean he lied, correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: True.

MR. DI GIACOMO: The mere fact that he was under the influence of something doesn't necessarily mean he was mistaken?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: True.

MR. DI GIACOMO: And in fact, it could be one of those explanations for why someone's time line could be slightly off?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: Maybe.

MR. DI GIACOMO: You would agree with me all those are possibilities? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: Uh-huh. Yes.

MR. DI GIACOMO: When you -- I'll move on to a different subject.

Obviously at this point you now know this is a club in which you'll hear a lot of discussion about strippers, for lack of a better term, and strip clubs and the strip club process and the way things work in this town -- I think someone -- I

4

5 6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25 think the juror next to you actually used the term seedy, that first initial feel it's like there's something seedy going on, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: Yes.

MR. DI GIACOMO: Whatever your opinions are of the strip club business, is it possible for you to set those aside and view the evidence that comes in through the witnesses in order to make a determination?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: Possibly.

MR. DI GIACOMO: When you say possibly, what's the hesitation?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: I have a very low opinion of those places and the people who run them and work in them. It's just my personal opinions.

MR. DI GIACOMO: This opinion that you're forming about the owners of those places, is that from kind of reading in the media of various owners and what their problems have been?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: Not necessarily, it's just the nature of the business.

MR. DI GIACOMO: The nature of the business?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: Yes.

MR. DI GIACOMO: And I guess the question comes down at the end of the day, I mean, there's an individual sitting in this courtroom that at one time owned a strip club, and his son is also here, and he worked at that strip club. At the end of the day if you're sitting over there, are you worried if there's 12 people like you sitting on this jury?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: I think I would be.

MR. DI GIACOMO: And the ultimate question, all of us in the courtroom at the end of the day just want 12 fair people, and we're not saying that some

people that have the opinion of strip clubs that you have can't sit on this jury. The question is if you sit on this jury, can you set aside that opinion because we don't have any more chances to talk to you? If the answer's no, the answer's no. If the answer's yes, now is the time we need to know. Can you set it aside and look at the evidence we present?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: In all honesty, no.

MR. DI GIACOMO: Judge, we'd submit it.

THE COURT: All right. Anything from the defense?

I'll see counsel at the bench.

(Conference at the bench.)

THE COURT: All right. I believe it's Mr. Gentile's turn.

MR. GENTILE: Ms. Bennett, you said something interesting, that is that your feelings, your opinions with respect to strip clubs -- actually, you didn't say it, Mr. --

did Mr. DiGia --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: Him.

MR. GENTILE: Him. He did a lot of talking and you said yes and you said no, okay. We're going to turn that around.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: Okay.

MR. GENTILE: How did your opinions about strip clubs form?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: Probably just the way I was brought up, our religious beliefs and the very nature of my upbringing. I was taught that those things were not right, and it was very degrading to females and just not conducive to a good business.

MR. GENTILE: So I'm going to take a guess that you've never been to a

MR. PESCI: He works in the same office as Mr. DiGiacomo and myself.

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: Well, congratulations. He's a good man.

MR. PESCI: Yes, he is.

Now, if you were seated over here, would you think that would

make you have concern?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: Maybe that I'd understand the law or have been exposed to those kinds of folks for a lot of years, those conversations.

MR. PESCI: Well, let me put it to you this way. Would you automatically find the defendants guilty just because we work with Mr. Ponticello?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: Absolutely not.

MR. PESCI: All right.

MR. GENTILE: Your Honor, just for a moment, I don't want to interrupt, but could the record reflect that when Mr. Pesci said if he was sitting over here

THE COURT: He pointed towards defense --

MR. GENTILE: -- he was pointing to defense table. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MR. PESCI: The State's going to call witnesses. We're the ones that have the burden. We have to prove the case beyond a reasonable doubt. Do you have any problem with that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: No.

MR. PESCI: The defense has no burden. They don't have to call any witnesses. They don't have to ask any questions. Nobody has to testify. Do you have any problem with that?

MR. PESCI: All right. We would pass for cause.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Gentile.

MR. PESCI: Mr. Marcella or Mr. Marcella?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: It was changed during the second world war where there could be certain fears because that wasn't a popular place to be because it was Marcella, and it was changed to Marcella because my dad thought that was French.

MR. GENTILE: Famous chess piece manufacturer in Florence by the name of Marcella. Anyhow, I think I heard you say that you might have a hard time finding the defendant not guilty --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: No, I meant the opposite.

MR. GENTILE: You meant the opposite, okay. Then I must have misheard you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: No, you heard correctly; I might have stated it.

MR. GENTILE: Oh, I see what you're saying.

I have to ask you about Frank Ponticello. How did you meet him?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: Well, I met him through his wife Terry.

Terry and I used to work at financial institutions together. She was the legal counsel at (unintelligible.)

MR. GENTILE: Now, a couple of things. Do you see him often?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: Often.

MR. GENTILE: Do you talk to Terry often?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: Every day.

MR. GENTILE: Okay. Have you ever -- now, you've known him 20

MR. GENTILE: And so given the fact that you're going to be here all

25

24

25

you consider comes from this courtroom. Plus, it would be uncomfortable for PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: Well, she wouldn't listen to me anyway. Let's talk about strip clubs. What do you do for the State? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: I'm the chief information officer. PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: I run all the computer systems, and you PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: I am. MR. GENTILE: Do you have children? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: I have three adults.

MR. GENTILE: Adults, 45, 35 and 35.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: No. That was someone else.

MR. GENTILE: Somebody else. I remember. That's you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: They're 24, 28 and 30.

MR. GENTILE: And you raised them?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: Well, I tried.

MR. GENTILE: You tried, okay.

Let me ask you about strip clubs. You ever been to one?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: Uh-huh.

MR. GENTILE: Do you have any response, any kind of a visceral, emotional, intellectual, whatever response when you just hear the term strip club?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: Oh, I just figure it's a little unfortunate for the girls, and their earnings are not necessarily theirs and that they end up in someone else's. I usually look at it from a financial aspect.

MR. GENTILE: That's what you do for a living. Well, how do you mean that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: Well, the work, the exposure and the short- term opportunities for these folks and then the share of what they end up with is -- that tends to be something (unintelligible).

MR. GENTILE: I need to explore this a little bit more. What do you know about how much a dancer gets to keep of how much she earns?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: We have to license those clubs. We license them as well through the city and their computer systems for the city. We know essentially what the business pay systems are and their financials and

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

MR. GENTILE: Is it your understanding that they all charge the dancers the same amount of money?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: No. I understand that there are different contract provisions. Some dancers contract and some folks are employees. It depends on what they do, from the waitress right on through the dancers and then a combination.

MR. GENTILE: Well, I don't think that that's going to be -- I mean, you're going to hear probably a good deal about the financial operations of the Palomino Club in the course of this. I don't think much of it's going to relate to payments but it could. What were your --

Do you remember when we were talking about prejudices a little while ago?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: Uh-huh.

MR. GENTILE: Do you have any with respect to that subject other than what you've just stated that you think the dancers don't make as much money as they should?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: Probably not.

MR. GENTILE: How about more, I mean, any issues there?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: No.

MR. GENTILE: You license those businesses?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: Yes,

MR. GENTILE: They are legal?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: They are.

MR. GENTILE: This is Las Vegas?

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: And then we moved to Long Island for the (unintelligible).

MR. GENTILE: Have you ever been afraid?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: Absolutely.

MR. GENTILE: Did you respond to fear -- I don't care what it was -- probably been more than once in your life I guess if you're at least 35 or 40 --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: Thank you.

MR. GENTILE: Have you -- do you respond when you're afraid the same way that you do when you're not?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: No.

MR. GENTILE: In what way is it different?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: I think I have a little bit more clarity of thought when the more excited or fearful I am the more focused I am.

MR. GENTILE: The more focused you are.

You ever hired a lawyer?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: Well, I've been married a couple times, yes.

MR. GENTILE: Other than for domestic relations --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: There's a trust lawyer and then -- and then obviously domestic relations.

MR. GENTILE: When you hear that somebody goes to a lawyer, do you have a response to that? I mean, just in general, forget about what it may be for or anything like that, just the fact that somebody, quote, unquote, has a lawyer.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: Doesn't mean anything. That's a

MR. GENTILE: Did you ever run the register?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: I did.

MR. GENTILE: Did you ever watch the other guy who was running the register?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: That was a requirement.

THE COURT: May I see counsel at the bench, please.

(Conference at the bench.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, it being late, and I know some people had responsibilities, we're going to take a break in a moment.

At this point in time, Badge No. 3, Ms. Bennett, you are excused.

Officer Wooten will direct you from the courtroom.

Badge No. 59, Ms. Lazo, you are excused. Officer Wooten will direct you from the courtroom.

Badge No. 64, Mr. Yancey, you are excused. Officer Wooten will direct you from the courtroom.

Badge No. 78, Mr. Choi, you are excused. Officer Wooten will direct you from the courtroom.

Badge No. 95, Mr. Klimes, you are excused, and Officer Wooten will direct you from the courtroom.

All right, ladies and gentlemen, we're going to take our evening recess in just a moment. We'll resume tomorrow morning at 9:30. As soon as I excuse you, you're going to follow our bailiff, Officer Wooten through the double doors, and he can answer any questions or give you additional instructions on where to meet tomorrow morning.

A couple of preliminary admonitions, during our evening recess

you're not to discuss this case or anything relating to the case or any subject matter about anyone relating to the case with each other or with anyone else. Once again, anyone else would include members of your family and your friends. You may tell them that you are participating in jury selection in a criminal jury trial, but please do not say anything else relating to this case. Do not discuss anything else relating to the case.

Additionally, do not read, watch, or listen to any reports of or commentaries on any subject relating to the case. Do not do any independent research on any subject or person relating to the trial. Don't visit the location or any of the locations made mention of during this, namely the Palomino Club and any other locations that were discussed, and please do not form or express an opinion on the case at this time.

All right. Ladies and gentlemen, once again we will be in recess for the evening break. We will reconvene tomorrow morning at 9:30.

If everyone will please get their belongings and follow Officer

Wooten through the double doors he'll instruct you on where to meet tomorrow morning and answer any questions or concerns you may have.

(Jury panel recessed 5:06 p.m.)

THE COURT: We need to put on the record Mr. Arrascada and Mr. Gentile both challenged Juror No. 3 for cause, and I did grant that for-cause challenge and excused Juror No. 3.

Mr. Arrascada challenged Jurors No. 1 and 2 for cause; I overruled those for-cause challenges, and they are remaining.

Mr. Arrascada, do you want to put anything else on the record?
MR. ARRASCADA: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: State, do you want to put anything else on the record regarding Jurors No. 1 and 2, whom I did not excuse?

MR. DI GIACOMO: Just very briefly because I don't have the information to even back it up in front of me, but during the course of the questioning it appeared that both jurors -- well, specifically Juror No. 1 was confused by the nature of the question, and once the Court clarified the nature of the question, the juror provided absolutely no basis whatsoever.

As to Juror No. 2 who while she says she brings a lot of attitude to a courtroom, she ultimately said she'd be fair and impartial which is the only test that we could really apply, and as such I believe the Court properly denied the for-cause challenge.

THE COURT: And, Mr. Arrascada, anything else, or Mr. Adams?

MR. ADAMS: Yes, thank you, Your Honor. We would just point out as we did at the bench that for Juror No. 1 she did indicate -- she indicated in an abstract question that she would require a defendant to testify or she would find him not guilty. When she was asked that more directly after a conference at the bench the same question in the construct of will you require that before you render a verdict and she did indicate that she would require a defendant to testify before she could acquit, and that was the basis of Mr. Arrascada's motion to cause challenge.

THE COURT: Yeah, I mean, the record speaks for itself, but my recollection or opinion is more that she sort of may have been a little bit confused and was speaking very generally, but then when it was explained to her she indicated no. And I think in my view feel fairly confident that no she would not require a defendant to testify.

All right. Anything else we need to put on the record?

MR. PESCI: Yes, Judge. I believe neither side had any objections to Your Honor kicking 59, 64, 78 and 95. Is that correct, Defense?

MR. ARRASCADA: That's correct, Judge.

THE COURT: And, Mr. Gentile, Ms. Armeni, is that correct?

MS. ARMENI: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. We'll see you all back here at 9:30.

MR. DI GIACOMO: Judge, I'm almost loathe to say this because I don't think we're going to get there, but I'm assuming you don't want witnesses and I'm hoping not openings tomorrow only because they'll be done after eight hours of talking to them, but whatever the Court's pleasure is.

THE COURT: No, we're not going to get to witnesses. I mean, I'm hopeful we can get a jury picked. I mean, again, it took us four hours to get through two people, but we did do a lot of the preliminary stuff. I think that now maybe we can move a little more quickly through some of the people now that we kind of know the logistics of how everything -- how we do everything in here. So I think we're going to speed it up obviously.

How long for the State's opening? And again, I don't like to break up the openings with an evening break because that's kind of unfair.

MR. DI GIACOMO: I don't know the actual answer to that question because it could be -- I could do it in 20 minutes, or I could do it in an hour, and I haven't decided which way to do it.

THE COURT: And you don't have a huge power point thing already?

MR. DI GIACOMO: I have a power point. The question is how much of the audio, if any, do I play, and that will determine for me the length of my

THE COURT: And then, Mr. Gentile, you indicated you had a rather lengthy opening statement; is that correct?

MR. GENTILE: Yeah, I could see an hour.

THE COURT: And, Mr. Adams, who will be opening on your side?

MR. ADAMS: I will be opening, Your Honor. My best estimate right now is 30 minutes, but I've also been toying with the idea of playing an entire wire that's 35 minutes.

THE COURT: All right. Then probably we're not going to get to do openings tomorrow.

MR. GENTILE: I actually think that the evidence in this case is going to go pretty fast.

THE COURT: Like I said, a lot of the stuff that took all the time today was preliminary stuff so we'll be able to pick it up tomorrow now that we've gone through all that.

Counsel, does anyone have an objection to kicking Mr. 51, Steven Ricks, the yellow -- he was a cab driver and now he's a glazier and --

MR. PESCI: He's going to do everything he needs to to get off anyway.

THE COURT: Right. I mean, he's already complaining to my bailiff that he's not coming back tomorrow and what would happen to him if he comes back --

MR. ARRASCADA: No objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Any objection to kicking him? If you do then we won't; we'll make him come back. I mean, as a glazier, I figure he makes a pretty decent union wage, but by the same token, you know, times are tough.

MR. GENTILE: Your Honor, he would be a good juror for us. I would not want to just let him go. Well, I mean, I don't mean that he'd be a good juror for us, but he kind of fits the profile that we want.

THE COURT: Okay. Like I said, I try to figure out what the hardship is, and like I said those are pretty decent jobs.

All right.

(Recess taken 5:13 p.m.)

\*\*\*\*

ATTEST: I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT I HAVE TRULY AND CORRECTLY TRANSCRIBED THE AUDIO/VIDEO PROCEEDINGS IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED CASE TO THE BEST OF MY ABILITY.

KIMBERLY LAWSON, TRANSCRIBER

KARReporting and Transcription Services