#### IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA 1 2 3 Supreme CoElectronically Filed Apr 08 2011 09:09 a.m. BRIAN KERRY O'KEEFE, 4 District Court Case No. (25063) 5 Petitioner, 6 7 EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT: THE HONORABLE MICHAEL P. VILLANI, 9 DISTRICT COURT JUDGE, 10 Respondents, 11 And 12 THE STATE OF NEVADA, 13 Real Party in Interest. 14 APPENDIX 15 TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE, A WRIT OF PROHIBITION 16 AND REQUEST FOR STAY OF TRIAL 17 18 VOLUME 8 19 PATRICIA A. PALM DAVID ROGER 20 BAR NO. 6009 BAR NO. 0477 1212 S. CASINO CENTER BLVD. CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 21 LAS VEGAS, NV 89104 DISTRICT ATTORNEY 22 200 LEWIS AVE., 3RD FLOOR (702) 386-9113 LAS VEGAS, NV 89155 23 (702) 671-2500 24 CATHERINE CORTEZ-MASTO 25 ATTORNEY GENERAL 26 100 N. CARSON STREET 27 CARSON CITY, NV 89701-4717 (702) 486-3420 28 Counsel for Real Party in Interest Attorney for Petitioner 1

#### 1 **INDEX** 2 3 VOLUME DOCUMENT NAME/FILE DATE PAGE NO. 4 5 1 AMENDED INFORMATION (2/10/09) 35-37 6 5 APPELLANT'S FAST TRACK STATEMENT 7 DOCKET NO. 53859 (8/19/09) 721-736 8 DEFENDANT'S BRIEF ON ADMISSIBILITY 9 OF EVIDENCE OF ALLEGED VICTIM'S HISTORY OF SUICIDE ATTEMPTS, ANGER 10 OUTBURSTS, ANGER MANAGEMENT THERAPY, SELF-MUTILATION (WITH 11 KNIVES AND SCISSORS) AND ERRATIC 12 BEHAVIOR (3/20/09) 598-606 13 DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO SETTLE 14 THE RECORD (3/24/09) 694-699 15 DEFENDANT'S OPPOSITION TO STATE'S 16 MOTION TO ADMIT EVIDENCE OF OTHER 17 CRIMES (2/6/09) 25-29 18 DEFENDANT'S OPPOSITION TO MOTION IN 14 19 LIMINE TO ADMIT EVIDENCE OF OTHER BAD ACTS PURSUANT TO NRS 48.045 AND 20 EVIDENCE OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE 21 PURSUANT TO 48.061 (1/18/11) 2449-2480 22 DEFENDANT'S PROPOSED EXHIBIT 23 B (MONTE VISTA HOSPITAL RECORDS) 607-49 24 DEFENDANT'S PROPOSED JURY 25 INSTRUCTIONS (8/23/10) 1038-1096 26 **INFORMATION** (12/19/08) 1-3 1 27 28 INSTRUCTIONS TO THE JURY (3/20/09) 650-692 2

1	VOLUME	DOCUMENT NAME/FILE DATE	PAGE NO.
2			
3	12	INSTRUCTIONS TO THE JURY (9/2/10)	2191-2218
4	5	JUDGMENT OF CONVICTION	
5		(5/8/09)	709-710
6	5	MINUTES (1/6/09 - 5/5/09)	713-720
7 8	6	MINUTES (4/29/10, 5/20/10, 6/6/10)	746-748
9	12	MINUTES (9/1/10 – 9/2/10)	2221-2224
10	12	MINUTES (9/16/10)	2235
11	12	MINUTES (9/14/10)	2239
12		WIINO LES (S/14/10)	2200
13	5	NOTICE OF APPEAL	
14	0	(5/21/09)	711-712
15			
16	1	NOTICE OF DEFENDANT'S EXPERT	
17		WITNESSES (3/5/09)	40-45
18	1	NOTICE OF DEFENDANT'S WITNESSES	
19		(3/6/09)	58-61
20	1	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO	
21		ADMIT EVIDENCE OF OTHER CRIMES (BY STATE) (2/2/09)	7-22
22		(DI STATE) (2/2/09)	1-22
23	6	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION BY DEFENDANT O'KEEFE TO PRECLUDE THE	
24		STATE FROM INTRODUCING AT TRIAL	
25		OTHER ACT OR CHARACTER EVIDENCE AND OTHER EVIDENCE WHICH IS UNFAIRLY	
26		PREJUDICIAL OR WOULD VIOLATE HIS	
27		CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS (7/21/10)	749-765
28			

1	VOLUME	DOCUMENT NAME/FILE DATE	PAGE NO.
2			
3	6	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION BY	
4		DEFENDANT O'KEEFE TO ADMIT EVIDENCE PERTAINING TO THE ALLEGED VICTIM'S	
5		MENTAL HEALTH CONDITION AND HISTORY,	
		INCLUDEING PRIOR SUICIDE ATTEMPTS,	
6		ANGER OUTBURSTS, ANGER MANAGEMENT	
7		THERAPY, SELF-MUTILATION AND ERRATIC BEHAVIOR (7/21/10)	765-784
8			.00 .01
9	6	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION BY	
10		DEFENDANT FOR DISCOVERY (8/2/10)	817-825
11		(0.2.10)	011 020
12	6	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION BY	
13		DEFENDANT TO SUPPRESS HIS STATEMENTS TO POLICE, OR,	
		ALTERNATIVELY, TO PRECLUDE THE	
14		STATE FROM INTRODUCING PORTIONS	
15		OF HIS INTERROGATION	826-872
16	6	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION BY	
17		DEFENDANT TO PRECLUDE EXPERT	
18		TESTIMONY	880-887
19	13	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION BY	
20		DEFENDANT TO PRECLUDE THE STATE	
21		FROM INTRODUCING AT TRIAL IMPROPER EVIDENCE AND ARGUMENT	
		(1/3/11)	2246-2315
22			
23	13	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION IN	
24		LIMINE TO ADMIT EVIDENCE OF OTHER BAD ACTS PURSUANT TO NRS 48.045 AND	
25		EVIDENCE OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	
26		PURSUANT TO 48.061 (BY STATE)	0001 0040
27		(1/6/11)	2321-2343
28			

1	VOLUME	DOCUMENT NAME/FILE DATE	PAGE NO.
2			
3	13	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION BY DEFENDANT TO DISMISS ON GROUNDS OF	
4		DOUBLE JEOPARDY BAR AND SPEEDY	
5		TRIAL VIOLATION AND, ALTERNATIVELY, TO PRECLUDE STATE'S NEW EXPERT	
6		WITNESS, EVIDENCE AND ARGUMENT	
7		RELATING TO THE DYNAMICS OR EFFECTS	
8		OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND ABUSE	0944 0970
9		(1/7/11)	2344-2370
	1	NOTICE OF WITNESSES AND/OR	
10		EXPERT WITNESSES (BY STATE) (2/3/09)	23-24
11	1	NOTICE OF WITNESSES AND/OR	
12		EXPERT WITNESSES (BY STATE) (2/17/09)	38-39
13		NOW, OF OF THE PROPERTY WAR	
14	1	NOTICE OF EXPERT WITNESSES (BY STATE) (3/5/09)	56-57
15		(DI STATE) (SISIOS)	50-57
16	14	OHIO V. BETTS, 2007 OHIO APP LEXIS,	
17		4873 (2007)	2588-2596
	5	ORDER OF REVERSAL AND REMAND,	
18		DOCKET NO. 53859 (4/7/10)	737-738
19	7	ORDER GRANTING, IN PART, AND	
20	1	DENYING, IN PART, MOTION BY	
21		DEFENDANT O'KEEFE FOR DISCOVERY	
22		(8/23/10)	1097-1098
23	$ _{12}$	ORDER GRANTING, IN PART, AND	
24		DENYING, IN PART, MOTION BY DEFENDANT	
25		O'KEEFE TO PRECLUDE THE STATE FROM INTRODUCING AT TRIAL OTHER ACT	
26		EVIDENCE AND OTHER EVIDENCE WHICH	
		IS UNFAIRLY PREJUDICIAL OR WOULD	
27		VIOLATE HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS	0000 0000
28		(9/9/10)	2236-2238

1	VOLUME	DOCUMENT NAME/FILE DATE	PAGE NO.
2	5	REMITTITUR, DOCKET NO. 53859	
3		(5/7/10)	739-745
5	1	ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT JANUARY 20, 2009 (7/10/09)	4-6
6 7 8	1	ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT FEBRUARY 10, 2009 (7/10/09)	30-34
9	1	ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT MARCH 10, 2009 (7/10/09)	64-68
11 12	3	ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT JURY TRIAL DAY TWO, MARCH 17, 2009 (7/10/09)	375-442
13 14	3	ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT JURY TRIAL DAY THREE, MARCH 18, 2009	070 112
15		(7/10/09)	443-494
16 17 18	4	ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT JURY TRIAL DAY FOUR, MARCH 19, 2009 (7/10/09)	495-548
19 20	4	ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT JURY TRIAL DAY FIVE, MARCH 20, 2009 (7/10/09)	549-597
21 22 22	5	ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT APRIL 7, 2009	
<ul><li>23</li><li>24</li><li>25</li></ul>	5	(7/10/09)  ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT (SENTENCING) MAY 5, 2009	704-703
26		(7/10/09)	704-708
27 28	6	ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT AUGUST 17, 2010 (11/23/10)	929-949

1	VOLUME	DOCUMENT NAME/FILE DATE	PAGE NO.
2 3	7	ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT AUGUST 19, 2010	
4		(11/23/10)	956-992
5 6 7	7	ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT AUGUST 20, 2010 (11/23/10)	996-1037
8 9 10	7	ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT (PARTIAL) JURY TRIAL (DAY ONE), AUGUST 23, 2010 (11/23/10)	1099-1122
11 12 13	7	ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT (PARTIAL) JURY TRIAL (DAY TWO), AUGUST 24, 2010 (11/23/10)	1123-1135
<ul><li>14</li><li>15</li><li>16</li></ul>	8	ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT JURY TRIAL (DAY THREE), AUGUST 25, 2010 (11/23/10)	1136-1258
17 18 19	9	ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT JURY TRIAL (DAY FOUR), AUGUST 26, 2010 (11/23/10)	1259-1552
<ul><li>20</li><li>21</li><li>22</li></ul>	10	ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT JURY TRIAL (DAY FIVE), AUGUST 27, 2010 (11/23/10)	1553-1790
23 24 25	11	ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT JURY TRIAL (DAY SIX), AUGUST 30, 2010 (11/23/10)	1791-2016
26 27 28	12	ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT JURY TRIAL (DAY SEVEN), AUGUST 31, 2010 (11/23/10)	2017-2190

1	VOLUME	DOCUMENT NAME/FILE DATE	PAGE NO.
2			
3 4	12	ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT JURY TRIAL (DAY EIGHT), SEPTEMBER 1, 2010	0010 0000
		(11/23/10)	2219-2220
5	$ _{12}$	ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT JURY TRIAL	
6		(DAY NINE), SEPTEMBER 2, 2010	
7		(11/23/10)	2225-2232
8	7	SECOND AMENDED INFORMATION	993-995
9	$ _{6}$	STATE'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S	
10		MOTION TO ADMIT EVIDENCE PERTAINING	
11		TO THE ALLEGED VICTIM'S MENTAL	
12		HEALTH CONDITION AND HISTORY (8/16/10)	900-905
13	6	STATE'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S	
14		MOTION TO SUPPRESS HIS STATEMENTS TO POLICE, OR ALTERNATIVELY, TO	
15		PRECLUDE THE STATE FROM INTRODUCING	
		PORTIONS OF HIS INTERROGATION (8/17/09)	915-928
16			
17	6	STATE'S OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO	
18		PRECLUDE EXPERT TESTIMONY (8/18/10)	950-955
19	14	STATE'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S	
20		MOTION TO PRECLUDE THE STATE FROM	
		INTRODUCING AT TRIAL IMPROPER	
21		EVIDENCE AND ARGUMENT (1/12/11)	2371-2428
22	$ _{6}$	STATE'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S	
23		MOTION TO PRECLUDE THE STATE FROM	
24		INTRODUCING AT TRIAL OTHER BAD ACTS	
		OR CHARACTER EVIDENCE AND OTHER	
25		EVIDENCE THAT IS UNFAIRLY PREJUDICIAL	
26		OR WOULD VIOLATE HIS CONSTITUTIONAL	891-899
27		RIGHTS (8/16/10)	091-099
28			

1	VOLUME	DOCUMENT NAME/FILE DATE	PAGE NO.
2	1.4		
3	14	STATE'S OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO DISMISS, AND, ALTERNATIVELY, TO	
4		PRECLUDE EXPERT AND ARGUMENT	
5		REGARDING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE (1/18/11)	2481-2538
6			<b>_</b> 101 <b>_</b> 000
7	1	SUPPLEMENTAL NOTICE OF WITNESSES (BY STATE) (3/10/09)	62-63
8		(D1 S1A1E) (5/10/09)	02-03
9	1	SUPPLEMENTAL NOTICE OF WITNESSES	00 <b>5</b> 0
10		(BY STATE) (3/11/09)	69-70
11	6	SUPPLEMENTAL NOTICE OF WITNESSES	
12		(BY DEFENDANT) (8/16/10)	888-890
13	6	SUPPLEMENTAL NOTICE OF	
14		DEFENDANT'S EXPERT WITNESSES (7/21/10)	785-816
15		(1/21/10)	700-010
16	6	SUPPLEMENTAL NOTICE OF EXPERT	050 050
17		WITNESSES (BY STATE) (8/13/10)	878-879
18	6	SUPPLEMENTAL NOTICE OF EXPERT	
19		WITNESSES (BY STATE) (8/16/10)	906-914
20	13	SUPPLEMENTAL NOTICE OF EXPERT	
		WITNESSES (BY STATE) (1/3/11)	2316-2320
21	$\begin{vmatrix} 14 \end{vmatrix}$	SUPPLEMENTAL NOTICE OF WITNESSES	
22		(BY STATE) (1/14/11)	2429-2432
23	$ _{2}$	TRANSCRIPT JURY TRIAL (DAY ONE)	
24		MARCH 16, 2009	
25		(10/14/09)	71-369
26	3	TRANSCRIPT (PARTIAL) JURY TRIAL	
27		(DAY TWO) MARCH 17, 2009	o <b>=</b> o ==:
28		(3/18/09)	370-374
- 1	1		

1	VOLUME	DOCUMENT NAME/FILE DATE	PAGE NO.
2		MD ANG CDIDM AUGUSM 10, 0010	
3 4	6	TRANSCRIPT AUGUST 12, 2010 (11/23/10)	873-877
5	12	TRANSCRIPT SEPTEMBER 16, 2010 (2/4/11)	2240-2245
6 7	14	TRANSCRIPT JANUARY 13, 2011 (2/4/11)	2433-2448
8 9 10	14	TRANSCRIPT JANUARY 18, 2011 (2/4/11)	2539-2544
11 12	14	TRANSCRIPT JANUARY 20, 2011 (2/4/11)	2545-2587
13	5	VERDICT (3/20/09)	693
14 15	12	VERDICT SUBMITTED TO JURY BUT RETURNED UNSIGNED (9/2/10)	2233-2234
16		,	
17			
18			
19 20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
		10	



# DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

Nov 23 10 21 AM '10

CLIAN OF THE COURT

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

CASE NO. C-250630

Plaintiff,

DEPT. NO. 17

VS.

BRIAN KERRY O'KEEFE,

Defendant.

Transcript of Proceedings

BEFORE THE HONORABLE MICHAEL VILLANI, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

## ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL - DAY 3

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 25, 2010

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF:

CHRISTOPHER LALLI, ESQ.

Assistant District Attorney

STEPHANIE GRAHAM, ESQ. Deputy District Attorney

FOR THE DEFENDANT:

PATRICIA PALM, ESQ.

Special Deputy Public Defender

COURT RECORDER:

TRANSCRIPTION BY:

MICHELLE RAMSEY District Court

VERBATIM DIGITAL REPORTING, LLC

Littleton, CO 80120

(303) 798-0890

Proceedings recorded by audio-visual recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 25, 2010, 9:43 A.M.

(Outside the presence of the jury).

THE COURT: We're on the record. Someone had a issue outside the presence of the jury panel.

MR. LALLI: Well, I guess two issues, your Honor.

One, Ms. Palm had some scheduling issues with her witnesses.

Mr. DeSalvio needs to testify tomorrow morning, I guess,

sometime around 10:30, and we're certainly able to accommodate
that. He's a very short witness.

The other witness is Dr. Grey from Utah. He needs to testify tomorrow at about 1:00 o'clock. We'll certainly still be in our case at that time, but I think I don't believe that is going to be a problem for us to accommodate and allow her to call that witness out of -- out of order.

The other piece is Mr. Schiro, I think, does he need -- I'm not sure if he needs to testify Friday morning?

MS. PALM: Yeah, he would need to testify Friday morning. I did tell him I thought -- I thought I only had him yesterday, but he was able to accommodate me so he could stay for Friday morning, but then he has to leave in the afternoon. So -- and he's going back to Louisiana. So he'll stay the extra day to do it on Friday so we're not interrupting their case too much. But he does need to get on Friday morning.

MR. LALLI: We -- we may still be in our case, but just -- I mean, we'll do everything we can to accommodate them.

THE COURT: All right, I appreciate that.

MR. LALLI: I don't --

THE COURT: I don't have any objection to that as long as you make sure everyone's schedules are accommodated.

I'm assuming Ms. Palm you'll accommodate the State's schedule as well?

MS. PALM: Certainly. Thank you.

MR. LALLI: Your Honor, one other issue, and it pertains to the redaction of the video of the defendant's statement to the police. The court will certainly recall we litigated all of the redactions and we did that last week to give us sufficient time to create a video of that, which we have done. I mean, all the redactions that the court has ordered have been made.

And I -- I wanted -- during the course -- I'm not sure if it was over the weekend or if it was Friday, but there was some discussion via e-mail between Ms. Palm and myself about where the tape would start and where the tape would stop. And our original discussion was to stop at the very beginning -- to start at the very beginning of the video and run through taking the redactions out, including the -- the approximate one hour in between the first part of the interview and the second part.

And then a question was where would we stop the video at the end because the video goes on for quite some time

afterwards. After the investigators leave, once their interview has been concluded, the defendant is photographed by crime scene analysts, things of that nature. He's making statements or make some statements throughout that part.

And sorting it all out, having concern for potential objection that we would deprive the defense of the complete story of the statement, what I did is not start at the very beginning of the video, but start at the point in time when law enforcement enters the room and stop just shortly after they leave for the break, and then it picks up again when they return and ends upon their release. These are defendant statements. They're hearsay to the defense. They can't admit them. Only I have the right to admit those and -- and that is admitting a fair portion of the tape, but still not depriving the defense in any way of the complete story of -- of that interview.

And I informed Ms. Palm this morning that the tape starts -- the video portion start at 1:35:47 a.m. and concludes at 3:28:34 a.m., but there is an issue -- now, I guess, if I understand Ms. Palm correctly, she wants more of the -- of the front part of the interview redacted, and she wants other portions after the police leave on the video.

And so I wanted to resolve that as soon as possible because I edit my own video, and it's extremely time consuming and it's not something that can just be done on the fly when

we're here in court. I mean, it's something that is -- that is going to take me several hours to do and has taken me many hours to do up to this point. So I'd like some clarification of that.

MS. PALM: And if I could respond to that. Last week after the court's ruling on what had to be redacted out of the video, Chris and I had a discussion, and then he asked me what -- where do you propose we start and stop, and I told him where I wanted to start and where I wanted to stop. And where I want to start is a little bit before the Miranda, but not entirely before the Miranda, and he's not Mirandized at that point, so the State can't admit that part.

And if they admit his statement, we get to admit other parts to show for --

THE COURT: How much --

MS. PALM: -- under the rule of completion.

THE COURT: -- more time do you want --

MS. PALM: I --

1.3

THE COURT: -- of the defendant?

MS. PALM: -- I wanted it to start at 1 -- well, here's what happened. I said I wanted to start at 1:38, and I want it to go -- include the crime scene analyst, when Dan Ford comes in and they start talking to him there because there's some more statements there that are exculpatory. And -- and then I wanted it to end when he starts undressing because the

jury doesn't need to see him get naked and take his DNA and stuff. We can do that another way.

So I wanted it to go from Dan Ford entering the room after the interview until 4:05, and I want it to start at 1:38 and then -- and so we couldn't agree on that, and so Chris said go ahead and make your own -- your own video, which I did, which took me hours to do. And then he comes in this morning and tells me that he wants to include some of that that he didn't want to include before.

So it's not that, you know, there hasn't been some discussion, but the part that I want in is 1:38 forward. I've made a video of the portions that I want in that could not include the part of the video that's on the transcript. If you understand what I'm saying that the transcript does not reflect the entire encounter. But I wanted 1:38 until the start of the interview because --

THE COURT: Well, you thought Mr. Lalli said it starts at 1:35:47.

MS. PALM: No, it starts much earlier than that. He's not Mirandized during that entire period --

THE COURT: All right.

MS. PALM: -- up until the interview starts at 1:43.

So what my video is is about a six minute little clip. It's -it's from 1:38 to 1:43 and then afterwards when Dan Ford enters
the room until 4:05. That -- and -- and I have gone to the

trouble to make a video that includes that, based on our discussions. THE COURT: Maybe I misunderstood Mr. Lalli said that 3 his video starts at 1:35 and 47. 5 MS. PALM: Right and there -- there's some things in there that I would be objecting to, then, and it's not 6 Mirandized, so --8 MR. LALLI: And I -- it's our position that he starts 9 off as soon as the police enter the room making spontaneous 10 statements. Not -- they're not the product of my interrogation. So, you know, I was certainly concerned that 11 now they were going to be requesting more redactions. So it's 12 just something that we're going to have to resolve, your Honor, 13 14 before -- before that video is played. 15 I don't intend to play the video in my opening 16 statement, and I don't anticipate using it until Detective 17 Wildemann testifies. So we'll have some time, but I'm not sure 18 19 THE COURT: Is there a transcript that someone can 20 highlight for me the sections --21 MS. PALM: No, your Honor, because the part that I 22 want in is not on the transcript --23 THE COURT: Okay. 24 MS. PALM: -- because the transcript only has the Mirandized portion on it. 25

1 THE COURT: Right. 2 MS. PALM: And the part that he wants in is not on the transcript either, but he wants more than I do. 3 MR. LALLI: Well, I have it on my computer. 5 MS. PALM: And less than I did in some ways. than I do at the end of the interview and, you know, after he's been Mirandized, which is -- is fine with me if it comes in. But the -- the before part, he wants more than I do. 9 to not start until 1:38. 10 THE COURT: You want three minutes later --11 MS. PALM: That's correct. 12 THE COURT: -- basically. And what's going on there in those three minutes? 13 MS. PALM: He's just -- he's going off about various 14 15 subjects, Dr. Buchanan, those kind of things. And so that's why I started it where I did because I felt the rest of it was 16 just too prejudicial and he hadn't been Mirandized yet, and the 17 18 police officers were talking to him and asking him questions or 19 having interaction with him. 20 THE COURT: Well, if it's only three minutes, I can 21 review that in one of the breaks. 22 MS. PALM: And if the court wants to look at the -the video that I made --23 MR. LALLI: Well, it's a little -- it's -- you're not 24 25 going to see the portions that I want in.

1 THE COURT: Right, so --2 MR. LALLI: And -- and what's -- what's telling is, you know, this man is claiming that someone was -- was --3 someone had died accidentally or via suicide who he loved. it's incredibly telling to see his demeanor and affect when he 5 first encounters the police. And they're not interrogating 7 him. He's making spontaneous statements. 8 THE COURT: Right. Well, let me just review the -the beginning of the -- the three minutes that's in dispute. 9 10 MR. LALLI: From the very start until Miranda? 11 THE COURT: Right, because Ms. Palm says she's okay 12 with 1:38 on. 13 MS. PALM: And where I've edited it, it starts right 14 after the Bucky comment --15 THE COURT: Okay. 16 MS. PALM: -- if that goes -- if that helps the 17 court. 18 THE COURT: All right. And then Mr. Lalli starts at basically three minutes -- it shouldn't take me long to review 19 three minutes. And on the -- on the tail end, Ms. Palm, you 20 21 wanted -- Mr. Lalli wants to stop at 3:28:34. When do you want 22 yours to stop? 23 MS. PALM: Well, I -- I actually cut out some and so I don't have a start time on here, but I want it to stop --24 25 THE COURT: Isn't there a counter on the --

1 MS. PALM: Yeah, you can -- you -- well, if the court wants to look at the counter on this one, it start -- mine 3 starts when Dan Ford enters the room and they have more interaction with him because he's sitting alone for a while. 5 Dan Ford enters the room and then goes number 4:05. 6 It's not very long. 7 THE COURT: Okay, but what I'm saying is the State wants to stop at 3:28. You want to stop at 4:05? 8 9 MS. PALM: Basically, but cut out the part where he's 10 sitting by himself. 11 THE COURT: Okay. Well, it doesn't seem like it's 12 that much time. I mean, I can review that hopefully this 13 afternoon or tonight. 14 MR. LALLI: We'd be interposing objections to it. 15 It's hearsay, any statements that are made. We're not offering 16 them. What happens there has nothing to do -- it's not taking 17 my of the previous interview out of context or putting it more 18 in the context. There's no -- there's no complete --19 completeness argument and so it's our position that it is -- is 20 21 THE COURT: Okay. -- hearsay. 22 MR. LALLI: 23 THE COURT: Well, I'll be more than happy to listen 24 to argument. I've got to review it. 25 MS. PALM: Right.

MR. LALLI: Right, so --

THE COURT: I appreciate you bringing that to my attention.

MR. LALLI: Okay, thank you.

THE COURT: Is that it? Let's call the jury in.

(In the presence of the jury).

THE COURT: All right, ladies and gentlemen, those of you in the gallery, I'd like to give you my thanks for -- for going through this process and your willingness to serve as a juror in this particular matter. At this time the clerk will now issue the oath of your office as a juror.

(Swearing in the jury panel).

THE COURT: All right, have a seat, please. Ladies and gentlemen, as I had mentioned before and at the beginning of this case, we expect this trial to last through the week and perhaps Monday or Tuesday. The attorneys have advised me that they believe they should be able to complete the evidentiary portion of this case by Monday.

I don't know if there's an outside chance of Friday, but we will stay on track as far as our expect the ending time. I just want to advise you that each day we hope to start around 9:30 or 10:00, we'll take our breaks typically around noon. If we're right in the middle of a witness, we'll probably wait until the examination of that witness has been completed and then we would take a lunch break.

Typically between 3:00 and 3:30 in the afternoon we'll take a mid afternoon break and we'll try to adjourn around at 5:00 o'clock. Again, if we're in the middle a witness, we may go a little longer.

Each day the marshal will check with you to see if you can stay later. If we can get more witnesses in on any give day, we can make sure that we do end on time. So that will be up to all of you each day. The marshal will check with you to see if perhaps you can stay 5:30 one day or 6:00 o'clock one day. If someone has a doctor's appointment and you need to leave at 5:00, we'll accommodate you.

And at this time I'm going to read to you some preliminary instructions. At the end of the trial you'll be give more detailed instructions which is the law of this particular case. After I read you the general instructions at this time we'll have a quick recess, the attorneys will prepare their -- their Power Points and -- and everything and the court -- courtroom here will be prepared for their opening statements.

After the opening statements are given we will start calling witnesses this afternoon.

(Pause in the proceedings).

THE COURT: Everybody okay? All right, good. Ladies and gentlemen, this is a criminal case brought by the State of Nevada against the defendant. This case is based on an

## ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT

information. The clerk will now read the information and state the plea of the defendant.

(Clerk reads Information; not transcribed)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, as we had mentioned earlier, you should understand that the Information just read to you is simply a description of the charge made by the State against the Defendant. It is not evidence of anything. It does not prove anything. Therefore, a defendant starts out with a clean slate. The defendant has pled not guilty and is presumed innocent.

This is a criminal case. There are -- and there are two basic rules you must keep in mind. First, the defendant is presumed innocent unless and until proved guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. The defendant is not required to pesent any evidence or prove his innocence. The law never imposed upon a defendant in a criminal case, the burden of calling any witnesses or introducing any evidence.

Second, to convict the State must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the crime was committed and the defendant is the person who committed it.

It will be your duty to decide from the evidence to be presented whether or not the defendant is guilty or not guilty. You are the sole judges of the facts. You will decide what the facts are from the evidence which will be presented. The evidence will consist of testimony of witnesses and

documents and other things received into evidence as exhibits. You must apply the facts to the law which I shall give you, and in that way reach your verdict.

It is important that you perform your duty of determining the facts diligently and conscientiously, for ordinarily there is no way of correcting an erroneous determination of the facts by the jury. You should not take anything I may say or do during the trial as indicating my opinion as to how you should decide the case, or to influence you in any way in your determination of the facts. At times, I may even ask questions of witnesses. If I do so, it is for the purpose of bringing out matters which should be brought out and not in any way to indicate my opinion about the facts, or to indicate the weight or value you should give the testimony of a witness.

In deciding the facts of this case you may have to decide which witnesses to believe and which witnesses not to believe. You may believe everything a witness says, or only part of it, or none of it. In considering the weight or value of the testimony of any witness, you may consider the appearance, attitude and behavior of the witness when testifying, and a number of other things, including the witness's ability to see, or hear, or know of the things the witness testifies to, the quality of the witness's memory, the inclination of the witness to speak truthfully, whether or not

the witness has any interest in the outcome of the case, or any motive, bias or prejudice. Whether the witness is contradicted by anything the witness said or wrote before the trial, and how reasonable is the witness's testimony when considered with other evidence which you believe.

In decide whether or not to believe a witness, keep in mind people sometimes forget things. You need to consider whether a contradiction is an innocent lapse of memory or an intentional falsehood, and that may depend on whether it has to do with an important fact or only a small detail.

The weight or value of the evidence does not necessarily depend on the number of witnesses testifying for one side. You must consider all the evidence, and you may decide the testimony of a smaller number of witnesses on one side, has more weight or value than that presented by a larger number of witnesses on the other side.

There are two kinds of evidence, direct and circumstantial. Direct evidence is testimony about what the witness personally saw, heard, or did. Circumstantial evidence is indirect evidence. It is proof of one or more facts from which you can find another fact.

By way of example, if you wake up in the morning and see the ground, the sidewalk and the streets are all wet and water is running down the gutters, you may find from those facts that it rained during the night. It is proof of one or

more facts from which you can find another fact.

If you were awake during the night and saw the rain fall, tht would be direct evidence, which is something you personally saw. You may consider both direct and circumstantial evidence in deciding this case. The law permits you to give equal weight or value to both. But it's for you to decide how much consideration to give any evidence.

Certain things are not evidence and you must not consider them as evidence in deciding the facts of this case. Statements and arguments by the attorneys, questions and objections of the attorneys, testimony I instruct you to disregard, and anything you may see or hear if Court is not in session, even if what you see or hear is done or said by one of the parties, or by one of the witnesses.

Remember, evidence is sworn testimony by a witness while Court is in session, and documents and other things received into evidence as exhibits.

You will be given the opportunity to ask written questions of any of the witnesses called to testify in this case. You are not encouraged to ask a large number of questions, because that is the primary responsibility of counsel. Questions may be asked only in the following manner: After both lawyers have finished questioning the witness, and before I excuse the witnesses, and only at that time, if there are additional questions you would like to ask the witness, you

may then seek permission to ask the witness a written question.

Should you desire to ask a question, write your question down and your juror number of a piece of paper and raise your hand. All questions from jurors must be factual in nature and designed to clarify information already presented.

In addition, jurors must not place any undue weight on the responses to their questions. The Marshal will pick up your question and give it to me. All questions must be directed to the witness and not to the lawyers or to the Judge. After I consult with counsel, I will determine if your question is legall proper. If I determine that your question may be properly asked, I will ask the question.

No adverse inference should be drawn if the Court does not allow a particular question.

There are rules of law which control what can be received into evidence. When the lawyer asks a question, or offers an exhibit into evidence, and the lawyer on the other side things that it is not permitted by the rules, that lawyer may object. If I overrule the objection, the question may be answered or the exhibit received. If I sustain the objection, the question cannot be answered and the exhibit cannot be received.

Whenever I sustain an objection to a question, ignore the question and do not guess what the answer might have been. Sometimes I may order evidence stricken from the record and

tell you to disregard or ignore such evidence. This means when you are decide the case, you must not consider the evidence which I have told you to disregard.

It is the duty of a lawyer to object to evidence which the lawyer believes may not be permitted by the rules. You should not be prejudiced in any way against a lawyer who makes objections on behalf of the party the lawyer represents.

Also, I may find it necessary to admonish a lawyer. If I do, you should not be prejudice towards the lawyer or client because I have found it necessary to admonish the the lawyer.

Until this case is submitted to you, do not talk to each other about it, or about anyone who has anything to do with it until the end of the case when you go to the jury room to decide your verdict. Do not talk with anyone else about this case or anyone who has anything to do with it until the trial has ended and you have been discharged as jurors.

Anyone else includes members of your family and your friends. You may tell them that you're a juror in a criminal case, but don't tell them anything else about it until after you have been discharged by me. Do not let anyone talk to you about the case, or about anyone who has anything to do with it. If someone should try to talk to you, please report it immediately to me by contacting the Marshal.

Do not read any news stories, listen to any radio

## ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT

broadcasts, watch any television or do any internet research about the case, or about anyone who has anything to do with it.

You may be tempted to visit a particular location.

Please do not do so. In view of the time that has elasped since this case has come to trial, substantial changes may have occurred at a particular location.

Also if you make an unauthorized visit without the benefit of explanation you may get an erroneous interpretation or impression, excuse me. Therefore, please avoid going near or past the location until after this case has been completed.

At the end of the trial, you will have to make your decision based upon what you recall of the evidence. You will not have a written transcript to consult and it is difficult and time-consuming for the court recorder to play back lengthy testimony. I urge you to pay close attention to the testimony as it is given.

If you wish, you may take notes to help you remember what a witness said. If you do take notes, please keep them to yourself until you and your fellow jurors go to the jury room to decide the case. Do not let note-taking distract you so that you do not hear other answers by the witnesses. You should rely upon your own memory or what was said and not be overly influenced by the notes of other jurors.

Do not make up your mind about what the verdict should be until after you have gone to the jury room to decide

#### ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT

the case and you and your fellow jurors have discussed the evidence. It is important that you keep an open mind throughout the trial.

21.

A juror may not declare to a fellow juror any fact relating to this case of which the juror has knowledge. If any juror discovers during the trial, or after the jury has retired, that the juror or any other juror has personal knowledge of any fact in controversy in the case, that juror shall disclose such situation to me in the absence of the other jurors.

This means, if you learn during the course of the trial that you have personal knowledge of any fact which is not presented by the evidence in this case, you must declare that fact to me. You communicate to me through the Marshal.

During the course of this trial, the attorneys for both sides and all court personnel, other than the Marshal, are not permitted to converse with members of the jury. These individuals are not being anti-social, they are bound by ethics and the law not to talk to do, for to do so might contaminate your verdict.

The trial will proceed in the following manner. One of the Deputy District Attorneys will make an opening statement, which is an outline to help you understand what the State expects to prove. Next, the defense attorney may, but does not have to, make an opening statement. Opening

statements serve as an introduction to the evidence which the party making the statement intends to prove.

The State will then present its evidence and counsel for the defendant may cross-examine the witnesses. Following the State's case, the defendant may present evidence and the deputy district attorneys may cross-examine the witnesses. However, as I have said, the defendant is not obligated to present any evidence.

After all the evidence has been presented I will instuct you on the law. After the instructions of the law have been read to you, each side has the opportunity to present oral argument. What is said in closing argument is not evidence. The arguments are designed to summarize and interpret the evidence.

Since the State has the burden of providing the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, the State has the right to open and close the arguments. After the arguments have been completed, you will retire to deliberate your verdict.

Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to take a quick recess so the parties can arrange their notes and prepare for the opening and then we will start calling witnesses this afternoon.

You may be aware that in a criminal case we have 12 jurors deliberate in the jury room. There are 14 of you seated

## ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT

in the jury box. Jurors No. 13 and 14 are not necessarily the alternates. We will have two alternates in this case. Those alternates will be randomly selected. So it's important that all of you pay attention to the evidence.

It's important that we have alternates because if during the trial one of the jurors becomes disqualified for some reason, we will need to have an alternate deliberate when this case is over. If we didn't have an alternate, we would have to start the entire process over and pick a whole new jury So you can understand why it's important that we have an alternate.

So, ladies and gentlemen, let's take a recess while the parties prepare for their opening, which should just be five to ten minutes.

During this recess, it is your duty not to converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with this case, or to read, watch, or listen to any report of or commentary in the trial by any person connected with the trial, or by any medium of information, including without limitation, newspaper, television, the radio or the internet.

You are not to form or express an opinion on any subject connected with this case until this matter is submitted to you. I think most of you have this admonishment memorized, but I am required by law to read it to you every time we take a break.

So we'll see you back in five to ten minutes. 1 2 (Court recessed at 2:45 p.m. until 2:59 p.m.). 3 (In the presence of the jury). 4 THE MARSHAL: All right, you may be seated, ladies 5 and gentlemen. Let's make sure all cell phones are turned off, 6 please. 7 THE COURT: State ready to proceed? MR. LALLI: Yes, your Honor. 8 9 THE COURT: And defense ready? 10 MS. PALM: Yes, your Honor, thank you. 11 THE COURT: All right, State, your opening. 12 STATE'S OPENING STATEMENT 13 MR. LALLI: Thank you. May it please the court, 14 Brian O'Keefe was found guilty by a jury of felony battery 15 constituting domestic violence in 2006. The victim in that 16 case, Victoria Whitmarsh is the same woman he murdered on 17 November 5th, 2008. 18 The evidence will show that he stabbed her, that she suffered a fatal stab wound under her arm and that she died as 19 a result of essentially bleeding out. Her death was by no 21 means instantaneous. And really, the murder should come as no surprise. You will learn that the defendant never really got 22 23 over the fact that Victoria was responsible for putting him in 24 prison. 25 He would say that he wanted to kill the bitch.

the defendant went to prison, his relationship with Victoria came to an end, at least for a time. Shortly after his release, he began a romantic relationship with a woman by the name of Cheryl Morris. And there was a somewhat eery resemblance between Victoria and Cheryl.

1.5

You will learn that like Victoria, Cheryl is a small Asian woman. The defendant's girlfriend Cheryl, the two of them became very close, and it was in this context that the defendant shared with Cheryl his feelings about Victoria. And he shared with her his ability to kill.

You will learn that the defendant would boast about being in the military. He bragged about knowing how to kill people. And whenever he talked about doing this, he only talked about doing it with a knife.

While his relationship with Cheryl was ongoing, the defendant began to secretly see Victoria again. Like most domestic violence relationships, there was a fatal attraction between the two. At one point the defendant even tried to move Victoria into the apartment in which he was living with Cheryl, while Cheryl was still living there. And Cheryl would have nothing to do with it. And she eventually moved out.

After a time the defendant took up a relationship in that apartment, 5001, El Parque, Unit 35, along with Victoria. In many ways Victoria Whitmarsh led a tortured life. She suffered from depression. Like many people who suffer from

that disease, she would cut herself at times to cope with her emotions.

You will learn that she had attempted suicide before. She took medication to help her deal with her depression. You will learn that at autopsy she had a drug called Effexor in her system, which is an anti-depressant. Victoria had been infected with Hepatitis C, she was estranged from her husband and from her daughter. By all accounts, the evidence will show that she was vulnerable, at times even pathetic.

At the time of her death she weighed just 108 pounds. Just the sort of woman the defendant could control. As I told you, the defendant lived in this apartment complex located at 5001 El Parque. His unit was the upstairs unit. And you'll learn that many of the neighbors in the apartment complex knew each other, they were somewhat close, somewhat friendly, certainly good neighbors.

You will learn about the Tolivers. Charles Toliver, who's known to his friends as Cooky, as well as his wife, Joyce. And the Tolivers lived just below the defendant. Well, back on November 5th of 2008, you will hear from the Tolivers that it was about 10:00 o'clock at night. And Mrs. Toliver is fairly certain of the time because she will tell you that something she did at this period was watched the Soap Opera Network. Night time was kind of her opportunity to catch up on the soaps.

And at about 10:00 o'clock was a soap opera that she would usually watch. Well, on this particular evening at that time she began to hear a disturbance upstairs directly above her apartment. And it continued for some 30 minute, getting louder and louder. Mr. Toliver, Cooky Toliver, is an early riser, he goes to bed early at night. He heard the disturbance. It woke him from a sleep.

And in an attempt to let whatever was going on upstairs become aware that they were being bothered, they took a broom and they began to bang the -- the ceiling to make a noise to let the people up above, you know, to cool it, but the noise didn't stop. At one point Mrs. Toliver will tell you that she actually heard a woman crying. And over the course of about ten minutes that crying turned to moaning and then fell silent.

Mr. Toliver was quite angry at being awokened and actually ascended those stairs to confront the defendant about making all the noise. When he gets to the front door, he sees the defendant and the defendant tells him come in here and get her. Mr. Toliver walks into the back bedroom and this is what he sees. He sees Victoria's legs on the floor. They are obstructed by the bed. She is naked from the waist down, and there is a great deal of blood in the room.

He looks at the defendant and he says man, what the hell have you done? He runs out in an attempt to get help. He

runs to the unit of an individual named Tom Armbruster. Both Todd and Cooky ultimately return to this apartment. They go up the stairs and into the room. Todd enters the room with Cooky just behind him. He sees Victoria's body.

The defendant is standing over or close to Victoria and saying words to the effect of come on, get up, come on, get up. Out of nowhere once the defendant realizes that Todd is in the room, he stands up and actually takes a swing at him. And then tells him to get the hell out of here.

The evidence will show that the defendant never called the paramedics. He never called for a firefighter. He never called the police. He never called anybody to try to help Victoria Whitmarsh on that evening. But 911 is called. Calls are placed to the authorities. Not by the defendant, but by among other people, Todd Armbruster, and you will hear that 911 call.

The police begin to arrive almost immediately. They make their way up to the apartment. They enter the living room area of the apartment and they are naturally very cautious. They have received information that there is a woman down who has been stabbed. There's blood in the area, the -- they don't know exactly what to make of the situation. They know that there is a male in the room where the female is at.

They enter, they attempt to talk to the defendant.

They tell him he needs to come out so that they can help

Victoria. He refuses to come out. He tells them get in here. You will learn what a CIT officer is. A crisis intervention team officer. Metro has a group of officers who are trained in deescalating situations like this. It just so happened that a crisis intervention team or a CIT officer was very close by who makes his way on scene almost immediately.

And he begins to explain to the defendant his need to come out of the back room so that officers and paramedics can come in to help Victoria. The police feel as though they're being baited. At one point the defendant says she's alive, come in here and help her or words to that effect. Then he's saying no, she's dead, it's too late. They have no idea what they're dealing with.

Eventually, they make the decision that they must enter the back bedroom to remove him so that they can assess Victoria and give her help if she needs it. So you'll learn that officers in a very methodical manner enter the room. As they're entering the room, they see Victoria's body naked from the waist down and the defendant almost laying on her.

And what does the defendant do when the police officers enter? He says don't look at her. He's putting her hands out. Don't look at her as though this is my woman and I don't want anybody else to see her in the nude. Eventually, he struggles with the police officers. He refuses to leave. They try to cuff him, he is fighting with them. They have to deploy

to tazer.

Eventually, they're able to actually pick him up and move him out of that room. Paramedics are very close by, but unfortunately it's too late. When the first police officer, Sergeant Dan Newberry, reaches Victoria's body, he attempts to find a pulse and he's up able to do so. Paramedics come in, they look for any signs of life, and unfortunately there are none.

Now, the defendant is taken out of the immediate area and eventually taken to a police car, he's put in the back seat of a patrol car. And he starts making statements that are spontaneous statements. So in other words, statements that are not in response to any questions that anybody had asked him.

And what he says at one point is I swear to God, V -- and he would refer to Victoria as V -- I swear to God, V, I didn't mean to hurt you. What I -- what did I do wrong? Let's go do the ten years. Homicide detectives respond to the scene, along with other members of law enforcement. Crime scene analysts, the CSI people that we see on TV sometimes, they respond to the scene.

The knife that was used to stab Victoria is located and impounded. It's photographed and packaged for forensic testing. They noticed that the defendant has received a cut on his hand. He has blood on his hand. And what you will learn is that in violent attacks it is not at all uncommon for the

stabber to actually suffer some injury on his hands while perpetrating the crime.

1.7

Now, the knife that was used to kill Victoria was processed by DNA scientists. And you will learn that they attempted to get fingerprints from the knife. And you will learn of the various techniques they employed, but they were unable to do so. The most they could do was get a partial print on the handle of the knife, but there was not sufficient information on that print to make a comparison.

You will learn that the blood on the knife and the knife itself was also processed by a DNA expert by the name of Jennifer Bas. And analyst Bas found just what one would expect. On the very end of the handle and the blood on the very top part of the blade, that blood was the defendant's blood.

Blood found in the middle of the blade was determined to be a mixture of Victoria's blood and the defendant's blood.

And blood on the very end of the tip of the knife was Victoria's blood.

Now, an autopsy was conducted on Victoria's body just two days later on November 7th of 2008. And the autopsy was conducted by a medical doctor by the name of Jacqueline Benjamin. And she will tell you that Victoria died as a result of a stab wound to the right side of her chest.

However, there are many other things that Dr.

Benjamin was able to learn during the course of the autopsy.

As part of that process, the blood is analyzed. And as I alluded to before, she found evidence of Effexor in Victoria's blood. She also found a large quantity of alcohol. Her blood alcohol was.24. Probably some of you have heard that the legal limit in the State of Nevada is.08. Well, Victoria's was.24, well over that limit.

There was also a great deal of blunt force trauma on Victoria's body. And that really is just a fancy way of saying that her body was badly bruised. Now, while it is true that Victoria suffered from the disease of Hepatitis C, which accentuates bruising in the body, in other words it makes it more visible, you will learn that each bruise on Victoria's body represents some form of trauma or hitting.

Many of the bruises will be described by Dr. Benjamin as acute or recent. But you will learn that Victoria suffered trauma on her head, both the front of her head and the back of her head. The head trauma was acute. She had trauma on her chest. She had trauma on her back. She had trauma on her buttocks. She had suffered trauma on her left arm, on her right arm, on her left leg, on the right leg.

So much bruising, in fact, on this woman's body that Dr. Jacqueline Benjamin listed blunt trauma as an other significant condition in her death. An anonymous domestic violence survivor once made this observation. If you can't be

thankful for what you have, be thankful for what you have escaped. Well, unfortunately Victoria was not able to escape from the defendant, and he murdered her in a brutal way.

At the conclusion of this trial we will ask you for justice for Victoria's murder. We will ask you to find the defendant guilty of murder of the second degree with use of a deadly weapon. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Lalli. Ms. Palm, do you wish to exercise your right for an opening at this time?

MS. PALM: I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

Я

## DEFENSE'S OPENING STATEMENT

MS. PALM: Thank you. Good afternoon again, ladies and gentlemen. This is where we get to give our road map of how the evidence -- how we expect the evidence to come in and what we would like you to pay attention to as it comes in, what we think is important about this case.

This -- the evidence is going to show you that this is not a murder case. This is not any kind of killing by my client, Brian O'Keefe. The only way you can get to murder in this case is by exaggerating, exaggerating what the bruises on Victoria's body mean. By that mean, I mean she had advanced cirrhosis. She had Hepatitis C. She was drinking that night.

She -- from Hepatitis C and cirrhosis, you bruise on slighter than normal contact. Some of those bruises on her

## ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT

legs, you'll hear, were most likely from bumping into things. This woman was very drunk at the time that she was -- at the time that she died and at the time that they performed her autopsy. So you can't rule out that she got some of those bruises from just walking around.

The other thing you're going to find out is that bruise cannot be dated, not with any kind of scientific certainty. Some of the bruises they show you in those pictures had green on them. If -- if you talk about how bruises age, they start with red, they kind of go maroon, then they kind of lighten up, start getting green around the edges. Some of those bruises had those. None of them can be tied to the time of her death. And I think that doctor Benjamin will testify that way and certainly our medical examiner's going to testify that way.

So I think to -- to get where they want you to get, you have to rely on extreme exaggeration of the evidence, of the evidence of the bruising in the context of her entire body, and, you know, don't be fooled by multiple pictures of the same bruise or -- or bruises blown up. Look at the pictures of the entire body and see -- see how many bruises this woman had and if they look old and if the testimony comes in that they're -- they can't be tied to the time of her death.

She could have gotten those bruises from accidentally stumbling around. And she could have gotten bruises from the

police bumping into her body, which is going to be another issue in this case. The -- the room that they were arrested in was -- or the -- that Brian was arrested in when the police came in was extremely small. And you will hear testimony from the police who tried very hard to avoid, admitting that they might have bumped into her.

1.9

But the fact is they had to go over her body to get to him. And there's only one report that even references the fact that the arrest involved her body at all. And that report is a private report called a use of force report. It's not in any of the regular police reports. But they did have to go over her body, and it's possible they bumped into her during that process.

And when they tazed Brian, he fell on top of her body, and there's four or five policemen there trying to get him into custody. So I think that the evidence is not going to convince you that these bruises are any reliable evidence of any kind of beating.

I want to go back and talk about Brian for a minute.

Brian -- Brian has had a problem with alcohol for a very long time. He -- when he was 17 years old he went into the 82nd Airborne Army. When he was 18 years old he married his first wife, Pamela Sue. When he was 20 years old he got a bronze star for meritorious achievement in combat.

When he was 20, his first child was born. When he

was 21, he was promoted to sergeant. He had two more children at the age of 24 and 26. And then that marriage fell apart. Brian was drinking a lot. And that marriage ended when he was 30. And then he met his second wife out here and got married when he was 34, and he had two more little girls by that wife. And because of his current alcoholism that marriage fell apart.

1.0

And in 2001, Brian was admitted to Monte Vista
Hospital. And he was admitted for detox. He was trying to
deal with his alcoholism. And so he's in there and that's
where he meets Victoria Whitmarsh. And Victoria was in there
herself getting treatment for psychological issues. She had
tried to kill herself.

And she reported that what happened in that incident was that she got in an argument with her husband, she went beserk, and she tried to cut herself and she overdosed. And Victoria also admitted to a long history of self-mutilation. By the time of her death she had been self-mutilating for about 15 years. And her problem, as she reported it, I cut myself when I'm angry. And she turned to knives and she turned to scissors.

So in 2001, Brian and Victoria meet and these two very flawed people cling onto each other. She start a relationship. And during that relationship he did go to prison for domestic violence. And he was in prison and they stopped contact, and he got out, and in early 2008, he's going on with

his life. He's done. He -- he served his time, he's out on parole, he wants to have a new life.

And he meets Cheryl Morris. And Cheryl Morris is who they want you to rely on for evidence that he made threats against Victoria whom he loved. Cheryl Morris is the person they want you to rely on for he demonstrated how he could (indiscernible) --

MR. LALLI: I'm sorry, your Honor. I'm sorry, Ms.

MS. PALM: -- kill people.

Palm.

MR. LALLI: I'm going to object. This is argumentative.

THE COURT: Sustained. Just rephrase the statements.

MS. PALM: Cheryl Morris is the witness who's going to come forward and tell you these things. Cheryl Morris is girl friend when he gets out of prison. And he and Cheryl Morris are building somewhat of a future together. She's staying at his house, his little trailer, on and off, and -- and she's putting up -- and he's -- he's drinking again. He's got a bad drinking problem, and she's putting up with his drinking problem.

And she's putting with sort of transiency issues and wasn't real stable where they were living. They went and lived with some friends. And she's putting up with him telling her from the beginning that he still loved Victoria. He was honest

with her about it and said I love this woman.

And so that goes on from January when their relationship starts until June of 2008. And Victoria seeks Brian. Brian did not seek Victoria. Victoria sought Brian out. And he went and met with her just after Father's Day, and as a result of that, he wanted to be back in that relationship. And he came back and -- and expressed it to Cheryl, you know, his feelings.

She was upset first he lied to her. And then he told her to the truth. I -- I can't lie, I was with -- with Victoria. She still puts up with it. She puts up with him still seeing Victoria. And throughout the course of the summer this is still going on and she's still staying with him. And they're doing things like buying a car together on her credit because he didn't have very good credit. And then they look for an apartment together, and they get an apartment together.

And about that same time she decides she's tired of it. Meanwhile, throughout the summer Victoria was calling Cheryl. Victoria's pursuing Brian and calling Cheryl. And they get had apartment together, and they decide what they're going to just go their separate ways and live together as friends and it works for a few days, and then Brian calls up Cheryl and he wants to come back to the apartment. But he wants to be with Victoria, too. They want to be together.

And Cheryl, of course, doesn't like that idea. And

Victoria gets on the phone and she talks to Cheryl. And in the end Cheryl ends up leaving and Victoria and Brian live in that apartment together. And -- and that apartment was a cute little apartment. They made a cute little home together. I'm just going to show you some of the pictures of how that place looked. It's -- it's small, but it's nice, it's clean, and it's a home.

This is the kitchen area. Can't see that very well. And this is the living room area going into the bedroom and this is the master bedroom back here. And again, just another kitchen one. But you can see, they -- they made a nice little home together. They were living together there as a couple. And you're going to hear from our other witnesses as they were as a couple. And our other witnesses are going to tell you that they were very loving with each other. And that Brian lit up when Victoria walked in the room. And they did things as a couple together.

Brian tried to get help for his alcoholism again, and he goes to his union leader, and he says I need help. I -- I have this problem. I don't know what to do. And the union leader sends him into counseling. He goes to MINES (phonetic) counseling. First he goes through detox. He goes through several days of detox and then he gets put into an after-patient counseling program. And Victoria goes with him. And the counselor's going to come in here and talk to you and

tell you that they were a loving couple. They were support of each other. They were talking about their future together.

And Victoria's still drinking at the time, but
Brian's not. Brian's dry. And -- and he makes it through the
entire program that way. And the other thing about it is Brian
knew that he had cirrhosis or that -- that Victoria had
cirrhosis. And he knew that she had Hepatitis C and he knew
that that was communicable. And he didn't care because he
wanted to be with Victoria.

He just wanted ten good years with her. She was a little older than him. When they met Brian was about 38 and she was about eight and a half years older than he was. And he didn't think she had much time left, but he wanted whatever time she had.

And he took her to meet his little girls by his second wife. And they went to -- and they did union activities together. They went to -- they worked on the presidential campaign in 2008 together for the union. And Victoria was a big part of that. They were a part of each other's lives in every way and a very loving couple. And the people at the apartment will tell you the same thing. They appeared to be a very loving couple.

And a couple of nights before the incident, and you're going to hear evidence of this from one of the police officers who -- who looked at the prescriptions that Victoria

had at the apartment. She -- she had gone off -- she wasn't taking her meds like she was supposed to. And she was having some problems. She was having problems because she got denied on SSD. She was having problems because her unemployment had stopped. She was having emotional problems.

So a couple nights before the incident she's having issues and she wakes Brian pointing a knife at him and yelling at him and poking the knife at him. And he's sober at the point so he's able to calm her down. What are you doing? And he calms her down. And that settles down, and she's okay again. But she's still having problems because of these things going on in her life. And then Brian, who's been out of work since he went through the counseling, gets a call -- or calls somebody and finds out that, you know, he's got a good prospect of going back to work in the next week.

And he's happy, and he's an alcoholic and so he wants to reward himself in several ways. One for being sober for so long and one forgetting the job prospect and he wants to go drink. So he and Victoria go out and they go to can -- well, first they run and get a little vacuum part because they had a vacuum that they needed to fix at their house for things they wanted to do there. And then they go to the Paris. And they start drinking at the Paris.

And they get there I'd say roughly around 6:00, 6:30 in the evening, I think it is, and -- and Brian is slamming

them because drinking are free when you're gambling. And he takes about 20 shots and some mixed drinks in the course of several hours. And Victoria was drinking, obviously, from her blood alcohol content. And when -- they'd been there for long enough, and they decide it's time to go home.

They get in the car, and she is driving because he's too drunk to drive. And she's drunk, but he's more drunk than she is. So she's driving. And you'll see that from the photographs of the car. The passenger seat is pushed back, leaned back, reclined, because he fell asleep on the way home, and the driver's seat is pushed way up. And you see two glasses in there. Those are alcohol. And you'll hear that.

And so she drives home, and they get there. And there's a little argument because she's mad about several things. She's mad, she didn't want -- she has to cook. She didn't want to cook. She wanted to go out to eat, and he's passing out on the driver's seat. And so she ends up being angry and she goes upstairs and Brian stays down there and sleeps.

And you're going to hear then from the neighbors, who tell you that they start hearing banging noises or bamming noises or however the various neighbors describe it. They start hearing it from their reports anywhere between 9:00 and 10:00 o'clock. And then they say it goes on until about 11:00 o'clock. And that's when Mr. Toliver, Cooky Toliver, goes

upstairs to see what the noise is.

Well, the problem with that time period is her body from the bruises could not have sustained a two hour beating, not with her condition. She would have been bruised head to toe, and she wasn't. So the evidence is going to show you that she -- she couldn't have been being beat, which is an implication from the evidence of we hear these bangs noises going on. That's the only guilty implication from it.

But given her history, the evidence is going to convince you that she was upstairs banging things around because she was mad. When you look at those photographs of the apartment, you don't see any disarray, except for in that bedroom. You can look in every room of that house, it's clean, it's neat, nothing's out of order. And then there's the bedroom.

And even the area where the knife is taken from, the corner of the kitchen where the knife is, when you look at a bigger shot of that, no disarray in that area. Nothing's bumped over. The knife wasn't grabbed out of there during some kind of altercation we're they're trying to go get a knife to have a fight. Somebody just took it out of there.

And so the evidence is going to show you that it was Victoria that took the knife, and she took the knife in the back room and she was in there with the knife. And Brian wakes up and he comes upstairs and he walks into the apartment and

walks in toward the master bedroom and sees that she's in the bathroom. There's a bathroom in there.

The master bedroom does not have an overhead light.

They use the bathroom light to light it up. The door is closed. She's in there. He knows she's mad. He still wants to smoke. He goes, he uses the bathroom. He comes outside to stand there and smoke.

I missed a part. On the way up when he was walking up, he bangs the rail and Cooky Toliver hears the bang on the -- not Cooky. Jimmy Hatchcox hears the bang, comes out, sees Brian going into his apartment. That is about 15 minutes before the police were called. He sees Brian walking in.

So it just doesn't match up time frame wise that Brian's in that apartment. The other thing that doesn't match up is nobody hears any yelling, nobody hears any screaming, there's no kind of -- of domestic going on that involves any kind of yelling or talking even that anybody hears. The most you'll hear of the noise of voices is that perhaps there was some crying going on, but that was not even explained in the first statement by Joyce Toliver. Joyce Toliver's first statement doesn't mention any crying. She doesn't mention crying until she testified in March of 2009 that there was crying.

So the evidence will show you that there's just no kind of noise going on other than some banging around a little

bit during the course of one or two hours. And then there's a lot of noise because what happens is Brian walks back in, he's getting too hot. He drank a lot, he was wearing his coat. He's getting too hot and he walks back into the house, he's going to go hang up his jacket.

And as he's going to hang up his jacket, Victoria comes at him. She comes out of the bathroom and he is -- he is drunk and in a fog and in a haze and she's coming at him with a knife. And what does he do? He takes his jacket and he waves it at her to get the knife away from him. The jacket flies into the blinds, which is supported by the physical evidence. This is the jacket and those are the blinds in the bedroom, and you'll see other pictures of it, too. But it flies across the room into the blinds.

And this is the layout of this bedroom. You can't see what very well. So this here by -- by the feet of the body is a dresser. Where you see that number ten over there is where the jacket was found. And so he's not able to ward her off with the jacket and she is still coming at him and he tries to grab the blade of the knife and he gets cut.

And you'll see paragraphs of the injury on his hand.

And you will hear from our expert who says that that is a defensive wound. This is the cut on his hand, on the inside of his hand. He's trying to grab the knife and he gets cut. He's unsuccessful and he lets go because he's bleeding.

So he's hurt and she's still coming at him. And facing each other he's able to grab her hands. Finally he gets both of their hands and they're struggle back and forth and she is holding the knife in her right hand. She's right handed and my client's also right handed. She's holding the knife in her right hand and holding onto her wrist facing her and they're struggle in that bedroom because he's trying to get out of there and they fall backwards onto the bed.

And when they fall backwards onto the bed, he starts to get his bearings again and then he realizes that she's snot moving very much. She's laying too still. And he's sitting there, and then he realizes the bed's getting wet. He knows something is wrong, and he doesn't know what happened, but he knows what she's done before, and he's thinking that maybe she did something to herself.

He doesn't know for sure if she got stabbed when they fell. And nobody was in the room, so nobody else knows either. But our experts are going to tell you that her wound was consistent with either an accidental stabbing, which cannot be ruled out, or an intentional suicidal stabbing. Even though it's in a weird funny place, it could have still been a suicide attempt. So Brian doesn't know what's going on and he's looking for the blood and -- and she's bleeding fast because of her blood clotting problem because the cirrhosis is a little bit like -- like having hemophilia disorder where you just

bleed really easily and -- and so he's -- he's trying to figure out what's going on and he can't see where it is.

So he pulls her off the bed and he's very drunk and he drops her on the floor and that's when the neighbors are hearing the commotion and they come upstairs. And when they come upstairs, Cooky Toliver comes in and Brian's Cooky, come here, come in here, come get her because Brian wants to get her out to the living room where there's some light.

In the meantime, Brian had pulled her pants up, and you'll see that in the photographs or in the -- in the DNA report that his blood is on the ankle of her little jogging suit which is covered with blood on the side. And he's pulling them up because they're drenched with blood. He wants to see if she cut herself somewhere.

So he's trying to figure out where on her body the injuries are. And he's kind of in automatic mode trying to stop what he can find as an injury. But it's kind of dark in there and he's really, really drunk.

So he's in there trying to aid her and Cooky comes in and he sees what's happening and no -- he runs out. And -- and when he runs out, he calls 911. And so the police response is on the way. But then he comes back upstairs with Todd Armbruster who was not what Brian expected and Brian was protective of his girlfriend. He didn't want Todd to see her laying there naked, so Brian comes in. And when Brian walks in

-- or when -- when Todd walks in, Brian's trying to pick her up by the waist and he's dropping her because he's drunk. He's trying to pick her up, he's saying come on baby, come on baby, get up, don't do this to me, come on, get up, get up. That's what Todd sees.

Brian sees Todd and his girlfriend's naked and he takes a swing at him and he almost falls over because he doesn't want somebody coming in there just to look at her.

Then the police come. And, I mean, you're going to hear words like baiting and stand off and -- and really what this was was never baiting, it was never a stand off. Brian was acting erratic because he was so drunk. But when the police get there, what they find is him laying on the floor right here, right on the side of Victoria between her and the closet, which is a couple feet. He's laying right there, he's stroking her head, he's staring at her, he's talking to her. That's all he's doing.

He doesn't have a weapon near him. He's not doing anything else. He just won't get away from Victoria. And so the police come, and they're rightly concerned about baiting. I mean, they don't know what they're walking into, and they hear downstairs from management that she's got AIDS and Hepatitis C, and they're worried about that blood. She didn't have AIDS, but that's the rumor that was going around there.

But they're worried about and rightly so. And so

they're careful going into it. But it turns out there's no big deal about baiting. He wasn't baiting anybody. He was just a drunk man who was laying there and wouldn't get up. And they come in, and it's about, I think, they said that they were in the bedroom for seconds once they get in there, seconds before they arrest him.

And they stack up right outside the door there, and then he's not listening and they're warning him we're going to taze you, get away from her, we're going to taze you. And he still won't stop looking at her and he's petting her head, and he won't pay attention to their commands get away from her. And so they taze him.

And one taze doesn't really bring him under control.

During that taze one officer at least goes to the other side of his body where you see those numbers five and six, sort of.

And they're trying to get him into custody, but the taze isn't really effective on him and he falls on his arm and he's not complying with their efforts to get him in cuffs.

And so they decide to taze him again. Each of those tazes is about 50,000 volts of electricity. And they taze him again and then they're -- they're able to -- to get control of him. And the officer's testimony varies widely an how many officers were over there. It's somewhere between four and five or maybe between two and five. I can't tell. And none of them really remember exactly. And you'll see a lot of

inconsistencies there.

And they were so -- but, you know, when these kind of things happen, they're shocking and adrenaline causing and there's a lot of -- it's a dynamic situation.

MR. LALLI: I'm sorry, your Honor, and I'm sorry, again, Ms. Palm. I'm going to interpose another argumentative objection, your Honor.

MS. PALM: Well, the -- the evidence will show -- THE COURT: I'm going to overrule the objection.

MS. PALM: -- that that was the kind of situation it is. And they do not remember all the details. And so their stories don't match up about what was where in the bedroom.

But very consistently they all deny that they saw anybody going onto the bed. However, there are apparent footprints on that bed. There's one right here. And this what you see -- that's not very clear. When you see the pillowcase that is up on top of that knife -- I'm not sure how to make this (indiscernible). I don't know if it's going to get any clearer. Oh, okay.

There's an apparent footprint right there on that pillowcase. And you'll be able to see that again because it's going to come in other ways. That's the pillowcase that's laying on top of the knife blade. And if that pillowcase is stepped on, and we think the evidence is going to show that it was, then you can't trust the results of DNA that they got off the knife blade. Even if you can trust them, it's going to

show you it's not inculpatory with Brian, but if they're up there stepping on it, a bloody pillowcase that's laying on top of the blade, it's going to get contaminated, and we think that the evidence is going to show you that it did.

And they have -- they have Brian's footprints from the bathroom where he went in and he was trying to get things to stop the bleeding. So they know what his footprints were like. But it was never compared to the prints on the bed. So we think the evidence is going to show you that the officers did go up over that bed and possibly contaminated the crime scene. And the officers did bump into Victoria's body.

And that accounts for a possibility of bruising that can't be linked to Brian. And with this whole situation, the evidence that they're relying onto show you culpability is just not that reliable. If this case is based on -- the evidence will show you this case is based on exaggeration and innuendos, and I don't think that they're going to be able to prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

Plain and simple story is that Brian acted badly. He acted very badly. He should have (indiscernible), but the evidence will show you that he just didn't want to leave Victoria. And he was so intoxicated that he wasn't in his rite mind. And that the entire scenario from the first call until he's taken custody is 12 minutes, but it's seconds in the bedroom.

And then after -- after Brian is taken into custody, after being tazed a couple times, he's dropped on his head in the bedroom or in the living room. Although, different officers say different places and different officers say different officers were carrying him at the time. He know he fell on his face somewhere. We know he was dropped somewhere. But we don't know where, bedroom, living room, which officers were carrying him. None of that stuff was consistent in the State's evidence.

l

And then so after all of that they take him down to the homicide offices to interview him. He sits in a room for awhile, and the interview starts and he is erratic and he's emotional and he's not making sense. And the interview continues, and he's not giving them what they want, so they take an hour long break because the evidence is that it's frustrating, but they take an hour long break and they come back and he's still not giving them what they want.

But what he is -- he is telling them some things. He is telling them how he hurt his hand, trying to grab a knife. He's telling them that. And it's going to show you it's consistent with somebody that thought his girlfriend was alive and didn't it want to get her in trouble because they told him she was alive.

They take advantage of his drunken stupor. They know how drunk he is when they're trying to talk to him, and they

tell him, she's still alive. Yeah, they're going to tell you when things change and they're trying to talk to him about that. And so he's vague and he's dancing around and, you no, that goes on for awhile until almost the end of the interview. And when they tell him she's dead, he asks for a cup of coffee and when the female detective leaves the room, he starts balling. He starts crying.

He's begging them to tell him that's not true. Tell me that's not true. And you'll see when you watch the -- the video of the interview, these detectives are very skilled and -- and how they're framing questions and they're very frustrated. But they also know it's being videotaped and they know it's going to be used for evidence and something if charges are brought.

And you'll notice things like at one point Brian's been saying do this, do that, please get this evidence, please go to the Paris and get the tapes from Paris, you'll see where we were, you'll see, please do this for me. And then when he asks the female detective to do something he says, where I this down, write this down, and the male detectives go don't order her around.

The evidence is going to show you that's partly for show. That's partly for this is how he treats women, he order them around. That's the inference you should make from that evidence or take from that evidence.

When the detectives don't get what they want and they end the interview, they do not attempt to preserve my client's blood alcohol level. They can do it. It's possible to do it there. In fact, we'll show you Metro's department manual which says you can do this. And for example, in a situation of a homicide suspect that appears to be slightly intoxicated. Can preserve it because it might be important to the defense. They didn't to that for us.

We'll never be able to show exactly how intoxicated he was. And yet, the evidence of him being belligerent and not cooperative and all of those things that are due to him being intoxicated is being relied on as evidence of his guilt.

There's other problems with the investigation in this case, and we'll have an expert that talks to you about those things too. But when the interview ends and they -- and the detectives leave and they come back in with the CSA Dan Ford to take DNA samples from my client, he's completely cooperative. And they're having to steady him to help dress him and they're having to steady him to put his booties on when he has to change his clothes.

And he's trying to tell them again, I just -- look at my hand, look at my hands. Just -- and what you'll see how he's talking. It's disjointed and it's weird, but he is trying to tell a story. He just is very, I guess, circumspect about it. But at this point he doesn't believe what they're telling

him. He doesn't know if Victoria's alive or Victoria's dead because they told him she was alive and then they told him she's dead, and now he doesn't know what to think.

If there's one thing that guessing to resound throughout this case is that a tragedy occurred. This case is a tragedy. But at the time of this offense Brian and Victoria were in love, they were having a loving relationship.

Everybody says it. Everybody who saw him knows it. They were doing couple things. He loved her. He didn't think he had much time left with her. The last thing he wanted was for her to leave him. He thought he had whatever time she had left. He hoped it was ten years.

And he didn't know what happened. And he wasn't able to explain what happened because he was so drunk and because of her history, he didn't know, had she done something to herself. And you'll see that in his questions. He thought she'd done something to herself, he didn't know. He couldn't figure it out, and he certainly couldn't figure it out in those hours when they were trying to talk to him and he was still trying to process it.

This was either an accident which occurred when Brian was defending himself from an attack by Victoria, or it was a suicide in which she stabbed herself just prior to coming at him. Either way it's a tragedy, but neither way does it indicate that might client is guilty of anything. Thank you.

```
THE COURT: All right, thank you, Ms. Palm. State,
 1
 2
    are you ready with your first witness?
              MR. LALLI: We, your Honor. I just want to preserve
 3
    the fact that I need to make a record regarding Ms. Palm's
 4
 5
    opening --
              THE COURT: All right.
 6
              MR. LALLI: -- statement at some point.
 7
 8
              THE COURT: Okay.
              MR. LALLI: Thank you. Your Honor, State calls Dr.
 9
    Jacqueline Benjamin.
10
              THE MARSHAL: Dr. Benjamin, if you'll remain
11
    standing. Please raise your right hand and face the clerk.
12
             JACQUELINE BENJAMIN, STATE'S WITNESS, SWORN.
13
              THE MARSHAL: Please be seated, Ma'am. Slide up to
14
    the microphone, state and spell your name for the record.
15
              THE WITNESS: Jacqueline Benjamin,
16
    J-a-c-q-u-e-l-i-n-e. Last name is B-e-n-j-a-m-i-n.
17
              THE COURT: Go ahead, Counsel.
18
             MR. LALLI: May I proceed, thank you. Your Honor,
19
20
   may I just move the podium out of the way?
             THE COURT: Yes.
21
             MR. LALLI: Can I just ask the clerk for the photos.
22
   Okay.
23
                         DIRECT EXAMINATION
24
25
   BY MR. LALLI:
```

Can you tell us how you're employed? 1 I'm currently employed as a neuropathology fellow at 2 Los Angeles County USC Medical Center. 3 0 And what is that? 4 Neuropathology fellowship is a post-doctoral training 5 program in diagnosing diseases of the brain. 6 I want to direct your attention to November of 2008. 7 What was your profession at that point? 8 I was a forensic pathologist with the Clark County Α 9 Coroner's Office. 10 For how long? 0 11 At that time, I believe, it was over a year. 12 And can you explain what you did at the Clark County 13 Coroner's Office? 14 I performed autopsies to determine the cause and Α 15 manner of death. 16 Did you work as a forensic pathologist there? 0 17 Α Yes. 18 Can you tell us about your formal education that 19 qualified you to be a forensic pathologist Coroner's Office? 20 Certainly. I obtained a medical degree from the Α 21 University of California at Irvine. After graduation from 22 medical school I spent a year internship with Kaiser Oakland in 23 internal medicine and three years of pathology residency 24 program in anatomic pathology. After that I did a one year 25

fellowship in forensic pathology. 1 Okay. Have you ever qualified as an expert in the 2 area of forensic pathology of the courts of either Nevada or 3 other states? 4 Α Yes. 5 Approximately how many times? 6 0 Six to seven. Α 7 MR. LALLI: Your Honor, at this point I'd ask that 8 Dr. Benjamin be allowed to render opinions in the area forensic 9 pathology. 10 THE COURT: Yes. 11 BY MR. LALLI: 12 Can you tell our jury what is forensic pathology? 13 Forensic pathologists as opposed to just autopsy 14 Α pathologists that work in a hospital, we deal with trauma. We 15 are specialists in evaluating traumatic injury. 16 Okay. And what is -- what is the objective of 17 0 forensic pathology? What do you ultimately trying to find or 18 determine? 19 The ultimate goal is to determine the cause of death Α 20 and the manner of death. 21 Do you use a process to analyze your patient or 22 0 descendant to arrive at those conclusions? 23 The process actually starts with scene 24 investigation, what occurs at the scene. We look -- in some

25

states the pathologist go to the crime scene or the scene of death. In this state the pathologist usually we do not go to the scene. But the process starts with investigation of the scene.

So it's looking at photographs, hearing what the police officers have to say, what witnesses have to say. Then the body is examined by the forensic pathologist. We do an external examination, also an internal examination. There's fluids, blood, urine --

Q I'm sorry, can you -- can you just wait just one moment.

(Pause in the proceedings).

THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Lalli.

MR. LALLI: Okay.

## BY MR. LALLI:

O Please continue.

A There's blood and urine, sometimes solid organs that are obtained at autopsy in order to test -- we test those specimens to find out what drugs are in the descendant's system. And after looking at all that data, we arrive at a cause of death and manner of death.

- Q What do you mean by the -- the phrase cause of death?
- A The cause of death is the disease or injury that resulted in that person's demise.
  - Q The actual thing that killed them?

1	A Correct.
2	Q And what is what do you mean by manner of death?
3	A Manner of death is how the cause arised. There's
4	several different manners of death. It could be a natural
5	death. For instance, atherosclerotic or coronary artery
6	disease is a natural death. There's also suicide. Suicide is
7	obviously self-inflicted injury. There can be homicide as
8	another manner, where the injury is inflicted by someone else.
9	There's also an accidental death, the most common of which is
10	motor vehicle accidents.
11	And when we can't determine based on all the data
12	that we have, we use a manner of undetermined.
13	Q I want to direct your attention to November 7th of
14	2008. Did you conduct a pathologic exam on the body of
15	Victoria Whitmarsh?
16	A I did.
17	Q Where was that conducted?
18	A At the Clark County Coroner's Office.
19	MS. PALM: Your Honor, I'd just like to note again my
20	objection for the record of
20	objection for the record of  THE COURT: I'm sorry?
:	
21	THE COURT: I'm sorry?
21	THE COURT: I'm sorry?  MS. PALM: I just wanted to note my objection that we

```
THE COURT:
                          Yes.
 1
    BY MR. LALLI:
              Dr. Benjamin, if you could just take a moment and
 3
    look through those. Doctor, for the record, have you looked at
    State's Proposed Exhibits 81 through 120?
 6
         Α
              Yes.
              Do they fairly and accurately depict the condition of
 7
    Victoria Whitmarsh's body when you observed it at autopsy?
         Α
              Yes.
 9
              MR. LALLI: Your Honor, move or the admission of
10
    those proposed exhibits.
11
              THE COURT: Ms. Palm.
12
              MS. PALM: Objection, for the record, your Honor.
13
              THE COURT: All right, they'll be admitted, 81
14
    through 120. You may publish.
15
                  (Exhibits 81 through 120 admitted).
16
              MR. LALLI: Thank you.
17
    BY MR. LALLI:
18
              One other photo I'd like to show you, Dr. Benjamin,
19
    is State's Proposed 130.
20
         Α
              Okay.
21
              Do you recognize that?
22
         Α
              Yes.
23
              Is that also a photo from autopsy?
24
              Yes.
25
         Α
```

MR. LALLI: Your Honor, move for the admission of 1 State's Proposed 130 as well. 2 MS. PALM: No objection. 3 THE COURT: 130 will be admitted. 4 (Exhibit 130 admitted). 5 BY MR. LALLI: 6 Dr. Benjamin, can you explain for our jury the 7 condition of Ms. Whitmarsh's body when you received it? 8 When the seal was broken, the deceased was wrapped in 9 a standard white sheet, hospital type sheet. After removal of 10 the sheet, she was clothed in a -- it was a black jacket and 11 12 black shirt. Was there any clothing on the lower extremities of 0 13 her body? 14 From the waist down she was unclothed. 15 As part of the autopsy process, do you ascertain the 16 Q weight and height of the descendant? 17 18 Α Yes. Did you do that in this case? 19 0 Not personally, but the technician did, yes. 20 Α It -- that's done as part of the process? 21 0 Α Correct. 22 What was Ms. Whitmarsh's weight? Q 23 108 pounds. Α 24 And what was her height? 0 25

Five feet, five inches. Did you observe any evidence of blunt force trauma on 2 3 her body? Α Yes. I'd like you to describe any blunt force trauma you 5 Q observed on her head and/or neck area. 6 On the head in the middle of the forehead close to 7 her hairline was hematoma, and basically a hematoma is blood 8 underneath the skin, and it elevates the skin away from the bone so you actually see a bone. 10 Okay. I'm going to show you State's Exhibit 86. Q 11 that -- well, first of all, let me turn the photograph this way 12 for just a moment. There appears to be a tag of some sort on 13 the photo. Do you see that? 14 15 Α Yes. Can you describe for your jury what that is. 16 Q The tag is a case identification number. The first 17 Α two numbers are the year, so it's 2008. And the autopsy number 18 is 8747. 19 Okay. So it identifies these photos to the pick 20 Q autopsy that you performed? 21 Correct. 22 Α Okay. Now, you were describing the injuries to the 23 Q 24 forehead?

25

Α

Yes.

In addition to looking at the injury externally, do 1 you as a forensic pathologist look at the injury under the skin? Yes, we do. How did you do that in this case? 5 After the external examination is complete, the body 6 А is opened, and usually the -- we examine the head last for a number of reasons. An incision is made behind the ear and it goes across the crown of the head in ear to ear, and the skin 9 is peeled forward and backward, and I look at the scalp at that time. 11 Okay. You wrote in your autopsy report that there is 12 hemorrhage in the subcutaneous tissue under the forehead 13 contusion scalp hematoma; is that correct? 14 Yes. Α 15 Can you explain to us what that means and what, if 16 any, significance you would attribute to that? 17 The hemorrhage in the subcutaneous tissue means 18 that there were broken blood vessels, that there is blood 19 actually in the tissue and that's what causes the bruising and 20 the contusion that you see on the skin. A contusion is 21 basically a bruise, and that comes about from broken blood 22

usually indicates that this was an acute injury.

So when you see a lot of blood with the naked eye, it

vessels.

23

24

What do you mean by the term acute? 1 It's a -- we have general classifications for sort of 2 dating and timing injury. It can be acute, subacute or chronic or old. So an acute means that it happened recently. It's difficult to say whether it was minutes or hours, recent? but it's certainly not days or weeks. 7 What about chronic? Chronic is old. It means that it's weeks usually or 9 -- yeah, days or weeks, typically. Okay. So you classified the injury to Ms. 10 Q Whitmarsh's forehead that we're seeing in this exhibit as 11 12 acute? Α That's correct. 13 Or recent? 0 14 Α Yes. 15 And did you say that your definition of acute was 16 minutes to hours old? 17 Roughly, yes. 18 Α 19 Okay. Now, in addition to looking under the skin on the forehead, do you have the ability to look under the skin 20 all around a person's head during the course of the autopsy? 21 Yes, that's done, that's standard procedure. 22 Α In doing that with Ms. Whitmarsh, did you 23 Q Okay. observe any other evidence of trauma to her head? 24

25

Α

Yes, there was hemorrhage or blood in the scalp

tissue towards the back of the head in the middle. This was not noted on the external exam because there's hair. She had very long thick black hair. And so the hair covered the injury in that area. Until the scalp was reflected, I did not see the injury.

Q Okay. Were you able to ascertain whether the injury to the back of the head was acute?

A It looked acute. There was also hemorrhage in the subcutaneous tissue.

Q Okay. Were -- in your autopsy report, you categorized these as areas of blunt force trauma?

A Yes.

12.

Q What -- can you explain to our jury what you mean by blunt force trauma?

A Yes. Injury, we usually put it in several categories. It can be incised, meaning it was caused by a sharp object such as a knife, a bottle, and those types of injuries, like stab wounds or even a surgical incision is an incised wound. And there are missile wounds, such as gunshot wounds, projectile injuries. Or blunt trauma, which is a broad category of injury. And contusions or bruises are caused by blunt force trauma.

And there are a number of things that can cause blunt trauma. Someone punching you in the eye and giving you a black eye, that's blunt trauma. Someone hitting you with a baseball

bat is blunt trauma. Falling onto the concrete and bruising yourself, that's also blunt trauma. So is it fair to say that blunt force trauma can be 3 4 something kind of induced by others or induced by self or even 5 induced by accident? 6 Α Correct. 7 So if I were to fall down, I might get blunt force 8 trauma on my body somewhere? Yes. 9 Α Now, does forensic science allow you to kind of 10 categorize the amount of force necessary to create an injury 11 12 such as the one on the -- the front of Ms. Whitmarsh's head? 13 I could not tell you of any precision the amount of 14 force that was required to cause that hematoma that we're 15 looking at. 16 0 Okay. Now I want to move down in your report. You 17 described blunt force trauma on the thorax, abdomen and back; 18 is that correct? 19 Α Yes. 20 0 I'm going to show you State's Exhibit No. 91. 21 you describe that for us? Yes, that's the -- a photo of the left shoulder and 22 Α 23 looking at, looks like two contusions on the front of the left

What is a contusion?

shoulder.

24

1 Α A contusion, again, is -- is a medical term for a 2 bruise. 3 Q I'm going to show you State's Exhibit 107. Specifically the area where my finger's indicating. Can you see anything there? There's redness of the skin, and I believe that's 6 likely livor, if that's the back surface, which is what it looks like. 8 What is livor? 9 Q 10 Livor is the pooling of blood independent positions that occur after death. 11 12 Okay is livor injury? 13 No. It's just a condition, an artifact of death? 14 15 It's one of the changes that occur with death. 16 Q I'm going to show you State's Proposed Exhibits --17 actually here admitted Exhibits 88 and 89. What are we seeing 18 there? 19 Α That's the left arm and there's a contusion. 20 And is State's Exhibit 89 another photograph of that 21 same area of contusion, but the back part of it? 22 Α It's the same arm with -- yes, it's the posterior back surface with three contusions. 23 24 Okay. And the same area shown in State's Proposed or 25 actual Exhibit No. 90?

Yes. Α 1 What are we seeing in State's Exhibit 92? 2 It's the back of the right arm and there's a 3 contusion there as well. State's Exhibit 93? 5 I believe that's the right arm. On the front there's 6 7 a contusion. State's Exhibit 95? 8 That's the back or the dorsal of the right hand. 9 Α again, what we're looking at are contusions. 10 What are we seeing in State's Exhibit No. 96? Q 11 It's the back of the left hand with an abrasion. 12 What's an abrasion? 13 Abrasion is when the upper area of the skin is rubbed 14 off, and what you are seeing is actually the underlayer of the 15 skin or the dermis. 16 So this was a scrape of some sort? 17 A scrape is a good way to describe that. 18 Okay. I'm going to show you State's Exhibit 98, the 19 What was that? 20 large red mark. That is a contusion. 21 Α I'm going to show you State's Exhibit 99. What is 22 that? 23 Those are two contusions on her abdomen on the rite 24 side. 25

Q Do you have any way of ascertaining either from the color or from any other manner approximately how old (indiscernible)?

A There's literature that talks about dating bruises based on color. In the old literature it was thought that you actual decree do that. But subsequent studies have shown that you can have an injury -- two injuries that occurred at the same time in similar location and the colors are different, although they were sustained at the same time.

So we don't use colors to date injury. If I were to take a microscopic section -- if I were to take a section of that tissue, process it and look at it under a microscope, I can give you a general idea in terms of whether it's acute, subacute or chronic, and that would be based on certain cells that come in to an area of injury and start cleaning off the blood. When we see those cells, they're called macrophages, then that's a subacute injury.

When you have fibrous tissue, a little bit of macrophages and most of the blood is cleaned up, that's a older injury. When it's all fresh blood, then that's an acute injury.

Q I'm going to show you State's Exhibit 100. What is that?

A Those are two contusions on the left side of the body.

1	Q Now I want to show you State's Exhibit No. 106, and I
2	want to direct your attention to the back area here. Did you
3	well, what are we look at first of all?
4	A Again, as you mentioned, it is the the back right
5	side and we're looking at a contusion near the top of the
6	shoulder.
7	Q Okay. Now, on this particular injury, did you make
8	an incision into it?
9	A Yes, I did.
10	Q And what what is your what is your purpose in
11	doing that?
12	A When I make the incision, I am I'm looking for
13	whether there's a lot of hemorrhage or no hemorrhage and a
14	subcutaneous tissue to give me an idea of whether this is an
15	acute or an older type of injury.
16	Q Okay. In your autopsy report you indicated that the
17	incision through the skin reveals a small amount of hemorrhage
18	in the subcutaneous tissue; is that correct?
19	A Yes.
20	Q What does that mean?
21	A That means that there wasn't a lot of blood. There
22	was some, but not a lot.
23	Q What is that it terms of relating that injury to
24	being acute or chronic?
25	A Again, it's difficult to say because a microscopic

section was not taken. There is blood there, but I don't know if there are macrophages that had cleaned up more blood that was there previously. So it's difficult to date.

- Q Okay. Would you -- would it be your opinion that is not an old injury?
- A It wouldn't be classified as a chronic injury. It's either acute or subacute.
  - Q And what's the difference between acute and subacute?
- A Again, just for qualitative stand point, acute, there's lot of red blood cells. There -- there are no cells there that are cleaning up the red blood cells. Subacute, there's red cells and there's also the cells that are cleaning up the red cells. And in terms of time, acute is probably more minutes, hours. Subacute is on the order of days.
- Q Okay. So the injury to -- that we're -- we're looking at now, you would classify that as acute or subacute, based upon what you observed?
  - A Correct.

б

- Q All right. Now I want to show you State's Exhibit 108. Can you tell us what we're seeing here?
- A Yes, this is the lower back end buttocks, and there's a large contusion on the right buttock and there's also actually a contusion further up on the back area.
- Q Okay. Now, with respect to the contusion in the -- in the middle of the back, did you attempt to, I guess, dissect

that or open it up to have a look at the subcutaneous tissue? 2 The one in the middle of the back I made an incision through to look at the subcutaneous tissue. 4 Q Okay. And what did you observe? 5 I believe, I also observed there was hemorrhage in 6 the subcutaneous tissue. 7 Okay. Is that inconsistent with being acute? 8 Acute or subacute, yes. 9 Q All right. What about the large bruise on the buttocks, did you incise that as well? 10 11 Α I did. When I incised that, there was no hemorrhage 12 in the subcutaneous tissue. 13 And what is that indicative of? 0 It's indicative that it's not an acute injury. 14 15 So it's older? Q 16 Α It's older, yes. 17 Q All right. Showing you State's Exhibit 110, 18 particularly the -- the lower back of the leg there. Can you 19 explain to us what we're seeing? And if it's easy for me to 20 show you the photo before I put this on the monitor, I'm happy to do that as well. 21 22 Α Actually, I don't see a whole lot there. 23 Q Okay. 24 So maybe -- it's a little blurry. Α MR. LALLI: May I approach the witness, your Honor? 25

1 THE COURT: Yes. 2 THE WITNESS: There's some discoloration to the skin that -- that may be contusions. BY MR. LALLI: This is something that's more difficult to classify? 5 6 Correct. All right. What are with seeing on State's Exhibit 7 111? 8 We're looking at both legs, and on the side of the Α 10 left leg we see a couple of contusions. What are we seeing in State's Exhibit 113? 11 12 There's a contusion just above the ankle on the right. 13 14 Okay, I'm going to show you State's Exhibit No. 114. Can you tell us what we're seeing there? 15 16 Α Yes, there's -- this is the body face up, and there are some contusions on the left leg. 17 18 State's Exhibit 115. I believe, that's the medial aspect of the right leg 19 20 showing a couple of contusions. 21 Q All right. What are we seeing in State's Exhibit 22 116? 23 That is the side of the right leg showing a contusion above the ankle. 24 0 How about Exhibit 117? 25

1 This is the top of the left foot showing some Α bruising. 2 Now, you had indicated in your report that you 3 Q observed an area of stab wound; is that correct? 5 Α Yes. 6 I want to show you first State's Exhibit 101. you did -- I don't know if you can touch your screen and -- and kind of circle where the stab wound is. 9 Oops, sorry. I circled over it. 10 0 Okay. Right. And where is that on Ms. Whitmarsh's body? 11 12 It's on the side of the body on the right. 13 Q Okay. Under the armpit? Α 14 Yes. 15 And I want to he show you State's Exhibit 102. Q 16 is that? 17 Α That is the stab wound again. 18 Okay. Can -- in addition to looking at the wound 19 externally, are you able, much as you did the head, look at it 20 internally? 21 Α Yes, that's how I determined it was a stab wound. 22 Just looking at it externally, it's difficult to tell whether 23 it's an incised wound that's -- that's just a cut or a stab 24 wound which is deeper into the body or longer into the body

than it is on the surface. That's how you classify a stab

wound.

Q Okay. Can you tell us the -- and it's your opinion that this was a stab wound?

A Yes.

Q Can you tell us the path that the -- the -- the object that caused this injury took through the body?

A Yes. It entered the chest on the right side. The lung was not injured. It cut through the diaphragm, which separates the chest cavity from the abdominal cavity and it went from the front of the liver to the back of the liver.

Q Were any major blood vessels, arteries, things of that nature struck?

A No. There are smaller vessels, the intercostal arteries and veins, and of course, the liver is very vascular, but in terms of a major blood vessel like the aorta or the vena cava, no.

Q Okay. When you ascertained the path of the -- the stab into the body, do you also use a trajectory rod to make it more easy to discern or easier to discern the directionality of the stab wound in the body?

A The trajectory rod is -- I do use that because I think it makes it visually it's easier to understand with the trajectory rod in place. I don't actually need it to tell directionality.

Q But it's for the purposes of illustrating direction

to others? 2 Α Correct. 3 Such as juries and lawyers? And law enforcement. 5 And law enforcement. Okay. I'm going to show you 6 State's Exhibit No. 130. What is that? 7 That's the trajectory rod. So does this mean that a -- the knife entered 8 Victoria's body in the direction of the rod into her body? 10 Α That's the -- more than likely. It's the path of 11 least resistance. So wherever the rod easily goes, it's an indication that's how -- whatever implement was used, that's 12 13 how it went in. Okay. I think you indicated at the beginning of your 14 15 examination that toxicology samples are taken from descendants 16 at autopsy? 17 Α Yes. 18 0 With as that done in this case? 19 Α Yes. 20 Was the blood analyzed? Q It was. 21 Α 22 Was it analyzed specifically for Hepatitis C? 23 Yes, we had indication that the deceased may have 24 been Hepatitis C positive, so a test was sent for that. We 25 don't routinely do that.

1 Q Did that test confirm that she was, in fact, 2 Hepatitis C positive? 3 Α Yes. Can you explain for our jury what Hepatitis C is? 5 Α Hepatitis C is a virus that's acquired usually by blood borne infection. And over time that virus can cause damage to the liver. 8 Okay. And -- and just in -- in -- in terminology that somebody like myself, a non-doctor could understand, what does -- how does Hepatitis C affect the body? What does it do 10 11 as a practical matter? 12 As a practical matter the virus causes inflammation. 13 And that inflammation, if we're dealing -- it just as an example, the inflammation in the liver will result in damage to 14 15 the normal liver cells. And after a certain point those cells stop regenerating, and what you have is not replacement with 16 17 liver cells, which are called hepatocytes, but it's replaced with fibrous tissue which obviously does not function as a 18 19 normal liver cell would function. 20 Q During the course of the autopsy, did you have the 21 occasion to examine Victoria's liver? 22 Α Yes, all organs are examined. 23 Q Can you explain the condition of her liver for our jury? 24

Her liver was very hard and composed of multiple

25

Α

large nodules, and that's appearance by the naked eye is called cirrhosis.

- Q As part of this particular toxicology examination was her blood alcohol level tested?
  - A Yes.

1

2

3

5

6

8

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

- Q What was her blood alcohol level?
- 7 A It was.24.
  - Q Now, with -- going back to this discussion of cirrhosis, does Hepatitis C contribute or create cirrhosis in the body?
- A There are a number of causes of cirrhosis. Hepatitis
  12 C is one.
  - Q How about excessive alcohol use?
  - A Yes, that's the probably the most common in the forensic community that cirrhosis is caused by alcohol abuse over long periods of time.
    - Q Does cirrhosis affect bruising on the body?
  - A Yes.
- 19 Q How?
  - A Again, when the liver cells are replaced with fibrous tissue they -- the fibrous tissue does not function like a normal liver cell. Part of the function of the liver is to make, excuse me, clotting factors which cause your blood -- cause you to stop bleeding when you're injured. So if you don't have the normal synthetic function of the liver, the

liver is not producing as much clotting factor as it normally would, so you would tend to bleed a little longer than most the individuals who don't have cirrhosis. 4 So is it fair to say that cirrhosis makes bruising 5 more prominent or more visible than it otherwise would be? Α Yes. 6 7 Would you also agree that there has to still be some underlying trauma to cause the bruise, however? 8 9 Α Correct. 10 So it would -- cirrhosis in effect makes it easier for us to see trauma that occurred on the body? 11 12 Α Yes. 13 Okay. It doesn't make a person more likely to bruise, only the bruising more visible; would you agree with 14 15 that? I would agree with that. You don't spontaneously 16 17 bruise with cirrhosis, that I'm aware of. Okay. Now, with respect to cirrhosis, if you take it 18 to its end point, its ultimate stage of development within the 19 20 body, can you die from it? 21 Α Yes. 22 Was Victoria Whitmarsh in fear -- not in fear, but close to death as a result of the condition of her liver? 23

gross and microscopically, and I -- it's a visual examination,

24

25

I actually do not know that. I look at her liver

it's not a functional study. So in order to know that I would
have had to be her treating physician. I would have seen a
decline in the function of the liver. The -- the liver is
responsible for many things, one of which is metabolism of
drugs, production of clotting factors. And there are certain
enzymes that a treating physician would follow to see if her
liver function is declining.

And I -- I don't have that data, and I obviously was

And I -- I don't have that data, and I obviously was not her treating physician, so I wouldn't be able to answer that.

- Q Okay did her condition of cirrhosis contribute in any way to her death?
- 13 A No.

9

10

11

12

14

15

- Q I want to talk more about her blood. Did you find any evidence of a drug called Venlafaxine,
- 16 | V-e-n-l-a-f-e-x-i-n-e?
- 17 A Yes.
- Q Is there a, I guess, a brand name of that drug that perhaps more people would be familiar with?
- 20 A Yes, it's called Effexor.
  - Q What was the amount of Effexor in Victoria's blood?
- 22 A It's 990 nanograms per ml.
- Q And excuse me question, but is that a lot?
- 24 A No
- Q What -- is that within therapeutic levels?

Α 1 Yes. 2 Now, did you reach an opinion with respect to the cause of death of Victoria Whitmarsh? 3 I did. 4 Α 5 What was that? 6 A stab wound of the chest. 7 In your report you indicate that there was another significant condition; is that true? 8 9 That is true. Α What was the other significant condition? 10 11 Cutaneous contusions or I'm sorry, it's cutaneous 12 blunt trauma. 13 Are those the bruises on her body? 14 Α Yes. 15 Why is that included in your report? 16 Α I included it for two reasons. One, the actual mechanism of death. So there is cause of death, manner of 17 death, and we also look at the mechanism of death. And the 18 19 mechanism is something non-specific. In this case the 20 mechanism is exsanguination or bleeding out. So you would get 21 that same mechanism with a stab wound or a qunshot wound or if 22 you're anti-coagulated. 23 So because her mechanism of death is bleeding out or 24 exsanguination, I had contributed the cutaneous blunt trauma

because any -- any injury that causes blood to be outside of

the blood vessels and outside of the vasculature system would contribute to the demise. And I didn't want to minimize the amount of external trauma that I saw. That's for those two reasons I included it as other significant conditions.

- Q Okay. Now, exsanguination just means blood loss?
- 6 A Correct.

- Q Is there any way for you to estimate how long it took for Victoria to die as a result of the stab wound?
  - A No.
- Q Why -- why not? They do it on CSI on TV all the time. Why can't you do it?
- 12 A That's entertainment. This is real life.
- 13 Q Okay.
  - A There are a number of factors. In any biological system you can't expect things to work the same each time. There are conditions that would alter things, even under experimental conditions. Say for instance, we were to bleed rats and to see how long those rats would die. There's a range. It's never it takes them two hours to die.

So there's always a range. You know, it can take between five minutes and two hours. And -- and that depends on, for instance, we're using rats, so that depends on the individual rat factors.

In this case it's one of the factors that would alter my determination is the fact that she is cirrhotic. The

cirrhosis decreases her clotting factors. So she's going to continue to bleed. Whereas, someone else might start to clot and the process would be maybe a little quicker with her than with a normal individual. So that's one reason.

1.0

Also, if -- if her blood alcohol content is indicative of chronic alcohol abuse, alcohol also inhibits platelet function. And platelets are also involved in stopping bleedings. And so with her platelets perhaps being abnormal, she may have also bled out a little faster than a individual who didn't drink chronically or had cirrhosis of the liver.

- Q So are those unknowns in -- in the evaluation of this issue?
- A They're unknowns in the fact that it would alter.

  Even if we had experimental data, it would alter that data.
- Q Okay. When ascertaining how long it would take for one to die from this sort of an injury, do you take into account that no major blood vessel was severed?
- A Yes, that's considered. If she had a transsection, which is a complete cut across the aorta, which is the largest artery in your body, the aorta pumps blood to the rest of your body. So if that vessel was injured, I would be more comfortable saying that she passed away within seconds to less than -- seconds to minutes because there's still a variation.
- Q So not finding something like the aorta severed would it be your opinion that death in this case took minutes or

longer? 2 A That's reasonable, yes. 0 Probably not hours, but --3 4 Α No, not hours. 5 -- certainly minutes, a number of minutes? 6 Α Yes. 7 Now, hypothetically if they were a neighbor 8 downstairs who had heard crying, which turned to moaning, and 9 that entire process took approximately ten minutes, is that 10 consistent with what you observed in terms of how long it would take for this woman to die? 11 12 Well, it's not -- it wouldn't be an observation, 13 obviously. It would be conjecturing. It is -- it would -- I 14 guess it could be consistent, yes. 15 Okay. Not your own observation --Correct. 16 Α 17 -- but the -- the time is consistent with what a 18 woman might have heard? 19 Α Yes. 20 Q Okay. And if there was a disturbance that was heard 21 which lasted the better part of an hour, certainly at least 22 with respect to the injuries that you observed on Ms. Whitmarsh 23 that you would categorize as acute, could those injuries have been caused in that hour preceding her death? 24

They could have been, yes.

1 And we've talked about manner of death or we've talked about cause of death, rather. Did you reach an opinion as to manner of death? 3 Yes. Α 5 And what is the manner of death? Α Homicide. 6 7 What is a homicide? What is your definition of that? 8 Α The forensic definition is death of the hands of 9 another. 10 Q What is suicide? 11 Suicide is self-inflicted injury or death. 12 Did you observe --Q Α Or of death, sorry. 13 14 -- anything on the body of Ms. Whitmarsh that was 15 consistent with a suicide? 16 Α No. 17 Can you -- is there anything about the directionality 18 of her stab wound that helped you to rule out suicide? 19 I did not use the directionality, per se. at manner, again, circumstances are very important. Also, the 20 21 nature of the injury is important. Location would be 22 important. For instance, a stab wound in the middle of the 23 back you wouldn't anticipate that an individual would be able 24 to reasonably do that to themselves. 25 So location, type of injury and circumstances are

very important in determining manner. Okay. Was the location of Ms. Whitmarsh's injury 2 important in your determination? 3 4 Α Yes. 5 Okay, how so? 6 I thought it was an inconsistent location with 7 someone who was trying to kill themselves. 8 Q Why? 9 That is not usually what I've observed in suicides. Α Usually it's the wrists, I've seen self-inflicted injury that 10 caused death, typically in men, slashing of the throat. 11 it's usually the wrists. Even abdominal wounds. But this --12 the location is a little awkward. And so if you were trying to 13 14 harm yourself why make it more difficult to do that? 15 MR. LALLI: Thank you, your Honor. That concludes direct examination. 16 17 THE COURT: Is the jury okay? Do we need a break at 18 this time? You're okay? 19 I need to get some exhibits marked. MS. PALM: 20 THE COURT: We'll take a very quick -- I'm sorry? I need to get some exhibits marked. 21 MS. PALM: THE COURT: All right, we're going to take a break, a 22 23 short recess. Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, during this recess, it is your duty not to converse among yourselves or 24

with anyone else on any subject connected with this case or to

read, watch or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial by any person connected with the trial or by any medium 2 of information, including without limitation, newspaper, 4 television, radio or the Internet. You are not to form or express an opinion on any 5 subject connected with the case until this matter is submitted 6 to you. We'll see you back in approximately five minutes. Mr. 7 Lalli, if you could speak with the (indiscernible) about the 8 (indiscernible). 9 (Court recessed at 4:45 p.m. until 4:58 p.m.). 10 (In the presence of the jury). 11 THE MARSHAL: You may be seated, ladies and 12 gentlemen. Let's make sure our cell phones are turned off, 13 please. Please remain seated and come to order. Department 17 14 of the Eighth Judicial District is again in session. 15 Honorable Judge Michael P. Villani presiding. Let's make sure 16 our cell phones are turned off, please. 17 THE COURT: Dr. Benjamin, you understand you're still 18 under oath? 19 20 THE WITNESS: Yes. THE COURT: All right, go ahead, Ms. Palm. 21 22 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. PALM: 23 Good afternoon, Dr. Benjamin. 24 Good afternoon. 25

```
I just want to run through some of the bruising noted
  1
  2
     on your autopsy report that you just testified about.
  3
               MS. PALM: May I approach the witness, your Honor?
  4
               THE COURT:
                           Yes.
  5
               MS. PALM:
                          Thank you.
     BY MS. PALM:
  7
               Showing you what's been marked as Defendant's
  8
     Proposed Exhibit C. Do you recognize that?
  9
          Α
               Yes.
 10
          0
               And is that the same bruise that you were just
11
    testifying about, the contusion on the forehead?
12
         Α
               Yes.
13
              MS. PALM: Your Honor, I would move to admit.
14
              THE COURT: Any objection to C.
15
              MR. LALLI: No, your Honor, I don't object to the
16
    admission of any of the photos, I'm sorry, that Ms. Palm showed
17
    me. I don't object to any of them.
18
              THE COURT: All right. Ms. Palm, why don't you
19
    identify all of them, and we can admit them right now to speed
    it up.
20
21
                         Those would be Defense C, B, D, E, F, G,
              MS. PALM:
22
    H, I, J, and A.
23
              THE COURT: Okay, those will be admitted.
24
         (Exhibits A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I and J admitted).
25
              MS. PALM:
                         Thank you.
```

BY MS. PALM: Looking at -- this -- this writing is really weird. 2 I'm going to see if I can (indiscernible) make this clearer. Is -- can you see that bruising there on the forehead? 5 Α Yes. 6 That's what you were talking about, the contusion on 7 the forehead? 8 Yes, it contusion and hematoma. 9 Okay. And that one you said was acute because it had 10 bleeding under the -- underneath it, hemorrhaging? 11 Α Yeah, there was hemorrhage in the subcutaneous 12 tissue. 13 Okay. And how many of the contusions that you checked had hemorrhaging or -- do you recall? 14 15 I would have to refer to my autopsy notes. (Indiscernible). 16 Q 17 There were three with hemorrhage in the subcutaneous 18 tissue, but not all of the -- all of the contusions were 19 examined. 20 0 Okay. And -- and of those three, were those ones the ones that you determined were acute? 21 They were either acute or subacute. 22 Α 23 Q Okay. What does subacute mean? The subacute again, is very broad ranges. 24 minutes to hours or so. The subacute, likely days. 25 And again

1 a more precise dating would be easier to be -- to determine with microscopic examination. Okay. And so the three that were either acute or subacute, what -- one acute is in front of the head. other acute in the back of the head? 6 Α Yes. 7 Q Okay. 8 Α That's correct. And the then the third one was subacute? 10 Α The -- both on the -- on the head, the forehead and 11 the back of the head were described as acute. There were 12 others that were incised that I thought were either acute or subacute, it was difficult to tell. 13 14 Okay. This injury on her forehead was the only injury in her facial area? 15 16 Α Yes. 17 And then showing you Defense H. And from -- from 18 that photograph were any of these bruises determined to be acute? 19 20 Α Those bruises were not incised, so I did not look at the subcutaneous tissue. 21 22 Okay. Did you notice any of those looking green? Q 23 If I did, it would be described in the autopsy Α report. 24 Okay. You can refer to your autopsy report, Doctor. 25 0

If you want to start with the -- the first green I see is the thorax (indiscernible). Okay. 4 Okay. And can you point out on the body where that green one is? This is not a good photograph for thorax, abdomen and 7 back. 8 Okay. This is a better photograph for, of course, the left 9 10 arm. So if you had another one, that would be good. 11 (Indiscernible) another photograph. What -- what 12 area is the thorax? 13 Α The thorax is the chest area. 14 0 The chest area? 15 Yeah. Α 16 So something in the chest area was green? 17 Α Correct. 18 And how about the -- you can see these little bruises here on the right side of her abdomen. 19 20 Α Uh-huh. Was one of those greenish? 21 22 No, they're not described as green. 23 Okay. If you could look at the second paragraph 24 under the thorax, abdomen and back. Is there one described as green or maroon? 25

Α Green, maroon and the other predominantly maroon. Okay. And then on the right side of the back, some 2 3 of those ones were green also; is that correct? Α 4 Yes. And then the -- the one that you incised above the 5 6 buttock, and I'm showing you Defense J, is this large one here? 7 That's the one you're talking about that you incised? 8 Yes. 9 Q Okay. And that one you determined was not acute 10 because -- can you explain that again? 11 Α It was not acute because I did not see any hemorrhage 12 in the subcutaneous tissue. 13 Okay, so you determined that this -- this one here 14 was an older bruise? 15 Α Correct. 16 Okay. And then she had another green bruise on one 17 of the bruises on the right arm was green? The lateral aspect? 18 Α Yes. 19 Okay. And then there's a puncture mark also on the 20 right arm. 21 It's described as a possible puncture. 22 0 Okay. And the -- the one -- going back to the one on 23 the buttock, that is -- that is a -- a red bruise, but it is 24 not acute? 25 Α Correct.

1 And then the -- the right hand you talked about the injury, showing you Defense F. Looking at that injury, did that determine -- did that appear to be a fresh injury to you? 3 It's an abrasion, and there's dried blood at the base. It looks more acute than old. Would it help you to look at the hand injury, if I 6 Q can show you a picture up close? 8 No, I can see it. I can see it on the screen, yeah. 9 You saw it well enough? Okay. So -- so you thought 10 that was a newer injury? It looks -- if I had to date I'd say it's more acute 11 than old because there's still blood in the dermis. 12 13 And then going to the shins, you described some of these bruises on the shins as green; is that correct? 14 15 I believe that was a dorsum of the food and yes. 16 Yes. 17 Q And -- and also green on the dorsum of the foot? so the way cirrhosis scars the liver -- it affects the clotting 18 factor so that somebody bruises more easily; is that correct? 19 The force necessary to cause a bruise may be a little 20 different. You would see the bruise being more prominent than 21 22 with someone who is not cirrhotic. 23 0 Okay. So you would have a bigger bruise on a slighter contact? 24 25 Α Yes, that's fair.

1 Right? And -- and blunt force trauma, as you 2 explained, can be something that somebody does to themselves or something that happens to them? 4 Α Yes. 5 0 And none of the bruises in this case are life threatening on their own, were they? 7 No, they are not. Α 8 And -- and you testified that there's no really 9 scientifically accepted theory that you can really gauge bruises by color? 10 11 That's correct. 12 Okay. Do bruises generally change color in a predictable fashion, though? 13 14 Α Yes. 15 And what -- what colors do they go through? 16 Α Red, red, maroon or blue to -- to green to 17 yellow/brown. And that's basically the color is changing 18 because the heme pigment and red blood cells, the hemoglobin is 19 being broken down. 20 Q Okay. So -- so as -- as the colors change, would 21 that vary depending on the person? 22 Α That can vary depending on the person, the person's 23 state of health, other factors such as whether they're cirrhotics. There are variables. 24 Okay. So for instance, in Ms. Whitmarsh we have the 25 0

one older bruise that's still a red bruise. Does that mean that it takes her much longer for bruising to turn through the colors number it gets to green? 3 Α No. 4 5 0 Why not? The colors change in a predictable fashion, but I 6 7 can't tell you if she had two bruises at the same time that one is going to change faster than the other, if that's what you're 9 asking. So it's -- it's different depending on the 10 Q area she's bruised or what's -- what's the variable? 11 The -- there's variability by the particular 12 There's variability if you are a diabetic, for 13 instance, and you have poor circulation to your extremities. 14 Your bruises may stay red longer because your circulatory 15 system doesn't work very well in that region. 16 17 Do you recall how old Ms. Whitmarsh was at the time of her autopsy? 18 19 Α I believe she was 54. Okay. Does -- does aging affect bruising at all? 20 Q It can if you have a peripheral vascular disease, 22 yes. Would you have seen evidence of that on the Okay. Q

We typically don't dissect legs, so I wouldn't know

21

23

24

25

autopsy?

Α

if she had peripheral vascular disease. 1 2 Bruises don't tend to change color post-mortem, 3 though, do they? No, they do not. 4 5 So it stops at the time of death? That's the color it's going to stay? 6 7 Α That's correct. Do -- do hematomas continue to grow. Would a bump 8 Q 9 continue to grow after death? Α It depends on if there's blood leakage continuing in 10 that area or if the person is dependent. If they were face 11 12 down and you have blood pooling, the hematoma may have gotten a 13 little larger. The liver in Ms. Whitmarsh was on her back area? 14 O The liver is on the front on the right. 15 Α On the front right? 16 Q Are you saying livor or liver? 17 Α Livor, I'm sorry? 18 Q 19 Α Livor. I'm sorry. I don't know how to pronounce it. 20 Livor is on the back. 21 Α 22 Q Okay. 23 It was on the back. Α 24 And -- and how does the alcohol affect bruising differently than the cirrhosis does?

Alcohol is known to inhibit platelet function, and 1 platelets are also part of the, what we call the clotting cascade. So if somebody has a clotting problem because of the 4 5 liver and you combine it with the alcohol, does that make a greater clotting problem because it's two different kinds? 6 7 It would be expected to be additive, yes. And you noted when you did the autopsy on Ms. 8 9 Whitmarsh that her spleen was also enlarged? 10 Α Yes. What did you attribute that to? 11 To her cirrhosis of the liver. Α 12 13 Okay. And I want to talk a little bit about the -the drugs that were found in her system on the toxicology 14 15 report. You testified about the Effexor, that it was a 990, is that milligrams? 16 17 Α It's nanograms per ml. 18 Nanograms per ml? Showing you what's Defense Exhibit Did you consider her other medications which she was 19 20 taking? Can you see those? 21 Α Not really, sorry. Would it help if I approach and show you? 22 Q Α I can't make out what it says. 23 Is that helpful to you? What other medications was 24 25 she on besides the Effexor?

1 Α The Trazodone and Spironolactone. 2 And what are those medications? 3 Trazodone is sometimes used for sleep. I believe it was also used as an anti-depressant. And Spironolactone, I believe, is a diuretic sort of medication, if I recall correctly. 6 7 And do you recall finding either of those in her system? 9 Α Those were not listed on the toxicology report. However, they would have had to -- in some cases unless we specifically ask for a drug to be looked for, it won't be 11 tested for it. There are thousands of drugs and our drug 12 13 screening won't pick up all of them. 14 Are those some of the drugs that might not pick up? 15 I am not sure at this point. I would have to check with our toxicology lab. 17 Okay. And the prescription for her Effexor, do you 18 agree it was 150, is it nanograms? I'm not sure how you say 19 that. 20 The Effexor says 75 milligrams. Α Twice a day? 21 22 Α I -- I can't see that on this -- it says take to 23 capsules, yes, so 150. 24 0 So 150 a day?

25

Α

Correct.

1 Q And Effexor's broken down in the liver? 2 It's metabolized in the liver, yes. Okay. And then there were also Effexor metabolites 3 0 in her blood; is that correct? 5 Α That's correct. 6 And what was the level of the Effexor metabolites? 7 The metabolite O-desmethylvenlafaxine was 870 8 nanograms per ml. 9 Q Okay. And are -- are those the levels you would expect to see on somebody that was taking 75 milligram capsules 10 11 twice a day? 12 I actually would not evaluate the levels in that 13 context because that -- what you're seeing here on this tox 14 report where it gives you the milligrams and it what is the reference ranges refers to steady state. And steady state 15 16 means that you have the same amount of drug being absorbed as 17 is being eliminated. So it's steady state in the blood. 18 And that occurs, according to this report, I believe, 19 it's two hours after taking the drug. Having not known when she took the drug, I couldn't say that I would expect this to 20 21 be her steady state level. I don't know that. 22 Q Okay. So she -- does that seem like a high level, if 23 it was her steady state level? 24 If it was her steady state, according to these

reference ranges, it would be high, yes.

25

Cirrhosis can also cause impaired cognition; is that 1 2 correct? 3 Α It can if it results in hyporeninemia, meaning that the liver is failing to breakdown ammonia, it will cause confusion, yes. 5 б Q And is that something that you tested for in the 7 autopsy? 8 Α No, we don't test for ammonia levels. 9 Q And alcohol also impairs cognition; is that correct? 10 Α That is correct. 11 I want to talk to you a little bit about the wound 12 path because I'm a little confused when I look at the 13 photograph. Showing you State's 130. And do you recall on the 14 autopsy report indicating a wound path? Do I --15 Α 16 In your autopsy report? 17 Α Yes, a wound path is stated in here. 18 Okay. I -- I thought you just testified that it was right to left, front to back and downward. I mean, I thought 20 you just testified it was back to front (indiscernible). 21 Α I don't -- I don't recall what the testimony was, but 22 it is in the report what I thought the path was. 23 Okay. And the report says right to -- right to left, front to back and downwards; is that correct?

25

Α

That's correct.

l 0 And is that what is indicated on this photograph? What's indicated with the trajectory rod is you can barely make out that it's right to left. What it's trying to 3 show is that it's downward. 4 5 Okay. How about the front to back? 6 Α The front to back is better seen internally because it's going from like the front of the -- well, it's more the 7 side, but it's better described as front and to the back of the 8 liver. So it would be more toward from the front of the body 9 10 surface to the back. 11 Q Okay. So you're not talking about from the front of 12 the body to the back of the body when you're describing that? 13 When I'm describing the wound path, that is what I'm 14 trying to do here, but it's not as clear cut as let's say it 15 was on the front here and it went to the back of the liver. 16 It's -- it's actually from side to back, but it was described as front to -- to back, if that makes sense. 17 18 0 Showing you Defense A, looking at this photograph, can you describe how -- how the wound is in relationship to a 19 20 knife, and I guess my question is the top of the knife and I 21 forget what you call it, the non-sharp part of the knife, can you indicate where that is in the picture? 23 MR. LALLI: Your Honor, I object to the question as 24 vague and ambiguous.

25

MS. PALM: I know this question's badly phrased

```
(indiscernible).
  1
  2
               THE COURT:
                           Sustain the objection.
               MS. PALM:
  3
                           Okay.
     BY MS. PALM:
  5
          Q
               Can you -- is there one part of that wound that is
     wider than the other part?
  6
  7
               Is there one -- I'm sorry, can you rephrase?
               On both ends of the wound from sharp cutting?
  8
  9
               The wound is described one end is sharp or pointed,
    the other end is square.
10
               Okay. And what end is the square end?
11
               Let's see, the square end is more towards the front
12
    and lower part of the body. So if you'd like me to point it
13
14
    would be --
15
              Sure.
              -- like right -- or like right here.
16
         Α
              Okay. So the sharp end is facing the back of the
17
    body?
18
19
              I can't say that. I don't know which end of the
    knife was where, but I'm -- I'm describing what the skin injury
20
21
    looks like.
22
         Q
              Okay.
              That's what that description is.
23
         Α
24
         Q
              Okay. And the -- how -- how deep does the wound go?
              There's an estimate in my report of approximately
25
```

four and a quarter inches.

Q All right. And were there any boney structures along the path of that wound?

A There were -- there obviously are boney structures.

The ribs are there.

Q Well, could you tell if an object hit any boney structures going in?

A There was no boney structures that was hit.

Q And I believe you testified that she would have bled out rather quickly give her physical condition?

A I believe my testimony was that I couldn't tell exactly how quickly, but that's -- yeah, given her medical conditions probably more quickly than someone who did not have cirrhosis.

Q Okay. When you determine the manner of death, whether it's homicide or some other manner of death, you don't go to the scene yourself; you just said that, right?

A Correct.

Q And you're relying on, you said, the circumstances and who did you get your information from regarding the circumstances of the scene?

A The information regarding the circumstances comes from our -- the coroner investigator and also law enforcement officials who are usually at the table at the autopsy, and I get to ask them questions at that time.

1	Q	Okay. So you rely on some of the homicide				
2	detectives?					
3	A	Yes.				
4	Q	Do you ever look at police reports?	·			
5	A	Occasionally, yes.				
6	Q	Okay. It sounded to me from your testimony	like			
7	other than the odd location of the wound there's nothing that					
8	you could say from the body that rules out suicide?					
9	A	That's correct.				
10	Q	Okay. So it's physically possible to stab yo	ourself			
11	in that location or a person stabs themselves there?					
12	A	It is I believe it's physically possible,	just			
13	very awkward.					
14	Q Can you could you determine whether the injury to					
15	her head	would have rendered her unconscious?				
16	А	I can't tell that just from the examine, but	just			
17	from personal experience it seems unlikely.					
18	Q	It wasn't that significant of a head injury?	•			
19	A	Correct.				
20	Q	Can you determine whether Ms. Whitmarsh would	l have			
21	been capable of purposeful activity after getting that stab					
22	wound?					
23	A	It seems likely that she would have been. Ty	pically,			
24	again, her aorta was not severed, so it wouldn't have been					
25	immediately incapacitating.					

Q Okay. Would that depend on how quickly she bled out?

A Yeah, it -- for instance, if you hit an artery,

you're going to bleed out faster than if you hit a vein or a smaller vessels. And so while you're losing blood pressure, of course, you're still capable of purposeful action until your blood pressure drops to where you become unconscious and then

clearly you're not capable of purposeful action at that point.

Q And would it depend on how much activity she was engaging in after the stab wound? How quickly she would have not been capable of purposeful action? Does the level of her activity decrease the amount of time she had that she'd be moving around?

A Theoretically, yes.

Q When -- when you're considering bruising in connection with the cause of death as an ME, do you consider the fact that a person operating on high alcohol level might have been bumping into things?

A Yes.

Q All right. And you can't rule out that any of the bruises were from bumping into things, can you?

A Some of the bruising I thought were unlikely to be from bumping into things. Usually, and folks who are chronic habitual alcohol users do bump into things and we typically see that on more extensor surfaces. You don't see that on the inner surface of the arm, per se. And I typically don't see

## ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT

buttock bruising on alcoholics. 1 On the inner surface of the arm there was a little 2 grouping of bruises; is that correct? 3 Yes, I believe that was the left arm. Α 4 Showing you Defense I. These bruises right here what 5 you were talking about? 6 7 Α Yes, there's one there. Okay. And are those bruises consistent with somebody 8 grabbing on arm? 9 Α They could be, yes. 10 Okay. But you can't say from looking at those 11 Q bruises whether they were caused by somebody grabbing an arm to 12 assist somebody or grabbing an arm to hurt somebody? 13 Correct. 14 Α And from considering just the body in this case and 15 not the evidence from homicide detectives or anything else, 16 considering just the body, can you rule out an accidental wound 17 sustained during struggle over a knife? 18 Given those circumstances I probably still would not 19 Α have called that an accident. It would have either been 20 homicide or undetermined. 21 Okay. But with that scenario you can't rule that out 0 22 a hundred percent, could you? 24 Α No. MR. LALLI: I object to 100 percent, your Honor. 25

1 THE COURT: Sustained. MS. PALM: She said probably. I'm trying to clarify 2 3 what's the range of probability. THE COURT: Well, you can ask it in medical terms, 4 you know. 5 6 MS. PALM: Okav. 7 BY MS. PALM: Well, again, from looking at the body, you can't 8 completely rule out whether this injury was sustained or in an 9 accidental struggle over -- is that correct? 10 Α That's correct. 11 Is it possible to say how long she would have been 12 conscious after receiving the injury? 13 I have no objective way of determining that. 14 Α MS. PALM: That's all the questions, I have. Thank 15 you, Doctor. 16 THE COURT: Any redirect by State? 17 MR. LALLI: Very brief, your Honor. 18 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 19 BY MR. LALLI: 20 Doctor, I think you described the process of healing 21 Q of a bruise as starting with red, maroon and then moving to green and then moving to yellow/brown; is that correct? 23 Α Correct. Yes. 24 And you can't tell us how long that process takes, 25

but you can tell us that it -- a bruise goes through that process of healing? 2 3 Α That is correct. 4 All right. And there were red and maroon bruises on 5 Victoria's body? Α Yes. 6 7 0 There were green bruises on her body? Α Yes. 8 9 0 So there were bruises in various stages of healing? Yes. 10 Α Is that consistent with somebody being roughly 11 12 handled in an ongoing manner? It could be consistent with that scenario, yes. 13 Okay. You indicated that there was this awkwardly 14 15 position stab wound to the side of the body. I think you 16 referred to it as awkwardly positioned? If that's how I referred to it, I --17 Α Okay. Would you refer to it that way? 18 0 Well, it's awkward for a suicide, yes. 19 Α Okay. So if somebody's going to commit suicide 20 Q 21 they're not going to make it that difficult for themselves; is that what you're saying? 23 Α In general. In my experience, no. Okay. You did not call this an accident, correct? 24 0 25 Α Correct.

1	Q	You could have if you wanted to?				
2	A	I could have if the circumstances were of such that	I			
3	thought it was an accident, yes.					
4	Q	You didn't call it a a suicide?				
5	A	No.				
6	Q	You could have if you wanted to?				
7	A	Again, if the circumstances and the examination				
8	supported that, yes.					
9	Q	As part of your determination of whether the case wa	as			
10	homicide or something else, you look beyond the body; is at					
11	that true?					
12	A	Yes.				
13	Q	You look to the circumstances of how the injuries				
14	were obtained, if you know them?					
15	A	Yes.	•			
16	Q	Would you also look at perhaps things that a				
17	perpetrat	or had said?				
18	A Yes, if I had those statements from the police, yes.					
19	Q	Okay. So if you had known, for example, that the				
20	defendant had threatened to kill or wanted the victim dead, for					
21	example, would that put you more in the camp of homicide?					
22	A	Well, certainly that would be considered, but I'd				
23	also have	to look at the whole totality of the scene and the				
24	and the autopsy findings as well.					
25	Q	But that would help you?				

1	A It would be a factor, yes.					
2	Q If you had known that the defendant said I didn't					
3	mean to hurt you in describing what had occurred, would that					
4	help you categorize this more firmly into the homicide					
5	category?					
6	A Yes, the the implication in that state would have					
7	been that I hurt you, but I didn't mean to, so yes, I					
8	Q You did, in fact, call this a homicide, correct?					
9	A Yes.					
10	Q Death at the hands of another person?					
11	A Correct.					
12	MR. LALLI: Nothing further.					
13	THE COURT: Ms. Palm.					
14	MS. PALM: No redirect, your Honor. I mean, no?					
15	THE COURT: I'm sorry, Ma'am?					
16	MS. PALM: Nothing.					
17	THE COURT: Okay. Any questions from any of the					
18	jurors? No questions. Dr. Benjamin, thank you for your					
19	testimony. You are excused.					
20	THE WITNESS: Thank you.					
21	THE COURT: Thank you very much.					
22	MR. LALLI: Your Honor, we have another witness. She					
23	my guess is she she's going to be anywhere from, well, at					
24	least an hour or longer. Whatever the court's pleasure, we can					
25	start, we can					

```
1
               THE COURT:
                           We're going to -- it's been a --
  2
               MR. LALLI:
                          -- come back tomorrow.
  3
               THE COURT: -- a long day for the jury, and --
  4
               MR. LALLI: Okay.
  5
               THE COURT: -- like I said, I think we're adjourn for
     the day. I do appreciate the jury willing to stay a little
  7
     later today. Thank you very much. We're going to come back
 8
    tomorrow at 10:00 o'clock, and we'll resume the testimony of
 9
    the various witnesses.
10
              During this evening recess, it is your duty not to
11
    converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject
    connected with this case or to read, watch or listen to any
12
13
    report of or commentary on the trial by any person connected
14
    with the trial or by any medium of information, including
15
    without limitation, newspaper, television, radio or the
16
    Internet. You are not to form or express an opinion on any
17
    subject connected with the case until this matter is submitted
18
    to you. Ladies and gentlemen, please have a good evening.
    We'll see you back at 10:00 a.m.
19
20
            (Court recessed at 5:34 p.m. until 5:37 p.m.).
21
                  (Outside the presence of the jury).
22
              THE COURT: All right. Mr. Lalli, you had something
23
    on the -- you wanted to put on the record.
24
             MR. LALLI: Yes, your Honor. I just wanted to make a
   note of multiple references during Ms. Palm's opening
25
```

statement. She indicated that the defendant and the descendant were a very loving couple. I counted at least five -- or at least three times, rather, when she made that statement.

In truth, there is a long history of police responding to domestic disputes between the two of them. There are at least five occasions when the police had responded outside of what the court has already allowed into evidence. And it's my position that in giving her opening statement in the manner in which she did, she has opened the door to that information.

THE COURT: Ms. Palm.

MS. PALM: Your Honor, the court's ruling that was that as long as we stayed in the parameters of the time frame when he got out of prison forward, we could talk about the relationship. We did that last time. That's always been the ruling. And that 's what I did again. And it was my understanding that that's the court's ruling.

MR. LALLI: I've read the court's ruling many times because I wasn't here last time, and I wanted to be sure that I was obedient to it, and I'm not seeing that anywhere in the ruling. So maybe -- maybe -- you know, I'll have a look again or maybe somebody can point it out to me, but it is -- it is certainly disingenuous for -- for -- if terms of the presentation of the evidence to portray this as a -- as a loving couple when, in fact, the police had responded multiple

times to incidents between them. MS. PALM: And, your Honor, I brought it up against 2 vesterday that that was my understanding of the court's ruling. 3 I think it was yesterday during argument on something. always been my understanding of what we were doing as long as 5 we stayed prison forward we were okay. 6 THE COURT: I don't recall the specifics of that. 7 But, Mr. Lalli, you were free to object at the time and also the jury will be advised that what's stated in opening and 9 closing arguments is not evidence, and, you know, if -- if that 10 evidence doesn't come out, Mr. Lalli, you know, you can -- I'm 11 sure you'll know how to attack that during closing. 12 MR. LALLI: So -- okay, so if a witness -- if -- if 13 -- if this issue comes up about -- I certainly won't be 14 bringing it up, but if it is brought up by the -- by the 15 defense, I can certainly attack that evidence the way I would 16 any other opinion with respect to whether they were a loving 17 18 couple? Well, it really depends -- I mean, it's THE COURT: 19 20 going to be very question specific --MR. LALLI: Okay. 21 THE COURT: -- on behalf of the defense. I can't 22 give you an advance ruling on --23 MR. LALLI: I understand. 24

-- how --

THE COURT:

25

MS. PALM: Well --

THE COURT: -- that may or may not come out, I have no idea.

MS. PALM: Well, your Honor, I can tell you that I had planned to present the same evidence we presented last time. Under the ruling that we've always been under is the people to talk about their relationship and how they treated each other when they got back together, period. And that has never opened the door in his prior offenses.

The court considered all of that. We -- the court ruled what prior offenses were going to be admissible and they got to have the felony conviction.

MR. LALLI: Well, it --

MS. PALM: So I -- I need to know if I can call my witnesses or not because that's what they're coming for, to talk about what they saw of their relationship.

THE COURT: I -- I think if you tailor it to the last year they were together or whenever they -- they became reacquainted as boyfriend and girlfriend, you know, what did you -- you know, what did you observe, then that's fine. If you ask have they always been a loving -- in a loving relationship, have they always acted that way, has he always treated her appropriately, then you've opened the door, I would think.

MS. PALM: And I -- I won't to that, and I -- I was

careful to limit my discussion to how they -- how they were 2 (indiscernible). THE COURT: And it's going to be (indiscernible) -- I 3 mean, I can't anticipate all your questions, and I'm sure the 4 State will object on the appropriate occasion. But I'm sure 5 both sides will be aware of not to open inappropriate door. 7 MS. PALM: Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: I need the disk of the -- the statement. 8 Okay. Well, I have my edited version with 9 10 me. THE COURT: And can you give me -- I can't -- I wrote 11 12 down the -- the time frame, and I can't find that note. If you can give that to me again of what the State is showing and what 13 14 you request. MS. PALM: Well, can I just show you my disk because 15 it's time stamped on there. 16 17 THE COURT: Okay. MS. PALM: I don't have a start time, but if you open 18 it, this is exactly what I'm requesting. 19 THE COURT: Okay. And Mr. Lalli, can you give me the 20 time frame that you're saying is appropriate? 21 MR. LALLI: 22 Yes. THE COURT: I had -- like I said, you gave it to me 23 before and I -- I cannot find my note. 24 MR. LALLI: Oh, the court has the entire -- actually, 25

the court has the entire video that was admitted at the last 2 trial. All of this -- well, at least the -- the portion that I 3 am seeking admission of is on that. All of it is on that. MS. PALM: I don't think the full thing was admitted. 5 They redacted some of it. 6 MS. GRAHAM: They only redacted the break, that's it. That's all that was redacted. MS. PALM: Okay. 8 9 THE COURT: Okay, so it says starts at 1:38 and goes to 1:43. So you want all that section, correct? 10 MS. PALM: Yes, and I put the two (indiscernible) 11 after the end of the interview is also on there from the end of 12 13 the -- or the -- the interview ends, then there's a little 14 break, and it starts back up when Dan Ford comes in the room. 15 And I want that on there until the end at 4:05. What's on there is exactly what I want. And it's time stamped the time 16 17 frame it is. THE COURT: I think your note on this is confusing 18 It said the -- it starts at 1:38 and it goes to 1:43. 19 20 MS. PALM: Right. 21 THE COURT: That's the pre-interview time frame? 22 MS. PALM: Yes. 23 THE COURT: Okay. And then we have the interview. I don't have a start up time again for the 24 MS. PALM: 25 post-interview time frame because that was just my note. I

didn't know we were going to be doing this today. THE COURT: Okay. I mean, do I -- do I need to do this tonight? 3 MR. LALLI: Your Honor, my --4 MS. PALM: I can admit it -- I might want to do it 5 through the detective, though, when this is. 6 THE COURT: I -- I just don't understand your note 7 here because I understood it better when I -- when we spoke 8 about it this morning. 9 MS. PALM: Okay, my -- my note was just for my own 10 personal, but if you watch the video, it's got the time stamps 11 on there from the times that I want, but it basically includes 12 that first pre-interview part until 1:43 when the actual 13 interview starts. And then it picks up again when Dan Ford 14 comes in the room after the interview is over. But I don't 15 have a time on that note. 16 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Lalli, we gotta work 17 backwards. What portion do you want to play for the jury? 18 MR. LALLI: What I written down here, your Honor, is 19 20 starting the interview at 1:35:47, which is the time that the detectives enter the room, and concluding the interview at 21 3:28:34, which is the time that the detectives leave the room. 22 23 THE COURT: Okay.

## ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT

ordered me to make, including the hour break in the middle.

MR. LALLI:

24

25

With all of the edits that the court has

And it's my position that any statements that the defendant made when crime scene analysts or detectives were in the room much later are not within the scope of this interview and they're hearsay if they're being offered by the defense.

They cannot offer his self-serving statements. He's probably going to testify and he'll be able to explain things that he might have said. But they're not entitled to admit his statements or for that matter, the other statements of the investigators and police officers that were in the room. It's hearsay.

THE COURT: Okay, so Ms. Palm, on your -- on your -- posted it stays start at 1:38. Mr. Lalli's saying that his interview's going to start at 1:35, so it actually starting before your requesting time.

MS. PALM: Yeah, and that part of the interview is not Mirandized, so, you know, Mr. Lalli couldn't admit those additional three minutes anyway.

MR. LALLI: Well, I certainly can because what happens is the detectives walk in and the defendant starts giving them the business. So he starts making spontaneous statements, not in response to any interrogation. So that's certainly admissible evidence.

THE COURT: Okay, Ms. Palm, again, you're saying anything prior to 1:38 should be excluded; is that correct?

MS. PALM: Yes, because I think it's -- it's --

ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT

```
unfairly prejudicial to him and, you know, he's talking about
  1
  2
    Bucky and those kind of things and that's where I cut it -- you
     know, where I started from it when -- when they start talking
  3
     about the incident.
  5
               THE COURT: And then you want to go from 3:28 to
  6
     4:05, basically another half hour?
  7
              MS. PALM: Well, not -- no, not really because
 8
    there's a big break before Dan Ford comes in the room. And
    that's -- that's -- the interview ends at 3:28, then they have
    a break where he sits there by himself. I cut all of that out.
10
    So I pick it back up when Dan Ford comes in the room. And I
11
12
    don't have that time on that note. But you can see the time if
13
    you look at the video.
14
              THE COURT: Okay, so I have to scroll through this
    from 3:28 to 4:05 and find out when he comes into the room?
15
                         It's -- no, no. That video only has what
16
              MS. PALM:
17
    I want.
18
              THE COURT: Okay.
                         It's about a six minute video.
19
              MS. PALM:
20
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
                         That's what I'm saying, I -- I -- I clip
21
              MS. PALM:
    it had to together.
              THE COURT: I think I understand.
23
                                                 I'll --
24
              MS. PALM:
                         Okay.
              THE COURT: -- try to review it tonight.
25
```

1	MS. PALM: Thank you.						
2	THE COURT: Okay.						
3	MS. PALM: And then your clerk asked for us to e-mail						
4	him jury instructions.						
5	THE COURT: We have the State's. They're on my desk.						
6	With and without citations.						
7	MS. PALM: I filed mine the first day.						
8	THE COURT: Okay. So then we have if you could						
9	e-mail them to us, we'd appreciate it.						
10	MS. PALM: Okay.						
11	THE COURT: All right. Anything else?						
12	MR. LALLI: I don't think so, your Honor.						
13	THE COURT: Okay. And like I said, we'll check with						
14	the jurors in the morning or						
15	THE MARSHAL: 5:30.						
16	THE COURT: 5:30 tomorrow.						
17	THE MARSHAL: No later than 5:30.						
18	THE COURT: All right.						
19	MS. GRAHAM: For purposes of lining up witnesses they						
20	can stay until 5:30?						
21	THE MARSHAL: 5:30.						
22	MS. GRAHAM: And we start at 10:00, Judge?						
23	THE COURT: 10:00.						
24	MR. LALLI: Great.						
25	THE COURT: All right. Actually, counsel can be here						
- 1							

```
at 9:45 just in case any issues pop up over the evening hours
 2
     that you want to bring to my attention.
               MS. PALM: Okay. Thank you.
               THE COURT: Thank you.
 4
               THE MARSHAL: We'll have the defendant here at 9:45?
 5
               THE COURT: Yes, 9:45.
 6
              (Court recessed at 5:47 p.m., until Thursday,
 7
 8
                            August 26, 2010).
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

			•	122					
	IN	DEX							
STATE'S OPENING STATEM	ENT			23					
DEFENSE'S OPENING STAT	DEFENSE'S OPENING STATEMENT								
WITNESSES_									
NAME	DIRECT		REDIRECT	RECROSS					
PLAINTIFF'S WITNESSES:									
Jacqueline Benjamin	*	87	107						
	* *	· *							
	EXHI	BITS							
DESCRIPTION:				ADMITTED					
PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBITS:				. *					
Exhibits 81 through 12 Exhibit 130	0			60					
EXHIBIT 130									
DEFENDANT'S EXHIBITS:									
Exhibits A through J				88					

VERBATIM DIGITAL REPORTING, LLC ♦ (303) 798-0890

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

ATTEST: Pursuant to Rule 3C(d) of the Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure, I acknowledge that this is a rough draft transcript, expeditiously prepared, not proofread, corrected, or certified to be an accurate transcript.

Verbatim Digital Reporting, LLC Littleton, CO 80120 303-798-0890

JULIE LORD! TRANSCRIBER

רא תב

ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT