#### IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA 1 2 No. 68165 3 GUILLERMO RENTERIA-NOVOA, **Electronically Filed** 4 Appellant, Jul 19 2013 09:45 a.m. Tracie K. Lindeman 5 v. Clerk of Supreme Court 6 THE STATE OF NEVADA, 7 Respondent. 8 9 APPELLANT'S APPENDIX- VOLUME II – PAGES 234-421 10 11 STEVE WOLFSON PHILIP J. KOHN Clark County District Attorney 200 Lewis Avenue, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Clark County Public Defender 12 309 South Third Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89155 Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2610 13 CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO Attorney for Appellant 14 Attorney General 100 North Carson Street 15 Carson City, Nevada 89701-4717 (702) 687-3538 16 Counsel for Respondent 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26

27

# INDEX GUILLERMO RENTERIA-NOVOA

-	Case No. 68165
3	PACE NO. 08103
4	Amended Information filed 01/26/11040-055
5	Amended Information filed 01/26/11112-126
6	
7	Criminal Complaint dated 06/03/10001-003
8	Defendant Motion In Limine To Preclude Use Of The Prejudicial Term "Victim" filed 04/07/11140-150
10	Defendants Notice of Witnesses Per NRS Filed 05/14/12 222-223
11	Defendants Proposed Jury Instructions Not Used At Trial Filed 05/24/12234-239
13	District Court Minutes through 09/06/12303-331
14   15	Information filed 10/27/10
16	Instructions To The Jury filed 05/25/12240-280
17	Judgment of Conviction filed 09/17/12291-298
18	Justice Court Minutes through 10/12/10020-022
19	Motion For Discovery filed 04/07/11160-169
20	Motion In Limine To Preclude The States Experts From Improper
21	Vouching And To Prevent "Experts" From Testifying Outside Their Area Of Expertise filed 04/07/11
22	
23	Motion To Suppress filed 04/25/12180-218
24	Notice of Appeal filed 10/05/12299-302
25	Notice of Witnesses And/Or Expert Witnesses
26	Filed 01/31/11
27	Order filed 12/23/10098-099
28	Order Denying Defendants Motion In Limine To Preclude The States Experts From Improper Vouching And To Prevent "Experts" From

i

1 2	Testifying Outside Their Area Of Expertise And Motion In Limine To Preclude Prejudicial Term "Victim" Filed 05/17/11158-159
3	
4	Petition For Writ Of Habeas Corpus filed 11/29/10059-097
5	Return To Writ of Habeas Corpus filed 01/05/11102-111
6	Second Amended Criminal Complaint 10/12/10004-019
7	Second Amended Information filed 05/22/12224-233
8	Second Supplemental Notice Of Witnesses And/Or Expert Witnesses Filed 05/14/12219-221
10	States Opposition To Defendants Motion For Discovery Filed 04/14/11170-179
11.	States Opposition To Defendants Motion In Limine To Preclude
12	Prejudicial Term "Victim" filed 04/14/11151-157
13	States Opposition To Defendants Motion In Limine To Preclude The
14	States Experts From Improper Vouching And To Prevent "Experts" From Testifying Outside Their Area Of Expertise
15	Filed 04/14/11
16	Supplemental Notice Of Witnesses And/Or Expert Witnesses
17	Filed 04/13/11
18	Verdict filed 05/25/12281-290
19	Writ Of Habeas Corpus filed 12/23/10100-101
20	
21	TRANSCRIPTS
22	
23	Jury Trial, Day 1    Date of Trial: 05/21/12422-757
24	Tury Trial Day 2
25	Date of Trial: 05/22/12758-938
26	Jury Trial, Day 3
27	Date of Trial: 05/23/12939-1211
28	Jury Trial, Day 4 Date of Trial: 05/24/121212-1424

1	Jury Trial, Day 5
2	Date of Trial: 05/25/121425-1
3	Transcript of Proceedings, Recorders Transcript of Calendar Call
4	Date of Hrg: 05/17/11 363-365
5	Transcript of Proceedings,
6	Recorders Transcript of Calendar Call Date of Hrg: 11/01/11366-368
7	Transcript of Proceedings,
8	Recorders Transcript of Calendar Call Date of Hrg: 01/17/12 369-373
9	
10	Transcript of Proceedings, Recorders Transcript of Calendar Call; Motion To Suppress; And
11	Jackson V. Denno Hearing: Defendants Motion To Suppress Date of Hrg: 05/15/12380-421
12	
13	Transcript of Proceedings, Recorders Transcript of Hearing RE: Arraignment Continued
14	Date of Hrg: 11/05/10332-335
1.5	Transcript of Proceedings,
16	Recorders Transcript of Motion To Suppress  Date of Hrg: 05/10/12 374-379
17	Transcript of Proceedings,
18	Recorders Transcript of Motion In Limine To Preclude The States
19	Experts From Improper Vouching And To Prevent "Experts" From Testifying Outside Their Area Of Expertise; Defendants Motion
20	For Discovery; And Defendants Motion In Limine To Preclude Use Of The Prejudicial Term "Victim"
21	Date of Hrg: 04/28/11343-345
22	Transcript of Proceedings,
23	Recorders Transcript of Motion In Limine To Preclude The States Experts From Improper Vouching And To Prevent "Experts" From
24	Testifying Outside Their Area Of Expertise; Defendants Motion
25	For Discovery; And Defendants Motion In Limine To Preclude Use Of The Prejudicial Term "Victim"
26	Date of Hrg: 05/03/11346-364
27	
28	

1	Transcript of Proceedings,
2	Recorders Transcript of Motion In Limine To Preclude The States Experts From Improper Vouching And To Prevent "Experts" From
3	Testifying Outside Their Area Of Expertise; Defendants Motion For Discovery; And Defendants Motion In Limine To Preclude Use
4	of The Prejudicial Term "Victim"
5	Date of Hrg: 12/05/12340-342
6	Transcript of Proceedings,
7	Recorders Transcript of Sentencing Date of Hrg: 09/06/121446-1455
8	Transcript of Proceedings,
9	Reporters Transcript of Closing Arguments/Bindover Date of Hrg: 10/12/10
10	Transcript of Proceedings,
11	Reporters Transcript of Defendants Petition For Writ of Habeas
12	Corpus Status Check: Discovery Date of Hrg: 01/26/11336-339
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

FILED IN OPEN COURT STEVEN D. GRIERSON PINU 1 MAY 2 4 2012 2 3 DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 5 6 STATE OF NEVADA 7 CASE NO. C268285 Plaintiff(s), 8 DEPT. NO. 20 -VS-9 C-10-268285-1 GUILLERMO RENTERIA - NOVOA 10 Proposed Jury Instructions Not Used At Tri: Defendant(s). 11 12 13 DEFENDANT'S PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS NOT USED AT TRIAL 14 15 Attached hereto are the proposed jury instructions which were offered to the 16 Court, but not submitted to the jury in the above entitled action. 17 DATED: This 24th day of May, 2012 18 19 20 Steven D. Grierson, Clerk of the Court 21 22 23 24 Tia Everett, Deputy Clerk 25 26 27 28

U:\COURT CLERK\FORMS-Court Clerk\Cover Sheets\Deft's Proposed Jury Inst Not Used.doc5/24/2012

## INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

It is not essential to a conviction in this case that the testimony of the alleged victim be corroborated by other evidence. It is sufficient if, from all the evidence, you believe beyond a reasonable doubt that the crime of sexual assault was committed by the defendant as alleged.

In May v. State, 89 Nev. 277, 279 (1973), the Court held the following is a correct statement of the law:

"It is not essential to a conviction in this case that the testimony of the prosecutrix be corroborated by other evidence. It is sufficient if, from all the evidence, you believe beyond a reasonable doubt that the crime of rape assault was committed by the defendant as alleged."

1516.

The credibility or believability of a witness should be determined by anything that reasonably tends to prove or disprove the truth or accuracy of that testimony. Among the factors that you may consider are the witness's ability to see, hear, or otherwise perceive the things about which the witness testified; the witness's ability to remember and describe what happened; the witness's behavior while testifying; whether the witness understood the questions and answered them directly; whether the witness's testimony was influenced by a factor such as bias or prejudice, a personal relationship with someome involved in the case, or a personal interest in how the case is decided; the witness's attitude about the case or testifying; whether the witness made a statement in the past that is consistent or inconsistent with his or her testimony; whether the witness's testimony was reasonable when considering all the other evidence in the case; whether other evidence proved or disproved any fact about which the witness testified; whether the witness admitted to being untruthful; the witness's character for truthfulness; whether the witness engaged in conduct that reflects on his or her believability; and was the witness promised immunity or leniency in exchange for his or her testimony.

If you believe that a witness has lied about any material fact in the case, you may disregard the entire testimony of that witness or any portion of his testimony which is not proved by other evidence.

CALCRIM 105

CALCRIM

## INSTRUCTION NO. \_ C

Before you may rely on circumstantial evidence to conclude that a fact necessary to find the defendant guilty has been proved, you must be convinced that the State has proven each fact essential to that conclusion beyond a reasonable doubt.

Also, before you may rely on circumstantial evidence to find the defendant guilty, you must be convinced that the only reasonable conclusion supported by the circumstantial evidence is that the defendant is guilty. If you draw two or more reasonable conclusions from the circumstantial evidence, and one of those reasonable conclusions points to the defendant being not guilty and one to the defendant's guilt, you must accept the one that points to the defendant being not guilty. However, when considering circumstantial evidence, you must accept only reasonable conclusions and reject any that are unreasonable.

## CALCRIM 224

Ì

Allen v. State, 97 Nev. 394, 398 (1981).

relationship, you must find him not guilty of all counts.

supports the theory, however improbable it may be."

If you find that Roxana Perez and Guillermo Renteria-Novoa had a consensual

"A defendant is entitled to a jury instruction on his theory of the case if any evidence

Where multiple sexual acts occur as part of a single criminal encounter, a defendant may be found guilty for each separate or distinct act of sexual assault and/or lewdness. However, when the sexual acts are part of the same episode, the defendant may be found guilty of only one count of sexual assault or lewdness. When there is no interruption between the acts, or any interruption amounts to merely a hypertechnical division of a single act, the sexual acts are part of the same episode. Additionally, when the sexual act is done merely to predispose the alleged victim to a subsequent act[s], the acts are part of the same episode and the defendant may be convicted of only one count of sexual assault or lewdness.

Crowley v. State, 120 Nev. 30, 34 (2004); Townsend v. State, 103 Nev. 113, 120-21 (1987).

FILED IN OPEN COURT INST STEVEN D. GRIERSON 2 3 4 DISTRICT COURTMICHETUCKET CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 6 7 THE STATE OF NEVADA, 8 CASE NO: Plaintiff, 9 DEPT NO: XX-VS-10 GUILLERMO RENTERIA-NOVOA, 11 12 Defendant. 13 INSTRUCTIONS TO THE JURY (INSTRUCTION NO. 1) 14 MEMBERS OF THE JURY: 15 16 17 you find them from the evidence. 18 19 20 21 given in the instructions of the Court. 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

CLERK OF THE COURT

C268285

It is now my duty as judge to instruct you in the law that applies to this case. It is your duty as jurors to follow these instructions and to apply the rules of law to the facts as

You must not be concerned with the wisdom of any rule of law stated in these instructions. Regardless of any opinion you may have as to what the law ought to be, it would be a violation of your oath to base a verdict upon any other view of the law than that

> C - 10 - 268285 - 1 Instructions to the Jury



If, in these instructions, any rule, direction or idea is repeated or stated in different ways, no emphasis thereon is intended by me and none may be inferred by you. For that reason, you are not to single out any certain sentence or any individual point or instruction and ignore the others, but you are to consider all the instructions as a whole and regard each in the light of all the others.

The order in which the instructions are given has no significance as to their relative importance.

. .

.

An information is but a formal method of accusing a person of a crime and is not of itself any evidence of his guilt.

In this case, it is charged in an Second Amended Information that GUILLERMO RENTERIA-NOVOA, the Defendant above named, having committed the crime of SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14 (Category A Felony - NRS 200.364, 200.366), LEWDNESS WITH A CHILD UNDER THE AGE OF 14 (Category A Felony - NRS 201.230), SEXUAL ASSAULT (Felony - NRS 200.364, 200.366) and OPEN OR GROSS LEWDNESS (Gross Misdemeanor - NRS 201.220) and in the manner following, to-wit: That the said Defendant, on or between February 1, 2005 and December 31, 2009, at and within the County of Clark, State of Nevada, contrary to the form, force and effect of statutes in such cases made and provided, and against the peace and dignity of the State of Nevada,

### COUNT 1 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14

did then and there willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously sexually assault and subject ROXANNA PEREZ, a female child under fourteen years of age, to sexual penetration, towit: by said Defendant placing his mouth and/or tongue on and/or into the anal opening of the said ROXANA PEREZ, against her will, or under conditions in which Defendant knew, or should have known, that the said ROXANA PEREZ was mentally or physically incapable of resisting or understanding the nature of Defendant's conduct.

### COUNT 2 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14

did then and there willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously sexually assault and subject ROXANNA PEREZ, a female child under fourteen years of age, to sexual penetration, to-wit: cunnilingus, by said Defendant placing his mouth and/or tongue on and/or into the genital opening of the said ROXANA PEREZ, against her will, or under conditions in which Defendant knew, or should have known, that the said ROXANA PEREZ was mentally or physically incapable of resisting or understanding the nature of Defendant's conduct.

### COUNT 3 - LEWDNESS WITH A CHILD UNDER THE AGE OF 14

did then and there willfully, lewdly, unlawfully, and feloniously commit a lewd or lascivious act upon or with the body, or any part or member thereof, a child, to-wit: ROXANNA PEREZ, said child being under the age of fourteen years, by said Defendant using his hand(s) and/or finger(s) to touch and/or rub and/or fondle the genital area and/or breast(s) and/or body of the said ROXANA PEREZ, with the intent of arousing, appealing to, or gratifying the lust, passions, or sexual desires of said Defendant, or said child.

#### COUNT 4 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14

did then and there willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously sexually assault and subject ROXANNA PEREZ, a female child under fourteen years of age, to sexual penetration, towit: digital penetration, by said Defendant inserting his finger(s) into the genital opening of the said ROXANA PEREZ, against her will, or under conditions in which Defendant knew, or should have known, that the said ROXANA PEREZ was mentally or physically incapable of resisting or understanding the nature of Defendant's conduct.

### COUNT 5 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14

did then and there willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously sexually assault and subject ROXANNA PEREZ, a female child under fourteen years of age, to sexual penetration, towit: by said Defendant placing his mouth and/or tongue on and/or into the anal opening of the said ROXANA PEREZ, against her will, or under conditions in which Defendant knew, or should have known, that the said ROXANA PEREZ was mentally or physically incapable of resisting or understanding the nature of Defendant's conduct.

### COUNT 6 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14

did then and there willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously sexually assault and subject ROXANNA PEREZ, a female child under fourteen years of age, to sexual penetration, to-wit: cunnilingus, by said Defendant placing his mouth and/or tongue on and/or into the genital opening of the said ROXANA PEREZ, against her will, or under conditions in which Defendant knew, or should have known, that the said ROXANA PEREZ was mentally or physically incapable of resisting or understanding the nature of Defendant's

conduct.

#### COUNT 7 - LEWDNESS WITH A CHILD UNDER THE AGE OF 14

did then and there willfully, lewdly, unlawfully, and feloniously commit a lewd or lascivious act upon or with the body, or any part or member thereof, a child, to-wit: ROXANNA PEREZ, said child being under the age of fourteen years, by said Defendant using his hand(s) and/or finger(s) to touch and/or rub and/or fondle the breast(s) of the said ROXANA PEREZ, with the intent of arousing, appealing to, or gratifying the lust, passions, or sexual desires of said Defendant, or said child.

#### COUNT 8 - LEWDNESS WITH A CHILD UNDER THE AGE OF 14

did then and there willfully, lewdly, unlawfully, and feloniously commit a lewd or lascivious act upon or with the body, or any part or member thereof, a child, to-wit: ROXANNA PEREZ, said child being under the age of fourteen years, by said Defendant using his mouth and/or tongue to touch and/or kiss and/or lick the breast(s) of the said ROXANA PEREZ, with the intent of arousing, appealing to, or gratifying the lust, passions, or sexual desires of said Defendant, or said child.

### COUNT 9 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14

did then and there willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously sexually assault and subject ROXANNA PEREZ, a female child under fourteen years of age, to sexual penetration, towit: digital penetration, by said Defendant inserting his finger(s) into the genital opening of the said ROXANA PEREZ, against her will, or under conditions in which Defendant knew, or should have known, that the said ROXANA PEREZ was mentally or physically incapable of resisting or understanding the nature of Defendant's conduct.

### COUNT 10 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14

did then and there willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously sexually assault and subject ROXANNA PEREZ, a female child under fourteen years of age, to sexual penetration, towit: digital penetration, by said Defendant inserting his finger(s) into the anal opening of the said ROXANA PEREZ, against her will, or under conditions in which Defendant knew, or should have known, that the said ROXANA PEREZ was mentally or physically incapable of

resisting or understanding the nature of Defendant's conduct.

### **COUNT 11** - OPEN OR GROSS LEWDNESS

did then and there willfully and unlawfully commit an act of open or gross lewdness by said Defendant masturbating his penis in view of ROXANA PEREZ.

## COUNT 12 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14

did then and there willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously sexually assault and subject ROXANNA PEREZ, a female child under fourteen years of age, to sexual penetration, to-wit: by said Defendant placing his mouth and/or tongue on and/or into the anal opening of the said ROXANA PEREZ, against her will, or under conditions in which Defendant knew, or should have known, that the said ROXANA PEREZ was mentally or physically incapable of resisting or understanding the nature of Defendant's conduct.

# COUNT 13 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14

did then and there willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously sexually assault and subject ROXANNA PEREZ, a female child under fourteen years of age, to sexual penetration, to-wit: cunnilingus, by said Defendant placing his mouth and/or tongue on and/or into the genital opening of the said ROXANA PEREZ, against her will, or under conditions in which Defendant knew, or should have known, that the said ROXANA PEREZ was mentally or physically incapable of resisting or understanding the nature of Defendant's conduct.

# COUNT 14 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14

did then and there willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously sexually assault and subject ROXANNA PEREZ, a female child under fourteen years of age, to sexual penetration, to-wit: digital penetration, by said Defendant inserting his finger(s) into the anal opening of the said ROXANA PEREZ, against her will, or under conditions in which Defendant knew, or should have known, that the said ROXANNA PEREZ was mentally or physically incapable of resisting or understanding the nature of Defendant's conduct.

///

///

## COUNT 15 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14

did then and there willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously sexually assault and subject ROXANNA PEREZ, a female child under fourteen years of age, to sexual penetration, towit: digital penetration, by said Defendant inserting his finger(s) into the genital opening of the said ROXANA PEREZ, against her will, or under conditions in which Defendant knew, or should have known, that the said ROXANNA PEREZ was mentally or physically incapable of resisting or understanding the nature of Defendant's conduct.

## COUNT 16 - LEWDNESS WITH A CHILD UNDER THE AGE OF 14

did then and there willfully, lewdly, unlawfully, and feloniously commit a lewd or lascivious act upon or with the body, or any part or member thereof, a child, to-wit: ROXANNA PEREZ, said child being under the age of fourteen years, by said Defendant using his hand(s) and/or finger(s) to touch and/or rub and/or fondle the genital area and/or buttock(s) of the said ROXANA PEREZ, with the intent of arousing, appealing to, or gratifying the lust, passions, or sexual desires of said Defendant, or said child.

## COUNT 17 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14

did then and there willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously sexually assault and subject ROXANNA PEREZ, a female child under fourteen years of age, to sexual penetration, to-wit: cunnilingus, by said Defendant placing his mouth and/or tongue on and/or into the genital opening of the said ROXANA PEREZ, against her will, or under conditions in which Defendant knew, or should have known, that the said ROXANA PEREZ was mentally or physically incapable of resisting or understanding the nature of Defendant's conduct.

# COUNT 18 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14

did then and there willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously sexually assault and subject ROXANNA PEREZ, a female child under fourteen years of age, to sexual penetration, towit: by said Defendant placing his mouth and/or tongue on and/or into the anal opening of the said ROXANA PEREZ, against her will, or under conditions in which Defendant knew, or should have known, that the said ROXANA PEREZ was mentally or physically incapable

of resisting or understanding the nature of Defendant's conduct.

### COUNT 19 - LEWDNESS WITH A CHILD UNDER THE AGE OF 14

did then and there willfully, lewdly, unlawfully, and feloniously commit a lewd or lascivious act upon or with the body, or any part or member thereof, a child, to-wit: ROXANNA PEREZ, said child being under the age of fourteen years, by said Defendant using his hand(s) and/or finger(s) to touch and/or rub and/or fondle the breast(s) of the said ROXANA PEREZ, with the intent of arousing, appealing to, or gratifying the lust, passions, or sexual desires of said Defendant, or said child.

### COUNT 20 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14

did then and there willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously sexually assault and subject ROXANNA PEREZ, a female child under fourteen years of age, to sexual penetration, towit: digital penetration, by said Defendant inserting his finger(s) into the anal opening of the said ROXANA PEREZ, against her will, or under conditions in which Defendant knew, or should have known, that the said ROXANNA PEREZ was mentally or physically incapable of resisting or understanding the nature of Defendant's conduct.

### COUNT 21 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14

did then and there willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously sexually assault and subject ROXANNA PEREZ, a female child under fourteen years of age, to sexual penetration, towit: digital penetration, by said Defendant inserting his finger(s) into the genital opening of the said ROXANA PEREZ, against her will, or under conditions in which Defendant knew, or should have known, that the said ROXANNA PEREZ was mentally or physically incapable of resisting or understanding the nature of Defendant's conduct.

### COUNT 22 - LEWDNESS WITH A CHILD UNDER THE AGE OF 14

did then and there willfully, lewdly, unlawfully, and feloniously commit a lewd or lascivious act upon or with the body, or any part or member thereof, a child, to-wit: ROXANNA PEREZ, said child being under the age of fourteen years, by said Defendant causing and/or directing the said ROXANA PEREZ to use her hand(s) and/or finger(s) to touch and/or rub and/or masturbate the penis of said Defendant, with the intent of arousing,

appealing to, or gratifying the lust, passions, or sexual desires of said Defendant, or said child.

#### COUNT 23 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 16

did then and there willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously sexually assault and subject ROXANNA PEREZ, a female child under sixteen years of age, to sexual penetration, to-wit: by said Defendant placing his mouth and/or tongue on and/or into the anal opening of the said ROXANA PEREZ, against her will, or under conditions in which Defendant knew, or should have known, that the said ROXANA PEREZ was mentally or physically incapable of resisting or understanding the nature of Defendant's conduct.

#### COUNT 24 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 16

did then and there willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously sexually assault and subject ROXANNA PEREZ, a female child under sixteen years of age, to sexual penetration, to-wit: cunnilingus, by said Defendant placing his mouth and/or tongue on and/or into the genital opening of the said ROXANA PEREZ, against her will, or under conditions in which Defendant knew, or should have known, that the said ROXANA PEREZ was mentally or physically incapable of resisting or understanding the nature of Defendant's conduct.

### COUNT 25 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 16

did then and there willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously sexually assault and subject ROXANNA PEREZ, a female child under sixteen years of age, to sexual penetration, to-wit: by said Defendant inserting his finger(s) into the genital opening of the said ROXANA PEREZ, against her will, or under conditions in which Defendant knew, or should have known, that the said ROXANA PEREZ was mentally or physically incapable of resisting or understanding the nature of Defendant's conduct.

### COUNT 26 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 16

did then and there willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously sexually assault and subject ROXANNA PEREZ, a female child under sixteen years of age, to sexual penetration, to-wit: digital penetration, by said Defendant inserting his finger(s) into the anal opening of the said ROXANA PEREZ, against her will, or under conditions in which Defendant knew, or should

have known, that the said ROXANA PEREZ was mentally or physically incapable of resisting or understanding the nature of Defendant's conduct.

# COUNT 27 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 16

did then and there willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously sexually assault and subject ROXANNA PEREZ, a female child under sixteen years of age, to sexual penetration, to-wit: by said Defendant placing his mouth and/or tongue on and/or into the anal opening of the said ROXANA PEREZ, against her will, or under conditions in which Defendant knew, or should have known, that the said ROXANA PEREZ was mentally or physically incapable of resisting or understanding the nature of Defendant's conduct.

# COUNT 28 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 16

did then and there willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously sexually assault and subject ROXANNA PEREZ, a female child under sixteen years of age, to sexual penetration, to-wit: by said Defendant inserting his finger(s) into the genital opening of the said ROXANA PEREZ, against her will, or under conditions in which Defendant knew, or should have known, that the said ROXANA PEREZ was mentally or physically incapable of resisting or understanding the nature of Defendant's conduct.

# COUNT 29 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 16

did then and there willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously sexually assault and subject ROXANNA PEREZ, a female child under sixteen years of age, to sexual penetration, to-wit: by said Defendant inserting his finger(s) into the anal opening of the said ROXANA PEREZ, against her will, or under conditions in which Defendant knew, or should have known, that the said ROXANA PEREZ was mentally or physically incapable of resisting or understanding the nature of Defendant's conduct.

# COUNT 30 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 16

did then and there willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously sexually assault and subject ROXANNA PEREZ, a female child under sixteen years of age, to sexual penetration, to-wit: cunnilingus, by said Defendant placing his mouth and/or tongue on and/or into the genital opening of the said ROXANA PEREZ, against her will, or under conditions in which

Defendant knew, or should have known, that the said ROXANA PEREZ was mentally or physically incapable of resisting or understanding the nature of Defendant's conduct.

## **COUNT 31** - OPEN OR GROSS LEWDNESS

did then and there willfully and unlawfully commit an act of open or gross lewdness by said Defendant causing and/or directing the said ROXANA PEREZ to use her hand(s) and/or finger(s) to touch and/or rub and/or masturbate the penis of said Defendant.

### COUNT 32 - SEXUAL ASSAULT

did then and there willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously sexually assault and subject ROXANA PEREZ, a female person, to sexual penetration, to-wit: by said Defendant placing his mouth and/or tongue on and/or into the anal opening of the said ROXANA PEREZ, against her will.

### COUNT 33 - SEXUAL ASSAULT

did then and there willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously sexually assault and subject ROXANA PEREZ, a female person, to sexual penetration, to-wit: cunnilingus, by said Defendant placing his mouth and/or tongue on and/or into the genital opening of the said ROXANA PEREZ, against her will.

## COUNT 34 - SEXUAL ASSAULT

did then and there willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously sexually assault and subject ROXANA PEREZ, a female person, to sexual penetration, to-wit: digital penetration, by said Defendant placing his finger(s) into the genital opening of the said ROXANA PEREZ, against her will.

## COUNT 35 - SEXUAL ASSAULT

did then and there willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously sexually assault and subject ROXANA PEREZ, a female person, to sexual penetration, to-wit: digital penetration, by said Defendant inserting his finger(s) into the anal opening of the said ROXANA PEREZ, against her will.

]]]

///

### **COUNT 36** - OPEN OR GROSS LEWDNESS

did then and there willfully and unlawfully commit an act of open or gross lewdness by said Defendant causing and/or directing the said ROXANA PEREZ to use her hand(s) and/or finger(s) to touch and/or rub and/or masturbate the penis of said Defendant.

It is the duty of the jury to apply the rules of law contained in these instructions to the facts of the case and determine whether or not the Defendant is guilty of one or more of the offenses charged.

Each charge and the evidence pertaining to it should be considered separately. The fact that you may find a defendant guilty or not guilty as to one of the offenses charged should not control your verdict as to any other Defendant offense charged.

. 17

A person who subjects a minor under fourteen to sexual penetration, against the minor's will or under conditions in which the perpetrator knows or should know that the minor is mentally or physically incapable of resisting or understanding the nature of his/her conduct, is guilty of Sexual Assault with a Minor Under Fourteen.

"Sexual penetration" includes cunnilingus, or any intrusion, however slight, of any part of a person's body into the genital or anal openings of the body of another, including sexual intercourse in its ordinary meaning. Evidence of emission is not necessary.

"Cunnilingus" means an intrusion, however slight, of the female sexual organ by the mouth or tongue of another, or placing the tongue on the victim's vagina.

"Digital penetration" is the placing of one or more fingers of the perpetrator into the anal or genital opening of another person.

If the State fails to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that any sexual penetration of a minor under fourteen was either (a) against the minor's will or (b) under conditions in which the perpetrator knows or should know that the minor is mentally or physically incapable of resisting or understanding the nature of his/her conduct, then you must find the defendant not guilty of the offense of Sexual Assault with a Minor Under Fourteen.

A person who subjects a minor under sixteen to sexual penetration, against the minor's will or under conditions in which the perpetrator knows or should know that the minor is mentally or physically incapable of resisting or understanding the nature of his/her conduct, is guilty of Sexual Assault with a Minor Under Sixteen.

### INSTRUCTION NO. \_ <del>\_</del>

If the State fails to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that any sexual penetration of a minor under sixteen was either (a) against the minor's will or (b) under conditions in which the perpetrator knows or should know that the minor is mentally or physically incapable of resisting or understanding the nature of his/her conduct, then you must find the defendant not guilty of the offense of Sexual Assault with a Minor Under Sixteen.

A person who subjects another person to sexual penetration, or who forces another person to make a sexual penetration on himself or on another, against the alleged victim's will or under conditions in which the perpetrator knows or should know that the victim is mentally or physically incapable of resisting or understanding the nature of his conduct, is guilty of Sexual Assault.

•

ara.

If the State fails to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that any sexual penetration was either (a) against the alleged victim's will or (b) under conditions in which the perpetrator knows or should know that the alleged victim is mentally or physically incapable of resisting or understanding the nature of his/her conduct, then you must find the defendant not guilty of the offense of Sexual Assault.

5.

If the State fails to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant engaged in an act of sexual penetration, then you must find the defendant not guilty of Sexual Assault with a Minor Under Fourteen, Sexual Assault with a Minor Under Sixteen, and Sexual Assault...

### INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

Physical force is not a necessary ingredient in the commission of the crime of Sexual Assault. The crucial question is not whether the alleged victim was "physically forced" to engage in sexual conduct, but whether the act was committed without her consent or under conditions in which the defendant knew or should have known, the person was incapable of giving her consent or understanding the nature of the act.

A person is not required to do more than her age, strength, surrounding facts and all attending circumstances make it reasonable to do in order to manifest opposition to a sexual assault.

Submission is not the equivalent of consent. While consent inevitably involves submission, submission does not inevitably involve consent. Lack of protest by an alleged victim is simply one among the totality of circumstances to be considered by the jury.

Any person who willfully commits any lewd or lascivious act, other than acts constituting the crime of Sexual Assault, upon or with any part of the body of a child under the age of 14 years, with the intent of arousing, appealing to, or gratifying the lust or passions or sexual desires of that person or of that child, is guilty of Lewdness With a Minor.

The law does not require that the lust, passions or sexual desires of either of such persons actually be aroused, appealed to, or gratified.

26.

If the State fails to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant willfully committed any lewd or lascivious act upon or with any part of the body of a child under the age of 14 years, with the intent of arousing, appealing to, or gratifying the lust or passions or sexual desires of that person or of that child, you must find the defendant not guilty of Lewdness with a Minor.

There is no requirement that the testimony of an alleged victim of a sexual offense be

corroborated, and her testimony standing alone, if believed beyond a reasonable doubt, is



sufficient to sustain a verdict of guilty.

Where a minor has been the victim of sexual assault and/or lewdness with a minor, and does not remember the exact date of the act, the State is not required prove a specific date, but may prove a time frame within which the act took place.

7<sub>.</sub>

For the crimes of sexual assault and lewdness with a child, there is no absolute requirement that the State allege the exact date of the offense charged, but may instead give the approximate date on which it believes the crime occurred. However, the alleged victim must testify with some particularity regarding the incident in order to find the defendant guilty of sexual assault and/or lewdness with a child.

}

To find the defendant guilty of more than one count of sexual assault or lewdness with a minor, you must first find that the State has proven beyond a reasonable doubt that there is some "reliable indicia" that the number of acts actually occurred. Mere conjecture on the part of the alleged victim as to the number of acts is not enough. "Reliable indicia" may include such evidence as the victim describing the incident(s) with particularity, or any other evidence that indicates that the acts that are alleged actually occurred.

-5 

Where multiple sexual acts occur as part of a single criminal encounter a defendant may be found guilty for each separate or different act of sexual assault and/or lewdness.

It is a defense to the charge of sexual assault that the defendant entertained a reasonable and good faith belief that the alleged victim consented to engage in sexual penetration. If you find such reasonable, good faith belief, even if mistaken, you must give the defendant the benefit of the doubt and find him not guilty of sexual assault.

A belief that is based upon ambiguous conduct by the alleged victim that is the product of force, violence, duress, menace, or fear of immediate and unlawful bodily injury on the person of another is not a reasonable and good faith belief.

.

Open and Gross Lewdness is defined as any indecent, obscene or vulgar act of a sexual nature that:

- 1. is intentionally committed in a public place, even if the act is not observed; or
- 2. is committed in a private place, but in an open manner, as opposed to a secret manner, and with the intent to be offensive to the observer.

To constitute the crime charged, there must exist a union or joint operation of an act forbidden by law and an intent to do the act.

The intent with which an act is done is shown by the facts and circumstances surrounding the case.

Do not confuse intent with motive. Motive is what prompts a person to act. Intent refers only to the state of mind with which the act is done.

Motive is not an element of the crime charged and the State is not required to prove a motive on the part of the Defendant in order to convict. However, you may consider evidence of motive or lack of motive as a circumstance in the case.

2 3

The lack of flight of a person after he is accused of a crime is not sufficient in itself to establish that he is not guilty, but is a fact which may be considered by you in light of all other proved facts in deciding the question of whether he is guilty or not guilty.

The Defendant is presumed innocent until the contrary is proved. This presumption places upon the State the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt every material element of the crime charged and that the Defendant is the person who committed the offense.

A reasonable doubt is one based on reason. It is not mere possible doubt but is such a doubt as would govern or control a person in the more weighty affairs of life. If the minds of the jurors, after the entire comparison and consideration of all the evidence, are in such a condition that they can say they feel an abiding conviction of the truth of the charge, there is not a reasonable doubt. Doubt to be reasonable must be actual, not mere possibility or speculation.

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

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

The evidence which you are to consider in this case consists of the testimony of the witnesses, the exhibits, and any facts admitted or agreed to by counsel.

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

Statements, arguments and opinions of counsel are not evidence in the case. However, if the attorneys stipulate to the existence of a fact, you must accept the stipulation as evidence and regard that fact as proved.

You must not speculate to be true any insinuations suggested by a question asked a witness. A question is not evidence and may be considered only as it supplies meaning to the answer.

You must disregard any evidence to which an objection was sustained by the court and any evidence ordered stricken by the court.

Anything you may have seen or heard outside the courtroom is not evidence and must also be disregarded.

The credibility or believability of a witness should be determined by his manner upon the stand, his relationship to the parties, his fears, motives, interests or feelings, his opportunity to have observed the matter to which he testified, the reasonableness of his statements and the strength or weakness of his recollections.

If you believe that a witness has lied about any material fact in the case, you may disregard the entire testimony of that witness or any portion of his testimony which is not proved by other evidence.

- 17

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

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

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

. 17

When you retire to consider your verdict, you must select one of your number to act as foreperson who will preside over your deliberation and will be your spokesperson here in court.

During your deliberation, you will have all the exhibits which were admitted into evidence, these written instructions and forms of verdict which have been prepared for your convenience.

Your verdict must be unanimous. As soon as you have agreed upon a verdict, have it signed and dated by your foreperson and then return with it to this room.

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

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

Now you will listen to the arguments of counsel who will endeavor to aid you to reach a proper verdict by refreshing in your minds the evidence and by showing the application thereof to the law; but, whatever counsel may say, you will bear in mind that it is your duty to be governed in your deliberation by the evidence as you understand it and remember it to be and by the law as given to you in these instructions, with the sole, fixed and steadfast purpose of doing equal and exact justice between the Defendant and the State of Nevada.

GIVEN:

DISTRICT JUDGI

1	We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the Defendant GUILLERMO
2	RENTERIA-NOVOA, as follows:
3	COUNT 3 - LEWDNESS WITH A CHILD UNDER THE AGE OF 14
4	(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
5	Guilty of Lewdness With A Child Under The Age Of 14
6	Not Guilty
7	We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the Defendant GUILLERMO
8	RENTERIA-NOVOA, as follows:
9	COUNT 4 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14
10	(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
11	Guilty of Sexual Assault With A Minor Under The Age Of 14
12	Not Guilty
13	We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the Defendant GUILLERMO
14	RENTERIA-NOVOA, as follows:
15	COUNT 5 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14
16	(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
-17-	Guilty of Sexual Assault With A Minor Under The Age Of 14
18	Not Guilty
19	We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the Defendant GUILLERMO
20	RENTERIA-NOVOA, as follows:
21	COUNT 6 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14
22	(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
23	Guilty of Sexual Assault With A Minor Under The Age Of 14
24	Not Guilty
25	
26	
27	
28	

1	We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the Defendant GUILLERMO
2	RENTERIA-NOVOA, as follows:
3	COUNT 7 - LEWDNESS WITH A CHILD UNDER THE AGE OF 14
4	(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
5	Guilty of Lewdness With A Child Under The Age Of 14
6	Not Guilty
7	We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the Defendant GUILLERMO
8	RENTERIA-NOVOA, as follows:
9	COUNT 8 - LEWDNESS WITH A CHILD UNDER THE AGE OF 14
10	(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
11	Guilty of Lewdness With A Child Under The Age Of 14
12	Not Guilty
13	We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the Defendant GUILLERMO
14	RENTERIA-NOVOA, as follows:
15	COUNT 9 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14
16	(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
17	Guilty of Sexual Assault With A Minor Under The Age Of 14
18	Not Guilty  The Computer Modern Computer Moder
19	We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the Defendant GUILLERMO
20	RENTERIA-NOVOA, as follows:
21	COUNT 10 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14
22	(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
23	Guilty of Sexual Assault With A Minor Under The Age Of 14
24	Not Guilty
25	
26	
27	
28	
	II

	We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the Defendant GUILLERMO
1	·
2	RENTERIA-NOVOA, as follows:
3	COUNT 11 - OPEN OR GROSS LEWDNESS
4	(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
5	Guilty of Open or Gross Lewdness
6	Not Guilty
7	We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the Defendant GUILLERMO
8	RENTERIA-NOVOA, as follows:
9	COUNT 12 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14
10	(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
11	Guilty of Sexual Assault With A Minor Under The Age Of 14
12	Not Guilty
13	We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the Defendant GUILLERMO
14	RENTERIA-NOVOA, as follows:
15	COUNT 13 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14
16	(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
17	Guilty of Sexual Assault With A Minor Under The Age Of 14
18	Not Guilty
19	We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the Defendant GUILLERMO
20	RENTERIA-NOVOA, as follows:
21	COUNT 14 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14
22	(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
23	Guilty of Sexual Assault With A Minor Under The Age Of 14
24	Not Guilty
25	
26	
27	
28	

1	We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the Defendant GUILLERMO
2	RENTERIA-NOVOA, as follows:
3	COUNT 15 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14
4	(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
5	Guilty of Sexual Assault With A Minor Under The Age Of 14
6	Not Guilty
7	We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the Defendant GUILLERMO
8	RENTERIA-NOVOA, as follows:
9	COUNT 16 - LEWDNESS WITH A CHILD UNDER THE AGE OF 14
10	(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
11	Guilty of Lewdness With A Child Under The Age Of 14
12	Not Guilty
13	We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the Defendant GUILLERMO
14	RENTERIA-NOVOA, as follows:
15	COUNT 17 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14
16	(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
17	Guilty of Sexual Assault With A Minor Under The Age Of 14
18	Not Guilty
19	We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the Defendant GUILLERMO
20	RENTERIA-NOVOA, as follows:
21	COUNT 18 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14
22	(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
23	Guilty of Sexual Assault With A Minor Under The Age Of 14
24	Not Guilty
25	
26	///
27	///
28	

	TO A LA CITILIERMO
1	We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the Defendant GUILLERMO
2	RENTERIA-NOVOA, as follows:
3	COUNT 19 - LEWDNESS WITH A CHILD UNDER THE AGE OF 14
4	(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
5	Guilty of Lewdness With A Child Under The Age Of 14
6	Not Guilty CHILLERMO
7	We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the Defendant GUILLERMO
8	RENTERIA-NOVOA, as follows:
9	COUNT 20 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14
10	(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
11	Guilty of Sexual Assault With A Minor Under The Age Of 14
12	Not Guilty
13	We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the Defendant GUILLERMO
14	RENTERIA-NOVOA, as follows:
15	COUNT 21 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14
16	(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
17	Guilty of Sexual Assault With A Minor Under The Age Of 14
18	Not Guilty
19	We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the Defendant GUILLERMO
20	RENTERIA-NOVOA, as follows:
21	COUNT 22 - LEWDNESS WITH A CHILD UNDER THE AGE OF 14
22	(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
23	Guilty of Lewdness With A Child Under The Age Of 14
24	Not Guilty
25	
26	5   ///
27	
28	3 ///
,	
	11

	We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the Defendant GUILLERMO
1	
2	RENTERIA-NOVOA, as follows:
3	COUNT 23 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 16
4	(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
5	Guilty of Sexual Assault With A Minor Under The Age Of 16
6	Not Guilty  To the Defendant GUILLERMO
7	We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the Defendant GUILLERMO
8	RENTERIA-NOVOA, as follows:
9	COUNT 24 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 16
10	(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
11	Guilty of Sexual Assault With A Minor Under The Age Of 16
12	Not Guilty
13	We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the Defendant GUILLERMO
14	RENTERIA-NOVOA, as follows:
15	COUNT 25 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 16
16	(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
17	Guilty of Sexual Assault With A Minor Under The Age Of 16
18	Not Guilty
19	We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the Defendant GUILLERMO
20	RENTERIA-NOVOA, as follows:
21	COUNT 26 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 16
22	(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
23	Guilty of Sexual Assault With A Minor Under The Age Of 16
24	Not Guilty
25	5   ///
26	5 ///
2′	7   ///
2	8 ///

l l	We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the Defendant GUILLERMO
1	
2	RENTERIA-NOVOA, as follows:
- 3	COUNT 27 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 16
4	(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
5	Guilty of Sexual Assault With A Minor Under The Age Of 16
6	Not Guilty
7	We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the Defendant GUILLERMO
8	RENTERIA-NOVOA, as follows:
9	COUNT 28 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 16
10	(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
11	Guilty of Sexual Assault With A Minor Under The Age Of 16
12	Not Guilty
13	We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the Defendant GUILLERMO
14	RENTERIA-NOVOA, as follows:
15	COUNT 29 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 16
16	(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
17.	Guilty of Sexual Assault With A Minor Under The Age Of 16
18	Not Guilty
19	We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the Defendant GUILLERMO
20	RENTERIA-NOVOA, as follows:
21	COUNT 30 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 16
22	(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
23	Guilty of Sexual Assault With A Minor Under The Age Of 16
24	Not Guilty
25	
26	///
27	
28	///

,	We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the Defendant GUILLERMO
1	RENTERIA-NOVOA, as follows:
2	COUNT 31 - OPEN OR GROSS LEWDNESS
3	(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
5	Guilty of Open or Gross Lewdness
6	Not Guilty
7	We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the Defendant GUILLERMO
8	RENTERIA-NOVOA, as follows:
9	COUNT 32 – SEX ASSAULT
10	(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
11	Guilty of Sex Assault
12	Not Guilty
13	We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the Defendant GUILLERMO
14	RENTERIA-NOVOA, as follows:
15	COUNT 33 - SEX ASSAULT
16	(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
. 17	Guilty of Sex Assault
18	Not Guilty
19	We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the Defendant GUILLERMO
20	RENTERIA-NOVOA, as follows:
21	COUNT 34 – SEX ASSAULT
22	(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
- 23	Guilty of Sex Assault
24	Not Guilty
. 25	///
26	
27	
28	

1	We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the Defendant GUILLERMO
2	RENTERIA-NOVOA, as follows:
3	COUNT 35 – SEX ASSAULT
4	(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
5	Guilty of Sex Assault
6	Not Guilty
7	We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the Defendant GUILLERMO
8	RENTERIA-NOVOA, as follows:
9	COUNT 36 - OPEN OR GROSS LEWDNESS
10	(please check the appropriate box, select only one)
11	Guilty of Open or Gross Lewdness
12	Not Guilty
13	n-th
14	DATED this 25 day of May, 2012
15	Robert M. Dell
16	FOREPERSON
17	Robert M. Dell
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23 24	
2 <del>4</del> 25	
25 26	
27	
28	
	N

Electronically Filed 09/17/2012 08:47:20 AM

Alun to blum

CLERK OF THE COURT

JOC

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

#2755564

10

11

12 13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24 25

26

27

SEP 10 200

DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Plaintiff,

-VS-

GUILLERMO RENTERIA-NOVOA

Defendant.

CASE NO. C268285-1

DEPT. NO. XX

JUDGMENT OF CONVICTION (JURY TRIAL)

The Defendant previously entered a plea of not guilty to the crimes of COUNTS 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21 — SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE ©F 14 (Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 200.364, 200.366; COUNTS 3, 7, 8, 16, 19, 22 — LEWDNESS WITH A CHILD UNDER THE AGE OF 14 (Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 201.230; COUNTS 11, 31, 36 — OPEN OR GROSS LEWDNESS (Gross Misdemeanor), in violation of NRS 201.220; COUNTS 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30 — SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 16 (Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 200.364, 200.366; and COUNTS 32, 33, 34, 35 — SEXUAL ASSAULT (Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 200.364, 200.366; and the matter having been tried before a jury and the Defendant having been found guilty of the crimes of COUNT 1 — SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14 (Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 200.364, 200.366; COUNT 2 —

28

SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14 (Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 200.364, 200.366; COUNT 3 - LEWDNESS WITH A CHILD UNDER THE AGE OF 14 (Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 201.230; COUNT 4 -SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14 (Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 200.364, 200.366; COUNT 5 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14 (Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 200.364, 200.366; COUNT 6 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14 (Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 200.364, 200.366; COUNT 7 - LEWDNESS WITH A CHILD UNDER THE AGE OF 14 (Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 201.230; COUNT 8 -LEWDNESS WITH A CHILD UNDER THE AGE OF 14 (Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 201.230; COUNT 9 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14 (Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 200.364, 200.366; COUNT 10 -SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14 (Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 200.364, 200.366; COUNT 11 - OPEN OR GROSS LEWDNESS (Gross Misdemeanor), in violation of NRS 201.220; COUNT 12 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14 (Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 200.364, 200.366; COUNT 13 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14 (Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 200.364, 200.366; COUNT 14 -SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14 (Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 200.364, 200.366; COUNT 15 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14 (Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 200.364, 200.366; COUNT 16 - LEWDNESS WITH A CHILD UNDER THE AGE OF 14 (Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 201.230; COUNT 17 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR

28

UNDER THE AGE OF 14 (Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 200.364, 200.366; COUNT 18 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14 (Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 200.364, 200.366; COUNT 19 - LEWDNESS WITH A CHILD UNDER THE AGE OF 14 (Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 201.230; COUNT 20 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14 (Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 200.364, 200.366; COUNT 21 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14 (Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 200.364, 200.366; COUNT 22 - LEWDNESS WITH A CHILD UNDER THE AGE OF 14 (Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 201.230; COUNT 23 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 16 (Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 200.364, 200.366; COUNT 24 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 16 (Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 200.364, 200.366; COUNT 25 -SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 16 (Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 200.364, 200.366; COUNT 26 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 16 (Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 200.364, 200.366; COUNT 27 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 16 (Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 200.364, 200.366; COUNT 28 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 16 (Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 200.364, 200.366; COUNT 29 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 16 (Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 200.364, 200.366; COUNT 30 -SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 16 (Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 200.364, 200.366; COUNT 31 - OPEN OR GROSS LEWDNESS (Gross Misdemeanor), in violation of NRS 201.220; COUNT 32 - SEXUAL ASSAULT

(Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 200.364, 200.366; COUNT 33 - SEXUAL ASSAULT (Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 200.364, 200.366; COUNT 34 - SEXUAL ASSAULT (Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 200.364, 200.366; COUNT 35 - SEXUAL ASSAULT (Category A Felony), in violation of NRS 200.364, 200.366; and COUNT 36 - OPEN OR GROSS LEWDNESS (Gross Misdemeanor), in violation of NRS 201.220; thereafter, on the 6<sup>TH</sup> day of September, 2012, the Defendant was present in court for sentencing with his counsels, AMY FELICIANO, Deputy Public Defender and, MIKE FELICIANO, Deputy Public Defender, and good cause appearing,

THE DEFENDANT IS HEREBY ADJUDGED guilty of said offense(s) and, in addition to the \$25.00 Administrative Assessment Fee, \$150.00 DNA Analysis Fee including testing to determine genetic markers, and to PAY \$880.00 RESTITUTION, the Defendant is SENTENCED as follows: AS TO COUNTS 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21 - LIFE with a MINIMUM Parole Eligibility AFTER TWENTY (20) YEARS in the Nevada Department of Corrections (NDC); AS TO COUNTS 3, 7, 8, 16, 19, 22 - LIFE with a MINIMUM Parole Eligibility AFTER TEN (10) YEARS in the Nevada Department of Corrections (NDC); AS TO COUNTS 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30 -LIFE with a MINIMUM Parole Eligibility AFTER TWENTY-FIVE (25) YEARS in the Nevada Department of Corrections (NDC); AS TO COUNTS 11, 31, 36 - TWELVE (12) MONTHS in the Clark County Detention Center (CCDC); and AS TO COUNTS 32, 33, 34, 35 - LIFE with a MINIMUM Parole Eligibility AFTER TEN (10) YEARS in the Nevada Department of Corrections (NDC); COUNT 3 to run CONSECUTIVE to COUNT 1; COUNT 6 to run CONSECUTIVE to COUNTS 1 and 3; COUNT 23 to run CONSECUTIVE to COUNTS 1, 3, and 6; COUNT 32 to run CONSECUTIVE to

COUNTS 1, 3, 6 and 23; ALL REMAINING COUNTS to run CONCURRENT with each other; with SEVEN HUNDRED SIXTY-TWO (762) DAYS Credit for Time Served.

FURTHER ORDERED, a SPECIAL SENTENCE of LIFETIME SUPERVISION is imposed to commence upon release from any term of imprisonment, probation or parole.

ADDITIONALLY, the Defendant is ORDERED to REGISTER as a sex offender in accordance with NRS 179D.460 within FORTY-EIGHT (48) HOURS after any release from custody.

COURT FURTHER ORDERED, Registration after conviction; duties and procedure, offender or sex offender informed of duty to register; effect of failure to inform; duties and procedure upon receipt of notification from another jurisdiction or Federal Bureau of Investigation.

- 1. If the Central Repository receives notice from a court pursuant to NRS 176.0926 that an offender has been convicted of a crime against a child, pursuant to NRS 176.0927 that a sex offender has been convicted of a sexual offense or pursuant to NRS 62F.220, that a juvenile has been adjudicated delinquent for an offense for which the juvenile is subject to registration and community notification pursuant to NRS 179D.010 to 179D.550, inclusive, the Central Repository shall:
- (a) If a record of registration has not previously been established for the offender or sex offender, notify the local law enforcement agency so that a record of registration may be established; or
- (b) If a record of registration has previously been established for the offender or sex offender, update the record of registration for the offender or sex offender and notify the

appropriate local law enforcement agencies.

- 2. If the offender or sex offender named in the notice is granted probation or otherwise will not be incarcerated or confined, the Central Repository shall:
- (a) Immediately provide notification concerning the offender or sex offender to the appropriate local law enforcement agencies and, if the offender or sex offender resides in a jurisdiction which is outside of this State, to the appropriate law enforcement agency in that jurisdiction; and
- (b) Immediately provide community notification concerning the offender or sex offender pursuant to the provisions of NRS 179D.475.
- 3. If an offender or sex offender is incarcerated or confined and has previously been convicted of a crime against a child as described in NRS 179D.0357 or a sexual offense as described in NRS 179D.097, before the offender or sex offender is released:
- (a) The Department of Corrections or a local law enforcement agency in whose facility the offender or sex offender is incarcerated or confined shall:
- (1) Inform the offender or sex offender of the requirements for registration, including but not limited to:
- (I) The duty to register initially with the appropriate law enforcement agency in the jurisdiction in which the offender or sex offender was convicted if the offender or sex offender is not a resident of that jurisdiction pursuant to NRS 179D.445;
- (II) The duty to register in this State during any period in which the offender or sex offender is a resident of this State or a nonresident who is a student or worker within this State and the time within which the offender or sex offender is required to register pursuant to NRS 179D 460;

(III) The duty to register in any other jurisdiction during any period in which the offender or sex offender is a resident of the other jurisdiction or a nonresident who is a student or worker within the other jurisdiction;

(IV) If the offender or sex offender moves from this State to another jurisdiction, the duty to register with the appropriate law enforcement agency in the other jurisdiction;

(V) The duty to notify the local law enforcement agency for the jurisdiction in which the offender or sex offender now resides, in person, and the jurisdiction in which the offender or sex offender formerly resided, in person or in writing, if the offender or sex offender changes the address at which the offender or sex offender resides, including if the offender or sex offender moves from this State to another jurisdiction, or changes the primary address at which the offender or sex offender is a student or worker; and (VI) The duty to notify immediately the appropriate local law enforcement agency if the offender or sex offender is, expects to be or becomes enrolled as a student at an institution of higher education or changes the date of commencement or termination of

the offender or sex offender's enrollment at an institution of higher education or if the offender or sex offender is, expects to be or becomes a worker at an institution of higher education or changes the date of commencement or termination of the offender or sex offender's work at an institution of higher education; and

(2) Require the offender or sex offender to read and sign a form stating that the requirements for registration have been explained and that the offender or sex offender understands the requirements for registration, and to forward the form to the Central Repository.

(b) The Central Repository shall:

(1) Update the record of registration for the offender or sex offender;

- (2) Provide community notification concerning the offender or sex offender pursuant to the provisions of NRS 179D.475; and
- (3) Provide notification concerning the offender or sex offender to the appropriate local law enforcement agencies and, if the offender or sex offender will reside upon release in a jurisdiction which is outside of this State, to the appropriate law enforcement agency in that jurisdiction.
- 4. The failure to provide an offender or sex offender with the information or confirmation form required by paragraph (a) of subsection 3 does not affect the duty of the offender or sex offender to register and to comply with all other provisions for registration.
- 5. If the Central Repository receives notice from another jurisdiction or the Federal Bureau of Investigation that an offender or sex offender is now residing or is a student or worker within this State, the Central Repository shall:
- (a) Immediately provide notification concerning the offender or sex offender to the appropriate local law enforcement agencies;
- (b) Establish a record of registration for the offender or sex offender; and
- (c) Immediately provide community notification concerning the offender or sex offender pursuant to the provisions of NRS 179D.475. (Added to NRS by 1997, 1655; A 1999, 1300; 2001, 2058; 2001 Special Session, 227; 2003, 289, 573, 1122; 2007, 2765,3252).

SEP 1 0 2012

JEROME TAO DISTRICT JUDGI

NOAS 1 PHILIP J. KOHN, PUBLIC DEFENDER CLERK OF THE COURT NEVADA BAR No. 0556 2 309 South Third Street, Suite 226 Las Vegas, Nevada 89155 3 (702) 455-4685 Attorney for Defendant DISTRICT COURT 5 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 6 7 THE STATE OF NEVADA, CASE NO. C-10-268285-1 8 Plaintiff, DEPT. NO. XX 9 10 GUILLERMO RENTERIO-NOVOA, 11 Defendant. NOTICE OF APPEAL 12 THE STATE OF NEVADA 13 TO: STEVEN B. WOLFSON, DISTRICT ATTORNEY, CLARK COUNTY, 14 NEVADA and DEPARTMENT NO. XX OF THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE 15 COUNTY OF CLARK. 16 NOTICE is hereby given that Defendant, Guillermo 17 Renterio-Novoa, presently incarcerated in the Nevada State Prison, The state of the s 18 appeals to the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada from the 19 judgment entered against sald Defendant on the 17th day of 20 September, 2012, whereby he was convicted of Cts. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 21 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 22 30, 32 - Sexual Assault With a Minor Under the Age of 14; Ct. 3, 23 7, 8, 16, 19, 22 - Lewdness With a Child Under The Age of 14; Ct. 24 11, 31, 36 - Open or Gross Lewdness; Ct. 33, 34, 35 - Sexual 25 Assault and sentenced to \$25 Admin. fee; \$150 DNA analysis fee; 26 genetic testing; \$880 restitution; as to Cts. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 9, 27 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21 - 20 years to Life in prison; 28

Cts. 3, 7, 8, 16, 19, 22 - 10 years to Life in prison; Cts. 23,

24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 28, 30 - 25 years to Life in prison; Cts,. 11, 1 31, 36 - 12 months in CCDC; Cts. 32, 33, 34, 35 - 10 years to Life; Ct. 3 to run consecutive to Ct. 1; Ct. 6 to run consecutive to Cts. 1 and 3; Ct. 23 to run consecutive to Cts. 1, 3, and 6; Ct. 32 to run consecutive to Cts. 1, 3, 6 and 23; all remainings counts to run concurrent with each other; 762 days CTS. Special sentence of lifetime supervision is imposed to commence upon release from any term of imprisonment, probation or parole. 8 Ordered to register as a sex offender within 48 hours after any release from custody; registration after conviction, duties and 10 procedure, offender or sex offender informed of duty to register, 11 effect of failure to inform and procedure upon receipt of 12 13 14

notification from another jurisdiction or FBI. DATED this 5th day of October, 2012.

> PHILIP J. KOHN CLARK COUNTY PUBLIC DEFENDER

16

15

17 " 18:

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

/s/ Nancy L. Lemcke ĿΣy: NANCY L. LEMCKE, #5416 Deputy Public Defender 309 S. Third Street, Ste. 226 Las Vegas, Nevada 89155 (702) 455-4685

# DECLARATION OF MAILING

1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Carrie Connolly, an employee with the Clark County Public Defender's Office, hereby declares that she is, and was when the herein described mailing took place, a citizen of the United States, over 21 years of age, and not a party to, nor interested in, the within action; that on the  $5^{\rm th}$  day of October, 2012, declarant deposited in the United States mail at Las Vegas, Nevada, a copy of the Notice of Appeal in the case of the State of Nevada v. Guillermo Renterio-Novoa, Case No. C-10-268285-1, enclosed in a sealed envelope upon which first class postage was fully prepaid, addressed to Guillermo Renterio-Novoa c/o High Desert State Prison, P.O. Box 650, Indian Springs, NV 89018. That there is a regular communication by mail between the place of mailing and the place so addressed.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

EXECUTED on the 5th day of October, 2012.

THE PARTY OF THE PARTY OF THE PARTY OF

/s/ Carrie M. Connolly An employee of the Clark County Public Defender's Office

3

# CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that service of the above and foregoing was made this 5<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2012, by Electronic Filing to:

District Attorneys Office E-Mail Address: PDMotions@ccdanv.com

Jennifer.Garcia@ccdanv.com

Eileen.Davis@ccdanv.com

/s/ Carrie M. Connolly
Secretary for the
Public Defender's Office

б

~

Į

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor

COURT MINUTES

October 28, 2010

C-10-268285-1

State of Nevada

Guillermo Renteria-Novoa

October 28, 2010

9:00 AM

Initial Arraignment

HEARD BY:

De La Garza, Melisa

COURTROOM: RJC Lower Level

Arraignment

COURT CLERK: Ruth Gilfert; Susie Schofield/ss; Tia Everett

RECORDER:

Kiara Schmidt

REPORTER:

**PARTIES** 

PRESENT:

Campbell, Cara L.

Attorney for State

Porray, Amy A.

Attorney for Defendant

Renteria-Novoa, Guillermo Defendant

# JOURNAL ENTRIES

- Also present: Spanish Interpreter Mario Torres.

Ms. Porray requested matter be continued to Court's Friday calendar. COURT SO ORDERED.

**CUSTODY** 

11/5/2010 10:30 A.M. - ARRAIGNMENT CONTINUED (LLA)

PRINT DATE:

11/02/2010

Page 1 of 1

Minutes Date:

October 28, 2010

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor

COURT MINUTES

November 05, 2010

C-10-268285-1

State of Nevada

Guillermo Renteria-Novoa

November 05, 2010

10:30 AM

Arraignment Continued

HEARD BY: De La Garza, Melisa

COURTROOM: RJC Lower Level

Arraignment

COURT CLERK: Carole D'Aloia

RECORDER: Kiara Schmidt

REPORTER:

**PARTIES** 

PRESENT:

Public Defender

Renteria-Novoa,

Attorney

Defendant

Guillermo

# JOURNAL ENTRIES

- Glen O'Brien, Deputy D.A., present on behalf of the State, Mike Feliciano, Deputy P.D., present on behalf of Defendant and Certified Spanish Court Interpreter, M. Peters, present to assist Defendant. Ms. Porray advised Defendant will be entering a not guilty plea. DEFENDANT RENTERIA-NOVOA ARRAIGNED, PLED NOT GUILTY, AND WAIVED THE SIXTY (60) DAY RULE. Court ACCEPTED plea and, ORDERED, matter set for JURY TRIAL. Ms. Porray advised she has just received a copy of the Preliminary Hearing Transcript and requested twenty-one (21) days from today's date to file a writ and, COURT SO ORDERED.

**CUSTODY** 

2/28/11 9:00 AM CALENDAR CALL

3/7/11 1:30 PM JURY TRIAL

PRINT DATE:

11/05/2010

Page 1 of 1

Minutes Date:

November 05, 2010

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor

**COURT MINUTES** 

January 26, 2011

C-10-268285-1

State of Nevada

Guillermo Renteria-Novoa

January 26, 2011

9:00 AM

All Pending Motions

HEARD BY:

Mosley, Donald

COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 12B

COURT CLERK: Linda Skinner

RECORDER:

REPORTER:

Maureen Schorn

**PARTIES** 

PRESENT:

Feliciano, Mike

Attorney for Defendant

Pandelis, Christopher

Attorney for State of Nevada

Public Defender

Renteria-Novoa,

Defendant

Guillermo

State of Nevada

Plaintiff-

## **JOURNAL ENTRIES**

STATUS CHECK: DISCOVERY...DEFT'S PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

Shirley Landberg, Court Interpreter, present to assist Defendant.

AS TO DISCOVERY: Mr. Feliciano advised there are no issues. Court so noted and advised this matter was discussed in chambers and pursuant to that discussion, counsel will not be prepared for trial on 3/7. Mr. Feliciano and Mr. Pandelis concurred. COURT ORDERED, trial date VACATED and RESET.

AS TO WRIT: Counsel submitted on the pleadings. Court advised it has reviewed the transcript and is satisfied that penetration was shown. However, does not feel there was evidence to support Count 27. Therefore, COURT ORDERED, Writ DENIED, however, Count 27 is STRICKEN.

**CUSTODY** 

PRINT DATE:

02/04/2011

Page 1 of 2

Minutes Date:

January 26, 2011

4/13/11 9:00 AM STATUS CHECK: DISCOVERY

5/9/11 9:00 AM CALENDAR CALL (#2)

5/16/11 1:30 PM JURY TRIAL (#2)

PRINT DATE: 02/04/2011

Page 2 of 2

Minutes Date:

January 26, 2011

Felony/Gross Misden	neanor	COURT MINUTES	April 19, 2011
C-10-268285-1	State of N vs	evada o Renteria-Novoa	
April 19, 2011	9:00 AM	All Pending Motion Motion in Limine State's Experts From Vouching and to From Testifying Carea of Expertise Motion for Discoud Defendant's Motion Freclude Use of the Term "Victim"	to Preclude the om Improper Prevent "Experts" Outside Their Defendant's very
•			10D

HEARD BY: Barker, David

COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 10D

COURT CLERK: Tia Everett

RECORDER: Sara Richardson

REPORTER:

**PARTIES** 

PRESENT:

Fattig, John T

Renteria-Novoa,

Guillermo

Ronmey, Claudia L.

Deputy District Attorney

Defendant

Public Defender

# JOURNAL ENTRIES

- DEFENDANT'S MOTION IN LIMINE TO PRECLUDE THE STATE'S EXPERTS FROM IMPROPER VOUCHING AND TO PREVENT "EXPERTS" FROM TESTIFYING OUTSIDE THEIR AREA OF EXPERTISE ... DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR DISCOVERY ... DEFENDANT'S MOTION IN LIMINE TO PRECLUDE USE IF THE PREJUDICIAL TERM "VICTIM"

APPEARANCES CONTINUED: Alex Andrade, Court Interpreter, present with Defendant.

PRINT DATE:

04/19/2011

Page 1 of 2

Minutes Date:

April 19, 2011

COURT ORDERED, matters CONTINUED for Judge Tao.

CUSTODY

CONTINUED TO: 4/28/2011 9:00 AM

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor		COURT MINUTES	April 28, 2011	
C-10-268285-1	State of N vs Guillerm	Jevada o Renteria-Novoa		
April 28, 2011	9:00 AM	All Pending Motions: Motion in Limine to Preclude the State's Experts From Improper Vouching and to Prevent "Experts" From Testifying Outside Their Area of Expertise Defendant's Motion For Discovery Defendant's Motion in Limine to Preclude Use of the Prejudicial Term "Victim"		

HEARD BY: Tao, Jerome T.

COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 10D

COURT CLERK: Tia Everett

RECORDER: Sara Richardson

REPORTER:

**PARTIES** 

PRESENT:

Luzaich, Elissa

Porray, Amy A. Renteria-Novoa,

Guillermo

Deputy District Attorney

Public Defender

Defendant

## **JOURNAL ENTRIES**

- MOTION IN LIMINE TO PRECLUDE THE STATE'S EXPERTS FROM IMPROPER VOUCHING AND TO PREVENT "EXPERTS" FROM TESTIFYING OUTSIDE THEIR AREA OF EXPERTISE ... DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR DISCOVERY ... DEFENDANT'S MOTION IN LIMINE TO PRECLUDE ISE OF THE PREJUDICIAL TERM "VICTIM"

Caridad Pfeiffer, Court Interpreter, present with Defendant. Ms. Porray requested matter be continued for Mr. Feliciano's presence. No opposition by Ms. Luzaich. COURT SO ORDERED.

PRINT DATE:

05/03/2011

Page 1 of 2

Minutes Date:

April 28, 2011

CUSTODY

CONTINUED TO: 5/3/2011 9:00 AM

PRINT DATE: 05/03/2011

Page 2 of 2

Minutes Date:

April 28, 2011

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor		COURT MINUTES	May 03, 2011
C-10-268285-1	State of I vs Guillern	Vevada o Renteria-Novoa	
May 03, 2011	9:00 AM	All Pending Motions: Motion in Limine To Preclude The State's Experts From Improper Vouching and To Prevent "Experts" From Testifying Outside Their Area of Expertise Defendant's Motion For Discovery Defendant's Motion in Limine To Preclude Use of the Prejudicial Term "Victim"	

HEARD BY: Tao, Jerome T. COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 10D

Tia Everett COURT CLERK:

RECORDER: Sara Richardson

REPORTER:

**PARTIES** 

PRESENT:

Feliciano, Mike

Luzaich, Elissa

Renteria-Novoa,

Guillermo

Public Defender

Deputy District Attorney

Defendant

## JOURNAL ENTRIES

- Phillip Cuartas, Spanish Court Interpreter, present with Defendant.

AS TO MOTION IN LIMINE TO PRECLIDE THE STATE'S EXPERTS FROM IMPROPER VOUCHING AND TO PREVENT "EXPERTS" FROM TESTIFYING OUTSIDE THEIR AREA OF EXPERTISE:

Mr. Feliciano stated the motion will also apply to detectives and other who will testify as experts

PRINT DATE:

05/06/2011

Page 1 of 2

Minutes Date:

May 03, 2011

although not endorsed as such. Ms. Luzaich stated this motion is premature as Mr. Feliciano will need to object contemporaneously during trial with the expert's testimony. COURT ORDERED, Motion DENIED although counsel may make the appropriate objections at the time of trial.

AS TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION IN LIMINE TO PRECLUDE ISE OF THE PREJUDCIAL TERM "VICTIM":

Mr. Feliciano stated the trial is to determine if there is a victim. Ms. Luzaich stated she will refer to the victims by their name although the term victim is used at times. COURT ORDERED, Motion DENIED although Mr. Feliciano may raise the issue during trial if appropriate.

# AS TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR DISCOVERY:

Following statements by counsel, COURT FURTHER ORDERED the following,

- 1-3 State to provide information for the Court's incamera review to determine if there is any information the Defendant is entitled to have.
- 4 GRANTED with no opposition
- 5 GRANTED IN PART as the State to provide if the victim (s) were referred to counseling and if that if money from the State fund was paid to the counselor.
- 6 GRANTED with no opposition.
- 7 GRANTED to the extent State is to run NCIC and provide any information as to the any felony convictions in the last 10 years, and/or any felony conviction for which the term of probation/parole/imprisonment ended within the last 10 years, and additionally any misdemeanor/gross misdemeanor information which may bare on credibility.
- 8 16 GRANTED with no opposition.

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor

COURT MINUTES

May 17, 20<u>11</u>

C-10-268285-1

State of Nevada

VS

Guillermo Renteria-Novoa

May 17, 2011

9:00 AM

Calendar Call

HEARD BY:

Bonaventure, Joseph T.

COURTROOM:

COURT CLERK: T

Tia Everett

RECORDER:

Sara Richardson

REPORTER:

**PARTIES** 

PRESENT:

Feliciano, Mike

Public Defender

Pandelis, Christopher

Deputy District Attorney

Ρ.

Renteria-Novoa,

Kenteria-110, o.

Defendant

Guillermo

# **JOURNAL ENTRIES**

- Francisco Mandrigal, Spanish Court Interpreter, present with Defendant.

Mr. Pandelis advised when this case was reassigned from Department 14 Mr. Feleciano contacted him to advise he may have a scheduling conflict and need to continue the trial. Colloquy regarding scheduling. COURT ORDERED, trial VACATED and RESET.

**CUSTODY** 

11/01/2011 9:00 AM CALENDAR CALL

11/07/2011 10:30 AM JURY TRIAL

PRINT DATE:

05/18/2011

Page 1 of 1

Minutes Date:

The second of the second of the second

May 17, 2011

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor

COURT MINUTES

November 01, 2011

C-10-268285-1

State of Nevada

Guillermo Renteria-Novoa

November 01, 2011

8:30 AM

Calendar Call

HEARD BY: Tao, Jerome T.

COURTROOM:

COURT CLERK: Tia Everett

RECORDER:

REPORTER:

**PARTIES** 

PRESENT:

Feliciano, Mike

Fleck, Michelle

Renteria-Novoa,

Guillermo

Attorney for Defendant

Attorney for State of Nevada

Defendant

# **JOURNAL ENTRIES**

- APPEARANCES CONTINUED: Caridad Pfeiffer, Spanish Court Interpreter, present with Defendant.

Mr. Feliciano advised there is still outstanding discovery such as the Defendant's audio statement which is needed to go forward with trial. Ms. Fleck stated there is additional discovery which has been requested and needs to be provided. COURT ORDERED, trial date VACATED and RESET.

CUSTODY

1/17/2012 8:30 AM CALENDAR CALL

1/23/2012 10:30 AM JURY TRIAL

PRINT DATE:

11/02/2011

Page 1 of 1

Minutes Date:

November 01, 2011

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor

**COURT MINUTES** 

January 17, 2012

C-10-268285-1

State of Nevada

Guillermo Renteria-Novoa

January 17, 2012

8:30 AM

Calendar Call

HEARD BY:

Tao, Jerome T.

COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 10D

COURT CLERK:

Tia Everett; Nancy Tibbetts/nt

RECORDER:

Sara Richardson

REPORTER:

**PARTIES** 

PRESENT:

Feliciano, Mike

Public Defender

Fleck, Michelle

District Attorney

Renteria-Novoa, Guillermo Defendant

## **JOURNAL ENTRIES**

- Spanish Interpreter, Shirley Landberg, also present. Following conference at bench, Court questioned Deft. about issues with his counsel and then assured him that counsel is qualified. COURT ORDERED, trial date VACATED and RESET.

**CUSTODY** 

5/15/12 8:30 AM CALENDAR CALL

5/21/12 10:30 AM JURY TRIAL

PRINT DATE:

01/18/2012

Page 1 of 1

Minutes Date:

January 17, 2012

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor COURT MINUTES May 10, 2012

C-10-268285-1 State of Nevada
vs
Guillermo Renteria-Novoa

May 10, 2012

8:30 AM

Defendant's Motion to Suppress

HEARD BY:

Tao, Jerome T.

COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 10D

COURT CLERK: Tia Everett

RECORDER:

Sara Richardson

REPORTER:

**PARTIES** 

PRESENT:

Feliciano, Mike

Fleck, Michelle

Renteria-Novoa, Guillermo

Attorney for Defendant

Attorney for State of Nevada

Defendant

# JOURNAL ENTRIES

- Court noted he has reviewed the transcript provided, however, the transcript is quite unclear and he would like a copy of the CD to review. Mr. Feleciano advised he provided a copy of the CD with the transcript, however, he will send another copy to chambers. Further Court noted the State has no opposition to a Jackson V Denno hearing. Colloquy regarding scheduling. COURT ORDERED, matter CONTINUED and SET for Hearing.

#### **CUSTODY**

5/15/2012 8:30 AM DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO SUPPRESS ... JACKSON V DENNO HEARING RE: DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO SUPPRESS

PRINT DATE:

05/16/2012

Page 1 of 1

Minutes Date:

May 10, 2012

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor

COURT MINUTES

May 15, 2012

C-10-268285-1

State of Nevada

vs

Guillermo Renteria-Novoa

May 15, 2012

8:30 AM

Calendar Call

HEARD BY:

Tao, Jerome T.

COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 10D

COURT CLERK:

Tia Everett

RECORDER:

Sara Richardson

REPORTER:

**PARTIES** 

PRESENT:

Feliciano, Mike

Fleck, Michelle

Porray, Amy A.

Renteria-Novoa, Guillermo

State of Nevada

Attorney for Defendant

Attorney for State of Nevada

Attorney for Defendant

Defendant

# JOURNAL ENTRIES

- APPEARANCES CONTINUED: Jeff Hanks, Spanish Court Interpreter, present with Defendant.

Parties announced ready, with 10 - 12 witnesses, no out of state witnesses and anticipate trial to be 1 week. COURT ORDERED, trial SET to begin 5/21/2012 at 9:00 am.

CUSTODY

PRINT DATE:

05/15/2012

Page 1 of 1

Minutes Date:

May 15, 2012

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor

COURT MINUTES

May 21, 2012

C-10-268285-1

State of Nevada

Guillermo Renteria-Novoa

May 21, 2012

9:00 AM

Jury Trial

HEARD BY:

Tao, Jerome T.

COURTROOM:

COURT CLERK: Tia Everett

RECORDER: Sara Richardson

**PARTIES** 

PRESENT:

Michelle Fleck and Nicholas Graham, Deputy District Attorneys, present on behalf of the State. Defendant present in custody, represented by Michael Feleciano and Amy Feleciano, Deputy Public Defenders.

# **JOURNAL ENTRIES**

- APPEARANCES CONTINUED: Spanish Interpreters, Lorena Pike, Maria Peralta De Gomez, Michael Berry, and Mario Maldonado present with Defendant.

# OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF PROSPECTIVE JURORS:

Ms. Fleck stated defense has informed her they intend to bring in the fact that the victim was pregnant at the time she disclosed to the police what has happened with the Defendant which is not relevant and she believes this issue should have been brought by written motion in order for her to file an opposition. Mr. Feleciano argued rape shield does not apply in this case, the information will be offered as to her motive for disclosing and the possibility of fabricating. Ms. Feleciano argued the disclosure comes out when she has to tell her mother she is pregnant, the relationship with her cousin and then the what happened with the Defendant. Further arguments by counsel. COURT ORDERED, defense request to reference the pregnancy of victim DENIED. Mr. Feliciano requested an emergency stay in the case in order to bring this issue before the Supreme Court for an Interlocutory appeal. COURT FURTHER ORDERED, Motion to stay the case DENIED although parties may seek the stay with the Supreme Court. Mr. Feliciano requested the Court give him today to have an opportunity to file their interlocutory appeal with the Supreme Court. Upon Court's

PRINT DATE:

07/02/2012

Page 1 of 2

Minutes Date:

May 21, 2012

inquiry, parties stipulated to the alternates being seats 13 and 14.

PROSPECTIVE JURORS PRESENT:

Voir dire.

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF PROSPECTIVE JURORS:

Court noted there is now a Tagalog interpreter present, Josephina Duley, who will assist prospective juror Armida Martinez, badge number 069. Court further noted that the interpreter s office has advised they are short on Spanish interpreters and they will not have one available for a while for prospective juror Elias Aguilar, badge number 068, however, the Court will have badge numbers 069 and 068 in outside the presence to inquire about there understanding of the English language. Court noted Yul Haasman, Spanish Court interpreter present with badge number 068.

PROSPECTIVE JURORS PRESENT:

Further voir dire.

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF PROSPECTIVE JURORS:

Ms. Feleciano advised as discussed at the bench, badge number 027, Michael Parry, stated his daughter is an attorney here in Las Vegas and she is friends with his daughter and went to law school with her, although there should not be a problem if he is seated on the jury. COURT SO NOTED.

PROSPECTIVE JURORS PRESENT:

Further voir dire.

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF PROSPECTIVE JURORS:

Counsel made record as to bench conferences.

Court recessed for the evening.

PRINT DATE: 07/02/2012

Page 2 of 2

Minutes Date:

May 21, 2012

May 22, 2012 COURT MINUTES Felony/Gross Misdemeanor State of Nevada C-10-268285-1 Guillermo Renteria-Novoa

May 22, 2012

10:30 AM

Jury Trial

HEARD BY:

Tao, Jerome T.

COURTROOM:

COURT CLERK: Tia Everett

RECORDER:

Sara Richardson

PARTIES

PRESENT:

Michelle Fleck and Nickolas Graham, Deputy District Attorneys, present

on behalf of the State. Defendant present, in custody and represented by

Michael Feliciano and Amy Feliciano, Deputy Public Defenders.

# JOURNAL ENTRIES

APPEARANCES CONTINUED: Maria Peralta de Gomez, Irma Sanchez, and Richard Evans, Spanish Court Interpreters, present with Defendant.

# OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS:

Second Amended Information FILED IN OPEN COURT. Court noted badge number 064 Charlotte Temple, has not arrived as of yet. Upon Court's inquiry, Ms. Fleck advised she has no opposition to excusing badge number 064 to proceed. Mr. Feleciano submitted. COURT ORDERED, badge number 064 EXCUSED. Court further noted, Josephina Dooley, Tagalog Interpreter, present with badge number 069 and Rico Rodriguez, Spanish Interpreter, present with badge number 068. Court Marshal informed the Court badge number 064, Charlotte Temple has arrived.

PROSPECTIVE JURORS PRESENT :

Further voir dire.

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS:

PRINT DATE:

07/02/2012

Page 1 of 2

Minutes Date:

May 22, 2012

Arguments by counsel as to challenges for cause for the record.

PROSPECTIVE JURORS PRESENT:

Further voir dire.

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS:

Counsel completed peremptory challenges. Mr. Feliciano made Batson Challenge as to the State's challenges. Arguments by Ms. Fleck. COURT ORDERED, Batson Challenge DENIED.

PROSPECTIVE JURORS PRESENT:

Jury and (2) alternate(s) selected and sworn. Clerk read the Second Amended Information to the jury and stated the defendant's plea thereto.

Court recessed for the evening.

May 23, 2012 COURT MINUTES Felony/Gross Misdemeanor State of Nevada C-10-268285-1 Guillermo Renteria-Novoa

May 23, 2012

10:00 AM

**Jury Trial** 

HEARD BY:

Tao, Jerome T.

COURTROOM:

Tia Everett COURT CLERK:

RECORDER:

Sara Richardson

PARTIES

PRESENT:

Michelle Fleck and Nickolas Graham, Deputy District Attorneys, present

on behalf of the State. Defendant present, in custody and represented by

Michael Feliciano and Amy Feliciano, Deputy Public Defenders.

# **IOURNAL ENTRIES**

- APPEARANCES CONTINUED: Maria Peralta de Gomez, Yul Haasman, and Sylvia Page, Spanish Court Interpreters, present with Defendant.

## **JURY PRESENT:**

Opening statements by counsel. Testimony and exhibits presented. (See worksheets).

# OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:

Ms. Fleck stated the Silver State counseling records which were just received this week, which were provided to defense, and in the report there are progress notes which state the victim and her Aunt are hesitant to tell the victim's Mother about the abuse because she will confront the Defendant and will cause problems with their citizenship status. Further, Ms. Fleck stated defense now intends to cross the victim on the issues of her immigration status which is prejudicial and is not relevant. Mr. Feliciano stated when he filed his discovery motion he requested any benefits given to any of the witnesses and that motion was granted. Upon Court's inquiry, Ms. Fleck stated that there were not any benefits given. Ms. Feliciano stated that the victim tells the counselor that she did not disclose Minutes Date: May 23, 2012 Page 1 of 2 07/02/2012

PRINT DATE:

the abuse based on the immigration status of both the victim and her Mother and defense is entitled to ask if any type of benefit such as a U visa was given based on the fact she is a victim. Further arguments by counsel. Court noted Roxanna Perez, present outside the presence of the jury. Court inquired as to what her immigration/citizenship status is at the present time. Roxanna Perez, advised she has a work permit. Upon questioning by Ms. Fleck and Mr. Feliciano, Roxanna Perez, stated her Mother was told to apply for the U visa based on the fact that she was victim of a crime. Further discussion regarding U visa. Mr. Feliciano moved for mistrial. COURT ORDERED, Defense may address the issue of the U visa and defense Request for mistrial DENIED.

## JURY PRESENT:

Further testimony and exhibits presented. (See worksheets).

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:

Colloquy regarding jury instructions and scheduling.

Court recessed for the evening.

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor

COURT MINUTES

May 24, 2012

C-10-268285-1

State of Nevada

Guillermo Renteria-Novoa

May 24, 2012

12:00 AM

Jury Trial

HEARD BY:

Tao, Jerome T.

COURTROOM:

COURT CLERK: Tia Everett

RECORDER:

Sara Richardson

**PARTIES** 

PRESENT:

Michelle Fleck and Nickolas Graham, Deputy District Attorneys, present

on behalf of the State. Defendant present, in custody and represented by

Michael Feliciano and Amy Feliciano, Deputy Public Defenders.

# JOURNAL ENTRIES

- APPEARANCES CONTINUED: Lorena Pike and Maria Peralta de Gomez, Spanish Court Interpreters, present with Defendant.

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:

Colloquy regarding jury instructions.

JURY PRESENT:

Further testimony and exhibits presented. (See worksheets).

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:

Defendant advised of his right not to testify.

JURY PRESENT:

07/02/2012 PRINT DATE:

Page 1 of 2

Minutes Date:

May 24, 2012

Further testimony and exhibits presented. (See worksheets).

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:

Instructions settled.

JURY PRESENT:

Court instructed the jury. Closing arguments. At the hour of 7:49 PM, the jury retired to deliberate.

Court recessed for the evening.

Felony/Gross Mis	sdemeanor COURT MINUTES	May 25, 2012
C-10-268285-1	State of Nevada	
	vs Guillermo Renteria-Novoa	

May 25, 2012

10:00 AM

Jury Trial

HEARD BY:

Tao, Jerome T.

COURTROOM:

COURT CLERK: Michele Tucker

RECORDER:

Sara Richardson

PARTIES PRESENT: Feliciano, Mike Fleck, Michelle

Graham, Nickolas J.

Porray, Amy A.

State of Nevada

Attorney for Defendant

Deputy District Attorney Deputy District Attorney

Attorney for Defendant

Plaintiff

# JOURNAL ENTRIES

- At the hour of 10:00 a.m., deliberations commenced.

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY: Telephone Conference between The Court and Counsel regarding question from Jury about a written transcript coming back for review. COURT ORDERED, Jury to review the CD.

INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY: At the hour of 2:58 p.m., the Jury returned with the following Verdicts:

COUNTS 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10,12, 13, 14,15, 17, 18, 20, 21, - GUILTY, SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14 (F);

COUNTS 3, 7, 8, 16, 19, 22 - GUILTY, LEWDNESS WITH A CHILD UNDER THE AGE OF 14 (F);

COUNTS 11, 31, 36 - GUILTY - OPEN OR GROSS LEWDNESS (GM);

COUNTS 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30 - GUILTY, SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 16 (F);

COUNTS 32, 33, 34, AND 35 - GUILTY, SEX ASSAULT (F)

Jury polled at the request of Defense counsel. Court thanked and excused the Jury.

PRINT DATE:

06/01/2012

Page 1 of 2

May 25, 2012

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY: COURT ORDERED, NO BAIL. FURTHER, matter REFERRED to Parole and Probation and SET for SENTENCING.

CUSTODY

8/30/128:30 AM SENTENCING

PRINT DATE:

06/01/2012

Page 2 of 2

Minutes Date:

May 25, 2012

Felony/Gross Misdemeanor

**COURT MINUTES** 

September 06, 2012

C-10-268285-1

State of Nevada

Guillermo Renteria-Novoa

September 06, 2012

10:30 AM

Sentencing

HEARD BY:

Tao, Jerome T.

COURTROOM: RJC Courtroom 10D

COURT CLERK: Linda Skinner; Louisa Garcia/lg

RECORDER:

Sara Richardson

REPORTER:

**PARTIES** 

PRESENT:

Feliciano, Mike

Fleck, Michelle

Renteria-Novoa, Guillermo

Attorney for Defendant

Attorney for State

Defendant

#### **JOURNAL ENTRIES**

- Hector Vasquez-Mena, Court Interpreter, also present.

Pursuant to the verdict of the Jury, DEFT RENTERIA-NOVOA ADJUDGED GUILTY OF COUNTS 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 14 (F); COUNTS 3, 7, 8, 16, 19, 22 - LEWDNESS WITH A CHILD UNDER THE AGE OF 14 (F); COUNTS 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30 - SEXUAL ASSAULT WITH A MINOR UNDER THE AGE OF 16 (F); COUNTS 11, 31, 36 - OPEN OR GROSS LEWDNESS (GM); COUNTS 32, 33, 34, 35 - SEXUAL ASSAULT (F). Arguments by counsel in mitigation of sentence. No Statement by the Defendant. Victim Speaker, with the assistance of Carol Partiguian, Court Interpreter, sworn and gave victim impact statement.

COURT ORDERED, in addition to the \$25.00 Administrative Assessment fee, a \$150.00 DNA Analysis fee including testing to determine genetic markers and \$880 restitution, Deft. SENTENCED as follows:

PRINT DATE:

09/10/2012

Page 1 of 4

Minutes Date:

- COUNTS 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21 LIFE with the possibility of parole after TWENTY (20) YEARS;
- COUNTS 3, 7, 8, 16, 19, 22 LIFE with the possibility of parole after TEN (10) YEARS;
- COUNTS 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30 LIFE with possibility of parole after TWENTY FIVE (25) YEARS;
- COUNTS 11, 31, 36 TWELVE (12) MONTHS Clark County Detention Center (CCDC);
- COUNTS 32, 33, 34, 35 LIFE with the possibility of parole after TEN (10) YEARS, with 762 DAYS credit for time served.

FURTHER COURT ORDERED, COUNT 3 TO RUN CONSECUTIVE TO COUNT 1; COUNT 6 TO RUN CONSECUTIVE TO COUNTS 1 & 3; COUNT 23 TO RUN CONSECUTIVE TO COUNTS 1, 3, & 6 AND COUNT 32 TO RUN CONSECUTIVE TO COUNTS 1, 3, 6 & 23; REMAINING COUNTS TO RUN CONCURRENT.

FURTHER COURT ORDERED, a special SENTENCE OF LIFETIME SUPERVISION is imposed upon release from incarceration and pursuant to NRS 179D.450, the defendant must register as a sex offender within 48 hours of release from custody.

Registration after conviction; duties and procedure; offender or sex offender informed of duty to register; effect of failure to inform; duties and procedure upon receipt of notification from another jurisdiction or Federal Bureau of Investigation.

- 1. If the Central Repository receives notice from a court pursuant to NRS 176.0926 that an offender has been convicted of a crime against a child, pursuant to NRS 176.0927 that a sex offender has been convicted of a sexual offense or pursuant to NRS 62F.220 that a juvenile has been adjudicated delinquent for an offense for which the juvenile is subject to registration and community notification pursuant to NRS 179D.010 to 179D.550, inclusive, the Central Repository shall:
- (a) If a record of registration has not previously been established for the offender or sex offender, notify the local law enforcement agency so that a record of registration may be established; or
- (b) If a record of registration has previously been established for the offender or sex offender, update the record of registration for the offender or sex offender and notify the appropriate local law enforcement agencies.
- 2. If the offender or sex offender named in the notice is granted probation or otherwise will not be incarcerated or confined, the Central Repository shall:
- (a) Immediately provide notification concerning the offender or sex offender to the appropriate local law enforcement agencies and, if the offender or sex offender resides in a jurisdiction which is outside of this State, to the appropriate law enforcement agency in that jurisdiction; and
  - (b) Immediately provide community notification concerning the offender or sex offender pursuant

PRINT DATE:

09/10/2012

Page 2 of 4

Minutes Date:

to the provisions of NRS 179D.475.

- 3. If an offender or sex offender is incarcerated or confined and has previously been convicted of a crime against a child as described in NRS 179D.0357 or a sexual offense as described in NRS 179D.097, before the offender or sex offender is released:
- (a) The Department of Corrections or a local law enforcement agency in whose facility the offender or sex offender is incarcerated or confined shall:
- (1) Inform the offender or sex offender of the requirements for registration, including, but not limited to:
- (I) The duty to register initially with the appropriate law enforcement agency in the jurisdiction in which the offender or sex offender was convicted if the offender or sex offender is not a resident of that jurisdiction pursuant to NRS 179D.445;
- (II) The duty to register in this State during any period in which the offender or sex offender is a resident of this State or a nonresident who is a student or worker within this State and the time within which the offender or sex offender is required to register pursuant to NRS 179D.460;
- (III) The duty to register in any other jurisdiction during any period in which the offender or sex offender is a resident of the other jurisdiction or a nonresident who is a student or worker within the other jurisdiction;
- (IV) If the offender or sex offender moves from this State to another jurisdiction, the duty to register with the appropriate law enforcement agency in the other jurisdiction;
- (V) The duty to notify the local law enforcement agency for the jurisdiction in which the offender or sex offender now resides, in person, and the jurisdiction in which the offender or sex offender formerly resided, in person or in writing, if the offender or sex offender changes the address at which the offender or sex offender resides, including if the offender or sex offender moves from this State to another jurisdiction, or changes the primary address at which the offender or sex offender is a student or worker; and
- (VI) The duty to notify immediately the appropriate local law enforcement agency if the offender or sex offender is, expects to be or becomes enrolled as a student at an institution of higher education or changes the date of commencement or termination of the offender or sex offender s enrollment at an institution of higher education or if the offender or sex offender is, expects to be or becomes a worker at an institution of higher education or changes the date of commencement or termination of the offender or sex offender s work at an institution of higher education; and

PRINT DATE:

09/10/2012

Page 3 of 4

Minutes Date:

- (2) Require the offender or sex offender to read and sign a form stating that the requirements for registration have been explained and that the offender or sex offender understands the requirements for registration, and to forward the form to the Central Repository.
  - (b) The Central Repository shall:
    - (1) Update the record of registration for the offender or sex offender;
- (2) Provide community notification concerning the offender or sex offender pursuant to the provisions of NRS 179D.475; and
- (3) Provide notification concerning the offender or sex offender to the appropriate local law enforcement agencies and, if the offender or sex offender will reside upon release in a jurisdiction which is outside of this State, to the appropriate law enforcement agency in that jurisdiction.
- 4. The failure to provide an offender or sex offender with the information or confirmation form required by paragraph (a) of subsection 3 does not affect the duty of the offender or sex offender to register and to comply with all other provisions for registration.
- 5. If the Central Repository receives notice from another jurisdiction or the Federal Bureau of Investigation that an offender or sex offender is now residing or is a student or worker within this State, the Central Repository shall:
- (a) Immediately provide notification concerning the offender or sex offender to the appropriate local law enforcement agencies;
  - (b) Establish a record of registration for the offender or sex offender, and
- (c) Immediately provide community notification concerning the offender or sex offender pursuant to the provisions of NRS 179D.475.

(Added to NRS by 1997, 1655; A 1999, 1300; 2001, 2058; 2001 Special Session, 227; 2003, 289, 573, 1122; 2007, 2765, 3252).

CASE CLOSED. BOND, IF ANY EXONERATED.

NDC

PRINT DATE:

09/10/2012

Page 4 of 4

Minutes Date:

Electronically Filed 12/11/2012 08:49:33 AM

TRAN 1 CLERK OF THE COURT 2 3 4 DISTRICT COURT 5 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 6 7 8 THE STATE OF NEVADA, 9 CASE NO. C-10-268285-1 Plaintiff, 10 DEPT. XX VS. 11 GUILLERMO RENTERIA-NOVOA, (ARRAIGNMENT HELD IN DEPT. LLA) 12 Defendant. 13 14 BEFORE THE HONORABLE MELISA DE LA GARZA, HEARING MASTER 15 FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 2010 16 RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING RE: ARRAIGNMENT CONTINUED 17 18 APPEARANCES: 19 GLEN P. O'BRIEN, ESQ., For the State: 20 Chief Deputy District Attorney 21 MIKE FELICIANO, ESQ., For the Defendant: Deputy Public Defender 22 23 MARIA PETERS, Also Present: Court Interpreter 24 25 RECORDED BY: KIARA SCHMIDT, COURT RECORDER

# FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 2010

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25 PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: All right. This is page two, State of Nevada versus Guillermo Renteria-Novoa, C268285. He is present in custody with the Interpreter.

Ms. Interpreter, if you'd just state your appearance for the record.

THE INTERPRETER: Yes, your Honor. My name is Maria Peters.

THE COURT: Thank you.

THE INTERPRETER: You're welcome.

MR. FELICIANO: Mike Feliciano for Mr. Renteria-Novoa. This is going to be a not-guilty plea and we are going to waive our right to a speedy trial.

THE COURT: Okay. Is it an Information?

MR. FELICIANO: It is. We'll -- it's quite lengthy.

THE COURT: All right, sir.

MR. FELICIANO: We'll waive the reading.

THE COURT: Did you receive a copy of the Information stating the charges against you?

THE DEFENDANT [Through the Interpreter]: He says that, yes.

THE COURT: All right. Did you read through it and understand it?

MR. FELICIANO: We -- he didn't read it because he can't read --

THE COURT: I'm sorry. Did -- was it read to you by either the Interpreter or

your attorney?

THE DEFENDANT [Through the Interpreter]: Today?

MR. FELICIANO: Not today.

23

24

MR. FELICIANO: And, Judge, I don't think the prelim transcript has been

filed, but I do have a copy. We're going to ask for 21 days from today to file any

writs. THE COURT: Yes. That'll be the order. MR. FELICIANO: Thank you. (Whereupon, the proceedings concluded.) ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the audio/video proceedings in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability. Kiara Schmidt, Court Recorder/Transcriber 

	<b>1</b>
	Electronically Filed
	11/19/2012 11:19:59 AM
1	DISTRICT COURT
2	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA Alm & Chum
3	CLERK OF THE COURT  * * * *
- 1	
4	
5	STATE OF NEVADA,
б	Plaintiff,
7	vs. ) Case No. C268285 ) Dept. XIV
8	GUILLERMO RENTERIO-NOVOA, )
9	Defendant. )
10	
11	
	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT
12	OF
13	DEFENDANT'S PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS STATUS CHECK: DISCOVERY
14	BEFORE THE HONORABLE DONALD M. MOSLEY
15	DISTRICT JUDGE
16	
	Taken on Wednesday, January 26, 2011
17	At 9:00 a.m.
18	
19	
20	APPEARANCES:
	For the State: CHRISTOPHER P. PANDELIS, ESQ.
21	Curer Deback Discrice Mecornel
22	For the Defendant: MIKE FELICIANO, ESQ.
0.5	Deputy Public Defender
23	<b>&gt;</b>   .

Maureen Schorn, CCR No. 496, RPR

24

25

Reported by:

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA. WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 26, 2011, 9:00 A.M. THE COURT: C268285, State versus Guillermo Renterio-Novoa, N-o-v-o-a. The record will reflect the 6 presence of the defendant in custody. The Court's interpreter is present. Mr. Feliciano is Defense counsel, Mr. Pandelis for the State. And the matter is on for a petition for a writ of habeas corpus and status check, discovery. Let's take the 10 11 discovery matter. At the outset, are there any problems with discovery? 12 MR. FELICIANO: At this point there isn't, 13 and if there is, then we'll definitely address that. 14 THE COURT: Now, we discussed this matter in 15 chambers, and it appears that both counsel have a problem-16 making this trial date of the 7th of March; is that 17 18 correct? MR. FELICIANO: That's correct. 19 MR. PANDELIS: Yes, Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: And we investigated the 21 22 possibility of changing it to the 16th of May. So if that's agreed, the trial date will be the 16th of May. 23 Calendar call? 24

THE CLERK: May 9th, 9:00 a.m.

25

```
THE COURT: And we'll set another date.
1
                             Status check discovery will be
                 THE CLERK:
2
   March 16th at 9:00 a.m.
3
                              Let's strike that. Let's make
                  THE COURT:
    that in April.
                  THE CLERK: How about April 13th?
6
                  THE COURT: So you have those dates;
    April 13th, May 9th and May 16th?
8
                  MR. FELICIANO: Yes, Your Honor.
 9
                  THE COURT: All right. Now, the petition
1.0
    for a writ of habeas corpus involves eleven counts wherein
11
     immigration is an issue.
12
              And then in Count 27, I believe, is the count
13
     that the Defense wishes to have stricken because they
14
     don't think the facts amount to an attempt; is that
15
     correct, Mr. Feliciano?
16
                   MR. FELICIANO: That's correct.
 17
                    THE COURT: Is there anything further to be
 18
      said here?
 19
                    MR. FELICIANO:
                                  No.
 20
                    MR. PANDELIS: Submit it on the pleadings,
 21
      Your Honor.
 22
                    THE COURT: Well, I examined the transcript
 23
      of the preliminary hearing, and I am satisfied that
 24
      penetration was sufficiently shown. So that involved
  25
```

eleven counts, I can't name them offhand, but I think we all know what we're talking about here. MR. PANDELIS: Yes, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: On Count 27, I'm inclined to 4 agree with the Defense, I don't think that the facts that 5 were adduced at the preliminary hearing were sufficient to 6 show an actual attempt. 7 Certain preparation solicitation, but no attempt 8 so I'm going to strike that. There is cause to have 9 stricken Count 27. Is there anything further? 10 MR. FELICIANO: No, Your Honor. 11 MR. PANDELIS: No, Judge. 12 THE COURT: You look a little perplexed, 13 Mr. Pandelis. Is there something more? 14 MR. PANDELIS: No. 15 THE COURT: Good enough. Thank you. 16 17 ATTEST: Full, true and accurate transcript of 18 proceedings. 19 20 SCHORN, GCR NO. 496. 21 22 23 24 25

Electronically Filed 12/05/2012 01:53:17 PM

RTRAN CLERK OF THE COURT 2 DISTRICT COURT 3 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 4 5 THE STATE OF NEVADA, CASE NO. C268285 6 Plaintiff, DEPT. NO. XX 7 VS. 8 GUILLERMO RENTERIA-NOVOA, 9 Defendant. 10 BEFORE THE HONORABLE DAVID BARKER, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE 11 12 TUESDAY, APRIL 19, 2011 13 RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT OF MOTION IN LIMINE TO PRECLUDE THE 14 STATE'S EXPERTS FROM IMPROPER VOUCHING AND TO PREVENT "EXPERTS" FROM TESTIFYING OUTSIDE THEIR AREA OF EXPERTISE; 15 DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR DISCOVERY; AND DEFENDANT'S MOTION IN LIMINE TO PRECLUDE USE OF THE PREJUDICIAL TERM "VICTIM" 16 17 18 APPEARANCES: 19 JOHN FATTIG For the State: Chief Deputy District Attorney 20 21 **CLAUDIA ROMNEY** For Defendant: Deputy Public Defender 22 23 RECORDED BY: SARA RICHARDSON, COURT RECORDER 24 ALSO PRESENT: ALEX ANDRADE, Interpreter 25 Page 1

Novoa. Record should reflect the presence of the defendant in custody. MS. ROMNEY: Additionally, Your Honor, we're waiting for Mike Feliciano THE COURT: All right. So we'll trail this matter. [Proceeding trailed until 9:18 a.m.] THE COURT: C268285, State of Nevada versus Guillermo Renteria-Novoa. The record should reflect the presence again of the defendant in custody, Would you state your appearance for the record, please? Counsel, defense counsel and State previously identified, this is time set for motion in limine to preclude State's expert from improperly vouching and to prevent experts from testifying outside their scope of expertise. I thought we were THE COURT: All right. Well, frankly, I was going to pass this for Judge Tao anyway. I didn't spend any time reading it this morning. I was doing my own calendar. Unless -- I could help push through any of the issues on discovery, but since we don't have special teams on either side in the room, why don't we just set

1	this for the next available date for Judge Tao.		
2	THE CLERK: April 28, 9:00 a.m.		
3	THE COURT: Mr. Renteria, do you understand, I'm continuing this for the		
4	assigned judge to hear it and make these decisions?		
5	THE DEFENDANT: Uh-huh.		
6	THE COURT: Do you have any questions?		
7	THE DEFENDANT: Where's my attorney?		
8	THE COURT: Your attorney is actually the attorney here is an attorney that		
9	works in your attorney's office. All she's doing right now is writing the new date,		
10	which is the 28 <sup>th</sup> of April. And she's going to tell that lawyer that that lawyer needs		
11	to be here. So we're not making any decisions today. And it's not and frankly,		
12	we're not continuing it because your lawyer's not here, we're continuing it because		
13	the assigned judge is not here; do you understand?		
14	THE DEFENDANT: Okay.		
15	THE COURT: All right.		
16	PROCEEDING CONCLUDED AT 9:19 A.M.		
17	****		
18			
19			
20			
21			
22	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the audio-		
23	video recording of this proceeding in the above-entitled case.		
24	SARA RICHARDSON		
25	Court Recorder/Transcriber		

Electronically Filed 12/05/2012 01:58:37 PM

1	RTRAN	Alun & Chum		
2		CLERK OF THE COURT		
3				
4	DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA			
5	THE STATE OF NEVADA,	) ) ) CASE NO. C268285		
7	Plaintiff, vs.	) DEPT. NO. XX )		
8	GUILLERMO RENTERIA-NOVOA,	<b>)</b>		
9	Defendant.	<b>)</b> <b>)</b>		
10		)		
11 12	BEFORE THE HONORABLE JEROME T. TAO, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE			
13	THURSDAY, APRIL 28, 2011			
14 15	RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT OF MOTION IN LIMINE TO PRECLUDE THE STATE'S EXPERTS FROM IMPROPER VOUCHING AND TO PREVENT "EXPERTS" FROM TESTIFYING OUTSIDE THEIR AREA OF EXPERTISE; DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR DISCOVERY; AND DEFENDANT'S MOTION IN LIMINE TO PRECLUDE USE OF THE PREJUDICIAL TERM "VICTIM"			
1,6,				
17		·		
18	ADDEADANGEO			
19	APPEARANCES:	LICATUTATON		
20	For the State:	LISA LUZAICH Chief Deputy District Attorney		
21	For Defendant:	AMY PORRAY		
22		Deputy Public Defender		
23				
24	RECORDED B1. SARA RICHARDSON, COORT RECORDER			
25				
	Page 1			

l.			
1	MS. LUZAICH: It's been continued a couple times, and there's a trial date		
2	next month. So maybe just next week.		
3	MS. PORRAY: That would be fine.		
4	MS. LUZAICH: Is that okay with the Court?		
5	THE COURT: All right. That's fine.		
6	MS. PORRAY: Oh, actually		
7	THE COURT: All right. We'll be		
8	MS. PORRAY: Can we do it Tuesday? He would be unavailable on		
9	Thursday.		
10	THE COURT: Oh, okay. We can do Tuesday. Tuesday's a bigger calendar,		
11	but that's fine. All right. Let's do Tuesday then.		
12	THE CLERK: May 3 <sup>rd</sup> , 9:00 a.m.		
13	MS. PORRAY: Thank you.		
14	MS. LUZAICH: Thank you.		
15	PROCEEDING CONCLUDED AT 9:41 A.M.		
1.6	**************************************		
17			
18			
19			
20			
21	have truly and correctly transcribed the audio-		
22	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the audio-video recording of this proceeding in the above-entitled case.		
23	Sau Richardon		
24	SARA RICHARDSON Court Recorder/Transcriber		
25			

Electronically Filed 12/05/2012 02:00:32 PM

RTRAN 1 CLERK OF THE COURT 2 DISTRICT COURT 3 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 4 5 THE STATE OF NEVADA, CASE NO. C268285 6 DEPT. NO. XX Plaintiff, 7 VS. 8 GUILLERMO RENTERIA-NOVOA, 9 Defendant. 10 BEFORE THE HONORABLE JEROME T. TAO, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE 11 12 TUESDAY, MAY 3, 2011 13 RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT OF MOTION IN LIMINE TO PRECLUDE THE 14 STATE'S EXPERTS FROM IMPROPER VOUCHING AND TO PREVENT "EXPERTS" FROM TESTIFYING OUTSIDE THEIR AREA OF EXPERTISE; 15 DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR DISCOVERY; AND DEFENDANT'S MOTION IN LIMINE TO PRECLUDE USE OF THE PREJUDICIAL TERM "VICTIM" 16 17 18 APPEARANCES: 19 LISA LUZAICH For the State: Chief Deputy District Attorney 20 21 **MIKE FELICIANO** For Defendant: Deputy Public Defender 22 23 RECORDED BY: SARA RICHARDSON, COURT RECORDER 24 ALSO PRESENT: PHILLIP CUARTAS, Interpreter 25 Page 1

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, TUESDAY, MAY 3, 2011, 10:20 A.M.

\* \* \* \* \*

•

7

THE COURT: Page 12, State versus Guillermo Renteria-Novoa, C268285.

MR. FELICIANO: Good morning, Judge, Mike Feliciano for Mr. Renteria. Do we have an interpreter?

THE COURT: And he is -- defendant is present in custody with an interpreter. Let's wait for a second.

MR. FELICIANO: May we approach?

THE COURT: Sure. And for the record, Mr. Interpreter, what is your name?

THE INTERPRETER: Phillip, P-H-I-L-I-P, Cuartas, C-U-A-R-T-A-S, from the Court Interpreters Office.

THE COURT: Thank you.

[Bench conference -- not transcribed]

THE COURT: All right. We're back on the record. This is on for three motions brought by the defense, a motion in limine to preclude the State's experts from giving certain testimony; a motion for discovery; and also a motion in limine to preclude the State from using the prejudicial term "victim." It's my understanding that as to the first motion in limine on the State's expert, the State is representing that they are not actually going to call an expert. But it's my understanding that the defense motion is essentially if they call an expert, that the expert shouldn't be allowed to testify in this particular way. And I think the State, because they're not planning on calling an expert at all, I'm assuming they have no opposition to that. But I don't know if you need a ruling on that or what?

MR. FELICIANO: Well, I mean, it would also apply to detectives and other people that are testifying as experts although they're not endorsed as such.

MS. LUZAICH: Well, I mean, what the motion says is we're not going to put an expert on the stand that will testify outside their area of expertise --

THE COURT: Right.

MS. LUZAICH: -- not necessarily they won't be an expert. But this is, I mean, the motion is premature. They need to object contemporaneously --

THE COURT: Right.

MS. LUZAICH: -- with the expert's testimony is the point.

THE COURT: Yeah, it's kind of a trial motion because you're sort of preemptively saying, well, experts shouldn't be allowed to testify outside their area of expertise, well, that's black letter law. If they try to do so, I'm sure you'll make an objection at the time of trial. And once I hear what they're saying, I can decide whether it is or is not outside the area of expertise. So, on that one, what we can do is --

MS. LUZAICH: Deny it as premature, and then he can make objections contemporaneously.

THE COURT: Yeah Right, exactly, that's exactly where I was going to do, is we can deny the motion now, but obviously, that's -- it's black letter law that experts can't testify outside their area of expertise. And if there's any objections at trial, I'll address them after I've heard the actual testimony.

As to the motion for discovery, it's my understanding that you guys actually wanted to go through the motion point by point and make a record, or at least have a ruling on every one of the discovery issues; is that correct?

MR. FELICIANO: Yes, Your Honor. We have the other one that we can dispose of pretty quickly, the victim motion, if you have that one.

THE COURT: Okay. Let's do that one first then. It's a motion in limine to

preclude the State from calling the -- well, from using the word "victim," and it's -- the basis of your motion is that the State hasn't -- well, it's very -- it's very -- the basis of your motion is that it's very much in contention whether or not a crime has actually occurred in this case; and therefore, you believe that the word "victim," to the extent it suggests the conclusion that the crime in fact did occur, that that term is prejudicial. Is that a fair summary of your motion?

MR. FELICIANO: Yeah, yeah. I mean, we're having a trial to determine if there, in fact, is a victim. So that's -- that's the point of my motion.

THE COURT: All right. And Ms. Luzaich, did you want to make a record on that?

MS. LUZAICH: Well, yeah, I mean, it's kind of a generic kind of term. It's not as if we're going to say in every single sentence, "The victim this, the victim that."

THE COURT: Right.

MS. LUZAICH: I mean, we can say once, "The victim in this is such-and-so, and this is what happened." But to say we can't use the word "victim" all, I mean, is kind of ridiculous.

MR. FELICIANO: Well, it's -- I don't think it's ridiculous. I mean, we can -- there's other words that we can use that wouldn't be overly burdensome. We can refer to people by their names, as the complaining witness, as accuser. We don't need to use the word "victim."

MS. LUZAICH: And the defense can do that. And we do refer to victims and witnesses by their names. But, you know, sometimes the word "victim" slips out, and we're not going to overuse it. But sometimes it slips out and it's appropriate.

THE COURT: Right. Here's what I'm going to do, I've read the cases. I'm not sure that all the cases that you cite actually support your proposition at least as to

the term "victim." But what I'm going to do is I'm going to deny the motion.

Ms Luzaich has done a lot of these cases before. If it turns out -- if it appears to me that she's abusing the term -- the word at trial, then I can make a ruling at that time. But just saying right now she can never use the word "victim" even once during a trial, I don't know that there's any case law that supports that. And so the motion's denied. But we'll address it at trial if there's any evidence that she's abusing it or taking advantage of it or overusing it or anything like that.

All right. On the motion for discovery then, in the motion you raise, let's see, how many points are there? A lot. There are 16 specific things that you are seeking. The State has filed a written opposition. It's my understanding that you guys actually want to go through all the 16 points one by one?

MR. FELICIANO: Yes, please.

MS. LUZAICH: For the most part, there's no objection.

THE COURT: Right.

MS. LUZAICH: Then the objection to the few that there is -- is more of a narrowing kind of thing.

THE COURT: Right. All right. Well, one of the ones that's in contention is point number one, which is the C.P.S. records. And it's my understanding that the State is agreeing that they — the defense is entitled to C.P.S. records concerning this event, but — but not to any other C.P.S. records that are not related to this event; is that correct?

MS. LUZAICH: Okay. Well, not necessarily they're entitled to, what we do with C.P.S. records is do an order having them sent to the Court --

THE COURT: Right.

MS. LUZAICH: -- for the Court to review them in camera:

THE COURT: Right.

MS. LUZAICH: And that we would certainly be happy to do.

THE COURT: Right, which I do all the time, right.

MS. LUZAICH: But what we would ask them to send the Court is records pertaining to this event not to anything pertaining to the family ever in the history of their lives.

THE COURT: Right.

MS. LUZAICH: That's not relevant.

THE COURT: Mr. Feliciano, what's your response?

MR. FELICIANO: Well, I mean, I absolutely think we're entitled to any notes concerning this event. However, if there's anything in the C.P.S. records that would be, say, *Miller* or *Summit* material, I think we would be entitled to that as well. I mean, that's another part of my request in another area of my motion. But we would be entitled to those C.P.S. records.

MS. LUZAICH: Right. And we -- when we get to that, I mean, I agree that we would have the obligation to ask the family, have there been any other allegations, have there been any false allegations that they're aware of.

THE COURT: Right. All right. And I think issues one --

MS. LUZAICH: One, two, and three are kind of together.

THE COURT: -- one, two, and three are all interrelated, they're kind of the same thing. So as to issues one, two, and three, I am going to order that the State produce for in-camera inspection any C.P.S. records concerning this event and/or any records of any mental health. I don't know if there have been any mental health evaluations, but on number three, any mental health evaluations relating to this case and any other records of social workers or case workers from C.P.S. concerning this

case for in-camera inspection.

All right. Number four, physical examinations.

MS. LUZAICH: They're absolutely entitled to that. They don't -- it was my understanding they had it, but if they don't, whatever they don't have they will get.

THE COURT: All right. So, the State is not opposing number four. So on number five --

MR. FELICIANO: So just for the record, Judge, that's granted?

THE COURT: Yeah, it's granted with no opposition by the State.

Number five?

MS. LUZAICH: Number five, you know, they're entitled to know that all witnesses get witness fees, that they're entitled to counseling. But I don't believe that they're entitled to the specifics of anything because the victims don't get any money. The money goes right to the counselors.

MR. FELICIANO: Well, I don't think we can get the information without actually knowing what the -- what the specifics are. So I'm not -- I'm not following you.

MS. LUZAICH: I mean, we're happy to say, yes, victims, you know, one, two, three were referred for counseling and went to counseling. But they don't need to know to whom and when and things of that nature.

MR. FELICIANO: Well, and we would disagree with that. And we think we would be entitled to all of that information.

MS. LUZAICH: Why? What's the relevance?

THE COURT: I mean, okay, so you're talking about — are we talking about compensation or are we talking about other, perhaps, psychiatrists or social workers that V.W.A.C. refers them to?

MR. FELICIANO: I'm talking about any information that V.W.A.C. has.

THE COURT: Well --

MS. LUZAICH: I mean, nobody's gotten anything. Nobody's bills are being paid for them, nobody's getting money or anything like that. The only thing --

THE COURT: Right V.W.A.C. doesn't do any of that, so I'm not sure whether --

MS. LUZAICH: Correct.

THE COURT: -- there even are any records.

MS. LUZAICH: The only thing they do is refer victims for counseling --

THE COURT: And they give them --

MS. LUZAICH: -- and then they actually pay it to the counselors.

THE COURT: Right.

MS. LUZAICH: The victim isn't getting anything. The victim's not getting, you know, \$100.00 every time they go to counseling.

THE COURT: Right.

MS: LUZAICH: They just get counseling.

MR. FELICIANO: Well, they're all -- but they're getting free counseling, which would be a benefit.

MS. LUZAICH: Right. And I said, they're entitled to the information that, for example, victim one, two, three was referred to and received counseling. That's the extent of the information they're entitled to.

THE COURT: Right. I mean, that's typically all that V.W.A.C. even has. All right. Well, here's what I'm going to do, on number five, since -- since most of these records that he referenced here probably don't even exist, is it fair to say, State, that you're technically not opposing it, that whatever V.W.A.C. has that you'll give 'em

23

24

25

because -- with the understanding that they probably don't have very much?

MS. LUZAICH: Well, they don't get the --

THE COURT: Is that a fair statement or not?

MS. LUZAICH: -- information that victim number one went to see counselor John Smith on 27 occasions. They just get the information that victim number one went to see a counselor. And the counselor was paid directly.

THE COURT: Right. Would V.W.A.C. even know how many times they went? They don't report back to V.W.A.C., do they?

MS. LUZAICH: Probably -- well, the victims don't. But the counselors do because they get paid.

THE COURT: Oh, because they get paid, right.

MS. LUZAICH: By the state fund. And it's not Victim Witness or the D.A.'s office that pays, it's the state fund that pays.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. FELICIANO: So, since that is a benefit, we would be entitled to know what payments were made, whatever log they keep of that.

MS. LUZAICH: Well, no, the counselor gets the benefit, not the victim. The victim gets counseling. That's the benefit, the counseling.

MR. FELICIANO: I would think counseling is a benefit though.

MS. LUZAICH: I don't think it's a benefit. I think it's unfortunate that the victim's been through what they've been through and therefore have to go to counseling, so I don't perceive it as a benefit. But --

MR. FELICIANO: But counseling isn't free. That's my point.

THE COURT: All right. Here's what I'm going to order, if V.W.A.C. has referred the victim to counseling, then they're entitled to know who the person was

referred to. I don't know that the -- that they're entitled to V.W.A.C.'s logs of how often they went to counseling. But there's -- yeah, I'm not sure what the -- I mean, I'm not sure what the difference between knowing that somebody was referred to counseling by V.W.A.C. and the State was paying for it out of a fund versus they went ten times and the State was paying it out of a fund when that fund is not -- it's a state fund, it's not in exchange for testimony or anything like that. I'm not sure what -- I'm not sure that you get much -- much more out of that. But to the extent that V.W.A.C. has information on any counseling that was -- that the victim was referred to, Ms. Luzaich, you -- you can turn that over. But I don't know that he needs the detailed logs on how often they went, what dates they went, and how many hours they were there, that kind of thing.

MR. FELICIANO: Okay. So, I'm just not sure what exactly I'm entitled to then. I mean, do I get to know how much was paid to the counselor? That would be the benefit.

THE COURT: Ms. Luzaich --

MS. LUZAICH: But it's not. The victim's not getting the monetary benefit, the counselor is.

MR. FELICIANO: And the counselor's getting the money because the counselor's providing counseling and the counseling is a service which is a benefit.

MS. LUZAICH: Right. So, they get to find out the victim was referred to counseling, they went, and that they went to this person.

THE COURT: And the State's paying for the counseling. Right. I mean, that's -- yeah, I mean, I think you're -- I mean, you're entitled to know if they were referred to counseling.

MS. LUZAICH: I'm not even sure that they did in fact go. So, I mean, I can't

even comment one way or another on that.

THE COURT: Right. It may be moot. There may be no such records. But let's assume for a second --

MS. LUZAICH: That is possible.

THE COURT: -- for the purposes of the motion that there was some referral and they actually went to the counseling and some amount of money was paid, what you're -- what I'm going to order is that the State has to indicate if there was a referral, and if the person actually went to counseling, but I don't know that -- but you're not going to -- you're not entitled to know how many times they went, what dates they went, and exactly how much money was paid because, again, I'm -- that's a benefit that doesn't go directly to the victim.

But it certainly is the kind of thing where if they went to a counselor, that could lead to discoverable evidence depending on what the nature of the counseling was. But in terms of how -- how many times they went, exactly how much money was paid, I don't know that that -- first of all, I'm not sure V.W.A.C. tracks that, but even if they do, I don't know that that helps you, and that and you're starting to get into the areas of potential privilege as well.

All right. So, number six --

MR. FELICIANO: So, that, I mean, as far as my request, that appears to be denied then?

THE COURT: It's granted in part. It's granted in part. You're entitled to know if V.W.A.C. referred them to counseling and if money was paid by V.W.A.C. through the state fund for any counseling that was — that they actually attended.

MR. FELICIANO: Okay. But not entitled to know how many times -THE COURT: The dates, how many times they went, yeah, that kind of thing.

MR. FELICIANO: And not entitled to know how much was actually paid?

THE COURT: Right.

MR. FELICIANO: Okay.

THE COURT: All right. Number six?

MS. LUZAICH: Not opposed.

THE COURT: Number six --

MS. LUZAICH: They're entitled to all of that, and I believe they've got it. And if there's anything else that comes up, we will get it to them.

THE COURT: Yeah, it's not opposed.

All right. Number seven?

MS. LUZAICH: They're not entitled to N.C.I.C. They're entitled to the information contained within, whether there are felonies convictions of witnesses --

THE COURT: No, I know. That's what I usually order is at least you --

MS. LUZAICH: -- misdemeanors to honesty, and --

THE COURT: Right. What my standard is, I'm going to order that you run N.C.I.C. You don't have to give the printouts because I understand that that's confidential. But if there is any information, any convictions within -- felony convictions within the last ten years or any felony convictions for which the term of parole, probation, or imprisonment ended within the last ten years, that's information that clearly is -- potentially exculpatory and any other information that -- additionally, any other possible misdemeanors or gross misdemeanors that may bear on credibility, theft, fraud, perjury, things like that.

You don't have to give the actual printouts, but you're entitled -- but you have to give the substantive information. And you understand your obligation, right?

MS. LUZAICH: I do. With all due respect to the Court, I don't think the Court

can order me to run N.C.I.C. pursuant to our agreement with N.C.I.C.; however, I mean, I want to know whether the witnesses have felony convictions and things of that nature. So I run them anyway.

THE COURT: Right. And if you run 'em, and you see any of that information, then you're required to turn that over.

MS. LUZAICH: Absolutely.

THE COURT: All right. Number eight?

MR. FELICIANO: I'm sorry, just to -- on seven, that was the issue of credibility, and just to make sure, that's also anything that would indicate any type of bias as well? Credibility and bias.

THE COURT: Like what? Other than -- other than convictions, what do you -- I'm not

MR. FELICIANO: Well, I mean, any type of conviction or anything that would either affect the witness's credibility or somehow bias the witness.

THE COURT: Well, other than what I've said, what else would that be?

MR. FELICIANO: Well, I don't know what's out there, so

MS. LUZAICH: I mean, for example, what kind of conviction could possibly bear on bias?

MR. FELICIANO: Well, if, without getting into too much, anything that's similar to this case.

MS. LUZAICH: Oh, all right.

MR. FELICIANO: Things like that, anything where -- well, it's another issue, but if the District Attorney's office prosecuted somebody for something or anything that would affect the witness's testimony. And they're pretty close, I mean, as far as the credibility-and-bias issue. But I just wanted to make -- that's one thing I added to

motion, I just wanted to make sure that was clear. Anything, of course, anything that's similar to this type of case would -- would definitely bias the witness.

THE COURT: Ms. Luzaich, your response?

MS. LUZAICH: I have no -- I mean, something along -- similar offense as this, that I understand. That's fine

THE COURT: Right. So you're not opposing that?

MS. LUZAICH: No.

THE COURT: All right. So ordered.

Number eight?

MS. LUZAICH: Prior allegations or false, I agree that, I mean, we've got the obligation to ask if any allegations were ever made, if they were false, and if they were we will turn them over. Just as long as the State -- or the defense understands that there are very specific requirements that they must follow should they choose to seek to use that information.

THE COURT: All right. Does that satisfy you, Mr. Feliciano?

MR. FELICIANO: Yes, so they will actually ask the witness?

MS. LUZAICH: Or family or --

MR. FELICIANO: Or whoever. Yeah, yeah.

THE COURT: All right. Number nine, it looks like the State's not opposing this one; is that correct?

MS. LUZAICH: That's correct. We'll ask.

THE COURT: All right. And number ten? Well, I mean, that's kind of broad, but --

MS. LUZAICH: You know what, I can't imagine that there is anything. But if something pops up we will certainly share it.

THE COURT: All right. Number 11?

MS. LUZAICH: They're entitled to that. If there's anything that they don't have, we will certainly give it. Pretty much everything else thereafter, they're entitled to it, if they don't have it already --

THE COURT: Yeah, I was going to say --

MS. LUZAICH: -- and it comes up, we will give it.

THE COURT: — all right. I was going to say, it looks like 12 to 16 are all unopposed.

MR. FELICIANO: Yeah. And just, I mean, to be clear on 11, we're, I mean, we're asking for any notes that weren't -- that didn't actually make it into the police report or any other type of reports or --

MS. LUZAICH: Correct, handwritten notes.

MR. FELICIANO: -- into Metro's system.

MS. LUZAICH: I understand. Generally, the notes get put into a police report and then destroyed. But if any notes have not been destroyed, then, yes, they're entitled to them.

THE COURT: All right. Then as I mentioned, 12 through 16 are all unopposed, is there anything else on this motion that you wanted on the record?

MR. FELICIANO: Well, as to -- Court's indulgence.

As to 15, we would ask that the District Attorney ask the witness if there's any type of immigration benefits as a result of this case.

THE COURT: Ms. Luzaich, your position?

MS. LUZAICH: We are not giving anybody any immigration benefits, period.

MR. FELICIANO: Well, not them necessarily, but there are certain, I mean, there's certain ways that people can get visas for if certain things happen.

MS. LUZAICH: If somebody comes to us for U visas, we do not sign them because we don't want people to think that they're getting benefits as this. So, nobody's getting any immigration benefits.

MR. FELICIANO: So, I would just request that if they ask if there's, I mean, any immigration benefits as a result of this case, not just from the D.A.'s office, but immigration benefits in general.

MS. LUZAICH: Okay, now if they go to Legal Aid, that has nothing to do with us.

MR. FELICIANO: Well, if they go to Legal Aid and they talk about this case, and Legal Aid helps them get a visa based on what they're told, then it does.

MS. LUZAICH: Well, it's my understanding that nothing happens regarding that until the case is concluded anyway.

MR. FELICIANO: Well, that's why I would just that the D.A. ask if there's any type of immigration case pending, open, any type of visa that has been applied for based on the allegations in this case.

THE COURT: Ms. Luzaich

MS, LUZAICH: Whatever.

THE COURT: -- you can just ask the question, I guess, the answer's probably going to be, no, but you never know.

MR. FELICIANO: Okay. So we'll ask?

THE COURT: Yeah, I'm going to require her to ask, it'll take her ten seconds to ask. All right. Anything else?

MR. FELICIANO: Nope, I think that's it.

THE COURT: All right. That takes care of all three motions, correct?

MR. FELICIANO: Yes.

1	THE COURT: All right. We have a calendar call date on May 17 <sup>th</sup> , I'll see you		
2	guys then if not earlier with any other motions then, all right.		
3	MR. FELICIANO: Thank you, Judge.		
4	PROCEEDING CONCLUDED AT 10:42 A.M.		
5	*****		
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16	and the programment of the state of the stat		
17			
18			
19			
20			
21	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the audio- video recording of this proceeding in the above-entitled case.		
22 23	Seur Richardon		
23 24	SARA RICHARDSON Court Recorder/Transcriber		
25	Godit (Cool dol) Transonios.		

RTRAN CLERK OF THE COURT 2 3 DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 5 THE STATE OF NEVADA, CASE NO. C268285 6 Plaintiff, DEPT, NO. XX VS. 8 GUILLERMO RENTERIA-NOVOA, 9 Defendant. 10 11 BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOSEPH BONAVENTURE, SENIOR JUDGE 12 TUESDAY, MAY 17, 2011 13 RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT OF CALENDAR CALL 14 15 16 17 18 APPEARANCES: 19 CHRISTOPHER P. PANDELIS For the State: **2**0 Deputy District Attorney 21 MIKE FELICIANO For Defendant: 22 Deputy Public Defender 23 24 RECORDED BY: SARA RICHARDSON, COURT RECORDER 25 ALSO PRESENT: FRANCISCO MADRIGAL, Interpreter Page 1

2

3

4

5

6

24

25

four-day stack -- or a four-day week.

THE CLERK: The November stack, the last week is November 7<sup>th</sup>, and it's a

4	DTDAN	Stun b. Commen	
1	RTRAN	CLERK OF THE COURT	
2			
3	DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA		
5 6 7 8 9	THE STATE OF NEVADA,  Plaintiff,  vs.  GUILLERMO RENTERIA-NOVOA,	CASE NO. C268285  DEPT NO. XX	
10	Defendant.	) )	
11 12	BEFORE THE HONORABLE JEROME T. TAO, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE		
13	TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 2011		
14_	RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT OF CALENDAR CALL		
	RECORDER O TRUMO		
15 16 17 18		and the second s	
19	APPEARANCES:		
20	For the State:	MICHELLE FLECK Deputy District Attorney	
21 22	For Defendant:	MIKE FELICIANO Deputy Public Defender	
23			
24	RECORDED BY: GARACTUST WAS STORY		
25	25 ALSO PRESENT: CARIDAD PFEIFFER, Interpreter		
		Page 1	

RTRAN CLERK OF THE COURT 2 DISTRICT COURT 3 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 4 5 THE STATE OF NEVADA, CASE NO. C268285 6 Plaintiff, DEPT. NO. XX 7 VS. 8 GUILLERMO RENTERIA-NOVOA, 9 Defendant. 10 BEFORE THE HONORABLE JEROME T. TAO, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE 11 12 TUESDAY, JANUARY 17, 2012 13 RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT OF CALENDAR CALL 14 15 16 17 18 APPEARANCES: 19 MICHELLE FLECK For the State: 20 Deputy District Attorney 21 MIKE FELICIANO For Defendant: Deputy Public Defender 22 23 RECORDED BY: SARA RICHARDSON, COURT RECORDER 24 ALSO PRESENT: SHIRLEY LANDBERG, Interpreter 25 Page 1

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, TUESDAY, JANUARY 17, 2012, 9:16 A.M.

\* \* \* \* \*

THE COURT: Bottom of two, State versus Guillermo Renteria-Novoa, C268285. Are you Mr. Renteria-Novoa?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you need the Spanish interpreter, sir?

MR. FELICIANO: He does.

THE COURT: Do we have the interpreter? Oh, we don't have one.

MR. FELICIANO: Could we approach briefly?

THE COURT: Sure.

[Bench conference -- not transcribed]

THE COURT: All right. First of all, it's my understanding that this case is not going to go. Mr. Renteria-Novoa, it's my understanding that there were -- well, your attorney believes that there are some things that you wanted to address with me today; is that correct? In terms of -- well, maybe -- maybe he misunderstood, or maybe I misunderstood, but it's my understanding that you and your attorney have been having some issues, and that you -- is that not correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. Either he -- I've been here for 18 months, and I see no results. Either he works for me or he should step aside, withdraw.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Renteria-Novoa, I don't know the details of what's going on between you and your attorney, this is how it works, under the law you are entitled to the assistance of a court-appointed attorney. You're not required, I mean, you're not permitted to pick and chose the attorney that you get. And Mr. Feliciano has been on your case, I know, for quite a long time. I can tell you that he's an extremely skilled and experienced attorney. He's assigned to one of the specialty

16: 

teams in the Public Defender's office, and you don't get assigned to that team unless you're a really good attorney and you've done a lot of trials and you really know what you're doing. So what I can tell you is you have one of the best attorneys for this type of case in town.

I don't know exactly what's going on here and what it is that you expected him to do, but based on my dealings with him, I'm confident that he's done everything that he thinks that he can do. And if there are things that still need to be done, he -- I mean, I don't want to speak for him, but just knowing of what he does and what his office does and the support system they have, he's probably in the process of doing them.

Now, what they've told me is he's still investigating, he's still working on some of the things that you need him to do and want him to do. And so this case is not going to trial next week. So we're going to reset this trial for a couple months down the road. And that will give him time to do more investigation and more preparation and maybe that will address some of the specific concerns that you have. I don't know what those concerns are, but there's still plenty of time for him to get this case ready and assert any defense that is warranted and appropriate.

All right. So that's the situation. We're resetting the trial so there's plenty of time for him to come and do more things, maybe you think he hasn't done enough. But again, based on my experience with him and knowing how his office works, I'm sure he's done a lot. And I know for a fact that motions have already been filed in this case.

All right. Does that address your concerns?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I expect some positive results.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So based on the conversation, let's reset this

trial. And Mr. Feliciano, you said that March wasn't good for you? MR. FELICIANO: It's not. I'm -- I think I'm set every week in March. THE COURT: All right. What's the stack after that? It begins, what's the exact date? THE CLERK: The next stack after the March stack is May -- it begins May 21<sup>st</sup>. THE COURT: May 21st, and then for the five weeks after that. Ms. Fleck, do you know what you schedule is or do you need time to --MS. FLECK: Can we just recall it in a few minutes? I'm just getting my schedule e-mailed to me. I should have brought it, but --THE COURT: All right. Let's do that. We'll trail it just for a moment just to get a trial date then. MS. FLECK: Thank you. [Proceeding trailed until 9:36 a.m.] THE COURT: Bottom of page two, State versus Guillermo Renteria-Novoa, C268285. Mr. Renteria-Novoa, again, is present in custody with the assistance of the Spanish interpreter. For the record, Madam Interpreter, what is your name? THE INTERPRETER: Shirley Landberg, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. And we were waiting for everyone to check their calendars for the trial date. MS. FLECK: So it would start the week of the 21st of May? THE COURT: Right. And go for five weeks after that, yeah, so 'til almost the end of June. 23 MS. FLECK: Okay. 24 THE CLERK: There's only four days in the --25

**RTRAN** 1 CLERK OF THE COURT 2 DISTRICT COURT 3 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 4 5 THE STATE OF NEVADA, CASE NO. C268285 6 DEPT. NO. XX Plaintiff, 7 VS. 8 GUILLERMO RENTERIA-NOVOA, 9 Defendant. 10 BEFORE THE HONORABLE JEROME T. TAO, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE 11 12 THURSDAY, MAY 10, 2012 13 RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT OF MOTION TO SUPPRESS 14 15 16 17 18 APPEARANCES: 19 MICHELLE FLECK For the State: Deputy District Attorney 20 21 MIKE FELICIANO For Defendant: Deputy Public Defender 22 23 RECORDED BY: SARA RICHARDSON, COURT RECORDER 24 ALSO PRESENT: MANUEL CALVILLO, Interpreter 25 Page 1

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, THURSDAY, MAY 10, 2012, 10:07 A.M.

\* \* \* \* \*

THE COURT: Bottom of nine, State versus Guillermo Renteria-Novoa, C268285.

MS. FLECK: Good morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Morning. This is on for a motion to suppress filed by the defendant. I'll note the defendant is present in custody. Does he need the interpreter or no?

MR. FELICIANO: He does.

THE COURT: Oh, okay. Let's give the interpreter a second, he's filling out his paperwork. All right. And I know you just said your name, and you've said it, like, ten times today, but for the record --

THE INTERPRETER: Manuel Calvillo, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

This is on for a motion to suppress a statement made by the defendant. I read the transcript here, I actually find it kind of interesting. On page two of the transcript he's read his *Miranda* rights, he says, "Do you understand your rights?" "Yes." "Do you still want to talk to me about Roxana?" And his next answer in the transcript is, "I don't want to forgot," and then it's a bunch of blanks. I don't know if somebody has the actual recording of this so I can hear what the blanks are because that's kind of an important statement.

MR. FELICIANO: When I filed the motion I sent a CD over with it. I don't know if that -- did that not make it?

THE COURT: It didn't make it through, yeah.

MR. FELICIANO: I can make another copy and provide it to the Court for you

to listen to.

MS. FLECK: And I don't have it -- I don't have the entire file, so I don't have the audio with me.

THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. But, I mean, obviously, that's -- that's kind of an important blank to have there in response to the question, "Do you want to talk to me?"

Anyway, so I've read the motion, I've read the response, it looks like the State has no opposition to a *Jackson v. Denno* hearing. The question is, we have a trial date of May 21<sup>st</sup>, so there's not that much time left to do a *Jackson v. Denno* hearing. I know the State's probably going to need some time to subpoena witnesses, that kind of thing. Or --

MS. FLECK: No, I mean, I would only have the detective. So --

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. FLECK: -- really, I think it's something that can be done --

THE COURT: Well, here's the question --

MS, FLECK: -- very quickly.

THE COURT: Yeah, we could do it a couple different ways, we could do it even the morning of trial, or do you want to do it earlier than that? I don't know what your preference is.

MR. FELICIANO: Well, when -- when would you have available, would it be in the afternoon or next week?

THE COURT: Well, our trial's not going next week apparently, so we could do it -- well, is that enough time for you to get your detective in here?

MS. FLECK: Are we first up on the stack for the trial? I mean, are there any murders or anything before us?

THE COURT: Oh, no, you're not, Johnny Brown is first. That's one that -yeah, that's a much older case. Is this overflow eligible or not? Yeah, I'd be
surprised, I mean, just reading the counts will take more than --

MS. FLECK: What's that?

THE COURT: I'm just joking. I was going to say because, you know, overflow has to be less than a week, there's 52 counts, just reading the instructions might be a day, so I'd be surprised if it's overflow eligible. I could be wrong. I'm just saying.

MS. FLECK: So you have a murder set that week?

THE COURT: It's not a murder, it's just -- it's a retrial of an older case is the problem.

MS. FLECK: Okay.

MR. FELICIANO: And that's likely going to go?

THE COURT: Yeah, it's a retrial, so, yeah, probably unless it deals in the next few days. How long is this trial going to be?

MS. FLECK: I would say a week. I don't -- I don't see how it would be more.

MR. FELICIANO: Unless we -- if we're in a department that just does afternoons it could go longer.

THE COURT: Well, I have Mondays and Fridays we can go 9:00 to 5:00. It's just Tuesdays, Wednesdays, Thursdays when I have morning calendars.

MR. FELICIANO: Okay.

THE COURT: And even Tuesday, Thursdays, you know, I'm usually done by about 10:15, we can start at 10:30. So it's three-quarters of a day.

MR. FELICIANO: That was -- that was more -- I mean, if we have to go to overflow, if we got a -- ended up in a department that was afternoons, we might go

22

23

24

25

over a week. But if we could maybe do the *Jackson v. Denno* hearing next week, whenever the Court is available.

THE COURT: The other idea my clerk just threw out, and I know this is probably a major inconvenience is I don't have a trial next week, the one that we thought was going to go is not going to go, we could move it up and try it next week. I don't know if that's doable with your witnesses.

MR. FELICIANO: Yeah, I won't be ready next week.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Well, let's at least set the *Jackson v. Denno* hearing. We can do that, the easiest way -- I usually set those after my Tuesday or Thursday morning calendar at around 10:30 or so. Is that enough time; you want next Tuesday or next Thursday?

MS. FLECK: Let's do Tuesday, but is there any way that we can do it right after lunch?

[Colloquy between the Court and the clerk]

THE COURT: With the courtroom sharing I have to make sure we have a courtroom, yeah.

MS. FLECK: Courtroom sharing. Yeah, because we both have so much going on in the mornings.

THE CLERK: And it probably is because you had a trial set.

THE COURT: Right, but let's double-check. The courtroom-sharing thing is --

Are we talking Tuesday or Thursday afternoon? Tuesday?

MS. FLECK: Tuesday would be great.

THE COURT: Okay. Good, let's do Tuesday afternoon then. Do you guys want --

THE CLERK: So do you want to do 1:00? 1:30?

**RTRAN CLERK OF THE COURT** 2 3 DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 4 5 THE STATE OF NEVADA, CASE NO. C268285 6 Plaintiff. DEPT. NO. XX 7 VS. 8 GUILLERMO RENTERIA-NOVOA, 9 Defendant. 10 11 BEFORE THE HONORABLE JEROME T. TAO, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE 12 TUESDAY, MAY 15, 2012 13 14 RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT OF CALENDAR CALL: MOTION TO SUPPRESS; AND JACKSON V. DENNO HEARING: 15 DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO SUPPRESS 16 17 APPEARANCES: 18 For the State: MICHELLE FLECK 19 NICKOLAS J. GRAHAM **Deputies District Attorney** 20 21 For Defendant: AMY A. FELICIANO MIKE FELICIANO 22 Deputies Public Defender 23 24 RECORDED BY: SARA RICHARDSON, COURT RECORDER 25 ALSO PRESENT: JEFF HANKS and CONSUELO CISNEROS, Interpreters Page 1

# INDEX OF WITNESSES

**INDEX OF EXHIBITS EXHIBITS** Defendant's Exhibit A Defendant's Exhibit B 

Page 3

<u>PAGE</u>

1	MS. FLECK: Nothing from the State.		
2	MR. FELICIANO: No, judge.		
3	THE COURT: All right. Then, State, do you have any witnesses present?		
4	MS. FLECK: I do. State would call Detective Jaeger.		
5	THE COURT: Are they out in the hallway right now or what?		
6	MS. FLECK: Yes, he is. Let me go get him.		
7	THE COURT: State, how many witnesses do you have total?		
8	MS. FLECK: Just one.		
9	THE COURT: Where did he go? Oh, he's Detective, we need you up		
10	here.		
11	MS. FLECK: Sorry.		
12	RYAN JAEGER,		
13	[having been called as a witness and being first duly sworn, testified as follows:]		
14	THE CLERK: Thank you. Please be seated. Please state your full name,		
15	spelling your first and last name for the record.		
- 16	THE WITNESS: My name a Ryan Jaeger, R-Y-A-N, J-A-E-G-E-R.		
17	THE COURT: All right. Before we proceed, Ms. Fleck, are you going to		
18	need the ELMO or anything? Any electronic stuff?		
19	MS. FLECK: I'm not.		
20	THE COURT: Okay. All right. You may proceed.		
2	MS. FLECK: Thank you, Your Honor.		
2	DIRECT EXAMINATION OF RYAN JAEGER		
2	BY MS. FLECK:		
2	Q Good afternoon, Detective. How are you employed?		
9	A With the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department.		

1	Q	And when you called him back, was he speaking did he identify	
2	himself as Renteria, Mr. Renteria-Novoa?		
3	A	Yes, he did.	
4	Q	And was he speaking English or Spanish?	
5	А	English.	
6	Q	Any problem understanding him that day?	
7	A	No.	
8	Q	You said that you then planned to meet down at the detective	
9	bureau?		
10	Α	Yes.	
11	Q	And that was on March 6th?	
12	Α	Yes.	
13	Q	He willingly came and voluntarily came that day?	
14	• A	That's correct.	
15	Q	Do you remember how he got to the detective bureau?	
16	` A.	* He drove himself."	
17	Q	Was he alone or with someone else?	
18	A	He was alone.	
19	Q	So what happened once he got to the bureau?	
20	A	We conducted a digitally recorded interview. After the interview he	
21	was released.		
22	Q	Do you see the person that you had identified as	
23	Mr. Renteria-Novoa and the person that came down to interview with you, do		
24	you see him in the courtroom today?		
25	А	Yes, I do.	

1	Α	Yes.	
2	Q	Did you have an opportunity to Mirandize the defendant?	
3	А	Yes, I did.	
4	Q	And did you do that from card or from memory?	
5	A	From card.	
6	Q	What was it that the what rights were given to him?	
7	А	His right to remain silent, his right to the presence of an attorney, if	
8	he could not afford an attorney one would be appointed.		
9	Q	Did he indicate to you during that interview and after you read him	
10	those rights that he understood those rights?		
11	А	Yes, he did.	
12	Q	And then what happened?	
13	Α	We conducted the interview. He, based on the phone call, he knew	
14	the allegations that were filed against him. During the phone call he said that he		
15	just kind of wanted to fix everything, and that's why he came down. We		
16	discussed the allegations and he admitted to most of them.		
17	Q	Okay. At any time during that entire interview did you have the	
18	feeling that the defendant couldn't understand the questions that you were		
19	posing?		
20	A	No.	
21	Q	Were his answers always articulate?	
22	Α	I wouldn't say always, but for the most part they were	
23	, Q	Maybe	
24	A	articulate.	
25	Q	that was a bad word. Were they always appropriate to the	

versus what was discussed at the interview room?

THE WITNESS: When he called on the phone he was worried that we were just going to take Roxana's word and he was automatically going to jail. I just discussed to him that if I just wanted to take him to jail I could just show up at whatever hour in the morning and take him to jail.

It was important that I get his side. We had to schedule the appointment for a time he wasn't working, so I think there was a gap in when it was scheduled. And I explained to him when I get his side, he'll be walking out of interview room.

THE COURT: All right.

THE WITNESS: And we'll submit it to the court. So that was -- that was a conversation that we had on the phone call scheduling the appointment.

THE COURT: All right. I appreciate that.

Cross-examination.

MR. FELICIANO: Thank you, Judge.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION OF RYAN JAEGER

## BY MR. FELICIANO:

- Q How long was the phone call? There was one phone call?
- A It's been a while. I know he left a message. I called him back. I couldn't say for sure that it was one phone call. But the norm is he would call and we would schedule an appointment that fits his schedule and mine.
- Q Okay. So when you set that appointment that's when you talked about wanting to get his side of the story?
  - A That's correct.
  - Q But when you first talked to him, was it, it was obvious to you that

1	Q	Now, during that conversation he told you that he didn't he wasn't	
2	comfortable speaking English; is that correct?		
3	Α	No, he never said that	
4	Q	He never said anything anything about not being able to speak	
5	English well?		
6	А	No.	
7	Q	Okay. How about during the recording?	
8	А	No.	
9	Q	Did he say that his English wasn't very good?	
10	Α	Not that I can remember.	
11	Q	All right.	
12	A	We communicated fine through phone calls and for a half an hour	
13	during the interview.		
14	Q	Okay. Page 13.	
15	MR. FELICIANO: May I approach?		
16	THE COURT: You may.		
17	BY MR. F	ELICIANO:	
18	Q	Okay. I'm approaching with a transcript on page 13, if you could	
19	read just that line to yourself.		
20	A	No, my English is not good.	
21	Q	Okay. So when you did interview him he did express concerns	
22	about his	ability to speak English; is that correct?	
23	Α	There was one sentence where he was he gave a reply and the	
24	tense was wrong. So he said, "No, my English is not good."		
25		And I believe I told him, your English is a lot better than my Spanish.	

1	Q	Okay. Do you speak Spanish?	
2	Α	Not at all.	
3	Q	Now are there interpreters available in the I.S.D. building?	
4	Α	Yes. Well, not in the building, but there is several detectives that	
5	speak Spanish.		
6	Q	So would that have been something that would have been difficult	
7	for you to set up if you wanted to get an interpreter for the interview?		
8	Α	It would have been a phone call.	
9	Q	All right. Now, is there a reason you didn't do that?	
10	A	I didn't think I needed one. There was no need for one.	
11	Q	And that's because, in your opinion, his English was was fine?	
12	A	That's correct. I was able to communicate quite openly with him.	
13	MR.	FELICIANO: Court's indulgence.	
14	THE	COURT: Sure.	
15	BY MR. FELICIANO:		
16	Q	Now, when you read him his rights, you read him his rights as soon	
17	as the recording started going, correct?		
18	A	I don't know immediately, but very shortly after the recording	
19	started.		
20	Q	Okay. You never asked him if he wanted to waive his rights; is that	
21	correct?		
22	A	I believe I asked him if he acknowledged his rights. It's in the	
23	transcripts	s. I don't know the exact words.	
24	Q	Okay.	
25	A	Or I asked him if he understands his rights. You would have to look	

∘16

language barrier, correct?

MS. FLECK: Well, and Judge, I'm just going to ask that if we're going to bring in that answer, that we get in the first question just to give it context and to be fair to the detective. If you look at the question he's basically saying, is there anything else you need to get off your chest, is there anything else you've been carrying around with you that you — if there was you might as well leave it here.

And then the paragraph that Mr. Feliciano refers to, I leave everything. I'm paying for my mistake. So you know, if you want to get out that paragraph I think it's fair --

MR. FELICIANO: That's fine.

MS. FLECK: -- to put it in context as to it's rambling because he is, it's a stream of consciousness, basically, of him getting everything off of his chest and sort of just haphazardly saying everything that's happened to him based upon the question that the detective posed to him.

MR. FELICIANO: I'm going to object at this point. Counsel's testifying.

THE-COURT: All right. So, Ms. Fleck, what's -- what's your objection then, you just want the --

MS. FLECK: Well, I would just like some context. To not, you know, for him to characterize it as that it's not him understanding, how can he say that it's -- that the defendant isn't understanding when we don't even know what the question is? So I would prefer that we just allow the question to come in to the record so that then when the answer is included it makes sense --

MR. FELICIANO: Okay.

MS. FLECK: Because it makes perfect sense with the question.

THE COURT: All right. Detective, do you, I know you just looked at the

transcript a second ago, did you read the question or did you not have time to read the question?

THE WITNESS: I read the question.

THE COURT: Okay. So, well, Ms. Fleck, do you want the question read into the record into the transcript of the record today? Is that what you're asking for? Because the detective said he read the question, so he understands the question. But I don't know if you want it in the transcript for the record.

MS. FLECK: Well, I'll just clear it up on redirect.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. FELICIANO: Well, for the record, I'd like to read in the question that I'm talking -- the answer that I'm talking about, if I may, the one that I just showed the detective.

THE COURT: The last paragraph on the bottom of page 21?

MR. FELICIANO: Yes, starting at, "I leave everything."

THE COURT: Well, here's the problem, and just for the record, I listened to the whole tape last night. The problem is the answer that you're getting at has these blanks in it in which the transcriber couldn't understand what was being said even though there are words, when I listened to the tape, there are words being spoken that the transcriber just didn't type them in there. So I'm not sure that reading it with these blanks in the transcript is really an accurate reflection of what was actually recorded.

I noticed that actually in several place throughout the transcript where there are just blanks because the transcriber, for whatever reason, couldn't make out what was being said. But things are actually being said, so.

MR. FELICIANO: This is the record we have to go off of, Judge, so, I

16: 

mean, if this is what we have in the record, this is his statement, this is supposed to be an accurate reflection of what he said on that day.

THE COURT: Well, I'm not sure what you're saying. Are you saying the actual recording from which this transcript was made is not part of the record?

MR. FELICIANO: Yes. But if I can't make out what is being said, for whatever reason, then the transcription, I guess the transcriptionist couldn't make that out, for whatever reason, so that's -- that's why we have the blank.

MS. FLECK: No, oftentimes they just don't.

MR. FELICIANO: And, again, I'm going back to the language barrier where, you know, we're saying that because of the language barrier we have this nonsensical answer.

MS. FLECK: No. That's not -- that's not what it is. Like, for instance, on page two, where, as Your Honor had pointed out a couple days ago, the question was, "Um, do you still want to talk with me about Roxana."

And the answer is, "I -- I don't want to forget," and then he kind of stops talking:

The detective says, "You want to put," and then there is crosstalk, as they say. And that's why there is a blank because it's more jumbled and then he goes on to talk. So not all of the blanks mean that you can't understand what was said. As you just pointed out, oftentimes, if you listen to the interview you can absolutely understand it. Just for some reason if they were doing the transcription too quickly or they were rushing through it, they didn't want to take the time to go back. But you can understand what was being said.

THE COURT: So --

MS. FLECK: And obviously the audio is part of the record.

THE COURT: All right. So we'll make the transcript of the voluntary statement the defense exhibit, proposed exhibit number one. And we'll make the actual recording, I have this copy -- A and B rather -- and then we'll make the actual recording of it or the DVD or CD of it Defense Proposed Exhibit B.

And, State, do you have any objection to admitting these Exhibits A and B?

MS. FLECK: I do not.

THE COURT: All right. Then they are admitted and that will save us time. That way you don't have to read the actual transcript into the record. All right.

### [DEFENDANT'S EXHIBITS A AND B ADMITTED]

MR. FELICIANO: Court's indulgence.

THE COURT: The copy that I have here, anybody object to my making this one B so that you don't have to provide another copy? All right. We'll make this one official Exhibit Number B. And then I need a clean copy of the transcript, because I wrote all over mine, to actually admit into the record.

Thanks.

MS. FLECK: Sure.

THE COURT: All right. This will be A.

#### BY MR. FELICIANO:

- Q During one of the conversations that you had with him on the phone, we're not sure if it's -- if it's one or more, his main concern was the fact that he would go to jail; is that fair?
- A In his mind he thought every police car out there was looking for him.
  - Q Okay. So he was -- he seemed scared, is that --

don't stand on formalities.

MS. FLECK: He can go ahead.

MR. FELICIANO: So State's going to reserve? Okay.

Judge, in this case we would submit that there was not a proper waiver of *Miranda* rights. We had the detective ask -- ask Mr. Renteria-Novoa if he wanted to -- still wanted to speak to him about Roxana. He then immediately went into talking about the case. He was never asked if he wanted to actually waive his *Miranda* rights. So, we would submit that there is not a valid waiver.

Furthermore, and the Court said it has listened to the CD? You have listened to the CD, Judge?

THE COURT: Yeah. I listened to the whole thing.

MR. FELICIANO: It's clear from the CD that Mr. Renteria-Novoa, English is not his first language, and he struggles with the English language. So we would submit that he should have had an interpreter there to actually read him his rights; and therefore, that reading of his rights was invalid because there was no interpreter there to make sure that he understood what was being told to him. Although he did say yes when asked if he understood, it was without the assistance of an interpreter. At every court date I've had with Mr. Renteria and visits with Mr. Renteria we always use an interpreter to make sure he understands what's going on. And that didn't happen in this case.

Judge, the other issue is voluntariness. And basically what we have is we have the officer basically promising Mr. Renteria that he will not be arrested if he comes in to speak to him. As we see, that's not the case. He was arrested afterwards. Well, it's -- well, he didn't arrest him that day, he did end up arresting him. And basically, what he did is he used a ruse to get him down

there to speak to him and used that statement and when he submitted to the D.A.'s office for an arrest warrant. Based on that, we would submit that the statement is not voluntary as well.

THE COURT: All right. State, your response.

MS. FLECK: Well, first, just based on the waiver, he is read his *Miranda* rights, asked if he or advised that he's got the right to counsel and that he has the right to remain silent. Per *Allen*, a specific waiver is not required. So *Miranda* is required to be given and a defendant must indicate or a suspect must indicate that they understand those rights.

In this case, on page two of the transcript, the defendant indicates that, yes, he indeed understands that he has the right to remain silent; he also understands that he has the right to counsel. So case law tells us that he doesn't specifically have to say, I waive those rights, and that by him going on to talk with the detective and to give a statement, which he immediately goes into, and I hope he cleared up that concern that you had by listening to the audio, hopefully, you did and I did again as well where he starts to say, he starts to say, he starts to say, he starts to say, he starts to says, "Do you still want to talk to me about Roxana?"

"I -- I don't want to forget."

And then detective says, "You want to put" --

And then he -- the defendant starts to finish that sentence, "Put everything away. I don't want to go see any more family," and he just starts to talk.

So there was nothing else then within the audio that I heard that indicated to me that he ever chose to exercise those rights. So that being said, it's sufficient that he knows his rights, he did in this case, and that by him going

-

on to talk, it shows that he has chosen not to exercise that right to remain silent.

No indication through any of the phone calls that the detective ever had with the defendant that he did not speak English and that he did not have a working understanding of the English language. He left a card at the house. It was the defendant that called the detective back. He didn't have his wife or girlfriend or a friend who spoke English call back and see what the detective wanted. He made a date to come down. The detective was able to relay to him where the detective bureau was, what time he should be there, the date that he should be there. The defendant clearly understood all of that in English because he made it there that day.

They then had normal conversation before they got into the interview room. Detective Jaeger indicated that it would have been a simple phone call for him to get an interpreter, absolutely no reason that he wouldn't have. It certainly wouldn't have been in the detective's best interest to get a inarticulate, incomprehensible interview from somebody who neither of them could understand each other. So he has access to interpreters or other detectives who speak Spanish. They use them all the time. And he indicated that that was a phone call away.

The reason that he didn't use one is because there was absolutely no indication through any phone calls or that preliminary conversation that the defendant didn't understand English and didn't speak English. He never asked for an interpreter. He never once indicated through the entire interview that he didn't understand. There was one time where he asked something, like, you know, did she -- did you lay on her. And he was like, what do you mean. But that is not necessarily a issue with understanding English, it could -- it's just a

understanding in what context did the detective mean "lay on her."

So any questions posed by the defendant through the entire interview are basically clearing up concepts, not English. Never once, again, did he say he didn't understand. He never once said, please, repeat yourself. He never said, you know, I don't understand that word in English, nothing.

So there was no interpreter because there was no indication that he needed one. And he can't come in now after every conversation before court being in English and all of a sudden say, oh, I completely don't understand. I mean, it's through that half-hour interview he understood every single question that was posed.

In terms of the voluntariness, first of all, he can use a ruse to get him, and he can use a ruse during his questioning. And he didn't in this case. I mean, all he said was, I'm not going to arrest you today. And he didn't. So he came down on his own free will. He certainly wouldn't have made the representation he was never going to arrest him. I mean, he's a sexual assault detective within Metro and his job is to ascertain if a child was raped and if the defendant is the person who did it.

So I can't foresee any circumstances in which he would promise someone he was never going to be arrested when he was investigating a rape charge. So every indication in this case that the statement was voluntarily made, was knowingly made, and that he understood his rights.

THE COURT: All right. This is on for a motion to suppress brought by the defendant. It essentially raises two separate arguments. First of all, were the requirements of *Miranda* complied with during the interrogation. And secondly, overall were the statements made in this case voluntary under the totality of the

circumstances. The burden is on the State to prove voluntariness by a preponderance of the evidence.

In this case the specific objection on the *Miranda* portion is that the -- there seems to be no dispute that the defendant was read his *Miranda* rights. And he said, when he was asked if he understood his rights, he had answered, yes. However, the defense's contention is when the detective asked, "Do you still want to talk about with me about Roxana," first of all, he's not asking for a specific waiver; and secondly, the defendant didn't respond to that question. And so there was no specific waiver. That's at least their argument.

In this case, I did go back and listen to the videotape, I'm sorry, the audiotape of the interview. The legal standard isn't whether or not there is an express word, "yes," spoken in response to a question about whether he wants to speak; the question is whether or not the waiver of *Miranda* was knowing and voluntary. In this case the defendant was read his rights, and I'll get to the language portion in a second, but at the very least he was read his rights in English. He was asked if he understood. He said, Yes. Detective then asked, "Do you still want to talk about Roxana?" And then the defendant began speaking.

The transcript is not -- it's not the world's best transcript. I listened to the whole thing. And I went through it with the transcript. And there are a lot of portions in the transcript that are kind of unclear that, frankly, I could make out. I don't know why the transcriber couldn't make them out. So it's not the world's best transcript. But in any event, if you look at lines -- well, they're not numbered here, but the bottom, sort of, quarter of page two, although in the transcript they're kind of separated, in the transcript it says:

\*16

Answer: "I don't want to forgot."

And then there is a blank.

Question: "You want to put" --

And then the transcriber indicates crosstalk.

And then the defendant's answer, "Put everybody away, I don't want to go see any more family."

And by the way, when I listened to the transcript there is a "her" between "any more" and "family." "I don't want to go see any more her family," which frankly makes a lot more sense to me.

But in any event, the way it actually plays out on the recording is the first statement, 'I don't want to forgot," and then the transcriber indicates crosstalk, and then has a separate answer, "Put everything away," the way it actually place out on the audiotape, they're actually kind of part of the same sentence. What happens is the defense says -- the detective asked, "Do you still want to talk to me about Roxana?"

And the defendant begins to make a very long statement about he doesn't want to see your family, he doesn't want to know anything about that family, he doesn't want to deal with that family, which the detective interrupts. In the transcript it indicates that as two separate answers. But really on the audiotape it's kind of one long answer that's kind of interrupted by the detective.

In any event, based on what I heard on the tape and based on what's in the transcript, the defendant is asked whether he wishes to talk about Roxana, and then he begins talking about Roxana's family and Roxana's family. And so based on what I've seen here, it appears that the defendant made a knowing and voluntary waiver of his right to remain silent and actually began

speaking about the subject matter that was at hand.

The second issue raised is whether or not the defendant understood his *Miranda* rights because they were read to him in English. And as I indicated, I listened to the entire audiotape. Mr. Renteria-Novoa does speak with a heavy accent. And there are portions of his statement that are a little bit hard to make out. I don't know if it's because of the quality of the videotape or because of his accent or because of his grammar or a combination of all three, but knowing of his language ability, I specifically listened to the entire tape very carefully. And his answers appeared to me to be consistently appropriate. He seems to understand the question.

There were a couple of times when he asked for clarification. But 95 percent of the time, he's asked questions and his answers are perfectly appropriate for the question. Obviously, I don't know what's going on in his head. But his answers appear to be appropriate to the question. And therefore, it does not appear to be me that language was an impediment in this case.

It's not like his answers are kind of have nothing to do with the question. And therefore, the language issue does not appear to have been a barrier. And I also note the detective testified today that Mr. Renteria-Novoa never indicated to him that he couldn't understand the questions or wanted an interpreter. But that aside, just based on my listening to the audiotape, it's pretty clear he does understand what's going on. In fact, he understands some of the questions that are pretty complex.

And so even though his grammar in some places is a little bit lacking, it appears that his comprehension is higher. And I will note, sort of as an aside, that typically is the case with people for whom English is a second

language that their comprehension ability exceeds their ability to actually generate the words in English and speak in perfect grammar. In fact, there are, as we all know, there are people whose native language in English whose grammar is not perfect. So you hardly expect someone for whom English is a second language for the grammar to be perfect. But in any event, his answers were appropriate to the questions.

MS. FLECK: Judge, I don't know, do you want me to go through the factors of the voluntariness? Because I didn't actually, I don't know if you want me to argue that part.

THE COURT: Well --

MS. FLECK: Because I didn't actually go through. I only -- I only talked about the promise part and getting him down there, but --

THE COURT: No. I understand, it's a totality of the circumstances test.

And in this case, one thing that I'll note that nobody mentioned, let me back up, we're on the whether or not his statement was voluntary under the totality of the circumstances, the defense's argument is that he was enticed to the station house on a ruse, that he was not going to be arrested.

If you look on page two, and again these lines aren't numbered, but it's lines five and six on page two, the detective actually says on the record, "Guillermo, earlier we were talking a little bit before we went on the recording, I reassured you that I'm not going to take you to jail today, that is still true." So that at least is some confirmation of specifically what they discussed. I know the detective said that he didn't remember all the details, but in any case, he is at least in part memorializing what they talked about on the record here.

And in any event, the -- even if the defendant was enticed there on

a ruse and I'm not sure it is a ruse because he says in the transcript here that I'm not going to take you to jail today, the detective denied that he assured that he would never be taken to jail. But even if that were a ruse, that's just one of the factors to be considered. I'm not sure it's actually illegal for police officers to employ ruses to get people to talk with them. But under the totality of the circumstances, they talked on the phone, the defendant drove down to the station house in his own car. He — well, I'm sorry, they talked on the phone, he made an appointment a couple weeks in advance on a day when the defendant was not working. he drove down to the meeting room in his own vehicle, they then had this conversation, he then left under his own power.

And therefore, under the totality of the circumstances, I find that the State has demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence that the statement was voluntary. All right. So the motion to suppress is denied. Do you guys want to talk about anything to do with the trial, or are we good until Monday morning?

information. Is there anything else?

MR. FELICIANO: No. Judge, would it be possible to get a transcript of today's proceeding for trial, before trial?

THE COURT: Can we get it done by next week?

THE COURT RECORDER: Probably.

THE COURT: Okay. We will try.

MR. FELICIANO: Okay.

THE COURT: Do you need a formal request in writing, or not?

THE COURT RECORDER: I think it helps just to have it on the record,

but I'll start it.

THE COURT: Yeah, if you can, yeah, she'll start it, but if you can submit a formal request then we'll at least have something in the file.

MR. FELICIANO: Okay. I'll send an order over.

THE COURT: All right. And then --

MS. FLECK: Monday, 9:00?

THE COURT: I'm sorry?

MS. FLECK: It was 9:00 a.m., right?

THE COURT: Yes, 9:00 a.m. Even though we announce 10:30, it's 9:00 a.m. We'll start picking a jury.

What I am going to try to do is when I get back to my chambers right now I'm going to look at my Wednesday calendar, and as I indicated, try to clear that off and see if we can get started earlier on Wednesday. And that way we'll at least try not to keep the jury here on a Friday. Because the other concern is even if they're here on a Friday, as you get closer to 5:00, they may just want to get a verdict just so they can go home for the weekend. That's, you know, one of my concerns why I'd like to, you know, have some — I don't know what you call it — a time buffer so that we can finish early so that we, you know, so the jury doesn't feel like they're pressured. That's not fair to Mr. Renteria-Novoa that they're just going to, oh, let's just find him guilty so we can go home for the weekend kind of a thing.

But let me get back to you on that. I need to go back and look what I have on Wednesday. So, but I'm going to shoot to do that. So, you know, plan on at least being here somewhat early on Wednesday depending on how the witnesses go. All right?

MS. FLECK: Okay.

MR. FELICIANO: Okay.

THE MARSHAL: Are we going to get into any witnesses on Monday so I can get enough interpreters?

MR. FELICIANO: I doubt it, probably picking a jury and openings seems reasonable.

MS. FLECK: That's what I would imagine too, picking a jury and openings.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MS. FLECK: So I would say, I mean, I certainly am not going to put the victim on on Monday afternoon.

THE COURT: Right. And then one thing that would help is if in the next couple days if you guys can circulate some drafts of the jury instructions and that way we don't have to take an afternoon off to fight over them next week as well.

MS. FLECK: For sure. I'll get the jury instructions to them by the end of the week for sure.

THE COURT: Okay. And then any proposed that you have, if you guys could at least start working on them. I just hate that, you know, I hate trials when the day before, you know, you close the evidence and then you sit there for three hours hammering over the instructions. We can do it during lunch or something outside the presence of the jury and not, you know, I'm a little bit worried about time. I'm not normally worried about pressing over time expect with the holiday out there, you know, it changes the dynamic of the jury. And like I said, I don't want the jury starting to feel like, oh, we just better just get this trial over with and not really deliberate, that kind of a thing.

1	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA
2	
3	GUILLERMO RENTERIA-NOVOA ) No. 68165
4	Appellant, )
5	vs.
6	THE STATE OF NEVADA,
7	Respondent.
8	
9	APPELLANT'S APPENDIX – VOLUME II– PAGES 234-421
10	PHILIP J. KOHN  Clark County Public Defender  STEVE WOLFSON  Clark County District Attorney
11	Clark County Public Defender 309 South Third Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2610  Clark County District Attorney 200 Lewis Avenue, 3 <sup>rd</sup> Floor Las Vegas, Nevada 89155
12	Attorney for Appellant CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO
13	Attorney General 100 North Carson Street Carson City, Nevada 89701-4717 (702) 687-3538
14	(702) 687-3538
15	Counsel for Respondent
16	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
17	I hereby certify that this document was filed electronically with the Nevada
18	Supreme Court on the Aday of July, 2013. Electronic Service of the
19	foregoing document shall be made in accordance with the Master Service List as follows:
20	CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO  NANCY LEMCKE  HOWARD S. DROOKS
21	STEVEN S. OWENS HOWARD S. BROOKS
22	I further certify that I served a copy of this document by mailing a true and
23	correct copy thereof, postage pre-paid, addressed to:
24	GUILLERMO RENTERIA-NOVOA NDOC No. 1092343
25	c/o HIGH DESERT STATE PRISON
26	P. O . BOX 650 INDIAN SPRINGS, NV 89070
27	
28	Employee, Olark County Public Defender's Office