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THE COURT: On the record in C-131341,
State of Nevada versus James Chappell.
The reoord will reflect the presence of Mr. Chappell, with his attorreys, the State attorneys, and our full jury panel.
fill continue on with the defense case in
chief. Mr. Patrick, Mr. Schieck, you all can call your
next witness.

THE CTERK: You do solemily swear the
testimony you are about to give in this action, shall be
the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth so
help you cod.
The WINESS: Yes.
THECLLERK: Be seated and spell your name for the record.
R-O-S-A-L-E-S. THE MITMSS: Marabel Rosales,
24
BY NR. PATRICK:

```
Q. Good morning.
    A. Good morning.
    Q. How ace you employed?
    A. I nork for the special public defender's
office.
    Q. What are your duties there?
    A. I'm a mitigation investigator. I assist the
attomey for finding mitigation in marder ard capital
murder cases.
    Q. Have you horked on James' case?
    A. Yes.
    Q. And did you have an opporturity to travel to
Lansing earlier this year?
    A. Yes.
    Q. thile you were there did you perfom any
interviens with witnesses?
    A. Yes.
    Q. Kould two of those witnesses be Ivory
Morrell and James Ford?
    A. Correct.
    Q. I'm going to show you what's been marked as
Defendant Exhibit Q. Do you recognize these two
gentlemen?
    A. Yes.
    Q. Could you tell us who they are?
    A. This is James Ford. And this is Ivory
    Morrell.
    Q. How, were Mr. Ford ML. Norrell, did they
    travel to las vegas to testify in this matter?
    A. Yes.
    Q. And do you know when they got to las
Vegas?
    A. Last TMesday.
    Q. Then did they leave?
    A. Saturday.
    Q. Are you aware of the circumstances under
which it was that they had to leave us?
    A. Yes. They -- we made every attempt to have
them stay through the trial to testify, but Iwory had
commitments in Lansing and had to get back to work on
Monday. Jares, we called his erployer to see if he could
stay through today, possibly, and we basically got a call
back frorn his job Friday evening and they said that If he
want at work Monday moming the would be fired.
    Q. Now, did they travel to Las Vegas willingly
to testify?
    A. Absolutely.
    Q. How did they feel when they had to go hone
before they had that opportunity?
    A. They were very upset and very disapoointed

1 that they come nere to testify to the jury.
\(2 \quad Q\). As he previously talked about, you had the ogportunity to talk to both of these gentlemen while in Lansing?
5 A. Correct.
\(6 \quad Q\). If you could, could you give a summacy of what they told you and what they hould have testified to had they had the opportunity?
A. Sure. Hell, it was actually through James, this gentienan that I was able to coordinate all the neetims with all of rest of the fanily and the friexds that we met with. And be was very willing to talk to us.
: 3 He coordinated -- it was actually a 'reesday night that we it got into Lansing, He ccordinated the rest of the group to meet there.

Pe had several hours of delay in Chicago, and they still stayed in the hane where they were neeting us. And while we nere there we talked about their up-bringing and as you have already heard, this was a very close-boit commenity. They're just friends. They're not blood related. At least Ivory ard Janes to Janes. Asd they were willing to help. They were willing to talk to us.

And they grew up in the same general area. They
knew -- their mothers know each other and are close
friends. The parents still live in the same neighborhood
as they lived growing up.
We talked about bow they would hang out at James' grandrother's house and how James was such a wonderful
©ok, and how they would know grancha's time of leaving
work or coming hane from bingo ganes, and they woid
just - they know the times so men grancina was around the
comer they all leave. It was just - that's what we initially started to talk about was their childhock.
Q. Did either one of them tell you any stories about Janes as they were growing up?
A. Yeah, I mean, the way that they hung out. How they met while they were very little and since elementary school and junior high school. How they grew up in the sane neighborhood.

Specifically, I reneriber fwory said that when they would go to school dances when they were in jurior high school Ivory, maybe kids were picking fights with them and it was almays Janes who would try and calm the situation dom or remove his friends frorn the fights.
Q. Did either one of then know Debbie?
A. Both of them did.
Q. Were either of then around Debbie and James
as they kere groring out together?
A. Yeah. They knew Debbie. They used to
double date with cebbie ard James. And they knew her
since Janes and Bebbie started to go out.
Q. Did they tell you anything about the relationship that James and Detbie had?
A. Hell, when they were going out, I believe it was just a nomal teenage relationship, other than there
was a lot of speaking that was cocurring because,
acoording to them there was great animosity from Lethbie's
parents because James was black. And they had to alrost
assist with sneaking to do the double dates and to -
Janes recalls that they would drive by Debbie's house and
if Delbie would cane to the window that was the clue that he could came in.

But James also recalls that Janes was afraid because if they forrd out that James was in the hoome her parent would call the police.
Q. Was there ever a time that you leamed about Janes and Debbie living with one of these gentleman?
A. Yes. I believe it was after JP was bom and Debbic was kicked oft of her home, they actually lived in Janes' house. And also I believe they lived in James' sister's hate for awhile.
Q. And did either of them have anything to say about hor James was with JP?
A. According to all of them, he was a great father to JP. He was just -- just loved his son. He took 9
care of him, made sure that he was fed, layered if it was oold outside, pretty mech lived for his son.
0. Did elther of then give you any idea as to James, how he acted in Lansing versus hor he acted in Ducson and Las Vegas?
A. When we explained everything that hat happened when he was in Tucson and Las Vegas, they said that is mot the James that we knew in lansing,

MR, PATRICK: That's all I have.
THE OCIRT: Mr. Oners, Ms. Heckerly.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. GTENS:
Q. You reviened the affidavit of Janes Ford?
A. Yes.
Q. And it vas his opinion, acoording to his
affidavit that Debra was very controlling and jealous of Jomes, conrect?
A. Yeah, according to the affidavit, yes.
Q. Fouldn't let him go out with the guys?
A. Correct.
Q. And would often verbally ahese him?
A. Right. And James did tell me about a
situation कhere Jarres was in Theson and he was in Lansirg,
and he could hear them -- James had called him, and he
could hear Debbie in the background arguing, screaming,
2 Q. Debbie was?
3 A. Yeah. :
1 Q. So did you -- you were bere when we were
looking at the testimony, we read the testimony of the
Defendant?
    A. I'm not sure if I was in the courtromm that
    day.
9. Q. Do you remember his testimony in the prior
    proceeding that it was his friends back in Larsing that
Il got ham involved in drugs again?
            A. No, I'm sorry. I don't recall that,
    Q. You don't remermer alything about that?
    A. Sorry, mo.
            0. James ford was one of his close friends?
    A. Correct.
    Q. Was he -- did be tell you that he was
    selling dope back there?
            A, $o.
            Q. Did you talk to him about his criminal
    history?
            A. No.
            Q. But his opinion of the relationship was that
    Debbie screamed?
            A. It yas during that one particular phrre
```

```
```

calling him the "N" word.

```
```

```
calling him the "N" word.
```

                11
    conversation. I con't think it was in general.
            Q. And she was controlling?
            A. I don't know, screaming at him while they
    are arguing.
            Q. That's what he said in his affidavit?
            A. If that's hhat he said in his affidavit.
            Q. Controlling, Debbie was jealous. Is that
    what he said?
A. According to the affidavit, yeah.
Q. Debbie was a bigot or raciest?
A. acconding to what he told me that har
occurred durixg that phone conversation, she referted to
him using the " k " word.
Q. And her family?
A. Right.
Q. That was Janes Ford's opinion of the
relationship?
A. Right.
NR. Ofreds: That's all I have.
THE OXRT: Mr. Patrick.
MR. PATRICK: Briefly, your Honor.
REDIRECT SXAINTION
BY MR. PATRICK:
24 Q. Were you present at James last trial?
25 A. No.


1 or read, watch, or listen to any report of or commentary
2 on the trial, or any person conrected with this trial, or
3 any surch other case by any mediun of information
includiug, without limitation, renspapers, television, $s$ intenet or radio.

You are further admonished not to foum or express any opinion on any subject connected with this trial until the case is finally sumitted to you.
on the recond, outside the presence of the jury. There's an issue about a caple of exhibits the State sents to introdice as part of it's rebuttal case.

They are pre-sentence investigative
reports from this case, back when Mr. Chappell was
otiginally sentenced. As well as a pre-sentence
investigative report from - what case namber is on the other che?

THE CLERK: 126862.
THE CORT: C-126682.
With regard to the gross misdaneanor, does
the dofense have an objection to that pre-sentence
investigative report being introduced as an exhibit.
怆. SCHIECK: 10 objection.
TIE CORRT: All right. Exhibit 140 will
be introduoed. Thank you -- adritted rather.
Then as to the pre-sentence investigative
report for the instant case back from when formal
sentencing was pronommed, does the defense have an objection to that.
M. SCHIECK: Your Honor, I understand the court has redacted the typed portions of that to remove all reference to the sentence imposed by the jury in that case.
With respect to the typed portion, we have no objection to the redactions, we do cbject to the admissions of the Deferdant's staterent, which was handwritten for the Cepartuent of Pacole and Probation after the jury had sentenced him to death.

Our contention is, one, it's a Mirandized statement. It stould not be able to be used against him at this point in time. And that given the ciromstances it was given, it's unfair to introctuce it at this time as part of these sentencing proceedings.

THE courr: The State.
MR. OWEDS: Your Honor, the Mirarsta issue
is only an issue if the Defendant wasn't Mirandized and
the Defendant was Mirardized. It also requires
interrogation anyway, awd there's nothing interrogating
about this particular process with the Defendant. This
was a voluntary statement.
THE COVRT: Kill, I often see defendants

1 who decline to give statements on the basis of an appealed
2 conviction and so forth and so on. Sanetine they do give
3 statement.
4
process. You're interviened by the Department of Parol
6 and Probation and asked hnether or not they want to make a
7 statement, whether or not they want to make a writ:en
8 staterent They're given a form to ask thern about -he
9 circurstance of teir offense or what your feelings are
10 about your situation and why you may be suitable for
probation, et cetera. A copy of the statement will be
sent to the judge, 'hhat's all on the form that's given to
then. And they can choose to mrite a statement or not
write a statement, deperding on what they want to do.
It's not the type of situation that gives
rise to Miranda maming. It's much like the shom
testimony from the prior proceed, the statement the
Deferdant wrote out for the Department of Parole and
Probation that was part of this case earlier on, I think
would be achissible in this proceeding as well.
So I'll allow the statement that's
attached to the PSI to be introdiced. I will note that we
did redact on the pre-sentence report, there was il -- the
very last tho sentences of page 7, which is where it got
to the recomendation. It referred to the fact that jury
returned a verdict of death.
So he whited out those tho sentences and
in actuality it doesn't appear that anything is wited out
because it's the last two sentences on the page. You really can't tell.

在e also redacted -- there was an error in
the pre-sentence report where it irdicated that Mr .
Crappell pled guilty to feleny offenses, so we whited that
out axd put in there was found guilty.
Then we removed the last page of the
pre-sentence report, where it reflected Pop sentencing
recumendations. I didn't think that was appropriate either.

All right. So that PSI, in the jnstant case be adritted as State's Exhibit 141.

All right, ready to get started.
MS. HECKCRLY: Yes.
THE CORRT: Back on the reoord in
C-131341, State of Neveda versus James Chappell.
The record will reflect Mr. Chappell is
present, with his attomeys, State's attomeys, in the presence of the jury.

The State may present their rebultal case.
25 MR. GHENS: The State would like to call a
reader for reading of testimony of the witness that
testified for the defense at the hearing ten years ago,
Clara Axan, the Defendant's grandnother.
THE COIRT: Okay.
TINE CIIRK: You do solemuly smear to
6 faithfully and accurately read the response set forth in
this transcript so help you cod.
THE READR: Yes.
THE CIFKK: Thank you,
THE CORRT: We'll do this the same way you
did the previous one with Mr. Schieck or Mr. Patrick.
BY MR. SCHIECK:
Q. Clara, will you please state your mane and spell you last name for the record?
A. (Clara Axam, A-X-A-M.
Q. Clara, where do yorlive?
A. In Lansiky, Michigan.
Q. How long have you lived there?
A. Life.
Q. Your entire life?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you kxow Janes Crappell?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. How do you know James?
A. He's my grandson.
Q. Do you recognize him in court today?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Can you point to him and describe an article
of clothing he's wearing?
A. Right there. I can't describe it because I can't see, you know, colors that far away. But that's
Janes right there with the glasses on.
Q. Will the record reflect the identification, your Honor?

THE CORRT: Yes.
BY M, SCHIECK:
Q. Do you recall who Janes lived with when he
was borm?
A. Yes. He lived with his mother and father.
Q. What was his mother's nane?
A. Shirley Chappeli.
Q. Is this your daugiter?
A. Yes.
Q. How long did she reside with her?
A. tho years.
Q. Wlas she killed?
A. Yes.
Q. How was she killed?
A. She got killed in a car accident. Hit by a car.
]

```
responsibility of raising James?
```

A. Yes, Idid.
Q. How did James react to the death of his
mother?
A. 保ll, he ras young, but very hard. Very
hard like be wouldn't commicate with anytody.
Q. How long?
A. Like he houldn't talk.
Q. Hor long a period of time passed before he would talk?
12 A. Probably a year or more.
$17 \quad Q$. How was James as a child, how did he treat you?
A. He treated me fine. He had problens, you
know. He was slow. But be treated ne all right. Had no problens. He wasn't a violent child, He was an easy going child.
Q. Khat do you mean by he mas slow?
A. Jike in he didn't learn things as fast as a
nomal child. Ke didn't understard things.
Q. Did that continue until he was in sciool?
A. Yes.
Q. What kind of student was he?
A. Up until - he went to nomal school up
until the fifth grade. Then they put him in special
education classes.
Q. 5th grade?
A. Yes.
Q. How did he respond to those special
education classes?
A. Well, he went to school and everything. He
went to special extucation classes all the way up to high
school.
—Q. Did he grachuate from high school?
A. M.
Q. how, you worked during the time that you
were raising Janes, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. hhere did you work?
A. For the State police Acadeny in the State of

Michigan.

- 0

Who would care for Janes while you were at
work?
A. Ny daughter Sheri.
Q. Do your know Debra Paros?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. How did you feel about Debra Panos?
A. A nice lady, very nice.
Q. Do you feel like atomes should be punished

```
for what happened on Auxust 31st?
    A. Yes, I do.
    Q. Do you want James to continue to be a part
of your life?
            A. Yes.
            Q. Sould you like to be able to correspord with
    hip?
            A. Yes.
                            NA. SCHIECK: That's the last question,
            THE CONRT: State had no questions.
            RT. aleNS: Correct, your Honor.
            THE: COWRT: Thank you. Appreciate your
time.
            The State may call the next witness.
            MR. OHENS: If I can address the court on
a couple of documents.
                    THE COURT: Okay, During the recess be
Mad marked as State's Proposed Exhibit No. 140, a
cettified oopy of the pre-sentence investigation report
utilized by the juxge in the gross misdameanor case
C-126802, State versus James Chappell, and moved for its
admission and the court adnitted it at that tire.
THE CONRT: That was adnitted as Exhibit
140.
MR, ONENS: Correct.
```

Then we had the document pertainirg to
this case, pre-sentence investigation report that was done
back in Decerber of 1996, which we had marked as Bxhibit
141 for identification. Oxce again a certified copy of
that partioular document.
THE COXRT: All right. That will be
adnitted as 141.
MR. OFWN: All right, And if we may aporoach on another related matter.

THE COXRT: Sure.
(Discussion held at the bench.)
MR. OHIWS; he've marked as maber 138, a copy of the prison visitation lays for James Chappell for the last few years. It's a certified copy, your Honor. Re move for its adnission at this time.

THE COURT: Any objection.
M. SCHECK: NO, your Honor.

THE CONT: 138 will be actuitted. Thank
you.
The state may call the next witness.
MS. GREMERIT: The next uitress, your
Howor, is Noma Penfield.
THE COURR: If you would cone back up here
please.
THE CLBRK: You do solemaly shear the
testimony you are about to give in this action shall be
the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth so
help you God.
THE WITNESS: I do.
THE CLEPK: Be seated. State and spell
your nate for the record.
ITE YHTNESS: [ $\quad$ Noma Penfield,
$\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{F}-\mathrm{I}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{J}-\mathrm{D}$.
DIRECT EXAYINATTON
BY MS. WRXERLY:
Q. You testified before you're Debbie Panos' mother?
A. Yes.
Q. We heard testimony this moming that: you
were not happy that Debbie was dating James Chappell. And
we heard testimony this moming that the reasen for that
was because of his race, has that the case?
A. No.
Q. What was the reason that you didn't like
your daughter being involved with Jates Chappell?
A. For the reason of the way -- the treatment that he had given Cebbie. He didn't support her. He didn't support the kios, his actions.
Q. Was that the case also when you all were living in lansing?

27

or read, watch, or listen to any report of or comentary
on the trial, or any person connected with this trial, or
any such other case by any mediun of information
including, without limitation, nowspapers, television, internet or radio.

You are further admonished not to form or express any opinion on any subject connected with this trial until the case is finally submitted to you.

We'll be in recess. Try be back here
at - me'll give you a longer time so that se have time to do the jury instructions.

We'll try to get started at 2:00
o'clock.
Thank you very much.
(Lunch recess taken.)
THE CCART: Outside the presence.
You mant to make a record of the prison
violation report you want to offer as an exhibit.
MR, OHEPS: Yes, your Honor. It's a violation report for an incident ocourcism in the fall -sumer and fall of last year, 2006 , where the defendant was corresponding with a wman from the midest, that was rebuffing his intentions towards her and he kept oosassing and writing to her in letters with a similar tone to those that were involved between the defendant and the victim in

1 this case. To the point where she contacted the warden of
2 the Nevada State Prison syster and asked him to tempinate
her - the Defendant's coumunication abilities with regard
4 to her, because she was afraid for herself and afraid of 5 birn.
6 This is offered by the State as a rebuttal
7 of the Defendant's recent testimony that we heand in
particular about how it was the victim that was
controlling, and the victim that was the one that kept
coming back to the Deferdant and obsessing over the Defendant.

And there's testimony throughout the trial, partioularly with Dr. Etcoff, that this was a perfect stom or an isolate incident in the Defencant's life.

In fact, it's not an isolated incident. It's a part of a pattem of conduct. I know that it seems a little odd when you think about it in the context of this case and the timing because Etooff testified in the middle of our case. But if you assume Etcoff testified at. the appropriate time and got up and said what -- about how this was a misalignment of the stars between these two people, then we would be coning in with this document inmediately afterwards to say, no, it wasn't. This is how 25 the Defendant does business and here's the proof of it.

2 we're offering that, this series of documents, which
culminated in a disposition in the prison system, your Honor.
THE ONRT: Mr. Schieck.
MR. SCHIFCK: Your Honor, we object. The court sustained that objection to adnitting it as rebuttal evidence.
9 We intentionally stayed away frcm prison records, prison infomation just to avoid any semblance of this type of thing having to be litigated because it has nothing to do with this case. I can represent to the court I was aware of this situation before the records here even gererated of the situation because of niy contact with Mr. Chappell and with the prison systern. It is a much broader story than is contained in -- certainly the disciplinary papers and the one correspondence that's attached to that.

This lady apparently had contacted other people that were corresponding with other immates in the prison and infomation was being passed back and forth. It was a long, long situation that develoged before there was ever any discipline for it. It certainly wasn't any way near compared to his ten year relationship with rebra
and the three children and the orrespondence that he had

|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| with ter athile he was briefly incarcerated in the county jail. |  |
|  |  |
| 3 | So number one, it's not proper rebuttal to |
| 1 anything we cpened the dcor to. Dr. Etooff made reference |  |
| 5 to the perfect stom type setting was referring to a |  |
| 6 nurber of factors having to db-- I'm not sure it was |  |
| 7 Dr . Etcoff, as opposed to Dr. Danton that used the phrase |  |
| \& perfect stom -- but irrespective of that, he was talking |  |
| 9 about scmeone that has attacknent disorcer, a leaming |  |
| 10 disability, and is unable to verbally communicate because |  |
| 11 his vertal I0 is so low, ard being in a relationship with |  |
| 12 a lady that may have same problers that foster that type |  |
| 13 of relationship. I think Dr Danton was the one that |  |
| 14 talked about that. |  |
| 15 So it has really nothing to do with |  |
| 16 repenting a course of conduct. Mr. Chappell ras in prison |  |
| 17 with no chance of getting out of prison, I don't now how |  |
| 18 the could possibly be concived to be writing threats, even |  |
| 19 if you think that the letters to deboie contained threats. |  |
| 20 Certainly, he was no threat to this individual. |  |
| 21 |  |
| 22 correct in sustaining the objection and not letting those |  |
| 23 records in. |  |
|  |  |
| 25 that we have Mr. Chappell's prison records, and in order |  |
|  |  |
| 1 to awoid this type of situation, these records being -- |  |
| 2 opening the door to these reconds coming in, didn't put in |  |
| 3 his prison records. He has a very good prison record. |  |
| 4 This is like the major disciplinary thing he ever had, and |  |
| 5 to me it's not a major thing. he wanted to avoid that and |  |
| 6 that's why we dim't bring then in. |  |
|  | THE Courr: All right. |
|  | M. SCHIRCK: We concur with the court's |
| 9 ruling. |  |
| 10 | THE CXFR: I think that obviousl |
|  | the conduct alleged in here in the letters attached to |
|  | this packet is conoeming. Do I think it has sane |
|  | relevance to a sentencing hearing, yes. Do I think |
|  | State sould have been entitied to bring it in in its case |
|  | in chief, yeah, probably so. |
|  | My main concem in tenms of actuissibility |
|  | is having to look at it in the narrow vision of where we |
|  | re now, which is in rebuttal case. And the main reason |
|  | it's being brought in rebuttal is it seens to be two-fold. |
|  | One, to rebut same things that the psychologist ot |
|  | psychiatrist said. And I don't thirk there was sufficient |
|  | things raised with them for this rebuttal - for this to |
|  | come in as rebuttal evidence. |
|  | econdly, it's being offered to rebut the |
|  | legation that the defense was making -- or the |

with her atile he was briefly incarcerated in the county jail. anything we opened the door to. Dr. Etcoff made refecence to the perfect stom type setting was referring to a mumber of factors having to do -- I'm not sure it was Dr, Etcoff, as opposed to Dr . Danton that used the phrase perfect stom -- but irrespective of that, he was talking about scmeone that has attacknent disorcer, a leaming disability, and is unable to verbally communicate because his vertal IQ is so lon, ard being in a relationship with a ledy that may have same problens that foster that type of relationship. I think Dr Danton was the one that talked about that.

So it has really nothing to do with repeating a course of conduct. Mr. Chappell yas in prison with no chance of getting out of prison, I don't now how he could possibly be concived to be writing threats, even if you think that the letters to debbie contained threats. Certainly, he was no threat to this individual.

So for all of those reasons, the court was correct in sustaining the objection and not letting those records in.

And, again, I can say -- tell this court 33
to awoid this type of situation, these records being -opening the door to these reconds coming in, didn't put in his prison records. He has a very good prison record. This is like the major disciplinary thing he ever had, and to me it's not a major thing. We wanted to avoid that and that's why we didn't bring then in.

The courr: All right.
MR. SCHIECK: We concur with the court's

THE COVRP: I think that obvioesly that the conduct alleged in here in the letters attached to this packet is conceming. Do I think it has sare relevance to a sentencing hearing, yes. Do I think the State would have been entitied to bring it in in its case in chief, yeah, probably so.

My main concern in tems of actrissibility is having to look at it in the narrow vision of shere we are now, which is in rebuttal case. And the main reason it's being brought in rebuttal is it seens to be two-fold. one, to rebut scre things that the psychologist of psychiatrist said. And I don't think there was sufficient things raised with then for this rebuttal - for this to cone in as rebuttal evidence.

Secondly, it's being offered to rebut the allegation that the defense was making -- or the
allegation, as the State puts it, the defense was naking that Ns. Panos was the controlling foroe within this relationship. I don't think the defense put fourth that evidence.

The deferse witnesses cane in to say
Ms. Panos was the controlling person and was the abusive
person, or anything. That was brought out by the State in
cross-examination of these folks in tems of things that
are apparently in aftidavits of scone of these folks may
have given previously.
So I don't think the State can
cross-exanine these witnesses and bring out these things
and try and use this to support what the state was trying to bring out in the affidavit on cross-examination. The defense dim't approach any of these issues.

So out of an abundance of caution I don't think it would be appropriate to bring these in in rebuttal at this time. So I'm denying the State's; effort to adnit the prison violation report.

For the record it's dated Septerber, Qctober 2006.

All right. I will mark it as a ourt
exhibit, however, if you want me to.
M, ortis: Yes, please.
THE CLERK: It's marked as 139.

1 TTE COKRT: he'll mark it as 139, but it's
not adnitted. Anything else?
NR. Gilis: H .
THE COOR': All right. We'll be in
recess.
We'll stick around and talk about jury
instnuctions.
(Brief recess taken,)
THE COURI: Back on the recond in
C-131341, State of Nevada versus James Chappell.
The reoord reflect the presence of
Mir. Chappell, with his attorreys, State attomeys. We're
outside the presence of the jury. Does the State have a
4 copy -- let me go through the instnuctions first.
Instuction mmer 1 , members of the jury
16 it is my duty as judge -- 2, if in these instruc-ions --
17 3, hearsay evidence at a penalty hearing - number 4 , the
18 jury shall fix punishment of a persor convicted of nurder
19 in the first degree -5 , life inprisoment with
20 possibility of parole -6 , the State alleged what
1 aggravating circumstances is present in this case -- 7s
22 you are instructed the following factors or circumstances
3 by which murder in the first degree nay be aggravated --
24 8, a person who subjects another person to senwl
5 penetration -- 9, physical force is not a neoessary

1 ingredient -- 10, the victim of a sexual assault -- 11 , 2 there is no consent when a victim is induced -- 12 , mitigatimg circunstances are those factors which -- 13 , in detemining khether mitigatimy circmstances exist -- 14 , there are certain circurstance which may be considered as mitigating -- 15, a reasonable doubt -- 16 , a jury is instncted that in deteminiry the appropriate sentence -17, in decidiry on an appropriate sentence -- 18 , in your deliberation -- 19, credibility or believability of a witness -- 20 , although you are to consider only the evidence -- 21, during your deliberation -- 22, the court has submitted three sets of verdicts to you -- 23 , now you will listen to argunents of coursel.

Does the State have a copy of those 23 proposed instuctions.

MS. WECKGRLI: Yes.
THE COXRT: Do you object to the giving of any of those instructions.

MS. KECKERLY: No.
THE COIRT: Any additional to have marked as court exhibits.

NS. YECKERLY: No, your Honor.
THE COURT: Does the defense have a copy of the proposed 23 instructions.
in. Schidec: Yes, your Horor.

THE Court: Do you object to the giving of any of those 23 .
N. SCHIECK: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you have any abditicnal
ones to offer as proposed instructions.
MR. SCHIECK: No, your Honor.
THE COURT: You all each I believe have
copies of the verdict fonts, as well.
NS. MECKERLY: That's being copied now.
TRE COURT; he fixed the one typo on there
and put sone more lines on mitigatixy circuristance verdict
fom, but other than those being copied right now you have
seen copies of the verdict forms.
MS. KECKERLY: Yes.
THE COMRT: You're in agteenent with
that.
M. hitrerly: yes.

THE COURT: Defense has seen oopies, as well.

MR. SCHIECK: Yes, your ilonor.
THE COURT: You're in agreement with
then.
M. Schieck: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Al1 right.
酺 will go get those and we'll get
started.
Back on the record in C-131341, State of
Nevada versus Janes Chappell.
The record will reflect the preserce of
Mr. Chappell with his attomeys, the State attomeys, in
the presence of our jury.
Ladies and gentlemen, we've reached a
point where I get to read to you sare jury instructions
now. Each of you has a packet that was left in your
chair. The instructions aren't too lengthy, but I think
it's much easier if you all read along as I read then to you so you can see what I'm talking about.

You'll be able to take the packet back with you when you go to deliberate. To the extent during
my reading of the instructions or during the argunents of
the attorneys you want to make notes on a particular
instruction, by all mean, do that. You get to keep your individal packet when you go back to deliberate.

All right, Instnuction No. 1 , instructions
to the jury, members of the jury, it is now my daty as
judge to instnuct you on the law that applies to this
penalty hearing. It is your duty as jurors to follow
these instruction and to apply the nules of law to the facts as fird then from the evidence.

You mast not be concemed with the wisdan
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of any rule of law stated in these instnuctions.
Regardless of any coinion 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 given
in the instuctions of the court.
Muber 2, if in these instructions any
nule, 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 indivichal point or
instaction and ignore the others, but you are to consider
all the instuctions as a whole and regard each in the
light of all the others.
Muber 3, in the penalty hearing evidence
may be presented concenimg aggravating and mitigating
circunstances relative to the offence. Hearsay is
admissible in a penalty tearing.
Murber 4 , the jury shall fix the
punishant for every person convicted of murder of the
first degree. The jury shall fix the punishant at (1) a
definite term of one husdred years imprisoment with
eligibility for parole when a minimm of 40 years has been
served; (2) life jeprisonment with eligibility of parole
beginning when a minimm of 40 years has been served; (3)
life irprisoment without the possibility of parole, or (4) death.
possibility of parole is a sentence of life inprisoment which provides that a defendant would be eligible for parole after a period of 40 years. This coes not nean he will be paroled after 40 years, but only that he may be eligible after that period of time. of parole means exactly what it says. The Defendant shall never be paroled, If you sentence a deferdant to death, you must assure that the sentence will be carried out.

Mumer 6, the State has alleged that one aggravating circunstance is present in this case. The 45 Defendant has alleged certain mitigating circumstances are 6 present in this case. It shall be your duty to detemine (a) whether the aggravating circumstances found to exist, and (b) whether a mitigating circustance or circurstances are found to exist, and (c) based upon these findings, whether the defendant should be sentenced to a definite term of one hundred years inprisoment, life ipprisoment with or without the possibility of parole, or death.

The jury may consider a sentence of death only if, (l) the jurors unanimously find at least one aggravating circumstanoe has been established beyond a
reascoable doabt, and (2) the jurors wanimously find there that are no mitigating circumstances sufficient to outreigh the aggravating ciromstance or circurstances found.

A mitigating circunstance itself need not be agreed to unanimously. That is any one juror can find a mitigating circumstance without the agreement of the other jurors or juror. The entire jury fust agree uanimously, however, as to whether the aggravating circunstances outweigh the mitigating circumstances.

Otherwise, the punisiment inposed shall be inprisoment in the state prison for a definite tem of one hurdred years imprisoment with eligibility for parole beginning when a mininen of 40 years has been served or life without the passibility of parole.

Mriber 7, you are instructed that the following factors are circunstance by which nurder of the first degree may be aggravated.

The rurder was carmitted during the perpetration of a sexual assault.

Number B, a person who subjects another
person to sexual penetration against the victims will or under conditions which the perpetrator knows or should krow that the victim is mentally or physically incapable of resisting or understanding the nature of his condict,
: is guilty of sexual assault.
Sexual penetration includes, any intusion, however slight, of any part of a person's body,
4 or any object manipulated or inserted by a person into the
5 genital or anal ppenirgs of the body of another;
6 including, senual intercourse in its ordinary meaning.
Evidence of cmission is not necessary.
Sexual intercourse is the placing of the
penis of the perpetrator into the vagina of the victim.
fellatio is the placing of the penis of the perpetrator
into the mouth of the victim.
Mriber 9, physical force is not a
necessary ingredient in the canmission of the crine of
sexual assault. The question is not whether the victim
was penetrated by physical force, but whether the act was comnitted without her consent and/or under conditions in which the deferdant knew or should have known the victim was incapable of giving her consent or understanding the nature of the act.

Murber 10 , the victim of a sexual assault
is not required to do more than her age, strength,
surrouding facts and attending circunstances making it reasonable for her to manifest her opposition.

Murber 11 , there is no consent where the victim is indhoed to surnit to sexual acts in fear of
death or serious bodily injury.
Number 12, mitigating circunstancess are
thase factors which, while they do not constitute a legal
justification or excuse for the commission of the offense
in question, may be considered in the estimation of the
jury in fairness and rercy as extenating or redocing the
degree of a defesdant's moral culpability. Any aspect of
the defendant's character or record, or any of the
circunstances of the offence, including any desire you may have to extend rercy to the deferdant may be considered by you as a mitigating factor.

In balancing aggravating and mitijating
circanstance, it is not the mere number of aggravating
circunstance or mitigating circurstance that control.
Surber 13 , in determining whether mitigating cirounstances exist, jurors have an obligation
to make an independent and cbjective analysis of all the
relevant evidence. Arguments of cansel or a party do not
relieve jurors of this responsibility. Jurors mist
consider the totality of circurstances of the crime and
the defencant as established by the evidence presented in
the guilty penalty phases of the trial.
Meither the prosecution nor the
defendant's insistence on the existence or renexisterce of mitigating circunstances is binding upon the jurors.
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which may be considered as miti.gating the crime of murder
in the first degree, even though mitigating ciranstances
is not sufficient to constitute a defense or reduce the
degree of the crime.
    In this case the defense alleges that the
    following mitigating circumstances are present:
            1. James Chappell suffered fran substance
    abuse addictions.
                            2. James Chappell attempted to be a good
father.
                    3. James Chappell's mother was killed
when he was very young.
            4. Janes Chappell has had no father figure
in his life.
            5. James Chappell was raised in an abusive
howsehold.
            6. James Chappell was the victim of
physical abuse as a child.
            7. James Chappell was the victim of mental
abuse as a child.
            8. Janes Chappell was bom to a
dnug/alcotol addicted mother.
                            9. Jares Chappell suffered a learnixy
disability.
10. James chappell was raised in a depressed housing area.
11. Janes Chappell was involved in a racially tense relationship.
12. James Chappell was taken away from his
support system by his relationship with Debra Panos.
13. Any other mitigating circomstances.
15, a reasorable doubt is one based on
reason. It is not mere possible doubt, but is such a
donibt 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's not a reasonable doubt.
Doubt to be reasonable mist be actual, not
mere possibility or speculation.
16, the jury is instructed that in
deterrining the appropriate sentence in this matter that
it may consider all evidence introduced at both the
penalty hearing phase of these proceedings and at the trial of this matter.
17, in deciding on approptiate sentence
for the defendant, you will consider three types of
```

1 evidence: Bvidenœe relevant to the existence of
2 aggravating circumstances, evidence relevant to the
3 existence of mitigating circumstances, and other evidence
a presented against the deferdant.
You mast consider each type of evidence
6 for its appropriate purposes. In determining unaninously
1 whether any agqravating circunstance has been proven
8 beyond a reasonable dabt, you are to consider only
g evidence relevant to that aggcavating circunstance. You
10 are rot to consider other evidence against the 11 defenciant.
12 In detemmining individually whether any 13 mitigating circumstances exists, you are to consider only 14 evidence relevant to that mitigating circunstance. You Is are not to consider other evidence presented against the 16 defendant.

In detemining indivicually whether any
18 mitigating circumstances outweigh any aggravating
19 circunstances, you are to consider only evidence relevant
o to any mitigating and aggravatirg circunstance. Yor are
1 not to consider other eviderce presented against the
defendant.
If you find unanimously and beyond a
reasorable doubt that at least one aggravating
circunstance exists, add each of you detemines that any
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1 mitigating circunstances to not outweigh the aggravated circunstances the defendant is eligible for any death sentence.
at this point you are to consider all three types of evicence, and you still have the discretion to irpose a sentence less than death. You nust decide on a sentence unanimously. If you do not decide uranimously
that at least one aggravating circumstance has been proven
beyond a reasorable doubt, or if at least one of you
detemines that the mitigating circurstances outweigh the
aggravating, the defermant is not eligible for a death
sentence.
Upon detemining that the defendent is not eligible for ceath, you are to consider all three types of evidence in detemining a sentence other than death, and you aust decide on such a sentence unanimously.

18 in your deliberation you may not discuss or consider the subject of guilt or inrocence of the defenclant, as that issue has already been decided.

19, credibility of believability of a
witness should be determined by his manner upon the stand,
his relationship to the parties, his fears, motives,
interest, or feelings, his opportunity to have observed the catter to which he testified, the reasonableness of his staterents, and the strength or weakess of his

1 recollections.
only the evidence in the case in reaching a vendict, you
rast bring to the consideration of the evidence your
everyday canmon serse and judgment as reasorable 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 ar
justified in the light of camon experience. Keeping in
mind that such inferences should not be based on speculation or guess.

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

21, curing your deliberation you will have all the exhibits which were adnitted into evidence, these written instnctions ard fom of verdict, which have been prepared for your convenience.

22, the court has subritted three sets of verdicts to you. One set is for a detemination of the
existence of an aggravating circumatance. The second set
is for a determuluation of the existence of mitigating
circurstarces. The thind set is for a detemunation of
weight to be given the aggravating and/or mitigating cimarstances.

23, now you will listen to the arguments
7 of counsel who will endeavor to aid you to reach a proper
serdict by refreshing in your mind the evicence and the
application thereof to the law. But whatever comnsel may
say, you will bear in mind that it is your duty to be
governed in your deliberation by the evideroe as you
urderstand it and rembiber it to be, and by the law as
given to in these instructions, with the sole, fixed and instead fast purpose of doing equal and exact justice between the defendant and the State of Nevada.

You should also each have several fonms of verdict attached to the back of the instuctions, I believe it's about four or five pages. They're fairly self-explanatory, The attomeys may disouss them further during closing arguments.

All right. On behalf of the State.
MR. Cfirs: Thank you, your Horor.
ctosing sumation
BY VR. CIENS:
Debbie loved life. She loved life. She

1 loved people, but she was afraid. She was very scared and 2 had a lot of reason to be afraid.
3
4 that ten years of what was a living hell with the
deferdant. This thing of weekly beatixgs by him, the
pain, the concern for her children. She had every reason
to want to give up. She had every reason to take it out
on other people, bot how did she respond to that. I don't
think of all of the nisery, but the beauty that slill
:0 remains. A quote from a yourg woman that lived decades
-1 ago that suffered a lot of pain and anguish and fear for
.2 an extended period of time, as well.
:3 And yet the beauty that still remins,
it You krow it really is a matter of perspective. It's a
15 matter of how people pick thenselves lip and go on with
i6 their lives. And we've got the whole spectnom of that in 17 this case. The whole spectran.

We have in Debbie Panos an indivitual who 19 had every reason to be bitter and dysfunctional. Yet, 20 what did we hear about her. She not only was up, she was 21 a person that other people lovod to be around. Sne loved 22 people. She morked at jobs, she worked two jobs.
23 Scretine she mocked three jobs to take care of her Family, 24 her three little children that she dearly loved.
25 She was enough of a giver beyond this, 51
outside of this sphere and difficulty she had, that people
liked being around her. \$ow did they describe her. That
she was giving. That she was compassionate. That she
hrould do anything for other people.
5 It was just the way that Debbie was. That
6 was how she chose to be in her life. She was even a
7 giving person with regard to the defendant, Mr. Chappell,
$\theta$ the person that killed her, the person that took her life.
9 Ard what a difference we see there. He is the toital -
10 opposite end, because he chase evil. He chose evil.
He chose, rather than to make the besto of 12 his situation, to love other people, to be kind to other
13 people, he chase to abuse other people, to take advantage 14 of them. the chose to only think of himself. Arkl in the 15 end he chose to take the life of Debbie Paros.
16 there are heroes in these lives that we've
17 heard about. There are saller heroes and there are
18 greater heroes. We heard about a grandrother who received
13 a call about the death of her daughter it cost her the
20 anguish in her heart to fall to the floor and bergan
21 screaming. Then picked herself up, went and got her three
22 little grandchildren and has raised them in a hane of love
23 and compassion. And what is really a great tribute to the 24 life that Debbie led.
25 What an amazing difference of choices we
have in this case, ladies and gentlenen. Debbie loved
cloms. That makes sense, doesn't it. She liked things
that made her happy. She liked things that made other
people happy.

How she lowed younger people. How she adored her ann
children. He saw the pictures how she liked to dress lip
like a clom. We heard about how she liked to collect
clowns. fe heard abort bow she liked hanging out with
people from work. How she liked to take her children and
11 they would go on picnics, go the Disneyland ard all the
12 other activities she had to work so hard as a single
mother to be able to provide for them, And still deal
with the things that the deferdant put her through over this entire time. It's just stumning, what she went. through.

And it's so important to think about this whole picture of what Dehbie went through as you are approaching the task that you now have.

You heard from a numer of her friends and
papole from Tucson, from Las Vegas. We heard about how 22 down in Arizona she would cane to work with the bnuising 23 on her face, or naybe not on her face, about on her anns 24 and her neck area, and she put extra make up on it to try 25 and disguise it. We asked co-mocker Dina, how often would
see that. She said at least every couple of weeks for the
2 entire tine she knew her. She knew Debbie for about five
3 years.
4 ne heard about the thing with the dresser
5 and sare of these other things that occurred that she had
6 the deal with. Dina talked about how she would get these
7 phone calls late at nigit from Debbie. She heard the
8 defendant's wice, chappell's voice in the background,
9 don't ever "E" around my kids because I will kill your 10 ass, he's yelling. I'll do an 0.J. Sippon on you.

He heard from Lisa Duran, Mike Pollard,
12 Kichelle Mancha, friends that worked at G.E. Capital with
13 Debbie. tho is she laying undemeath, the defendant 14 danands on the phone. She is not going have to any 15 friends. She's not going to have any life, and that 16 includes you, If I can't bave her, no one will,

Mike Pollard talked about when he sad the
18 defendant take his hand and slap it across Debbie's face.
19 She got out of the car, trying not to cry, went into work.
20 Then he drove off in her car.
How he showed $\mathrm{t} p$ at work trying to denand
22 money. It's just amazing. Little Debbie is goirs around
23 to her co-workers trying to beg money from them so that
24 she can get rid of him and get him out of the lobby.
25 Finally they have to have a nule that he's not allowed to
cone around nork, and they have to post security there.
Hichelle Mancha talked about the choke marks that she sow on the neck area and hor Debole talked to her about the knife that he held to ber throat. Claire talked about that incident, June lst. The defendant held
a knife to Debbie's throat and demanded things ficm her
and if claire hadn't gone up to the door it hould have progressed and gotten worse from there.
There was afi internption on Jure 1st, 1995. There was no internption of his activities of violence against Debbie Aucgust 31, 1995. There wes no Claire Mocuire to knock on the door and internpt him from completing the desire of his heart. The desire of his heart was a manifestation of his jealousy, his rage, his selfishness, his greed, and his need to control Debbie. Because his choloes were all about himself and notrody else.

We've Listened to days now, from people that ken him, both sides of this, and scne people in the middle of it, sonfe people that just went out there. The police, observed it. Heren't friends of Debbie. Meren't friend of his. Other individuals that saw this thirg, and the way that he was acting and the way he was trexting Debbie. And there was nothing, nothing redeening about this man that came out.

Kh had days to present that. He's a
despicable human beirg. We're talking about a guy that sells his baby's diapers. It's just appalling. You'vegot little children, they get same shoes fran the shoe store. And this gry is out there taking all the children's shoes back. Iheir mother goes to Dismeyland and gets shirts for the kids. Takes them hame. The defendant takes the shirts out and sells then so he can get mocey for himself, take care of his needs, because he thinks he's more inportant and his needs should cone first.

It is not enough that he just abuses these people. He now wants to hide behind thent, ard he wants to
portray hinself as a good father. He wants to still use
then. He wants to still abuse them, even in this proceeding, ten, eleven years later It's just appalling,

Blame, we heard a lot about blame in this case. Some of it was very up front, some of it was very subtly hidden in a lot of questioning you heard. But
there was an attequt to place the blame in this case for
what happened everyhhere but where it should be placed,
everywhere but where it should be placed.
What did we hear about, fe heam that the
25 defendant -- and we got this from his testimony in the
prior hearing. Ke said it to Dr. Etcooff, Dr. Etooff's
report, things he told other people, his actions other
people witnessed, his actions that police witnessed, his
letters that he wrote. I mean, we heard a whole busch of different things, even pecople that we heard from yesterday that knew him.

What do we hear, yeah, I had a lot of jobs but it's not my fault, they wouldn't give me a raise. Or, yeah, we had to leave Jucson because the job was getting too much into our private lives. Debbie was coning into the police department where she worked with bruises all over her axd the police were seeing her as a victim where they would be pulled aside, talk to the officer at the time of the dresser, and was pulled aside and the officer, out of concern, asked her what it was about, and Derbie broke dosn and started crying.
fold how she just bought this dresser for her daughter and the defendant had taken it back to get money for hinself.

But what's the problem with Tucson, not the defendant we're told. The defendant tells Dr. Etcoff in his testimony, well the $j$ co was just intading into our private lives. In other hords, shat I went to do is my business. IF I want to abuse my children or abuse ry wife, that's my private business. All of these pecple need to

## keep their nose out of it.

Well, our noses are in it now, ladies and
gentlemen. It was in it ten years ago when he was
arrested. It's too little too late for Debbie Panos.
But you can make sare corrections now. We can't brimg Debbie back, but we can see that justice is
done. We're going to talk about justice in a few minutes.

You heand about that cap beating incident
on January 9th of '95. The medical records are in
evidence. Take a look at those. She had a laceration
across her forehead. Her nose was broken and busted open.
3 He said he just through a opp at her and was as surprised
4 as anyone else mhen it happened to hit her nose. That's
not khat she told the doctor. That's not consistent with the injuries she received.

Once again be wants to blane scriebody else. He says the beating was an accicent -- the cup beating. It's an accident. These things happen. Igroring the fact that they happen to him and Desbie on a weekly basis, this one just was an accident. It was police abuse, he says. They were unfair to him. They erbarcassed him. They treated him poorly. That an appaliing perspective he has on himself and on life,

They arrested me in front of ny children,
: hou dare they do that. That K-Mart incident, the gross
2 misdaneanor - by the way, we put that into evidence,
3 today, It was one of the last exhibits. You can take-a
Tlook at that. It's a pre-sentence report. There's two of
5 then in there. one wis preparod for that grosi
6 misdeneanor conviction he suffered in the spring of 1995.
7 The other one was prepared in conjunction with this
3 case.
You'll see in there there's aceas ithere
the -- Parole ard Probation gees and they do hackground.
family information, things like that. Look at the one
2 involving that gross misdemeanor and you'll see in there
3 that he makes a pronise to the court, just give me a
4 chance at probation. at first he says, I didn't co any of
this. I mean, they made it up. It's boqus, but sinoe I
6 pled guilty, give me probation. Why? Because I manise.
this will never happen again. I love my fanily, just give
3 ne this one chance and I'll be grood from nos on. And the
9 oourt gave him a chance. Just like the system had always
0 given him a chance and given him a chance until they gave
21 him the chance to kill Debbie, uitinately.

23 getting, when he sruck off and went to Debbie's hane,
cs instead of where he has supposed to be. It was drux is rehaib. The systen was trying to reach out to the

1 defendant in his needs. And the consequence was death of
2 this nice young mother. Blame.
yesterday that said that Debbie --wll, actually it was
the -- we heard from the friend yesterday that Detbie was
the ore that was controlling, and Debbie was the one that
was alusing the defendant throughout this relationship. I
mean, my goodness, just incredible.
But it was Dr. Etcoff that said how the defendant told him he was upset at Lebbie for leading him to do this. Stabbing her fourteen times. Debble's fault, because sine led hin to do this. Blame.

Than we heard about the granctuther, Now at the last hearing ten years ago the granamother care in and testified, and you hear ber testimony today wiere she cane in ard appealed on belalf of her grardson. The talked about how she did her best to try to take care of him and his siblings. She made a plea on his behalf.

What to ke hear in this case. Despite the
fact that the defendant in those PSIs that you have,
characterizes his up brimging as good. He talks -- he
said he got whooped, but he says that he didn't want for
anything and he consicered it to be good. Take a look at those.

Bemerber what Dr. Etcoff said abcut that.

He told Dr. Etcoff the same thine about his gramhother.
What did we hear in court, blame the graxdmother. She wos abasive. And we hear, my goodress, physical abuse. And she -- it's child negligent. Ard it's the granctother's fault.

Then the last thing, and one of the nore
amazing things in this whole case going all the way
through it now, just this moming we had the issue of race
injected into these proceedings. I's almost like an
afterthought. We hear that not only is the mother of the
deceased person, Dedbie, she was a bigot, she was a
raciest and that's part of the problen going in. But that Dehbie herself was a raciest, he hard that from one of the indivictuals.

Just amazira all the blame that's going out avery direction from the defendant, but back to where it really reeds to be in this case.

Repole aren't perfect. Systems aren't perfect. But it's time, ladies and gentlemen, for the blane to stop and for there to be accountability. Yes, the defendant had difficulties in his early life. But they're not uncammon things. A lot of people grow up humbly. A lot of people grow up without a mother or a father or some other parent. There's granquarents raising kids all over the place these days.
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one cormentator once said, pain is
inevitable, but suffering is optional. We cone back to
the individuals we got in this case. In light of all
these circurstances, yes, pain is inevitable Everybody is
going to have pain. Everybody is going to have
difficulty. But how to we address that. Do we go around
blaming everybody else and doing bhatever we selfishly
want to do, or do we rise above it. Because it's possible
to becund a better person, as a consequence of pain, not
just get through it. Everybody knows that, he know that.

Those that have suffered through the travails of life and risen above then and conguered thern know that you can beccme a better person. Debbie did that.

Debbie was a great person, because she dealt with her difficulty. The defendant, Mr. Chappell, did rot. He chose the easy corrse. He chose the selfish course. Ile chose to not suffer. He chose to inflict suffering on other people.

Dr. Victor Frankle (ph) has been around for decades. He was a holocaust victim. A psychiatrist. He lives in Vienna. He thought long and hand while he was in the concentration carp -- he had lost his wife, lost both parents to the fascists -- about the idea of life and

1 its meaning, and kow you can have meanimg when yor're so
confired and so restricted and so oppressed in a situation
like he was in. He watched other people. He counseled
people while he was in the conoentration camp about
suicide and things of that nature.
6 It's important I think to take a jook at
same of the differences in opinions in this profession.
Because he had Dr. Etooff cone in. He did a tho-hour
intervien. He gave a fen tests, and this is montus and
months after the crime, that was based on a situation that
had been going on a dynamic for years, and he comes in and
basically has opinions where all he really did was
regurgitate same self-serving things the defendan: told him. that kind of analysis can you give the man.

It's not that pspchiatrists don't have a good role in helping people. They do great things. But what we heard in this courtrom was only what. the doctor did not krow. Ard it becare so obvious to all of us who have sat through this proceeding, you've heard the evidence, the things that he didn't knon, to conce in and give assessments based upon a two-hour intervief, when you see the eromity of what was going in this case, it just doesn't cut it. It doesn't even oane close.

We have Or. Frankle talked about human
suffering, and said even in the most absurd, painful, and
dehnmanized situation, suffering is menningful. A human
being is graced with the power of self-definition. His
path, his destiny, he decides hinself. Even in
concentration camps, you can have people that chcose to be
clecent and people that chose to be not decent pecple, to
be evil pecple, basically.
Wh had Dr. Etcoff talking about he has
less free will than the rest of us. You know, is there anybody that has less free will then sanebody who was in
one of the fascists concentration cimps, where there was
psychological torture, physical torture, death, losing
loved ones. And we hear from a survivor of this, a
psychiatrist; both altematives are hidden in a person,
and which rill be realized depends on decisions and not on conditions. Decisions, not onditions. We've heard a lot about blame. He've heard at lot abouk corditions from the detendant. Ladies and gentlenen, what we need to sentence the defendant on is decisions that he made, and he made then. He made then one after another.

That shows his tnue intent, And that's
the fair basis for assessing the appropriate penalty in this case.

Opposition is a principle that has always
been with us. And a lot of times, when you really think
about it, it's the decisions we make against opposition that really define us. Easy choices don't define us, do they. It's choices that people make in times of difficulty. Those are the people we call heroes. Liike the grandrother here, mayte both grandrothers, who stepped in a situation that was thrust upon then and stood up and did a very heroic thing for these children.

The ripple affect of the defendant's actions are just amazing. I mean, it's more than just Debhie's death and the horrible way she died. It's a horror, that she was gurgling in her onn blood. There is no way to sugarcoat that. I don't care if it was 15 second of 15 minutes, it was a horror. And like her nother said on the stand or her aunt, probably the last thing she was thinking of was her children. Hhat would she be thinking. Who is going to take care of them. I'm not going the be there to take care of therr. I love them so much - the ripple affect.

It's the difficult decisions that define our actions. We saw the time line. We talked about these incidents. We hit the high points in our opening. You heard a lot nore datails in between. We told Dr. Etcoff about 15 arrests for breaking and entering and other things that started when he was about thirteen years of age, choices he made. You heard about the incident back
in 1988, where he thren a brick at an individual and struck hiva with it over a confrontation.
he heard about incidents that occurred domn in Arizona and Mroson. The time line talks about some of the major ones, the notes and threats to kill her, that were heard in the backgrouxd by Dina. Selling the dresser. Threatening to do an 0.J. Sirpson on Detbie before they ever came to Ias vegas. But there were a lot of other things that occurred in nucson betwen that You've got the records here in Exhibit $\$ 0$. 129, that details sare of these thing.

Now, the police weren't there every other week then she was getting beaten like we've heard about. bat the time they were there, they were able to doanent sare of these incidents of theft, taking care of himself, stealing things, and abusing the poople around him physically and emotionally and mentally.

Back in '92, there's docinents of darestic violence, laceration to the forehead. You'll see that. cebbie didn't want to report these as sonething he did. She tried to make up excuses for hin and cover for him.
'93 anothet danestic violence, another disorderly conduct. We've got kicking from the defendant when she confronted him about the chest. His response was to throw her dom and start kicking her.

Theft of her dresser for the refund. The 2 phone call to co-worker. The defendant deranding the car 3 and money wanting the keys to the car or he was going to 4 do an 0.J. Sirpson on hes.
$5 \quad$ Then we bave that nove to Las vegas 6 because the police departrent in Iucson becare insolved 7 and that becane bothersone to his way of life. 8 We talked about same of the bigge: things 9 that happened here in Las vegas that were doomen=ed by io the police. The broken mose that happened. The slap il across the face. The knife attack. The letters he sent 12 with the threats. The direct threat to her the day before
i3 when she went to testify against him in court. There's a
: lot of other things that unent on there. Asd cnce again
is they're docmented in the book and in those two judgments
:6 of conviction that go into it a little bit and the
$\Rightarrow$ history. and we see a lot of other thing that wese going
: 8 on in between, vehicle stops, traffic warrants, petty
:9 larceny -- even after that incident on June lst, he's on 20 probation for a gross misdeneanor at that point in time. 21 he gives that beating on -- go to the next screen -- June 22 lst, and than on June 11th, re's back out and he's doing a 23 petty laroeny and stealing a bumch of T-shirts.
24 Then he goes in for that and gets
25 arrested. He's back out on June 26th, committing a petty
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1 larceny where bes stealing clothing at K -Mart. It's at
2 that point in time when he goes back in they Einaily book
3 him for a probation violation. And he's got a hoid on him
4 fron city court, and that's when he starts writing the
5 letters to Debbie threatening her and denanding whty she
6 isn't coming to see him, and sho she has been see:ng, and
7 all the other threatening things he said.
She's not going to have any friends in her
g life. If I can't have her, to one will. And it's in the
io confusion of the booking when the juxige decides to give
il him a chance at drug counseling without putting a detainer
12 on him, he goes to city on their warrants -- traffic
13 warranks -- they're reading to release hint, because he's
14 done his time on those, and instead of sending back to
15 county they're dumping him on PbP. He's trying to fird
16 out what's going on with him and they get their w-res
17 crossed, and he sees this opportunity to get out and to
18 have his vengeance against Debbie, and that's exactly what 19 he does.
20 Those are the facts. That's the time 2 line. It's not one thing. It's not two things. Ladies 22 and gentlemen, we're not talking about a couple here that 23 had a disagreement and been fighting and drinking all
24 afternoon and one of them gets so wset at the other and a
25 knife is involved and one of them gets stabbed. 'That's

1 the classic damestic violence we hear about.
Danestic violence can to be repetitive
too. It can happen over a period of time. 隹at we have here when you look at these fact, is terror. It's terror. Ard it's calatiated. It's designed over years period of tine to give screbody selfish satisfaction. It's tary, many opportunities to reform, that are rejected.
he's the one that call everyone else a liar thelked about this with Dr. Etcoff a little bit. Fe blamed everyone else. He called everyone else a liar. He said be didn't kick her at the dresser incident. He said he never did that. He said Ms. Freeman is lying about the O.J. conment. The victim is lying about getting kicked. The victint is lying about the cop beating. That was just an accident. He didn't do a dance, he didn't do a jig after the murder, They're lying about that. He didn't go to Lucky's to commit a shoplift. He just sent over there to buy a newspapers. He never told Lisa, if I couldn't have her nobody else could. All these other people are lying.

He's the one that's being truthful. All these other people are to blane. He's the one that doesn't have any blame. It's an accident. And yet, look at his convenient merory, He ounes up with excuses. He
omes $\varphi p$ with some sort of stories that don't make any sense in light of the evidence -- and we'll talk about that in a minute.
and he's the one when it actually comes
doun to the point of the murcer, all of a suxden has a
menory lapse so that he don't -- the last time he
testified doesn't have to explain what he's thinking of
axd the impossible explanation of how he picked up that
knife and plunged it into her body in the way that he did.
Hor convenient. But he's not a liar, it's everybody else.

Let's talk about the facts. You heard a lot about the hare. Ie's pat sane of these together. You heard about the location of things in the rocn. How he cravled throwigh that front window in the master bedrocm that had the bath attached to it. How Debbie's body was found right inside the door to the living roan. He had all of these letters right down around the back wall of that master heatrocm, letters he had written.

涫 had the knife positioned right by the top of Debbie's head. That's the knife used to kill her. Then his - or blood in the bathroom here, demonstrating the clear up that occurred after. He says he panicked and ran straight outside afterwards because be couldn't deal with it. But the evidence says conclusively that he went

1 into the bathrocm and did a clean up atter that occurred.
And than avails himself of her purse and
3 his and dildren's social security cards, shich he tried
4 to dunp at the Lacky store. He was trying to get rid of
5 those things. So we had the scene in the living rocm and 6 in the master bedrocn,
7 We have these letters, threatening letters
a he had write to bee. And he says that he, when he went in
$g$ that room, didn't create that problen. He just grabbed
10 them later and thresw them at her. That be wasn't going
11 through the letters. But we have sheri snith, Lattona
12 snith -- is the mane she goes by now -- heard her, the
victim on the phone, tebbie, asking her for help, begging
for help, asking to come up with a plain so she ould
leave the residence and go get her kids and get. away frar the defendant.

The deferdant has this whole story about how he fixds this other letter in the car. There is another letter, ladies and gentlemen, but he did not find it in the car. coes it make sense that all the letters are in one place in the bedrocon here and they're disturbed and throm all over the floor, but the one letter that they end up fighting over is in anothex location.

We krow he's going through the rom,
5 because he's heard by steri when she's on the phone with

1 the victim denaming money. Well, at least she hears the
2 victim saying, I don't have any money. But the day care
3 worker can hear his wice in the back roam.
the cane back to the area of the ssene.
5 There's a lot of physical evidence there that's irportant
6 to take a look at. The physical evidence, ladies and
7 gentlenen, does not lie. It is what it is. It is where
a it was. ke know from the owa that he had vaginal sex with
g Detbie and ejaculated. Yet, the story that we hear fram
10 the defendant in his testimony and Dr. Etcoff, is that he
1 did not ejaculate during semal intercourse. He canes $\varphi$
12 with this whole thing that he thought she'd been with
3 other men. She's messy, and so he withdraws and walks
4 axay. Aud she canes to him, becouse he's so lovable that
5 everybody always wants to keep him happy. I don't know if 6 you see that threat in the way he thinks about things.

But she wants to please him. Aro she
feels bad because ste knows she got caught. So she offers
him oral sex. And that's how they consumate sex.
But you heard about the physical evidence
in the case. That's not what happened, plain anc simple.
That did not happen. He caue in and had sex, forced sex
with Debbie. And we know that for a lot of different
reasons. We know that she's in a fetal position in Mr.
Pollard's apartuent only minutes before she tries to rum
back and get the kids thing. He can see her sitting there
at Mike's house. Nike wants me to wait. The lorger I
wait the more the chance is he'll get there betore me. If
I mun back now, Mike's trying the get oot of the shower.
You see why she takes off. So Debbie goes.
She goes over there. He's already there.
He's going through the letters. He's found the letter and
he's and at her. She canes in, and the confrontation is
on. There's a beating that occurs we know 15 minutes or nore before the fatal wounds are given to her neck.

Why tro episodes of physical violence against her. Because there's compulsion. Thinks about those injuries to that upper amm -- her upper am. That's the kind of injury you get when you're graboing samebody to try to get compliance for sometody. That's the kind of injury that she would have received back in June when te
was kreeling on her atris, grabbing her amm and holding the
knife to her throat trying to get infomation about boyfriends.

That's exactly the kind of injury you would see after finding the letter and confronting her, fighting over the letter, and it gets tom up in this room, ladies and gentlenen. But it gets tom up at a time when the door is open. Right there at the door, not in the car. There's no pieces of the letter that are in the
car. The pieces are in this roan right here by the letter - by her head, right outside by the door jami ard outside that door where she got the door open to try and get away from the defersant. Haybe right before the confrontation, mayte right at the time of the confrontation, or right after tearing the letter, she tried to get out the doot.

Whe of her shoes is outside on the porch.
You'll see that in the photos. One of her shoes is
inside. When he dragged her back in and threw her on the
floor, all of those pieces and all of that evidence is
consistent with the attack occurring right there,
including the blood pattern evidence that he've talked about. Nothing in the car is consistent with that story the defendant tells.

So why does the tell it. Secause he wants to convince the police, the doctors, you, that the rape was consensual ard everything was just hunly-dory until a certain point wen he foum that letter. Because be needs a reason for going off, and that's what later sends him into a rage.

Nothing in the physical evidence in this
23 case supports that version of events. It's simply not
4 true. Dr. Etcoff could see that as he was hearing the
evidence as mell that he'd been coned and that essentially

1 lied to by the defendant in his interview.
You can't see the red in this reai well. bat you see in the photograph dorl on the floor here,
Detective Vaccaro talked about the blood pattern evidence.
5 How that would line up with her stomach.
6

8 in the neck and the chest area. That wound there Dr.
9 Green testified would bleed for amtile. And it ded bleed
10 for awtile, stich it wouldin't have been able to do if it
11 had been adninistered at the sane time as the neck
12 wound.
13 And if she had tumed over with that is bleeding on her side to her front to try and craw. away, 15 or get away, or protect herself and he had to turn her 16 back over to get on her for the fatal stab, it would leave
that exact kird of pattem there on the floor and on the chair from the arterial bleeding.

Renember the chart we had, Exhibit: No.
135. This physical evidence is important here, ladies and gentlemen, because the aggravating circurstance in this case is that this crime occurred during the commission of a sexual assault. And sexual assault is an unconsensual sexual penetration, or sexual penetration under
circurstances where the assailant meer that his victim was
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incapable of resisting an assault. It doesn't rexpire
damage to the vagival area, anythingy of that natwe, it's
non-consensual or under non-consensual circurstances.
That's the aggravating circurstance.
The defense in their open statement said
several times about, hell, the state never chargel that as
a crime in this case. Kell, as the court has instucted
you the state is not required to allege it as a crine in
order to utilize it as an aggravating circunstance that
would merit the imposition at the death penalty hearing.
You have to remenber in light of the facts
of this case, the D*A evidence, and the other evidence
they were getting developed wasn't know at the beginning
of the case when we filed the initial charges about the
robbery and sane of the other things they krew aboktt
initially, burglary and marder. It came along later after
a hearing and after the case progressed.
So the state made the sexual assault an aggravating circumstance and didn't choose to include it
as one of the counts where it really wasn't -- when you've
got the murder and all the other things, it wasn't. as
critical to charge it in the original plea.
But it is a decision that you have to make
4 in this case, beyond a reasonable doubt, that sexual
assault occurred. And that's why ne're talking ahout it
ron. Ard that's why they emphasized that in their opening statement.
But based upon the evicence in this case, 4 ladies and gentlemen, there's no question that a wanan who
5 is in a fetal position shaking, who has been told the day
6 before he's going to xill her, who calls the jail every
day to see if he's gotten out, is planning on moviny out
as soon as she can, who spent hours to talking to is probation officer telling her that she thinks he's going to kill her, is not going to have consensual sex with this man who cratrls through her window wile she's trying to gatherer up clothes and get back to a place of safety. If we didn't know anything else about all of the physical evidence and his lies about how the rape occurred, you'd kow that this is a semal assault that cocurred here. 阫 look at the injuries to the victim.

See all of that bruising, abtasions up
around the head ard chest area. lie've got that shot to the abdurnen. There is a pattern here that really jusps out. It really jurps out. Because when you look at the spread of the knife hounds, you can think, well, you konow, mype he's a bad aim. We've got one in the groin. he've 3 got one in the stomach. He's not a bad aim. He hits exactly what be wants to hit. I mean, look at how concentrated these are. They're so conoentrated Dr. Green
said that it was hard on the internal exam to tell shich direction each cut wont. He just does a number on her neck, No problem with his ain there.

So why do we have ore clom here and one here randra. This is a message, ladies and gentlemen.
This a message that he's giving to her in his rage. That
message is intended -- that shot in the abdonen in
intenced to cause pain. Ard he hit right at the core of
ber being and who she is and he put all of his anger into that cut.

That shot dom in the groin ared, he doesn't hit it exactly, but it definitely doun in that
area, maybe she moved or twisted, it doesn't line up with
the bleeding wedve got here on the floor, butt that is a
symbol of his control over her that's so present and
visible throughout all of those letters that he sent to
her, all those phone calls about who are you with noi, and
his desire to control her sexual, that's that shot that he takes there.

He's got tine to think about this, ladies
ard gentlemen, before those fatal shots to her reck to
take ber life span dom to 15 seconds. It was a rape,
ladies and gentlemen. It was a semal assault. And
that's the aggravator that we have in this case.
It's been proven beyond a reasonable

1 doubt. Ard once it's proven beyord a reasonable doubt,
the next step you do is you balance the mitigators against
that aggravator, in this case, to see if that aggravator
is outweighed by the mitigator. There's a whole list of
mitigators that are being given to you by the defense
about how he grew lp and this or that. These are sad
things that cocur, some of them. But nothing in that list
outheigis the emonity of what they did to cebbie ganos on August 31st, 2001.

So we're at the point where we alkays had
to be. You couldn't know that at the beginnirg of this
case, but the evidence here mandates it. It mandates that
you would always have this choice. You would cone to the
point where death would be on the table.
It doesn't mean that you have to select
death, bat there's no question that death is on the table
7 as an option in this case. That's why we ask so many
questions about this at the beginnixg.
I ask you to bear with me for a corple
more minutes while we talk about why death is the
appropriate and the fair consequence in light of all the
facts and circumstances of this case.
I had a little philosophical discussion with Dr. Etcoff. I hope I didn't boor you. Mayoe you got fed up with it. "Re talked about free will, and choices,

1 percentages. You know, our system of criminal justice, 2 ladies and gentlemen, is based on accountability. He can say we're going to take the utilitarian approach. You can't live in this society, we're not going to cament did
you do it, you dim't mean to do it, this is a proven
risk, to separate you fram scciety. And that's it. Kind of like no fault criminal law.
he could do that, but we don't. 战 could
say, well, you kon, it's not very cost affective to
separate you from society. You know, why pay for that.
You can't function in society, why pay for that, we'll
just execute everybody ard that way we won't have to pay
the cost. he can put it to work helping people that could
be belped that can live with other people, put then into
those kinds of things, people that can be saved. Trat's

*'ve got a fault based system, Ye have a
systen that's based upon choices people make and being held atoountable for their choices. That's what we call justice. Aristotle said that justice is giving to every man their due -- what they're due. I'm not talking about the defendant bere just getting his due of an eye for an eje, or a tooth for a tooth. He take a life, so we're going to take a life. That's not the due.

I of the case, what's fair, what's appropriate. It's important to be that way. It's important to be that way, because it needs to be a decision. It needs to be sanething people can live with. People can be confortable with, so we feel good about ourselves and give society an application of laws. entitled to protections of the law. It's clear that everytody should be liable to the nules of law. Fe talk about less free will or more free will, I mean, it's smething that kird of cuts at the heart of what we're about in the criminal justice systen. I nean, the intent is the thing here. And that's what we look about in our system of justice.

Herle's ghost told Scroxge on that first night before Scrooge bree the eromity of what he was getting into there, in the Christras Carol, "I wear the chain I forged in life, replied the ghost. I made it link by link, and yard by yard. I gircered on of my omm free will." Link by link and yard by yard, and we have that in this case.

You don't see in this case just one narrow spectrom of how he came and killed her. You've seen years of abuse and horror and terror that he subjected this weman to and her children. And you can consider that in
assessing what is an appropriate penalty.
Each man his due, not for revenge, not by
default, those are poor reasons. Reverge is sonething you
feel good in the manent, but he don't impose the death
penalty because we are upset. There's a lot of reasons to
be upset in this case when you see what happened here and
just react. But that's not hhat we're about here. That's
why we take the tine to look and examine and deliberate,
not for revenge. But not because it's the only choice
left, or it's maybe the easiest choice in sone minds or
the hardest choice. But because it's the right choice.
That's the only test that is really going to be fairly applied in this case.

We shouldn't impose a different sentence then death because it's a little easier. It isn't as difficult for us to do it and not as enotional. It's not the right sense.

I sutait, ladies and gentlemen, under the entire facts of this case, life without the possibility of parole is not enough. It's not encugh for what he subjected this wanan to. It's not enougn for the intention of the act that occurred here, and the terror that was involved, and the selfishness. Yes, good ol' fashion motives that we're all familiar with: greed, control, jealousy, a choice for selfishress.

2 chose evil. Is there a place for mercy in muther cases. There 15. There is. That's something that you need to consider. Mercy is sorething that ounes in sideways based upon same circurstances, and then it's decided that it will apply. And it will kird of take over the denrands of justice, khich would nomally be a life for a life.

But there are things that compel mercy.
That mould those things be. A person recognizes what they
did was wrong, maybe. Sanebody that really understands
the erourity of what they did. That really truly feels
bad about it. That feels remorseful, truly remorseful. I
don't mean just lip service after you're in troubse, but true remorse.

And hou do we know remorse. You sook at a person's condict, You look how they acted right aster the event. And then sme time later and you listen to them. Anyboty can get up and say I'm sorry, I wish I hadn't done that. When you look at all the ocoument in this case, ard when you look at the acts -- one said actions speak so mach louder than words -- you can't hear what you're saying because you know your actions are in the way. They really do. And when you look at the facts and circunstance and actions of the defendant in this case, that little jig that he danced at the enx, his conduct.

## right after, the way that even in the times he got caught

his intention to blame everybody else, blame everybody but
hifn. That's not true remorse.
There's nothing about this mon that recommends to you mercy in this partioular case. He mad a
mother that died at an early age. Are we prepared to
imminize everybody from the death penalty that had a
mother that died at an early age or didn't know their
father. Maybe he had a father that wasn't nice to them,
or say that's enough right there, not going to get the death penalty.

Everyiody has mothers. All mothers and Father are different. All grandothers, grandfathers are different. Sane people have ups, same people have dovis. Ard it's mhat you do with it, that makes all of the difference.

But those things do not recommera and caupel mercy. he have that phome off the hook. Debbie tried to crarl or get ower to that area again, neybe after she set up the plan, she dion't get all the way cutside the door. The mercy the defendant gave her, the jury trial the defendant gave her, the sentence the deferdant gave her, ladies and gentlemen, this is Dehbie Panos' parole eligibility right here, none.
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1 little children. Her daughter said she wanted to die so that she could be with her mother. The ripple affect in this, where is the parole for the rest of her family. They have no pacole.

They can't go and visit cebbie in an
6 institution. They can't give her presents that she could
respond to. They can't have conversations with her. If
you put the defendant in jail or the rest of his life, his
farily will still have those opportunities. We put the visitations logs in pertaining to this defendant, There's
been just a fen people that have cone over the years to visit with him, but he has that acoess in the prison system. Where is that access for the family merbers that are left picking up the pieces of their lives.

I don't care if it's ten minutes after the crime, ten years after the crime, the enomity of what he did is no different. Nothing has changed and he say that as these people where on the stand. We saw their anguish, even after all this time they're living with in Tucson. They keep her picture in the police depariment.

Sane of these pecole held up well, same lost it right toward the end. It's amazing after this ruch time this waran's life still has this kind of affect on people. Made all the worse by the fat she was so violently taken from them.

1 system, and he coned Mr. Duffy, sat across from him for
tho hours saying he really wented to do something about
that drug problen enough that Duffy let him gor and he went straight out over to kill Debbie.
He would like to see you coned in this case, ladies and gentleren. Don't be coned. Lon't sell it short. Please, don't go for the lesser things because it's easier, Do the right thing, even though it's the harder thing, and that would be an irposition of the death
penalty. Because ladies and gentlemen, the evidence in
this case indicates this is the appropriate penalty in
this case. It is the only appropriate penalty in this
case.
Thark you.
THE OONRI: Thank you, Mr. Onens.
Mr. Schieck or Mr. Patrick.
ctosng staration

## BY HR. PATRICK:

All I have to say is Mr. Owens dicm't get one thing right. There is absolute nothing that cramels you to give the death penalty to James. Is not having a mother or is not having a father enough to show mercy. Of course, it is.

The jubge told you that when he read the instructions to you. Why are you bere today. What is

1 your jow. Your jab so to determine what purishrent James deserves for killing Debbie Panos.

His girlfriend of ten years. His lover,
His rock. His confidant. And the mother of his three
cinildren. What you are not bere to do is to determine if
James killed Debbie. You were told that over a week aco.
The State wants you to Jmpose the death penalty or. Janes.
In order to do this, as you've heard, you nust fird an aggravating circumstance beyond a reasonable doubt You have to do that as a jury in a unanirous vote.

How the only aggravator that we heve for
you to consider is that the murder was camitted curing
the perpetration of a semal assault. What you need to
ask yourself wien you go back to the jury room is has the state proved that.

Over the last week the State has croved to you that Janes killed debbie. But you already knew that.
The state has proved to you that James beat Debbie. You
already knes. They have proved to you that Debbie's death
was very tragic and it affected a lot of people. But you
knew that a week ago also. So what the State has proven
to you is nothing that you did not already now when you
first sat in those seats a week ago today.
So what they tried to do is to corfuse
you, to mix it up and go off on tangents, because there

1 was a lot of evidence presented that they could not
impeach. They tried to hide the ball from you, and possibly the worst thing they did was they took every opportunity they could to show you greascre photographs, gnescre photographs of the autopsy, and gruesane
photographs of Debbie layirg on the carpet of her and James' trailer house.

They didn't need to show you those. Those are ued to prove that James killed Detbie. But you krew that.

Now, if you decide correctly that over the last week the State has not proven to you the aggravator that they've alleged, you don't even have to consider the death penalty. That's the first thing you need to do as a jury. Before you consider the history of danestic violence, before you consider Jantes' criminal arrest, you read to detemine if that aggravator has been proven and if you even need to consider the death penalty.

If you don't find the State has proven that, then you can give James a life sentence with parole or without. And you're finished.

I'm going to talk to you about the State's arguments, how they tried to hide the ball as it appijes to the doctors that the deferse called and had you listen to.

We call Dr. Etcoff for a very specific issue. He was here to explain to you Janes' personality, his conditions, and possibly how he thinks and reacts.
Dr. Etcoff perfomed a forensic evaluation on Janes.
That's all he was asked to do. He was not asked to do
therapy. He was not asked to do anything else, but to
give a forensic evaluation to tell what's good about. Janes
and what's bad about James no matter how the chips would fall.

Now the State had a copy of Dr. Etcoff's report from ten years ago. They kness what his testimony would by this time, because it mirrors the testimony he gave last tine. Unfortunately, for the defense Dr. Etcofe is a very busy man and his scheduling would tot allow him the testify sten we mould like him to and that's why you heard him out of order.

But now after hearimg fron danes' friends and family, Dr. Etcoff's testimony should be clearer to you. Everythim Jates told Or. Etooff about his childhood was validated not only by the school records that Cr. Etcoff had that the State had, but by James' friends and family on this stand over the last fev days.

In fact, listening to the fanily and listening to what Janes told Dr. Etcoff, it seers that Janes actually down played hor bad his childnood was to

1 the doctor.
Haw Dc. Etcoff also administered zests to Janes. These tests mere valid. We know that because the tests have built in invalidity irdicators. And all of those indicators showed that James was honest and truthful and his tried best when he took those tests. So the key points you need to think about when you are thinkng about deliberating regarding Dr. Etcoff's testimony are these:
There's no reason to question the accuracy of James'
history that was given to you and Dr. Etooff by Janes' school records. The history given in those schoo. records was also confimed by James' friends and fanily on the stand.

The tests given by Dr. Etcoff to James in foming his poinions were valid. And that Dr. Etcoff was testifying to a very specific question posed to him by Janes' defense, and that was to explain Janes, his personality, and how his chilohood would possibly affect the rest of his life.

Now James' mother died very young. She has nun over by a police care. According to the State, that's not uncamion to have your parents killed by the cops. His mother was addicted to drugs and aloohol, ard it's quite possible that she was using either drues and/or alcohol while she was pregrant. James' father was never

## around. Janes first met his father when he was ten years

 old. The most significant father son bonding incident was when Jates' father asked him to rob a bank. And again as the state just told you, that's not uncamon for yous father to ask you to help him rob a bank. Luckily Janes denied his father's request and did not help him rob that bank.Next Janes turned to his older brather
Rick. You sâw Rick testified. But unfortunately fick vas
not a good role model either. He gren up in the sane
household, under the sane circunstances that Janes did.
And Jaues, Rick had problers with dougs and going to prison.

The only other male role model Janes had an attempt to bord with was his uncle Anthony But his uncle Anthony was brutally stabbed to death while Janes was at a young age.

Janes and his three sibling were sent to live with their grandrother. A granchother who was both verbally and physical abusive. Psyctoloyical torture, physical torture, raybe, maybe not. Unfortunately, for Janes, unlike the doctor that lived in a concentration charo, he did not have the mental capability to pull his way out of that and bectere a better person by the age of 26.
care. She would beat then with sticks and extension cords. Ard while Dr. Etcoff said that spanking is fine, a but a beating with a stick or extension cord to the extent it leaves marks, that somods more like abuse then a spanking,

Grandma leaves them at hare alone for hours Because of this their house was the party house on the block. All the kids in the neighborhood knew there was no actult supervision. They krew they could go to the bouse and partake in alcohol, do drugs, didn't matter what tiseir ages were, granda was out playiny bixgo. They kew when she would be back, they cleaned the house, out the back door, Mobody was any the wiser.

Wow, to their credit the Lansing school District did try to help Janes. Whe leamed from Dr, Etcoff that as early as the fouth grade social norkers were involved with James' development. The report from the forth grade social worker noted that Janes would not respond when spoken to. He was in the fourth grade, but functioning at a second grade level. He had diffioulty foming meaningfil relationships, and she thought he should receive individal therapy outside the school district. However, James never received that therapy. After that James has placed in a severe
learning disabled class, special education The special
education teachers sere concemed because of his low self
concept and his trouble verbalizing his concens to
others. Somehor James made it to high school. At Sexton
High School he was seen again by a social worker, seen by
the school psychologist. That psychologist gave James an
extensive interview and revealed that James had little
hope of succeeding in life.
He does not have many copying skills. He
could not deal with problens. He would intend to withdraw
and awid problens and would take the easy way out.
Compared to the evaluation given of James three years earlier, Jates has made little progress. He still had the lón self concept. He was distnistfinl. Depressed, had poor problem solving skills, and few copying skills. Again, the psychologist reanmended psychotherapentic intervention, Ard again Janes was not afforded this help.

James also told Dr. Etcoff about his long history with drog abuse. Startixy with marijuana as a young teenager, aloohol abuse before school, to finally free basing or smoking crack cocaine by the time he was 18 years old.

When Dr. Etooff leamed fron James and the
Lansing School District, Dr. Etcoff adnuristered several

1 tests. One that he talked about was the Hexler Adult
2 Intelligence Scale IQ tost. On this test James sared
3 belon average, borderline score on his verbal IQ of 77.
4 And Dr. Etcoff explained, that placed tim in the 'Th
5 percentile, wich means that Jares' ability to urderstand
6 words, understand concepts, and to express himseli: with
7 words in a logical fashion is worse than 94 out or: 100
9 people.
9 10 with hords, He coned everyone. He coned Dr. Etcoff. A ll well-kown licensed psychologist with years of expetience 12 daling with people, just like Jams. Yell, be coned 13 Mr. Duffy, the Psp officer. But James has trowle 14 explaining himself. How is he $m$ ask yourself, hew is he 15 going to oamenticate in a way that is going to con people 16 who are used to dealing with pecole who are on probation, 17 ard who used to daal with baard a certified psychologist of with people just like hin.

Next, Dr. Etooff told you about Jares'
full scale FQ of 80 . That falls at the botton of the low
average range and places him in the 9th percentile. That
means that 91 out of 100 people of Janes' age will show
superior intellectual capabilities compared to James. \$o
what the State is telling you, that out of the gl people
25 Dr. Etcoff and Mr. Dusfy from Pse, aren't one of thent.
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1
2 Clinical Multi-axial Inventory II Personality test.
3 However, they do an anagram to that, I'd hate to say that a burch.

Now, James' test was found to be velid and rediable. Nor because of James' difficulty with reading
and words and comprebension Dr. Etcoff had to give him the test via audio tape. Fram this test Dr. Etcoff told you that you he found Jemes to be sensitive to hemiliation and rejection. Sirultangously Jomes would be very distustfill, he would still have a strong need to be dependant upon another person. This was due to his feelings that he could not function independently.

Now in Dr, Etooff's opinion, these $\pm r a i t s$ were enomously important in regards to Jomes' motive for killing Debioie. If he thought Debbie was leaving him, he sould be scared of losing her due to his dependency needs that started all the way back when his mother was
tragically killed. He would have difficulty functioning alone, but at the same time he would be prone to mistrust her.

Dr. Etcoff also told you he found Janes to be socially unconfortable and he would deperd on others to assure responsibilities that Janes didn't feel he had the ability to shoulder.
detached frum Debbie and being too close to her, because neither the closeness nor the detactment for fear of losing soneone that he was dependant on was anotionally tolerant for James. That sourds an awful like the motorcycle syndrame that Dr. Danton talked about. The need to need a relationship.
Dr. Etcoff told you about hod Jances ${ }^{1}$ deperdency issues again cante from the loss of his mother at a very young age. The fact that he never had a father figure, whether it's his orn dad or any other male relatives. That he had a less than adequate parent figure in gramata.
As to James' drug use, we leamed that the cocaine dependency was understandable. As it was a way for James to escape. It nould heip ease his feelings of iradequacy and low self-worth.
As a result of the cocaine dependency James was not afforded the opportunity to leam how to cope with his many problems. How, Or. Etcoff erded his testimony abcut statements about memory loss and free will. James said he does not remerber the actual events of stabbing Detbie. Now as for you as a jury to decide the weight and importance to give to that statement, everyone has a tendency to block traunatic painful events
fron your memory, Either consciously or unconsciously.
Ask yourself if any of you have ever done that. Then ask yourself an even more relevant question, does it matter.
Janes has always adnitted that he killed Debbie.
That's not the question before you,
whether or nat Junes killed her or whether he didn't kill
her. You heard that in Pr. Schieck's qenimg statement.
So what difference does it really make if he remenbers the actual stabbing.

Free will, Mr. Orens described it as a philosophical discussion with Dr. Etcoff. But again, it's an atterpt by the State to hide the ball, go off on tangent to get you to confused about what Dr. Etcoff was tnuly testifying about. Dr. Etcoff did not once sit on that stand and tell yon that James did not have a choice Whether or not to kill Debbie. Everyone has an ability to make choioes. What he told yon was the thought process in making those choices or free will is different in everyone. Under the same circurstances, you would not necessarily make the sane choice as a person sitting next to you.

As Dr. Etcoff pointed out, this decision making process or free will is influenced by many factors. First one was a low verbal IO. The abllity not to be able to sit and talk things out.

2 pacents, ro father figure, a less than aderuate
granctother as a primary care giver, constant dnag use to
escape reality, and any nutier of the personality
disorders that Dr. Etcoff testified that James has. So
ask yourselves, does a person with a backgrourd such as
this have the same ability to make the same choices, have
the same free will, as you do. And if you take nothing
else fram Dr. Etcoff's testimony, take one statement. He said, I think he is one of the minority of people who kill, who would actually do anything to tum back the clock and undo what he did. Dr. Etcoff testified to his opinions. opinions that he believed from tests, school records, and talking to James. The State was unable to repudiate Or. Etcoff's findings. The findings of a well-respected neuropsychologist with years of experience in dea.ing with people exactly like Jenes. So they went out on tadgents in cross-exanination, simply trying to confuse the situation and get you off point of why Dr. Etcoff was hired and what he was telling you.

Dr. Denton came in and testified. He was arother psychologist that was hired by the defense tean
for a very specific pucpose. He was here to talk to you sabout danestic violence in general and possibly give a

1 little insight as to James and Debbie's relationship. He talked about the domestic violenoe 3 cycle and how it is exactly that, a cycle. It goes from 4 good to, bad, back to good again. The cycle can te
5 entered into at any point, but once entered into it's
6 extcenely difficult to break.
I think Dr. Denton summed it up
8 beautifully, Jove the abuser, hate the abuse. Or, Denton
also explained to you the motorcycle syndrame, how a
person needs to need the want of a relationship, and how a
person with aftachment problens will be attracted to
screbody wito is initially cold to them, but when the
relationship gets going, gets close, the person with the
motorcycle symdrome will start pushing away that person.
It's rot the actual relationship they want, it's just the need to need a relationship.

Ask yourself from what you krow of how
James and Debbie fit into this. He jost talked about
Dr. Etcoff pretty mach summed up that James really fits into that. Dr. Denton told that if cebbie happened to be screone that had a strange relationship with her father or step father figure, that she could fit into the classic example of the motorcycle symirome.

Kext Dr. Denton gave you insight as to why
Debbie nould consent to have sex with James, even after

1 this darestic violence cycle bad started. He mentionad things like guilt, appeasenent to decrease the threat, leamed helplessress, the Stockiolm syndrune, and force. Well, if Detbie was seeing other men, guilt would seem to be a pretty ponerful motivator. Aqpeasement, well, we know from Mr. Stcoff, James had very linited verbal skills. Dr. Denton, in what little time he kas able to spend with Jares confimed this,

He told you that James would not be the person to sit domm and rationally talk outt problens. He didn't have that ability. Janes and Debbie, they both thought kould have the very physical relationship. They hould use sex to make w, sex to calm things down.

Now think about this, the cay that Denbie
died. James was upset. Debbie hadn't visited him, hadn't
call him in jail. They started to fight. Debbie knows that using sex has calmed him dom in the past. James does not have the capability to verbalize why he was mad. So like always, Debbie would voluntarily use sex to calm things down and make up, or simply to change the subject.

If you really think about it, from all you've heard over the last week, that's kird of a scemario that would make the most sense.

Or. Denton also told you a little about

James' dinuy use. How Janes would use drugs to control his emotions and to hide from reality. This fits in with or.
Etcoff's assessient of low self-worth and abardoment issues. The drugs would help the pain.

So not unexpectedly after the nost painful thing that's ever happered to Janes in his life, the first thing he does is go to a place where he knows he can get drugs.

How, again, the State could not directly attack Dr. Centon's professional findings. They had to attack Dr, Denton. And, again, trying to deflect your attention away frocn the facts. Then once again, tre State could provide no evidence to repuriate anything Dr. Denton told you.

Dr. Denton spent a wery short tirre with Jafres. That was becalse the specific reason he was here was to talk nore about domestic violence in general, wat he gave you about Janes and Debbie was just what he had gleaned off a very short time of talking to him. But again he wasn't here to give Jares a full and complete psychological evaluation. He was here nostly to talk to you about donestic violence in general. That's why Dr. Denton did not go into every minute detail of Janes and Cebbie and their history of danestic violence. But that in no way dininishes his testimony in regards to the

1 domestic violence íssues.
As with both the psychologist, we brought
Dr. Grey in to testify about a very specific firding, and
that was the fact that there was no physical evidenoe that
James sexually assaulted Debbie. Hr. Schieck will talk to
you in a minute about Dr. Grey. We brought him $\varphi$ to show
you ance again the tactics used by the State to confuse
and mislead you and to get you off the testimony provided
by Dr. Gray.
Again, they could not repudiate [r. Gray's
findings. Dr. Green was on the stand. He was called by
the state He said nothing in his testimony to repudiate
what Dr. Gray told you regarding physical evidence of serual abuse. So essentially they couldm't tell you that Dr. Gray's testimnny was wrong, they simply used him as another time to show you the gnesane photagraphs of Detbie's autopsy. They did that simply for shock affect, to hide the ball, because, again, you are not here to detemine if Janes killed Debbie, because you already knew that.

So when you go back and deliberate, please, just remenber why you are hare, and what your job is. It's not to detemine if Janes killed Debbic. It's to detemine what panishment James should receive for that crime. Wo one is goimg to stand here and no ore had told
over the course of this trial that Janes should not be puished for what he did. But what is appropriate.

The death penalty should only be used on the worst of the worst. Ask yourselves, if what really fits here. Certainly Delbie's death is tragic. It was horrible. But for now and what you know about James and his childhood, his lack of parents, lack of an aciequate parental figure, and his lack of a positive role model, his leaming disabilities, his low IO, and his constant drug usage Erom age 13, and probably most importantly, his true regret and remorse, ask yourselves, is James Chappell truly one of the worst of the worst.

You heard testimony fram James' friends and Eanily. Most of them had drug problens. Most of them had prison time. As they have matured, they of changed their lives for the better and are trying to rake better lives for them and their family. Ihe Janes that sits before you today is not the Jates of 12 years agc. He is not the 26 -yearold kid that killed Debbie. James has worked to better himself while he's been in prisen, and he would like to continue to do so.

Janes krows that no matter what sentence you give hin, it's very unlikely he will ever get out of prison.

WS. HECKERLY: I Dbject at this point

1 There's no evidence in the recond.
IHE ONRT: I'll sustain the objection,
Move on.
1R. PATRICK: Okay.
But what Janes does not desecve is to die
6 at the hards of the State. So just remember Dr. Etcoff's
7 assesstent, Janes would tum back the clock on this and
o unco it, if he could.
Thank you.
CLOSISG SLXMATION
BY IR. SCHICKK:
Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I'm
going to try not to be too long and certainly try not to be repetitive.

In a case such as this the lan allows for both counsel to argue on behalf of the defendant, and in so doing, Mr. Patrick axd I try to divide up our argument 50 we don't say the same things twice. As I'm going secord. I'm the one that's task with not repeating what Mr. Patrick has said. I'm going to do my best not to do so.
any crininal case, there are certain burdens that have fallen upon the State in a penalty hearing, and one of those burdens is to prove that there is an aggravating circunstance to prove that to you beyond a reasonable doust. Because they have that bumen, they get the last hord at this penalty hearing.

There are a number of instructions. I
know the judge read them to you. Ard you got to read alony. Axd you'll have those instuctions back in the jury room with you. I'm not going to boor you with reading those instructions, I an going to go over guickly the framerk of wat takes place at a peralty hearing where the death penalty, at least, initially is an cption for the jury.

Ard these are rules of law that have been set down by our legislature the court instructs you on so that there is a structure to shat takes place when you go back to deliberate in a case like this.

The first instruction that really gets into that is Instruction No. 6, which tells you really what your need to find in a case to detemine what possible sentences you can inpose. The first thing that you have to decide is whether or not there is an aggravating circurstance that's been proven beyond a reasonable doubt. You have to make that decision
: collectively, all 12 jurors, unanimously. If ore juror
2 does rot believe the State has proven the aggravating
3 circunstance, it is not present, and the death penalty is
4 not an option. I'll adiress whether they have proven an
5 aggravating circumstance in a manent.
6 If you find there's an aggravating,
7 circunstance, then you have to go to the next step, which
$a$ is to detemine mitigating circurstances. And as you
9 pretty much can guess, mitigating cincurstarces are the
10 things that defense asserts are present in the case that
11 mitigate olyainst the aggravatify circunstance.
12 Axsi wien deciding rítigating
13 circumstances, your job is just a little different then an
14 aggravating circurstances, in that you don't have to make
15 that finding beyond a reasorable doubt. That's net a
16 burden that's put on the defendant. You can individually
17 make that decision. You don't have to have all 12 agree
18 that there is a mitigating circunstance in order to
19 consider that circunstance.
For instance, an we've listed a nunber of possible nitigating circumstances. Sane of you or any one 22 of you could find that the fact that James had an covvious
23 addiction to controlled substances, in this instance
I cocaine, as a factor to mitigate against the aggravating
; circustance. Others of you may find, I don't believe
that should be used as mitigation, but that one juror can
use that fact as nitigation when they reach the next step.

Likenise, you could find the fact that his
mother was taken away from him at a very young age and
without that mother figure, even though there was a
maternal grandmother present that provided a lot of the
basic needs for a child, dicn't provide that nurturing we
cane to expect fron a mother type figure in the lise of a
young child.
You may find scmentere, all of you, that
that is a mitigatiry circunstance. You don't all have to
find it. Your don't all have to find it beyord a
reasonable doubt. But it's a factor that you can
consider. So if you do find the aggravator, and you get
I to the ritigators, you each bave to make that decision and
discuss it arong yourselves as what you believe is
18 rintigation and hat maybe the others believe is
mitigation.
Then you take one aggravator that you
found undar this scerario, and you take the mitigators
that each of you found, and you weigh those, And this is
where the law sort of becomes vague, for lack of a better
word, it doesn't tell you how to weigh those. It deesn't
say one aggravator two mitigators, the mitigators
outheigh. One acgravator can outweigh two mitigators.
One aggravator can outmeigh five ritigators. That's ip to you to decide the weight to give the aggravator, and the 1 weight to give mitigators.

So this weighing process is very
6 subjective for each juror. That comes cut of this
weighixg process however has to be a conclusion reached by
the entire jury beyond a reasonable doubt, unanimously,
that the aggravator ortreighs the mitigator, or the mitigators con't outweigh the aggravator, before you know whether or not the death penalty is available and you go to the next step. Or you go to the next stop and only bave three other cotions.

So there's that process you rust go detemine if there is an aggravator, if not you just go consider the three foum of punishment. If you find there is an aggravator you go to mitigators, consider those, decide hhat weight to apply to then in weighing agairst the aggravators. If you decide the nitigators cutneigh, then you only have the three options available. If you decide that the aggravator outweighs any of the mitigators that you each form, you have all four options available.

Then you go to the last step, which is the step where you decide what punishment to choose from those available to you. When you get to that last step, you're
going to either have three punishments available to you, that being 40 years minimum to a hundred year maximus in prison, or life in prison with parole eligibility no sooner than 40 years, or life without parole urder one scenario. and if you made it through all the steps and get to the point where death is an option, then the fourth option would be the death penalty.

That's sort of the break down of the procedures you go through.

Now, be have to factor into that the information that you can consider of each step of the process, and that's spelled out for you in Instruction No. 17, which tell you there's three types of evidence for you to consider at a penalty hearing.

There is first, the evidence that's relevant to the aggravating circumstance. That's only that evidence that relates to this case, hhether or not there was a sexual assault durinx the perpetration of the murder. So you can consider only those facts that relate to the aggravator in deciding whether they lave proven the aggravator.

You than have evidence of nitigators. You can only consider the evidence of mitigators in support of mitigation in the case. That's the second thing.

The third type of evidence is called a

1 variety of things, but it's really other evidence.
Evidence in this case that would consist of other acts
such as doing illegal drugs, shoplifting, acts of dorestic
violerce, which are misdereanors that James was arrested
for, possession of dnug paraphemalia, the other acts you
beard about from the various witnesses called by the
State. That other evidence, that body of evidenoe that relates to -- and if, Onem, in his presentation put up 9 the two screens, on of then had the incidents in fucson, :0 they had the dates highlighted in blue, then the -etter in If white It broke down the various events, shoplifting, the traffic violations, the incident where the police were call fron the convenience store because James sold the dresser. That other type of evidence, you don't consider that evidence in deciding whether or not the aggrivator is present, because it doesn't go to prove anything to do with the aggravator. It doesn't go to prove anytring about the sexual assault. So you have to hold all of that body of information to the side shile you decide whether or not the aggravator is present, the mitigators are present. And in weighing those, they don't go into the weighing process.

You don't say, we've got this aggrivator and we found cur mitigators now let's heigh, and in doing the weighing less consider the fact that James was caught 111
with dinugs, James was caught with paraphemalia, Jomes was
a shoplifter. That doesn't go into weighing process. You
have to weigh and reach the last step before you use this other evidence.

I krow it sound difficult. The law
sametines is difficult. But that's the procecture you must
go thromgh. And that's these instructions try to tell
you, wich, over the years, have been written to tie best
of leyal ability so that people like yourselves on juries
can understand what you need to go through in order to
decide a sentence in a partioular case.
Now I'ri going to go back, now that you understand sort of the procedure you nust go throwh, I'fo going to walk throrgh those steps with you as quickly as I can, highlighting certain factors that we feel you should consider in making these decisions.

First is whether or not an aggravating
is circunstance has been prowen in this case. Mr. Onens, in
19 his presentation, talked a lot and he had the photograph
20 up of debra in the mobile home, hortibly tragically
I deceased. A terrible act. Shouldn't have harpened. But
they needed to show you scone of those in order that you
3 understand what had transpired. And he kind of - when
s talking about sexual assault, cane up with a theory that,
25 well, the letter mast have been with the other letters and

1 almays in the house and this going out to the car never
2 happened. And if you'll look at the photograph, you'll
I see there's a shoe outside and there's a shoe inside.
You've got the photographs. Whey're in evidence. You can look and see the shoes that are there, and bry looking at those you'll find that the shoe that's outside doesn't match the shoes that's inside rext to Debra's body. It's not any evidence of anything taking place, as the State would have you speculate.

That's the thing you don't want to do in a case like this is engage in speculation or guess, or mayde it happered this way, or it could have happered this way, when you're considering the aggravating circumstance, because that's the fact in this case. They must prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt based on the evidence of sexual assault. What is the evidence of sexual assault.

The evidence in the case from Dr. Gray was
there is to physical evidence to support, per se, sexual
assault. The type of things you hould expect to see if
there was forced interocurse. The bruising of the legs or areas below the waist, things that would indicate that there mas trauma inflicted during the perpetration of some act of sex by force. You do't see those.

Dr. Gray said he didn't see them. He complizented Dr. Green as being a very fine pathologist.

Dr. Green was in here and gave you his findings. He didn't relate anything that said this shows me there was sexual assault. We have the presence of CWM that shows there was sexual contact of some nature between Janes and Delbie, but nothing that mould show that it was sexual assault as defined in the instruction given to you.

Now, the State says, we've got all these bruises -- and we've left this chart up here, intentionally left it up here, because we can talk about those bruises. He have bruises on the hands, the ams, contusions to the face. There sere blows struck. She was hit at sare point, and Dr. Gray said at least 15 mirutes prior to the stabbing. Dr. Green, I believe was a little bit longer. He said 15 to thirty minutes before the stabbing.

Why is that irportant in considering the aggravating circunstance in this case. It's inportant because the aggravating circomstance is sexual assault during the perpetration of the killing. The killing was the stabbing. What happened thirty minutes before was not during the perpetration of the killing, Use your common sense in looking at the aggravating circurstance, the way it's worded. It's during the perpetration of the killing. The killing took place after the bruises were inflicted by fifteen to thirty minutes, at least, said Or. Green.

2 killing and the bruising. We subnit, that the evidence does not support that there was any sexual assault. There was an altercation. There was domestic violence. But no indication of sexual assault as part of that altercation
or as part of those bruising. In other words, there's nothing to tie the bnuising to the sexual assault.

If you accept the State's sort of theory
that the bruising was part of a beating that was part of a
sexual assatilt, that wes not the act of killing. The bruising did not cause the death, contusions did not cause the death, the knife wounds caused the death.

What do we know about those knife wounds.
They are inflected while she was fully clothed, because we
have the knife wound -- certainly this one -- goes through
both her stretch black pants -- you've see them ir. the
protographs .- and her under garments. And they line up
directly with the stab wounds. She was fully clothed at
the time she was statbed. Anything that happened of a
sexual natare took place before she was ever stabbed.
Obviously, while she was undressed, because of the
presence of [NA, irdicating vaginal oontact.
So she had already gotten dressed after
any form of semal contact had occurred, prior to being
5 stabbed. She was not killed as part of a sextual ansault.
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Den if you believe there was a sexual assault it was not during the act of killing, therefore there is no aggravating circumstance.

As horrible as the case may be, as tremendous and wrong as those injuries were, the law tells
us there's not an aggravating circumstance here. That
should be your first and last step in that analysis.
Findivg that there was not a killim during the
perpetration of a sexual assault, the only aggravating circunstance set forth by the State. In the absence of that aggravating circunstance you then proceed to croose between the three remaining punishments available to you.
And as Mr. Owens told you, you need to make the right decision in deciding that. We will seave that to you, based on James' past, based on the history between the two of them, based on all he factors in this case to decide the appropriate punisment when you cet to that point and there's only three available to you.

You can certainly reassert that the evidence doesn't support the aggravator, and you'll never have to consider the death penalty in this case.

However, I would be remiss if I didn't continue to angue to you conceming the other factors that you need to consider, should you not agree with riy
discussion concerning the aggravating circunstances.

A mitigating circurstance is sort of a onncept that
depends on every different case and every different jury.
And they're defined for you in Instructions 12,13 , and 14. You need to understand, mitigating circumstance is
not offered by the defense in this case as a justification for having committed first degree murder. It's not justification for first degree murder. It's not an excuse for first degree murder. It's not a defense for first degree murder. They're just factors that the jury needs to have in order to make the appropriate decision as to penalty in any case.

Axd they're defined for you as factors, while they do tot constitute a legal justification or excuse, may be considered in the estimation of the jury in faimess and fercy as extenuating or recucing the degree of notal culpability.

You are also told that in detemining whether mitigating circumstances exist, jurors -- and this is Instruction $13-$ - jurors have an obligation to make an imapendent and objective analysis of all the relevant evidence. Arguments of camsel do not relieve jurors of their responsibilities. Jurors must consider the totality of the circumstances of the crime, ard the defendant. And
neither the prosecution nor the deferdants insistence on the existence or non-existenoe is binding on the jury.

Murber 13 basically tell you you can find
whatever you want to find or not find in this case as a
mitigating ciramstance. With that in rind, Instuction
14, lists a number of factors in this case that are
present, or may be present in the coinions of same of you
for you to consider. The last one of those -- and it goes
frai Jares' substance abuse problens to his relationship
with his children, or at least with $\mathbb{P}$, with the loss of
his mother, the absence of the father, the household, all
those factors are listed as possible mitigating circunstances.

The last one is any other mitigating
circumstance. And that relates back to the previous instruction. Instruction No. 13, actually corresponds to mitigating circumetance 13, which is any other mitigating
circumstange which means anything you find is a
mitigatiry ciromstance, you can rely upon.
On the verdict fomms - you'll have these
back there with you. The verdict forms go through the
same process I've just gone through with you. The first
one is whether or not you find the aggravating
circumstance. That's the step one I just went through.
If you don't find the presence of an
aggravating circumstance, you don't have to do the
reighix. You can skip to the last verdict form, khtich is
the three possible foms of punishment.
one of the verdict $\rightarrow$ special verdict
foms has lines for you to list the mitigating
citcunstances that you fird. Whoever is selected as the
foreman in the case should fill that in on whatever
mitigating circurstance or circunstances are Eound. And
if you need rore roam or more pages, I'm sure the court.
would assist you in that. But there are plenty of blank spaces to fill in.

Then the thim verdict form would be, oo
to nitigators outweigh or do the aggravators outweigh,
which is the third step I talked to you aboat. Sc the special werdict fom pretty much mirrors the order that we've discussed the evidence in the case.

How the State and Mr. Patrick touched upon
this a little bit as it portrayed Janes as being aole to
on Dr. Etcoff and conning Mr. Duffy and asked that he not
on you, that you not somebow fall victin to a con. But
in amalyaing the evicence in this case, there are sane
factors you need to take into acount in really
detemining that James was not of the sophisticated nature
to be able to perpetrate this crite and come up with a
scenario that samelow explains away his combict, that
119

I explains the fact that he had gone alt to the car and the
note was in the car. That he was able to come with
3 this schere to make it look other than exactly as it is,
which is they did go pat to the car and fourd the rote,
5 which explains why the note is outside and in different
condition in different rooms then the other letters that were found.

They want you to believe he is
sophisticated enough to con Mr, Duffy, yet, in making Lp
this story he doesn't -- in his testimny -- he dich't say
I went and got drunk and I was so high I dicn't know what:
I was doirg. In fact, he testified be was sober and he
denied he had done any drugs. He had the opportunit:y to
say, yes, there was beer there and I had the beer. He
denied having beer. So this individul who they want to
say is sophisticated enough to con everyboty in this case,
isn't so scophisticated as not to say I wasn't intoxicated,
I was sober. I didn't drink, and I didn't have dnows at
the time. But I did become enraged, unoontrollably
enraged.
And those wound don't show anything other
than urcontrolled rage. There's no pattern there.
There's no -- if you'll look in the photographs, Dr. Green
sort of drew them in. But if you look at the photographs,
you'll see the angles and bou frenzied it must lave been
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in a very sort period of time. Not a thinking act. Not a
preaeditated act. An act of unoontrol lable rage that
factored in all of his shortoming in his life, his disabilities, his inability to oope with situations that involve loss of loved one, attachment disorders, learning disabilities, inability to verbalize what he's feeling, the fear of loss of a loved one, all those thing that: factored into frenzied unthinking conduct that se see in this case.

Ihis sophisticated person at was porning everyone takes the car and drives to a location where he's uell-knomin then has contact with people axd rents the car out in order to get money for cocaine to these two ladies. You heard thair testimony read fron the previous trial. That's hon scopisticated he was. He ran to the nearest place where everybody would know him, so he could get caugit quickly I srppose. There's no conving going on there. It's, at that point, self-medication is what the needed.

He reeded to hide from himself because of what he bad done and knew he had done. And he sent to the one place he knew he could get what he needid at that point in time and that was scmething to make him not rementier what he had done.

What does he do the next day. He goes to
the Lucky store that's right there in the neigbborhood and oomments sane shoplifting. You'll see the photographs of the things he was shcolifting. Clearly was an invitation to get caught with the itens that he had. And he does so, carcying the names on he social security carrs of Debra and the children to be sure that if he is caught staplifting he could be linked to the hanicide that just happered the day befone just top the street.

How, is that a sophisticated person with the ability to con anyone by his coxbuct or by his words, or, again, sareone looking to get the necessary quick
money to continue to self-medicate to calfin wat he must be feeling for what he had done.

You'll have the letters he wrote to Debra
in there fron the jail. And they only highlighted some of the bad thing that were in those letters. I tried to bring out scme of the things that he was writing to bebra, I love you, I ayself you, I need you. Then the next sentence is calling her a slut.

Look at those and consicier how
sophisticated and how continise this individual was, as opposed to very confused, very afraid young man, that didn't want to lose probably the longest relationship he had in his life at that point with an adalt person, that being with Debra. IThey'd been together for aine or ten

I years at that point in time. And the fear and the anger
2 and the reed for love that he expresses in those letters
3 is what you feed to consider is in his mind when these
4 terrible events happened.
Mr. Owns talked about, with respect to
6 Debra, that she had been in a living hell, there were
7 weekly beatings. That she had tried to hide, fe can't
8 ignote in considering what is the appropriate punishment.
9 in this case, the real dymanics that this relationship
0 had. They had been together all this time. If it was a
If living hell, they won't have been together all this time.
12 There was samething there that kept them together, that
13 sired three children, that caused Debra to even -- when
14 she came to Las Vegas - - to tell $m$ I believe it was Dina
15 or maybe lisa Duran -- that ocmimg to Las Vegas was a
6 chance to have a fresh start with James She wasn't
nuning from James. She was coning to Las Vegas with
James, still trying to make this relationship nork, despite what had happened in Tucson.

You can see that there was satething in
1 this relationship that was more to the two of then then
just a living hell. Arsi certainly I don't mean to down
play how difficult and wrongfully difficult it must have
1 been for Debra to deal with James' addictions and
shortcanings and his attachment disabilities and inability
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1 to hold a job. She had to deal with that. But there was
i scmething there that caused them to, at least, want to try J to stay together.
1 Perhaps mrongfully and they should, 1 't
5 have. But there was more to that then just saying this
6 was a living hell that she was subjected to on a conistant
7 basis. She had the opportanities not to be with Jemes,
a must at same level, loved him in order to stay witr. him
g through this ard stay with him through all of the kad
things that he had done, and try to help him.
Certainly that doesn't mitigate James'
conduct. I don't mean to imply that it does. It siat of
explains the dymaics of this relationship when you're
considering what panishent are we going to give to James,
given that dymanic of that relationship, if you get to
that point. Is death really the appropriate punistrient or
is life in prison a sufficient severe punishment fo: James
to deal with the relationship that had gone so terr-bly
wrong. But at one point, at least, kas a relationship
that they desired to foster between therselves.
It goes without saying that my argument to
you is that the mitigators outweigh the aggravators, and
the conclusion of that was the dymaics of that
relationship is something to consider in deciding
punisment in this case as possible mitigation.

2 nothing that se have done in this case was ever meant to
be hamful in portraying the relationship, and wether we felt it was necessary to portray that entire relationship to point out that $i t$, for instance, in the same letters Where James said bad things, James says loving things and comersational things about his daily existence there in jail. That it's rot recessary, and the right verdict is not the death sentence in this case. If you even make it to that point.

That in fact life in prison is severe puishment for Jates. A punishment that should be inposed in this case.

Thank you.
THE CONRT: Thank you. Let's take a quick recess.

## GREY ALYONITICK

During the recess, ladies and gentlenen, you are adnonished not to converse amony yourselves or with anyone else, including, without limitation, the lawyers, parties ard witnesses, on any subject consected with this trial, or any other case referred to churing it, or read, watch, or listen to any neport of or commentary on the trial, or any person comected with this trial, or any such other case by any medium of infomation
including, without limitation, newpapers, television, intemet or radio.

You are further admonished mat to font or
express any opinion on any subject connected with this trial until the case is finally subnitted to you.

肬'll take ten minutes.
(Recess taken.)
Ite coutr: Back on the record in
C-131341, State of Nevada versus James Chappell.
The record will reflect the presence of Mr. Chappell, with his attomeys, States attomeys, in the presence of our jury.

We'll continue with closing argunents at.
this time. Ws. Weckerly.
MS. HECKERLY: Thank you. CIOSING SUAHTION
BY HS. HECKERLY:
When the defendant, James Chappell, was convicted of burglary, robbery, and murder these were his comments of remorse. "I live no comment on my case, but to say that I got convicted of the wrong charges. I'n the only one who knows what I did and to have these people convict ae on false charges hurts really bad, But what can i do. Wo one ever has listened to me and rever will. I guess I'm going to have to white my on book same day. I

1 went through so much shit that I'm surprised I lest
2 control in '95. I'm extrenely sorry for what I've done, 3 but there's nothing I can do. The victim in my case meant
4 everything to me and meant the mole world to me, and she
s krew that. But she still made a bad choice and got
6. caught, I quess she thought I would have let her get away

7 with it, since I let her get away with so mach in the past."

Those were his cuments of renotse. She
got caught and he wasn't going to let ber get away with
it. And he's going to write a book. Undoubtedly,
recounting all the wrong that have been done to dames
Chappell over the years. It's offersive.
1 plays into every extrenely out-dated
sexist vien of violence in life. There's a tendercy to
domil play this murder because they kaen each other. It
was a domestic. And we've even shortened the phrase
throughout the trial, this was a DV. There was same
relationship, discord betueen the two. The two had a
troubled relationship.
The trouble in this relationship was, he kept hitting hec. The trouble in this relationshio was he broke her mose. The trouble in this relationship was he killed her.

It's probably a certain prejudice that he 127
i all sort of intermalize to some degree the idea that a nurcer betmeen two pecple who knew each other isn't: that bad. It's not as bad or scary as a stranger murder.
Because if a stranger had climbed through Debbie Panos' window, raped her, had bent her up, stabbed ber to death and then stole her car, there wouldn't by a whole lat of
conmentary about marijuana houses on the strect he grew up
on. There souldn't be a shole lot of camentary abost,
well, naybe she liked him, or maybe she wanted him back.
Fouldn't we discussing that at all. 胧'd be discussing
the violence of the act of that day. And that's bhat this case is about.

The fact that this deferdant knew his victim doesn't mininize what he did. It doesn't water down what he did. It doesn't make it less violent. This rurder was torturous and it was cruel. It was an outrage.

The fact that he kew who he was doing it
to, the person who had supported hin for ten years. The
person who he had children with. The person who had given
him chance, after chance, after chance. that does tee do,
that's the person he kills. It makes it worse. And he
kner, he knen when he did that who it would impact the most, and he chose to do it anyray.
25 It was the ultimate act of selfishness If

1 I can have her, ro one can. Inat apparently included his 2 son $\mathrm{JP}_{\mathrm{r}}$ his son Anthony, and his daughter Chantelle.
3 Because they didn't get her either after the deferdant was 4 done.

6 she was going to be out of everytocty's life, because he
7 had some hurt feelings. He felt abardonet'. He had a
8 troubled childhood. He was confused. He was afraid.
9 Cosh, poor Janes, why on earth would Desbie ever bave
wanted to leave him. The guy who call her a slut. The person who called her a whore. Finy would she ever leave this person, why did she decide to move out that day. Why would she have ever left the guy that pulled a kaife on her. The guy that broke her nose. What must she have been thinking.

Mr. Patrick talked to you about the psychologist that was called by the defense in this case, Dr. Danton, who hypothesized that what happen in this case was a situation of appeasenent sex, or sex out of guilt. Because certainly there's no indication that Debbie Panos may have not wanted to have sex with the defendant that day.
Dr. Danton was sort of a interesting witness. He talked about the need to need a relationship. He talked about this motorcycle syrxirome, and maybe she
had it, maybe he had it. Bat there was a sort of vague quality about what he was saying throxghout his testimony,
and they say the state is trying to hide the ball. It was
curious he fonned this hypothesis about a ten year
relationship after a two-hour interview with the defendant
and after reviening no police reports, no ritness
statements, no interviews with her family, nothing but the
defendant's version of events. But it's the state,
acoording to Mr. Patrick who's trying to hide the ball,
How accurate could any assessment be by
this doctor ho purposely shielded himself frof all the
relevant evidence in the case. Like the crime scene
photos, like the autoosy photos, so he could assess whether or not the deferdant's version of events where he offered up that this relationship was almays, always healed by sex, was truly what happened in this case. He didn't review anything, and then shen confronted with his shortomings, when confronted with the fact that the version of events offered to hin didn't matcin the physical evidence of the scene, what was his answer to that. Yell this is just a hypothesis. Well, that's really convenient, this hypothesis that you throw out there that doesn't match any of the evidence in the case. The hypothesis that suggests that Debbie went from being shaken and scared and rolled up in a ball on a couch
and 20 mirutes later was so excited that the deferiant
showed up so she could have sex with him. This typothesis
was meanifgless. He didn't evaluate any of the evident,
and shoulder't be anything that you rely upon in ceciding
what happened in the case.
Mr. Patrick made an interest oorment. He
said, well, what happened in this case was that Dabbie
tried to heal the relationship with sex, like she always
did. Do you recall the testimony of Dr. Danton. Even he
adnitted that after a tho-hour interview with the
defendant there wasn't a single incident where sex was described as the healing force in the relationship.

When there was conflict in this
relationship, we all know what happened. He hurt Derbie, and cefbie typically called for help. She called her friends. She called the police. She left the house and flagged dom the police. There is no healing witt. sex ever. This relationship had violent acts and Debbie asking for help.

She call her Dina Preenan when the deferdant threatered to do an $0 . J$. Simpson on her. When they fought over the dresser, what did she do. Did she heal the relationship with sex. Wo. She went dowa to where she knew an off-duty ufficer was working and she asked for help. 'limen he slapped her in the face, did she
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heal the relationship by hugging him in the car, ou trying to be affectionate with him. No. She got out of the car and ran to the safety of her co-workers.

How about the right he broke her rose. Was that healing with sex. No. She got a restraining order cight after that iscident occurred. Ard wher he dragged her into the bedrocn, threw her on her bed and stradiled her and held a knife on her to, as he put it, get sone inforration out of her. fas that bealed by sex. Wh. That was healed by the police caning and claire hooking on the door. There should be mo surprise to anyone that on the day that Debbie Panos was nurderad by Janes Chappell, she rade a call for help and that call was to Latrons Snith, and you all heard her testify.

She wasn't healing anything with sex. She was't trying to appease anyore. She was calling for help, help. But all of this didn't fit in with Dr. Danton's 8 hypothesis, so when Mr. Patrick asked why the state chose to cross-exanine him, why state questioned the conciusions he dred, it's because be didn't examine the evidenoe. It's because he igrored the history of the relationship.
It's because his hypothesis didn't rely on any factual
infomation relevant to this case. But it's the state that's hiding the ball.

We also heard fram Dr. Etcoff. He did an

1 examination of the defendant ten years ago, did sane
2 psychological testing on him and asked lanes chappell to
3 describe the events that occurred and cane to the
a conclusion that he had been truthfil and honest with 5 hin.

7 will, the percentage of free will that we all bave at 3 various manents. And Dr, Etcoff really didn't want to get into that conversation, because he didn't want to concede that really James Chappell had free will throughast his life. He made decisions on the 3lst. He made a decision to threaten ber on the 30th. He nade a decision to give a false name to the police on the first. He was always acting with free will.

But it's the state that's hioing the ball,
not Dr. Etcoff, who mon't put a percentage on when you have free will and when you con't. These sort of anorphoss theories about how in control or rot in control we all are of our om lives. Instead he makes excuses for the deferdant. He wasn't capable of mading a positive adaptive decision that day, Really. He was nad at Dekbie Paros for leaving him. He didn't want her to do that, and so he killed her. He solved his problen on the 31st.

Dr. Etcoff also talked about the had
childhood that Janes Chappell had, his father, apparently
asked him to participate in criminal activity. He heard frou his brother, who had his onn criminal history, and he talked about an uncle who had been mardeted. Ard certainly there's no guestion that the defendant in this case did not have an ideal chilchood. He didn't have a great experienoe growing up. Bot none of that outweighs the violence that he inflected on Detbie paros on the $31 t$.
Dr. Etcoff talked about Mr. Chappell's abusive grandmother, the corporal punishent that she used. And certainly there's probably great debate about the extent of corporeal puniskment and hou - when it goes over the line, or when it's appropriate and when it's not.

But it's inportant to remerber that this crime wasn't done by a 9 -year-old boy. This crime wasn't done by a 10 -year-old boy. This crime was done by a 26-year-old man, hho wasn't living at hane, who was living with the mother of his three children. And this is done by a 26 -year-old man who had been given chance, after chance, after chance in the criminal justice systen. He was arrested on felony charges. They got reduced to gross misdeneanors. When he was getting sentenced on the gross misdeneanor, he could have been sent to jail, could have got probation, he got another chance.

1
2 have been sent back to jail, but he got another chance. A
chance to go to durg courseling. These were dec: sions
that a 26 -year-old man made con August 31st. He chose not to go to the drug counseling program. He chose to make a right turn and head for Debbie Panos' house.
he heard about the defendant who atterded
special ed. We heard that to same extent the scrool
systeri seemed to address same of those issues. In fact, he was going to a nomal high school by the time he reached that age. But that's when his drug problents start.
Nos certainly the fact that he had this
troubled u-bringing ard be kas in an enviroment that
appacently a lot of people ware doirg drugs than, would
make his life more difficult. But it doesn't erase what
he did on August 31st. And it doesn't mean that he didn't
have chanoe, after chance, after chance to adress the
very ding problers that the deferse now asks you to give him same credit for.

It doesn't erase what be did. It's just part of his background. And nost of us have a background that is less than ideal. Wost of us have had parents or were raised be pecple who didn't do a perfect job. But it doesn't diminish what he do as adults. It doesn't take

## away his actions.

Mr. Qatrick asked an interesting guestion.
He said the state spent all this time asking these two
doctors for the - about the defendant's version of the events. You recall that. We went through that with Dr.
Etcoff, as well a Dr. Danton. Step by step, minute by
mirate how this marder ocourred. And according to the
defense this was just a waste of time. Why on earth would
the state spend time on that. But the answer is canpletely obvious.

If the defendant was not being honest
about what occurred, if he didn't describe events
accurately and honestly, how con you trust any of the
conclusions offered by these tho doctors, who, of course,
relied solely on the deferdant hinself in maxing their
evaluations or these conclusions.
The issue is was he honest when he save
8 those versions of events to the doctors. And you krow by
9 now he was campletely not honest. You know what he
20 described doesn't match the crime soene photos. So y/h
1 have to ask yourself, do you think Dedbie Paros was truly
happy to see him on the 31st, when he climbed through that
wirdow, Do you think Eebbie Panos was truly waiting to
offer him oral sex after he acolsed her of being with
scmeone else and clains that, well, I sensed scmething
different when I was kaving intercourse with her. Do you
think tee was being truly honest when he said Debbie Paros
suggested that they two go get those kids together from
the day care. The place where she dion't have hirn on the pick-וp list.

You think he was being truthful when he said he found this letter conveniently enough away from every other letter in the car and that the two struggled over it. You think he was truthful about that, the struggle that occur in the car It doesn't natch the physical evidence. That letter is rot in the car. And all the pieces are outside of it.

If he is not being trethful about hhat he cescribed to those doctors, then his version of events is completely suspect and of course that relates to the sexalal assault.

The sexual assanlt in this case is a really simple question. You know they had sex. His cik is found in her vagina. No guestiors about that. Sexual intercourse occurted that day. So your duty, or your job as jurors is to decide a really sirple question. Do you think she consented to it that day. Do you thirk Deobie Panos went from Mike Pollard's ourch into the amाs of the deferdant thrilled to be having sex with him. The man who threatened to kill her the day before. The one she was
plannira on leaving.
You think Debbie Panos changed her mind
that quickly, went from shaking in a ball on the couch to, gee, I'm glad to see you honey. It's like a pron date, he came through a wimiow and surprised her. What a happy day that must have been.

The defendant actually offered a version
of event that contradicts completely the physical evidence
in the case, because of course according to him he never
even ejaculated in her. Fell, that doesn't ratch the evidence at all. So could he be being honest. Is it possible maybe he's describing sanething that didn't occur, didn't ocaur how he described it.

The defenkant says that Debbie panos was hane shen he got there. Detective Vaccaro testified about the time it would take for him to walk from the Department of Parole and Probation over to the Vera Johrson apartments and get the bike. And you know of course that cerble Panos made a call at $12: 30$ in the aftencoon. You krow where she was at about 12:00 o'clock. She was at Mike Polland's house.

So defenciant got there before she dic. He surprised her and when she got there the fight was on. He had gone through the letters, He was mad at her. He had threatened to kill her. Asd he knew that he was losing

1 control over her. He knek it was done and she was leaving 2 him.
3 The deferdant says that when he got in the 4 car with Debbie Panos he was upset because there were beer 5 cans aild over the inside of the car. Look at the photos. 6 You have the inside of the car films. It's has teen 7 captured by the polipe. Theres ro beer can in trere. 8 He's lying about that.

The defendant says that he was upset
10 because he saw this box of eipty beer cans around the side It of the house. You have the crime scene photos. There is 12 no box. There's no box of beer cans. The defendint said
3 that he fought over the letter and Debbie Panos and he 4 struggled over it in car. She got ahold of it, But we 15 know the letter was not in the car. So nothing he is 16 describing is matching the physical evidence at the 7 scene.

So you have to monder why it is he's trying to acoount for a sexual contact with Debbie Panos.
And of course that's because he knew what the aggravating
circunstance was by the time he offered his versicn of events. And he's trying to account for the evidence.

But he tells suxh a poor story, such an incredible version of events, that even the defense witresses had to concede on cross-examination that that

I does sound a little odd. You bet it dees.
2 Smeone does go from being petrified and
i afraid of sameone, saneone hto's threaten is kill them,
4 to, hey, great honey, let's have sex, I'm really giad you
5 are hane fram jail. I've totally forgotten all those
6 threats you've made against ine.
The next amguent that Mr. Schieck made
with regard to the sexual assault was that there was sore
g tire gap in between the sexual assault that occurred and
) the actual act of killing. That's a pretty convenient
argment. So I guess the defense's position has shifted
slightly in that if there was a sexual assault, becuuse it
didn't occur at the exact same time as the carotid stab,
that sareiow this sexial assault didn't ocour at the same
time as the murder. But of course you know that on August
3lst of 1995 , there was a simgle criminal transaction. He
burglarized her house mhen he climbed through that window,
and from then he was angry at her and the fight was on.
Look at every single one of those autopsy photos. Ib you
think anything that happened to Debbie Pancs on that: cay was done with her consent.

Ithe fact that there weren't findings on
her genital region doesn't change the fact that she was
sexually assaulted. The instructions tell you, subnitting
to sex for fear of bodily ham or sulmitting to sex
: because someone is holding a knife on pau, or sumitting to sex because samebody is beating you up, that's not corsent, It still connts as a sexual assault. And that's exactly shat occurred in this case.

And the defendant's suggestion that
6 samehow she willingly engaged in sex, and be decided that
somehow he felt sanething different abcut ier is just absolutely ridiculous. And it's insulting. And the teaninology that he used to describe that encounter speaks wolumes about how he thought about Debbie Panos, this piece of property, this person who was there to service his needs.

Mr. Patrick spent time tellimy you that. Janes chappell is a remorseful man, and if he could he would turm back the clock. He would take it all back. Well, that's quite a gesture on his part. $\mathrm{It}^{1} \mathrm{~s}$ really easy to offer the incossible, offer Cobbie Panos, if she's out there, I would change places with you, I'd turn back the clock.
then considering how remorseful or gerninely remorseful you think this defendant is, rementer what he told the parole and probation officer Duffy, he told hin that he's tired of being in jail. He told him te was ready to adiress his drug problen. He told him he had gemuinely changed his attitude. He also told him, I'll be
back by 1:00 o'clock. Hias any of that true. He got out the door and made a right turn to Debbie Panos' house. And it wasn't just Dr. Duffy that got snowed by the defendant. Or. Etcoff was snowed just as well. The dactor who assessed truthfulness, the doctor who
applied these validity tests to the deferdant's comments.
He said on cross-examination that had he knom all of the
inforration, had be heard about the witness statenents,
had he revieined the autopsy photos, he might have reached a different conclusion. That's probably a very accurate staterent and probably an understatement at that.

You krow this defendants prior behavior, I'm sure he mould say a bunch of things about that. He would say he's sorry about breaxing her nose. In fact, he referred to that in his testimony which was read to you. He called it the accident that Debbie and I had with the cup. Loes that seen like an accurate portrayal of what happered when be slashed her noise and lacerated her eye with an object. Was that an accident. Like these two wete suddenly a caple arad made sane wromy tum and an accident occurred between the two of then.

This was him breaking her nose. But he's a resorseful guy. I'm sure he'd say he's sorry about pulling a knife on her and straddling her in Juse. She asked for that. I'm sure he was sorry about all of these
incidents. I'm sure he was really sad when he went in her
bathroom and washed off her blood. And ask yourself, how
much remorse do you think he felt when he said, I'll just
take the car because that's a quicker getaway than the bike.
6
the facts suygest that he masn't remorseful at all. How
remorseful do you think he vas when he got to the Vera
Jotnson Apartnents and started negotiating with kiloma
Jackson and Debra Turner about the price of the car
rental. There had to be same real grief their as he was
selling then some shrimp and a pie, probably overcone with grief.

The reality was he was their frierd, the
guy they nicknamed hip hop, and they saw him dancing
around acting like nothing happened. Sure he was devastated.

Ask yourself as ise was sitting there getting high that night, how urach grief ise was feeting over the fact that his children were spendirg the night in Child Haven.

How about his statement after the jeath -this statement, she got caught and she probably thrught I
was going to let her get away with scmething. Thece's
sore real remorse there. That's sameone who truly

## understands the gravity of nhat he's done.

When the defense tells you that Janes
Chappell is this troinled guy, axd he's got a low -Q. He
doesn't have any trouble manewrering through the system.
He didn't have any trouble convincing a judge to give him
the benefit of probation. He didn't have any trouble
convincing a PsP officer -- parole and probation
officer - to give him another chance, let him go to dnug
treatment for himself. He was strart enough to realize
when he got caught for shoplifting right after the murder
he should give a fake name and the did. He was srart
enough to know he should try to ditch those social
security cards. And he tried to do that as well.
The defense in this case has asked you for rercy on behalf of this deferdant. They suggested to you that he warrants rercy because of his troubled chillonood.
And, again, you know I don't think anyone is really disputing that his childhood was less than perfect.

The other main reason for mercy, according c to the defense, is that he had this drug problem. But, of course, he made the decisiors about drugs. It was his decision to becore involved in drugs. It was his decision not to take advance of treatrent. And certainly he wasn't 1 on drugs the night that he did - or the day he did the 25 murcher. He even says that.

1 2 really do you have it in yourselves, or are you a merciful 3 person because as jurors you are serving a different role in this case. You don't just one Jares Chappell the 5 consideration of nercy, you owe the victins and the State 6 of Nevada a just sentence as well. It's probably tempting 7 in this case to give life without, that seents like a realistic sentence. You probably would feel like you are not giving him any breaks at all with a life without sentence.

But you need to ask yourself, is that truly justice for what he did over the years. What panishment reflects what he did to Debbie Panos, not just that day, but over time. What punishment reflocts how he degradad her by calling her bitch and slut. Hhat punisiment cortpensates for breaking her nose. She had to go to work with that object on her nose after it was broken and tell her friends what happened. He humiliated her. Shat puniskent ocmpensates her for holding a knife to her in her om home so he could get infomation because he thought she was gone too long that day.

This fram the person tho spent his days taking her money and going and getting high for the day. What punishent acoounts for all of that. that punishtent is justified for taking the life of a 26 -year-old young
woman, a mother of three. Or how about what punisprent accounts for Noma Penfield's loss the day. She lost her daughter, James Chappell brutally turdered ter only child that day. What compensates her.

Has that changed for her over ten years.
6 Does she stiul bear that loss, that burden ten years later. I mean, really the reality is it was easy for him after he got arrested on Septexber ist, '95. It was all done for him at that point. He didn't have to deal with the aftemath of the devastation he caused. He didn't have to look two littie boys in the face and tell then their mother wasn't oaning back. He didn't have to listen to an eight-year-old boy ask for sleeping pills. He didn't have to listen to any of that. He didn't have to listen to a four-year-old girl talk about -- asking ber grandmother to sing like mom did. He dion't have to see any of his children's faoes when they wanted their mother over the years when they missed her. He didn't have to arrange, at all, for Debbie Panos; body to be transported to Hichigan. He was spared all of that. Those pieces were picked up by Koma Penfield.

He got to sit and worry about himself and Fonmlate the best spin on events, the best version. Asxd that's all he has ever done his whole life. He got to tell the doctors about his problens and his trombled
childhood. It's so typical of bow he spent his whole life.

He sells those children's coats and shoes, and Detbie horks three jous so she can buy nore. He beat Debbie in Tucson and she decides to move to Las Vegas so they can get a fresh start. He treats Debbie badly, and she tells her on mother, well, his gramather wasn't nice to him, she threw hir out. But the problem is what the did on that day, on Alujust 31st, is so treacherous and so selfish and so evil there's truly no fixing what he did.

There will never by exact punistment for what he did on that day. He mon't be invaded in his own hane no matter what punishsent you impose. No matter mhat proushment you impose, he won't be violated before the purishant is inposed on him. No matter wat you choose 17 be won't have to endure someone beating him. He ron't 18 have his upper ama bruised. He won't have his ear 19 bruised. He won't be hit repeatedly in the face, and he 20 won't be aspirating, spitting up his own blood wondering where his children were. He'll be spared all of that, no matter what you choose.

Most importantly, no matter what
ponisment you choose to impose on the defenciant, it hon't 25 be unjustified punishment. Dełbie's murder was the
: cpposite. It was unjustified, She was killed for no
2 reason. The only reason why Debbie got killed tha: day is
3 because te didn't like her leaving the relationship.
\& Punishrent is different than that.
5 When you inpose the panishrent on him, it will be because of things be chose to do. He chose not to go to drug treatment that day. He chose to climb through that rindow. He chose to pick up a that knife. He chose to violate her. He chose to kill ber. And then he chose to leave it all behind. Bat now you're the decision maker. He's not the decision maker anymore. And te doesn't get to dictate the end, the final chapter of the relationship between James chappell and babbie Pancs. That's your decision. That's your call, collectively. All those decisions that Jares made over the yoars to spend money, to hit Debble, to sell her children's clothes, he's out of the decision at this point, ard that's your role as jurors.

解've atl said and you all know at this point that the punisiment should fit the crime. And when you consider the decade of toment that he inflicted on this woman, the loss that he imposed on three young children, the loss that he imposed on her mother, and his attitude after the fact, there's only one punisinent and that's the death penalty.
7 is talk amongst yourself, elect a foreperson, then tell ma
a what you want to do.
to do some deliberating right after they've heard closivy
1 arguments, but it's 5:45, So I'll take my cle from you.
If you want to stay, I'll stay. If it's your decision you
want to come back tomorrow and begin anen in the moming,
by all means we can do that as hell.
Wo ahead and get back and get and discuss
16 it.
17
18 charge.

OFFICER: I do.
THE COURT: Ms. Staley and Mr. Scott, you all are the altemates, so when you go back -- the other
tulve of you are going to go back and elect a foreperson and chat about what I jurt discussed.

Wolly will take the tro of you.
Essentially you are still umer the actronition about not
discussing the case until you hear from us, telling you
that the remaining jurors have reacted a verdict and the
case is concluded, in case one of you has to come back and deliberate.

Thank you.
(Jury escorted out of the coustrocn.)
The jury gets the trial instructions to go
back with then as well. It would be my intent to send
then the trial instnuctions fran this case, but in
particular, Instruction No. 43, as I was looking back
through them from the trial tells the trial jury in
arriving at a verdict in this case as to whether the defendant is quilty or not guilty, subject of peralty or punishment is not to be discussed or considered by you, and should in no way influence your verdict.

If the jury's verdict is murder in the
first degree, you will at a later hearing consider the subject of penalty or punishment.

If we give then these instructions I think
we should not give then, at least, that instruction. I
don't want this jury to think that the last jury was taxed
with deciding penalty or punishtent.
MR. OWFN: I agree with the court. But
when I give instructions back there defining these other
crimes like burglary and robbery, they may get confused
about rhat their function is.
THE COAFT: Personally, it would le my
opinion that they probably don't need the trial
instuctions. It's always given to them because usually
the same jury is hearing both.
PR. SCAIDCK: sith it being a different
1 proceeding and a different jury that didn't have to
15 consider those issues, they don't need those instructions.
6 They're toId that another jury decided all of those 7 issues.

THE CORRT: Okay. Do you both agree and
stipulate we will not give then the instunctions fram the
underlying trial.
MR. OMPW: They got instructions on
reasonable doubt and burden.
THE COORT: Okay.
THE COURT: You're in agrement.
MR. SCHIECK: Yes.

5 court's order which was the basis for the reversal of the
6 penalty phase and the reason why we're in this proceeding,
7 the decision by Judge Douglas, I believe, confimed by the
Suprene Court and the order of affimance that the tefense
failed to call certain witnesses that would have mate a
difference in the out come of the original case.
There was eight or nine witnesses that
2 were detailed in the briefs and the decision. For the record, my notation on that nould indicate that that would
be Sherily Cerrell ratames Ford, Ivory Morrell, Chris Bardo, David Green, Benjawin Dean, Clara Axam, Barbara Dean, and Ennestire Harvey. Of those nine names the deferdant only called two of then, by my urerstanding
deferdant only called two of then, by my urderstanding
There were five of then that were not
called, no affidavits were stonitted no letters pere
written in, no testimpny was given in sumary by third
called, no affidavits were stonitted no letters pere
written in, no testimpny was given in sumary by third parties. 㢮 called one of them. It was the $\cdots$ through testimony reading todiay, that was Clara Axom, the
defendant's grandnother, he read her testimony in.
The court aentioned that they anticipated
that on the new penalty hearing there would be sme
M. Chtw : Yes,

THE CORT: We'll give them all the
evidence and the penalty phase instuctions.
MR. CWFNS: I went back and reviewed the
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Tadritional factors that she would put into the record that
hould assist the defendent, but we didn't get to those.
And I'mbringing this to the court's attention out of an abuydarce of caution, try to protect
the record we have here, because essentially the have two
s of those witnesses of the eight or nive that they sent
this back to testify in this proceeding. That wes all.
THE COURT: Mr. Schieck.
MR. SCHIECK: Your Honor, I don't krow -
9
10 I haven't reviened the suprene court opinion for some
time. Sore of those witnesses related to the original petition and supplemental petition, which address both guilt and peralty phase issues. Certainly I'm familiar with all of the names of those witnesses, and there were reason why most was -- that weren't called, weren't called.

But James Ford and Ivory Morrell were here, ready, willing, and able to testify. Honever we ran rather long. They had to go back. We already made a record on that.

He did have Fred Dean, Benjamin Dean, and Charles Dean testify. Their mother, Barbara Dean is very 23 ill on three times a week dialysis and can't travel. 24 Clara Axca, is deceased. Mr. Bardo is gone somentere that 25 no one can find. We did speak yith him years and years 153
ago in preparation for the supplenental petition, but he
disappeared before we could get him to sign an affidavit.

Likewise, with Mr. Green also. He has resurfaced. He's in prison in Arizona and wouldn't have been available. Ke didn't feel he would be a good witness to call.
8 So of all of those names of the witnesses
we called the witnesses we felt were necessary and apprcopriate in this penalty hearing.

THE CORR: Just for the record, you all
were the ones that pursued the post-conviction relief on
behalf of Mr. Chappell in front of Judge Doxylas, correct.
W. Schteck: Correct. That was ne in 6 private practice, your Honor.

THE COVkI: So I trust that in pursuing
8 that claim, then subsequently prevailing on this
19 post-conviction claim as to the penalty hearing and
0 undertaking an investigation of the same thing that you
1 were able to contact everybody that was available for
2 contact, investigated in the manner you felt was
appropriate to put together witnesses you thought sere
appropriate for the hearing we've had over the last week-and-a-half.

1
2 Honor.
3
1 post-conviction petition alleging ineffective ounsel and
going to investigate, you tend to make a lot of
allegations concerning what should have been done by trial
counsel. When you actually get dom to later on in the
proceeding where you're actually making decisions on who to call and who not to call, sometimes you make different decisions The point in this case is none of those pecple were even talked to. That was the original complaint, none of these people were -- these names were provided to previous counsel and were never even contacted or talked to.
allegations to begin with, which eventually ended up in the Supreme Court.

THE CONFT: That was the issue I raised
that with a broad stroke on post-conviction you'll -- when
there hasn't been any or little investigation you dor't
know even all these names provide who's got the
information that's relevant to present during the heariog.
So bring of the post-conviction clain and alleging that
none of these witnesses were contacted, you kind of have
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: to do that without nothiry everything everybody is going
2 to say, nobody talked to them in the beginning.
So to the extent that after defense
( prevailed on the issue then you undertook to investigate
5 to prepase for a new penalty hearing, the fact that things
s get whittle domn to shat they were today, is not wreasonable, but obviously appropriate as well.

I'll just state for the record, there was a great deal of bestinony from a numer of people that grew up with Hr. Chapeell, family merbers, as well as
friends to explain his chilchood ard the dynamics of
things in his hame with his grandoother as well as,
sibilings testifying to a certain degree, and some of his
friends testifying and infomation from affidavits being
brorght out about similar things.
In addition to the three expert witnesses
that defense prodiced. So -- anything else, Mr. Orens.
VR. OFWN: No, thank you, your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you all very axin.

〈uury deliberating.)
TEE COMRT: The jury will return tomorrow
moming at 9:00 o'clock.
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| clock 99：12， | caniny 8：5r 31：10 | complete 102：20． | coordinate 7：10． | 155：7，155：13． | 105：22，106：．， |  |
| 105：7，141：15， | 31：23，34：2， | campletely 136：10， | coordirated 7：13， | counseled 63：3． | 134：1，134：2， |  |
| 141：19． | 57：10，68：6． | 136：19，137：15． | 7：14． | counseling 69：11， | 134：21， |  |
| close 7：24，11：15， | ，123：15，123：17， | 138：8． | cupe 97：20， | 135：3；135：5． | 140：16． |  |
| 63：23，97：2， | 132：10， | completing | 121：4． | coumts 76：20， | critical 76：22． |  |
| 100：13． | 146：12． | 55：13． | copied 38：9， | 141：3． | cross－Examination |  |
| close－krit 7：19． | oorment 69：14． | compliance | 38：12． | Cownty $1: 7$ 7，33：1， | 3：8，3：19， |  |
| closeress 97：3． | 80：4，126：20， | 73：15． | copies 38；8． | 68：15． | 10：11，14：23， |  |
| CLOSING 3：23， | 131：6． | cupplimented | 38：13，38：18． | corple 13：14， | 35：0，35：14， |  |
| 3：24，3：25， | commentary 17：1， | 113：25． | cops 91：23． | 17：10，25：16， | 86：22，95：19， |  |
| 3：26，29：19， | 30：1，125：23， | comprehension | copy 19：11，25：19， | ，28：18，54：1． | 139：25，142：7． |  |
| 50：20，50：23， | 128：7，128：8． | 96：7． | 26：4，26：13， | 69：22，79：19， | cross－eramine |  |
| 67：17， $126: 13$, $105: 10$, $126: 16$, | cammentator 62.1 | compulsion | $26: 14$, $37: 14$, $37: 14$, 37 | 142：20． | 35：12，132：16． |  |
| 149：3．149－10． | camments 122：2， | osi 95：15，119：19， | 90：10． | 62：18，62：19， | 28：16． |  |
| clothed 115：14， | 126：20，127：9， | 119：20，119：20， | corying 94：9， | 87：23，104：1， | crossed 69：17． |  |
| 115：18． | 142：6． | 120：9，120：16， | 94：15． | 136：14，137：15， | cruel 128：16． |  |
| clothes 77：12， | comatssion 43：13， | 122：10． | cond 93：4． | 138：9，138；18， | cry 54：19． |  |
| 148：17． 22.4 | 44：4，75：22． | cancede 133：9， | corda 93：3． | 139：20，140：15． | crying 57：16． |  |
| clothing 22：4， 68：1， | comat 69：18． cummitments | 139：25． <br> cormelved 33：18． | core 78：8． | 144：21． | cue 149：11． 38.3 ． |  |
| clown 53：8． | 6：15． | concentrated | corporal 134：10． | 63：17． | culpability 44：7， |  |
| cloms 53：2， | comidited 42：19， | 77：25，77：25． | copporeal | conutrocm． | 117：18． |  |
| 53：9． | 43：16，88：12， | concentration | 134：12． | 150：13． | cap 58：9，58：13， |  |
| clue 9；11． | 117：6． | 62：24，69：4， | Correct 5：20，7：5， | cover 66；21． | 58：10，69：15， |  |
| co－worker 53：25， | cormitting | 64：4，64：10， | 10：17，10：20， | crack 94：22． | 142：17． |  |
| 67：2． | 67：25． | 92：22．90 | 11：16，14：19， | crawl 75：14． | guriosity 15：11． |  |
| co－workers 54：23， 132：3． | cammon $49: 19,9114: 21$. | concept 94：37．3． | 24：13， $25: 25,11$, | 84：19．70：15． | curious 130：4． <br> cat 63：23，78：2， |  |
| coats 147：3． | comminicate 23：7， | concepts 95：6． | 154：14，154：15， | crawls 77：11． | 78：10．${ }^{\text {cat }}$ |  |
| cocaine 94：22r | 33：10，95：15． | concern 34：16． | 155：1． | create 73：9． | cuts 61：11． |  |
| 97：15，97：18， | cmimication | 51：6，57：15． | corrections | credibility 37：9r | cycle 100： |  |
| 107：24， | 31：3． | concerned 39：25， | 50：5． | 48：20． | 100：3，100：4． |  |
| 121：13． | communty 7：20． | 94：2． | correctly $89: 11$. | credit 93：15． | 101：1． |  |
| cold 10：2， | Compared $32: 24$ ， | concerning 34：12， | corresporis 25：6． | 135：20． |  |  |
| 100：12． | 94：12，95；23． | 40：16，116：24． | corresporidence | crine 43：13， |  |  |
| collect 53：8． | 4parisar | concerns 94：3． | 32：17，32：25． | 44：20， $45: 53: 12$, | ＜ $\mathrm{dad}^{27}$ |  |
| 15：10． | mpassion | concluded | 30：22，32：20． | 75：22，70：7， | daily 125；7． |  |
| collectively | 52：23． | 150：10． | corresponds | 76：8， 85.16 ， | Dale 28：20． |  |
| 107：1，148：14． | compassionate | concludes 149：2． | 118：16． | 85：16，103：25， | demage 76：2． |  |
| color 29：9． | 52：3． | concluding | cost 52：19．80：9， | 117：25，119：24， | dance 69：16． |  |
| colors 22：6． | $\begin{aligned} & \text { compal 83: } 1 \text {, } \\ & \text { A4:19. } \end{aligned}$ | 125：1． | 80：13． | 130：12，134：16． | danced 83：25． |  |
|  |  | conctur 166 | couch 130：25， | 134：16，134：1）． | dances 8：16． | 169 |
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| 104；8，108：6， | 117：10，117：10， | form 17：6，19：8， |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10日：9． | 116：22，133：13， | 19：12，30：6， |
| filed 76：14． | 150：24 | 38：12，49：22， |
| f111 119：7， | fit 100：18， | 115－24，119：25 |
| 119：11． | 100：22，132：17， | 119：12，119：15， |
| films 139：6． | 148：20． | 126：3． |
| final 148：12． | fits 100：19， | formal 18：1． |
| Finally 17：9， | 102：2，104：5． | formed 130：4． |
| 30：8，54：25， | flve 16：15，50：18， | ，Fomming 91：15， |
| 68：2，94：21， | 54：2，109：2， | 93：22． |
| 126：5． | 152；18． | Forms 3日： 1 ，38：13， |
| find 39：24，41：2 | fix 36：18，40：19， | 50：16，109：16， |
| 42：1，42：6， | 40：21． | 118：20，118：21， |
| 47：23，68：15， | fixed 38：10， | 119：3，119：5， |
| 71：19． $88: 8$ ， | 50：13． | 149：5． |
| 69：19，106：21． | fixing 147：10． | fommate |
| 107：6，107：22， | flatgyed 131：17． | 146：23． |
| 107：25，108：4， | flat 86：23． | forth 19：2，21：6， |
| 109：11，108：13， | floor 52：20， | 32：21，116：10， |
| 108：13，100：13， | $71: 22,74: 11$. | 157：12． |
| 109：16，113：6， | 75：3，75：17， | foster 33：12， |
| 118：3，118：4， | 78：14． | 124：20． |
| 118：4，118：18， | folks 35：8， | foughe 131：22， |
| 118：23．118：25， | 35：9， | 139：13． |
| 119：6，153：25． | follon 39：22． | fourd 9：14，20：9， |
| Finding 5：8， | following 36：22， | 41：17．41：19． |
| 73：21，103：3， | 42：17，45：7． | 42：4，70：17， |
| 107：15，116：8． | force $35: 2,36: 25$ ， | 73：7，74：19， |
| findirgs 41：19， | 43：12，43：15， | 96：5r 96：9， |
| 99：16，99：16， | 101：3，113：23， | 96：22，108：21， |
| 102：10，103：11． | 131：12． | 108：22，109：22， |
| 114：1，140：22． | forced 72：22， | 111：24，119：8， |
| finds 71：10． | 113：20． | 120：4，120：7， |
| Flne 23：15，93：3， | Ford 5：19，6il， | 137：7，137：19． |
| 113：25． | 6：3，10：13， | four $50: 18$ ， |
| finish 16：18． | 11：15，12：16． | 109：22． |
| finished 89：21． | 13：19，152：14， | four－year－old |
| fired 6：19， | 153：17． | 146：15． |
| firs 110：15． | foregoing 157：11， | fourteen 60：11． |
| First 13：16， | 157：15． | fourth 35：3， |
| 36：14，36：19， | torehead 58：12， | 93：17，93：19． |
| 36：23，40：21， | 66：19． | 93：20，110：6， |
| 42：18，45：3， | Foreman 119：7． | Etamentork |
| 56：11，59：14， | Eorensic 90：4， | 106： 12. |
| 91：15，80：23， | 90：7． | Frarkle 62：21， |
| 89：14，92：1， | froreperson 149：7， | 63：24， |
| 98：24，102：6， | 150：4． | Fred 153：21． |
| 106：19，106：22， | forever 15：22． | Free 64：8，64：9， |
| 112：17．116：7， | forged 81：10． | 79：25，81：10， |
| 117：8，117：9， | Forgotten 140：5． | 81：10，81：19， |


| 135：8，156：3 | 102：12，110：39， | 92：6，97：10， |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| exteruating 44：6， | 143：6，143：7． | 99：2，100：21， |
| 117：17． | factual 132：22． | 100：22，118：11． |
| extemakly 16：7． | failed 152：9． | 133：25． |
| extra 53：34． | fair 64：22，79：21， | ，fault 57：8，60：11， |
| extremply 100：6， | 61：1，86： 6. | 61：5，60：7， |
| 127： 2 ，127：14． | fairly 50：19， | 80：17． |
| eye 80：22，80：23， | 82：12． | faults 16：2． |
| 142：18． | faimegs 44：6r | fear 43：25，51：11， |
|  | 86：12，117：17． | 97：3，121：7， |
|  | faithfully 21 ；6． | 123：1，140：25． |
| $<\mathrm{E}$ | fake 144：11． | fears 48：22． |
| Face 53：23，53：2 | fall 30：20，30：21 | fed 10：1， $79: 25$. |
| 54：16，67：11， | 52：20，90：9， | Eeal 6：23， $24: 23$ ， |
| 114：11，131：25， | 119：20． | 24：75，46：14， |
| 146：11， | fallen 106：2， | 49：12，81：5， |
| 147：19． | falls 95：20． | 82：4，96：24， |
| faces 146：17． | false 126：29， | 112：15，145；日， |
| face 19：25，31：16， | 133：13． | 154：6． |
| 49：3，58：20， | familiar 82：24， | feeling 121：6， |
| 60：20，69：4， | 153：13． | 122：13， |
| 90：23，97：10， | fatsily 7：11， | 143：19． |
| 103：4，107：22， | 12：14，15：20， | feelings 19：9， |
| 108：2，108：4， | 15：20，15：25， | 48：23，96：13， |
| 111：25，113：14， | 51：23，59：11， | 97：16，129：7． |
| 120：1，120：12， | 59：17，84：25， | Feels 72：18， |
| 125：11，128：13， | 85：3，85：9， | 83：11，自3：12． |
| 129：18，130：19， | 85：13，90：18， | Eellatio 43：10． |
| 135：9，135：13． | 90：22，90：23， | felony 20：6， |
| 140：22，140：23， | 91：12，104：14， | 134：22． |
| 142：14，143：20， | 104：17，130：7， | fult 125：4r 129：7， |
| 148：24，156：5． | 156：10． | 141：7，143：3， |
| factor 44：11， | far 22：6． | 154：9，154：22． |
| 107：24．10．${ }^{\text {a }} 14$ ， | fascists 62：25． | Eotal 72：24， |
| 110：10． | 6A：10． | 77：5． |
| factored 121：3， | Eashion 92：24， | Een 26：14，58：7， |
| 121：8． | 95：7． | 63：9，85：11， |
| factors 33：6， | fast 23：20， | 90：22，94：15． |
| 36：22，37：3， | 50：14． | fifteen 114：25． |
| 42：17，44：3， | frit 85：24． | fifth 24；1． |
| 98：23，112：15， | fatal 73：10，75：7， | fight 101：16， |
| 116：17，116：24， | 75：16，78：21． | 138：23， |
| 117：11，117：14， | father 9：25， | 140：18． |
| 118： $6,118: 12$, | 22：14，45：11， | fighting 68：23， |
| 119：22，153：1． | 45：14，56：14， | 71：23．73：22． |
| facts 15：14， | 61：24，84：9， | fights $8: 17$ ， |
| 39：24，43：22， | 84：9，84：13， | 8：19． |
| 68：20，70：12， | 87：22，91：25， | figure $45: 14$ ， |
| 76：11，79：22， | 92：1，92：2， | 97：11，97：12． |
| 82：19，63：23． | 92：3，92：3． | 99：2，100：22， |


| 90：17r 106：2 | 89：23，98：12， | 133：4，136：116 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 106：6，106：12， | 102：2，103：18， | 136：17，136：19， |
| 110：14，150：24， | 121：20，123：7， | 137：2，138：11． |
| 151：12，152：25， | 130：3，130：9． | homestly 136：13． |
| 154：10，154：19， | Wding 132：24， | borey 138：4， |
| 154：24，155：23， | 133：15． | 140：4． |
| 156：5， | High 8：13，8：16， | Jtomer 12：21，13：9， |
| hears 72：1． | 24：日，24：10， | 13：22，14：3， |
| Hearsoy 36：17， | $65: 21,94: 4$, | 18：4，19：19， |
| 40：17． | 94：5，120：11． | 22：9，25：11， |
| heart 52：20， | 135：10，143：19， | 26：14，26：17r |
| 55：13，55：14， | 145：23． | 26：22r 29r14． |
| 61：11． | highligited | 29：2，29：5， |
| held 13：13，26：11． | －111：10． | 29：15．30：19． |
| 55：4，55：5， | 122：15． | 32：4，32：6． |
| 80：19，85：21， | hughlightirg | 37：22，37：25， |
| 132：8． | 112：15． | 38：3，38：6， |
| hell 51：4，123：6 | hip 143：15． | 30：20．36：23． |
| 123：11，123：22， | hired 99：21， | 50：22，153：9， |
| 124：6． | 99：23． | 154：16，155：2， |
| help 4：18，7：22， | history 11：21， | 156：18． |
| 15：25，16：7， | 67：17，89：15， | HCNORARIE 1：27． |
| 21：7，27：3， | 91：10，91：11， | hook 64：10． |
| 71：13，71：14， | 94：20，102：24， | hop 143：15． |
| 92：5，92：7． | 116：16．132：21， | hope 79：24， |
| 93：16，94：18． | 134：2． | 94：8． |
| 97：16，102：4， | Hit 22；24，58；14， | hopefully $06: 2$ |
| 124：10，131：15， | 65；21，77：24， | horrible 65：10， |
| 131：19，131：25， | 78：8，78：12， | 104：6．116：4． |
| 132：13．132：16， | 114：12，147：19， | borribly 112：20． |
| 132：17． | 148：16． | horror 65：11． |
| 149：25． | hits 77：23． | 65：13，81：24． |
| helped 00：14． | hitting 127：22． | bours 7：16，77：日， |
| helping 63：16， | hold 68：3．111：18． | 67：2，93：8． |
| 80：13． | 124：1． | houte 8：3，9：10， |
| helplessmess | holding 73：17， | 9：20，20：4， |
| 101：3． | 86：4，141： 1. | 73：2，偁：7， |
| nereby 157：9． | 145：19． | 93： 8 ，93： $\mathbf{\theta}_{1}$ |
| HFPRDCN I：27． | bolocaust 62：22． | 93：11，93：13， |
| heroes 52：16， | hare 6：23，7：17， | 113：1，131：16， |
| 52：17，52：18． | 9：5，9：14，9：19， | 135：6，138：21， |
| 65：4． | 9：21．52：22， | 139：11，140：17． |
| herote 65：7． | 56：7，59：23， | 142：2． |
| herself 31：4， | 70：13，93：7， | household 45：17， |
| 52：21，61：13， | 112：20，134：18， | 92：11r 118：11． |
| 75：15． | 138：15，140：5， | houses 120：7， |
| hes 68：1． | 145：20，147：14，h | housing 16：2． |
| hididen 56：20， | 156：12．$\quad 1$ | Howard 1：42． |
| 64：13． | hamicide 122：7． | 157：26． |
| hide 56：13，89：2， | bramest 15：8，91：5， | maggirg 132：1． |


| $\begin{gathered} \text { influence } \\ 150: 22 . \end{gathered}$ | instructed 36：22． $37: 7,42: 16 \text {, }$ | 55：10． <br> interval 115：7． |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| influenced 49：16， | 46：19，76：7． | intervention |
| 90：23． | Instruction 36： 15 ， | 94：17． |
| information 17：3， | 39：17，39：19， | interview 63：9， |
| 30：3．32：10， | 39：23，40：12， | 63：21，75：1． |
| 32：21．59：11， | 106：19．106：20， | 94：7，130：5． |
| 73：18，110：11， | 110：12，114：6， | 131：10． |
| 111：19，125：25， | 117：21，118：5， | interviewed |
| 132：9，132：23， | 118：16，118：16， | 19：5． |
| 142；日，145：20， | 150：17，151：2， | interviens 5：1\％， |
| 155：23， | instructs | 130：7． |
| 156：14． | 106：16． | intoxicated |
| ingredient 37：1， | Sraviting 141：8． | 120：17． |
| 43：13． | intellectual | introduce 17：11． |
| fritial 76：14． | 95：23． | 18：16． |
| Inftialty 8：8， | Intelligence | introctroed 14：16， |
| 76：16，100：12， | 95：2． | 17：21，17：24， |
| 106：13． | interd 94：10． | 19：22，46：21． |
| Enjected 61：9． | intended 14；9， | tntniting 57：2\％． |
| injuries 50：16， | 40：8，78：7， | intrusion 43：3． |
| 73：13，77：16， | 78： B ． | invaded 147：13． |
| 116：5． | intent 64：21， | invalidity 91：4， |
| injury 44：1， | 81：12，150：15． | Inventory 96：2． |
| $\begin{aligned} & 73: 14,73: 16 . \\ & 73: 20 . \end{aligned}$ | intention 82：22， $84: 2$ | investigate 155：5， 156：4 |
| 1rmates 32：20． | Intentionally | investigated |
| troncence 48：16． | 32：9， 114.9. | 154：22． |
| inguixe 14：6． | Intentiont | investigation |
| incuisit iveress | $30: 23$. | 25：19，26：2， |
| 15：11． | intercourse 43：6， | 154；20， |
| inserted 43：4． | 43：8，72：11， | 155：21． |
| ingide 70：17． | 113：20，137：1． | investigative |
| 74：10，113：3． | 137：20． | 17：12．17：15， |
| 113 7 ，139：5， | interest 15： 11. | 17：21，17：25． |
| 139；6． | 48：23，131：6． | investigator 5：7r |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { irsight } 100: 1, \\ & 100: 24 . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { interesting 86: } 19 \mathrm{r} \\ & 129: 23,136: 2 . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13:17 } \\ & \text { invitation } \end{aligned}$ |
| insistence 44：24， | intemal 79.1. | 122：3． |
| 119：1． | Internasize | involve 121：5． |
| instance 107：20， | 120：1． | involved 11：11． |
| 107：23，125：5． | intermally 16：6． | 13：4， $27: 20$ ， |
| ingtant 10：1， | internet 17：5， | 30：25，46：3， |
| 20：14． | 30：5，126：2． | 67：6，68：25， |
| Instead 50：14， | interrogating | 82：23，93：18， |
| 59：24，68：14， | 10：22． | 144：22． |
| 133：19． | intercogation | jnvolving 59：12． |
| instítution | 18：22． | 10 33：11，95：2， |
| 85：6． | tnterimt 55：12． | 95：3，95：20， |
| instruct 39：21． | interruption 55：9， | 98：24．104：9， |

180



| $\begin{aligned} & 37: 22, ~ 38: 9, \\ & 39: 14, ~ 38: 17, \\ & 69: 13,104: 25, \\ & 105: 24,126: 14, \\ & 126: 15,126: 17, \\ & 149: 1,150: 2 . \end{aligned}$Mult1-axial | $\begin{gathered} \text { necessarily } \\ 90: 20 . \end{gathered}$ <br> necessary 36:25, | $\begin{gathered} 140: 7 . \\ \text { nice } 24: 24,24: 24, \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | 60:2, 84:9. |
|  |  | 147:8. |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 122: 11,125: 4, \\ & 125: 8,154: 9 . \end{aligned}$ | ndclonamed |
|  |  | $143: 15$. |
|  | theck 53:24, 55:3, night 7:13, 54:7, |  |
| 96:2 | 73:10, 75: ${ }^{\text {1 }}$, | 61:16, 132:4 |
| murder 5: 0 , 5:9, | 75:11, 78:3, | 143:19. 143:20, |
| 36:18, 36:23, | 78:21. | 144:24. |
| 40:20, 42:17, | neoded 112:22, | nine 122:25, |
| 42:19, 45:2, | 121:19, 121:20, | 152:11, 152:16, |
| 69:17, 70:5, | 121:22. | 153: 6. |
| 76:16. 76:21, | needs 56:9, 56: | Ho. 1:2, 1:3, |
| 83:2, 88:12, | 60:1, 61:17. | 25:18, 28:12, |
| 110:19, 117:8, | 74:19, $61: 3$, | 28:24, 39:19, |
| 117:9, 117:10, | B1:3, 96:17, | 66:10, 75:19, |
| 117:11, 126:19, | 100:10, 108:8, | 106:20, 110:12, |
| 127:16, 12日:2, | 117:11, | 118:16. 131:23, |
| 128:3, 120;16, | 141:12. | 132:2, 132:5. |
| 136:7r 140:15. | negligent 61:4. | 132:10, |
| 144:10, 144:25, | negotiatirg | 150:17. |
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| 145：15． | scmatimes 112：6， | 8：15． | suminer 30：21． |  | torns 34：16， |  |
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| sprity 59：6． | stay 6：14， 6 6：17， | strange 100：21． stranger 120：3， | $6: 21$, $49: 11, ~$ 47：13， | threat 33：20， $67: 12,72,16$, | 日8：23，104；18． $152: 22,156: 6$. |  |
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| 97：23， $98: 9$ | 157：14． 79 | strons 96：11． | testing 133：2． | 68：5، 69：7， | tolerant 97：5． |  |
| 114：13，114：15， | Step 13：25，79：2， | struck 66：2， | tests 63：9，91：2， | 71：7． 33.18 | tanorich 149：13， |  |
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| stars 31：22． | stepped 65：5． | Subject 14：4， | theories 133：18． | 52：21，昭：4， | top 70：21． |  |
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| 57：16，65：24， | 151：19． | 150：25． | therein $15 \% 12$. | 146：2，147：4， | torturous |  |
| 96：38，101： | Stockholm 101：3． | subjected 81：24， | thereof $50: 9$ ． | 148：22，153：23， | 128：16． |  |
| 101：16．143：9． | stocking 28：3． | 82：21，124：6． | thereon 90； 0 ． | 156：16． | total 14：7． |  |
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| 18：19， 18 19； 14, | 111：13，122：1． stories $\theta$ ， | $30: 8$, $49 ; 24,128,126.5$ | Thinks 56：10， | 31：12， 60.7 ， | towards 15：18． |  |
| $19: 7{ }^{\text {a }}$ 19：8， | 70：1． | 152：19． | 77：9，90：3． | 130：2，133：10． | traffic 67：18． |  |
| 19：11，19：13， | storm 31：14，33：5， | submiteting 140：24r | third 50：3， | throw 66：25， | 68：12，111：12． |  |
| 19：14，19：17， | 33： $\mathrm{B}_{\text {．}}$ | 140：25，141：1． | 110：25، 119：12، | 130：22． | ragic 15：12， |  |
| 19：21．76：5， | story 32：16， | subsequently | 119：14， | thrown $71: 22$. | 88：20，104：5． |  |
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BEFORE THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS HERNDON DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
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LAS VEGAS, NEVADA; WEDNESDAY, MARCH 21, 2007
PROCEEDINGS * * * * *

THE COURT: We'll be back on the record in C-131341, State of Nevada versus James Chappell.

Let the record reflect Mr. Chappelil is preset, with his attorneys, State's attorneys, and our jury.

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, did you first of all elect a foreperson?

IMPANELED JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Who is that? Juror number one, for record is our foreperson. Ma'am did the jury reach a verdict?

IMPANELED JUROR: Yes.
THE COURT: Hand the verdict forms to my bailiff, please.

The clerk will now record the verdict into the record.

THE CLERK: Djstrjet Court, Clark County, Nevada, plaintiff, versus James Montel Chappell, defendant, case number C-131341, Department 3, Special Verdict: We the jury in the above-entitled case having heard evidence jn the above-referenced matter in which the
defendant, James Montel Chappell has previously been convicted of Count (3) first degree murder with use of a deadly weapon, designate that the aggravating circumstance or circumstances which have been checked below have been established unanimously and beyond a reasonable doubt, the murder was committed during the perpetration of a sexual assault, dated this 21 st day of March 2007, signed by the foreperson.

Special Verdict: We the jury in the above-entitled case, having heard evidence in the above referenced matter in which the defendant, James Montel Chappell has previously been convicted of count (3), first degree murder use of a deadly weapon, one or more of the jurors designate that mitigating circumstance or circumstances, which have been listed below, have been established:

1. James Chappell suffered from substance abuse.
2. James Chappell had no father figure in his life.
3. James Chappell was raised in an abusive household.
4. James Chappell was the victim of physical abuse as a child.
5. James Chappell was born to a drug,
alcohol addicted mother.
6. James Chappell suffered a learning disability.
7. James Chappell was raised in a depressed housing area.

Dated this 21 st is day of March 2007, signed by the foreperson.

Special Verdict: We the jury in the above-entitled case, having heard evidence in the above-referenced matter, in which the defendant, James Montel Chappell has previously been convicted of Count (3), first degree murder with use of a deadly weapon, find the mitigating circumstances do not outweigh the aggravating circumstance, date this 21st day of March 2007, signed by the foreperson.

Special verdict: The defendant, James Chappell, having been found guilty of Count (3), murder of the first degree with use of a deadly weapon, we the jury having found that the aggravating circumstance outweighs any mitigating circumstance impose a sentence of death, dated at Las Vegas, Nevada, this 21st day of March 2007, signed by the foreperson.

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, are these your verdicts as read, so say you one, so say you all?

IMPANELED JURY: Yes.

THE CLERK: Thank you.
THE COURT: Does either side wish to have the jury polled?

MR. SCHIECK: Yes, your Honor.
THE CLERK: Juror number one, are those your verdicts as read?

MS. JOHNSON: Yes.
THE CLERK: Juror number two, are those your verdicts as read?

MR. TAYLOR: Yes, they are.
THE CLERK: Juror number three, are those your verdicts as read?

MR. HENCK: Yes má'am.
THE CLERK: Juror number four, are those your verdicts as read?

MR SMITH: Yes, ma'am.
THE CLERK: Juror number five, are those your verdicts as read?

MS. CARDILLO: Yes.
THE CLERK: Juror number six, are those your verdicts as read?

MS. NOAHR: Yes.
THE CLERK: Juror number seven, are those your verdicts as read?

MS. BUNDREN: Yes, ma'am.
THE CLERK: Juror number eight, are those your verdicts as read?

MR. MORIN: Yes, ma'am.
THE CLERK: Juror number nine, are those your verdicts as read?

MR. WHITE: Yes, ma'am.
THE CLERK: Juror number ten, are those your verdicts as read?

MS. WASHINGTON: Yes.
THE CLERK: Juror number eleven, ase those your verdicts as read?

MR. FEUERHAMMER: Yes, ma'am.
THE CLERK: Juror number twelve, are those your verdicts as read?

MR. EORBES: Yes, ma'am, they are.
THE COURT: The clerk will enter the verdicts for the minutes.

Ladies and gentlemen -- and we're going to go ahead and set a formal sentencing date, if you would, in 45 days.

THE CLERK: May 10th, at 9:00 a.m.
THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, at this time, I'm going to excuse you. I'm sure you'11 be happy that I'm not going to recite to you that admonition one
final time. You're completely discharged from your service.

What I'm going to tell the attorneys is that after I release you here -- I'll be available to talk to you for a few minutes, if you wish -- I'll have Leslie take you back downstairs so you can get your vouchers, and if the attorneys wish to try to you for a few minutes they can meet you downstairs. I would advise you that, to the extent you have a little bit of time and can give them a few minutes, please go ahead and talk to them. It's very valuable for the attorneys, and the best way for us as attorneys to learn a little about, not only our performance as attorneys, but things you think about the case, the way things are presented, is to talk to you all because you are the representatives of the community that hear the trial, watch the process unfold and can give them the best input on how that unfolded in this particular case.

I know it's been a long week-and-a-half, but nonetheless, if you have a few minutes, I'd appreciate it if you would talk to them, and just chat with them for a few moments.

With that, I will tell you that it's obviously been a very difficult case. I realize that. It's never an easy thing to sit as a jury on a capital
penalty hearing. Nonetheless, over the last week-and-a-half you have everything expected of ycu, not only by the court and the attorneys, but by your fellow community members as well.

I thank you for the service you have given to the court system and the community.

You are free to talk to whomever you want to now. I encourage you to chat with the attorneys, but whether it's the attorneys or anybody else, you do not have to talk to anybody that you do not want to.

But to the extent somebody persists in trying to talk to you after you told them you do not wish to talk to them about the case, let Leslie know that, if it's today or any other day, you can contact my chambers and we'll do what we need to to help you out in that regard as well. But that's your decision.

Co-workers, family members, friends, you can talk to whoever you want to now. But you certainly don't have to.

Thank you, very much. You all can go with Leslie.

Still on the record, outside the presence. Does anybody have anything for the record?

MS. WECKERLy: Not on behalf of the State.

MR. SCHIECK: Your Honor, I don't know if the court would consider remanding him back to High Desert as opposed to being held here at the Detention Center, due to his custody status.

THE COURT: I don't have a probiem with that. Does the State have a problem?

MR. OWENS: I won't take a position on that.

THE COURT: I will order that Mr. Chappell be returned to High Desert State Prison. If the state would prepare a transport order and have him come back on May 10 th, for formal sentencing.

We'll be in recess. Thank you all very much.

*     *         *             *                 * 
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|  | 18 19 | 6-7 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF OCTOBER 15,1996 <br> VOLUME 6 <br> (FILED 10/16/1996) | 1530-1700 |
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|  | 24 25 | 8 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF OCTOBER 21, 1996 PENALTY PHASE VOLUME 1- AFTERNOON SESSION (FILED 10/22/1996) | 1828-1952 |
|  | 26 27 | 8 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF OCTOBER 22, 1996 PENALTY PHASE VOLUME 2 <br> (FILED 10/23/1996) | 1953-2061 |
|  | 28 | 9 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF OCTOBER 23, 1996 PENALTY PHASE VOLUME 3 <br> (FILED 10/24/1996) | 2063-2122 |


| 1 2 | 9 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF OCTOBER 24, 1996 PENALTY PHASE VOLUME 4 <br> (FILED 10/24/1996) | 2123-2133 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | 9 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF DECEMBER 11, 1996 (FILED 12/12/1996) | 2172-2174 |
| 4 5 | 9 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF DECEMBER 30,1996 (FILED 12/31/1996) | 2179-2189 |
| 6 7 | 10 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF NOVEMBER 8, 1999 <br> STATE'S MOTIONS <br> (FILED 1/13/2000) | 2363-2365 |
| 8 | 10 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF NOVEMBER 15,1999 (FILED 11/16/1999) | 2354-2356 |
| 9 10 | 10 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF DECEMBER 15, 1999 (FILED 12/16/1999) | 2360-2362 |
| 11 12 | 10 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF JANUARY 19, 2000 <br> STATUS CHECK <br> (FILED 2/29/2000) | 2366-2370 |
| $\begin{array}{lll} \text { and } & 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | 10 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF JUNE 27, 2000 <br> (FILED 6/28/2000) | 2371-2373 |
|  | 11 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF NOVEMBER 6, 2000 HEARING: WRIT <br> (FILED 12/23/2002) | 2651-2654 |
|  | 10 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF JUNE 12, 2001 (FILED 6/13/2001) | 2400-2402 |
| 18 <br> 19 | 10 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF JULY 26, 2001 STATUS CHECK ON BRIEFING SCHEDULE (FILED 8/28/2001) | 2403-2404 |
| 20 21 | 10 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF JULY 25, 2002 <br> HEARING: WRIT <br> (FILED 8/19/2002) | 2544-2549 |
| 22 | 11 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF SEPTEMBER 13, 2002 <br> (FILED 9/24/2002) | 2554-2621 |
| 23 24 25 | 11 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF APRIL 2, 2004 DEFENDANT'S PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS (FILED 7/23/2004) | 2774-2779 |
| 26 27 | 12 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF JULY 17, 2006 STATE'S REQUEST PER SUPREME COURT REMITTITUR (FILED 2/13/2007) | 2924-2926 |
| 28 | 12 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF JULY 25, 2006 <br> (FILED 2/9/2007) | 2912-2914 |


|  | 1 | 12 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OG OCTOBER 3, 2006 HEARING ON MOTIONS (FILED 2/9/2007) | 2918-2920 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 4 | 12 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF NOVEMBER 2, 2006 HEARING ON DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS (FILED 2/9/2007) | 2921-2923 |
|  | 5 6 | 12 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF NOVEMBER 16, 2006 RE: HEARING ON DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS (FILED 2/9/2007) | 2915-2917 |
|  | 8 | 12 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF JANUARY 11, 2007 PRE-PENALTY PHASE MOTIONS (FILED 2/20/2007) | 3012-3031 |
|  | 9 | 16 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF JANUARY 11 PRE-PENALTY MOTIONS <br> (FILED 4/9/2007) | 3833-3853 |
|  | 11 | 13 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF MARCH 14, 2007 MORNING SESSION <br> (FILED 3/15/2007) | 3047-3166 |
|  | 13 14 | 13 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF MARCH 14, 2007 AFTERNOON SESSION (FILED 3/15/2007) | 3167-3222 |
|  | 15 16 | 14 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF MARCH 15, 2007 <br> MORNING SESSION <br> (FILED 3/16/2007) | 3268-3404 |
| $\begin{array}{rl} 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | 17 18 | 13 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF MACH 15, 2007 AFTERNOON SESSION <br> (FILED 3/16/2007) | 3223-3267 |
|  | 19 20 | 14-15 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF MARCH 16, 2007 <br> MORNING SESSION <br> (FILED 3/19/2007) | 3450-3627 |
|  | 21 22 | 14 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF MARCH 16, 2007 <br> AFTERNOON SESSION <br> (3/19/2007) | 3405-3449 |
|  | 23 24 | 15 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF MARCH 19, 2007 PENALTY HEARING <br> (FILED 3/20/2007) | 3630-3736 |
|  | 25 26 | 16 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF MARCH 20, 2007 PENALTY HEARING <br> (FILED 3/21/2007) | 3765-3818 |
|  | 27 28 | 16 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF MARCH 21, 2007 PENALTY HEARING VERDICT (FILED 3/22/2007) | 3819-3830 |



| 1 |  | (FILED 5/16/2012) | 4479-4485 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 3 | 20 | STATE'S OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR AUTHORIZATION TO OBTAIN EXPERT SERVICES AND PAYMENT OF FEES (FILED 5/16/2012) | 4468-4473 |
| 4 5 | 20 | STATE'S OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR AUTHORIZATION TO OBTAIN SEXUAL ASSAULT EXPERT AND PAYMENT OF FEES, AND OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR INVESTIGATOR AND PAYMENT FEES <br> (FILED 5/16/2012) | 4474-4478 |
| 7 8 | 20 | STATE'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S PETITION FOR <br> WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS AND DEFENDANT'S <br> SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF <br> (FILED 5/16/2012) | 4431-4467 |
| 9 10 | 10 | STATE'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S SUPPLEMENTAL PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS (FILED 6/19/2002) | 2481-2520 |
| 11 12 | 9 | STIPULATION AND ORDER <br> (FILED 5/27/1997) | 2207-2257 |
|  | 11 | STIPULATION AND ORDER EXTENDING TIME (FILED 9/2/2003) | 2726-2727 |
|  | 1 | STIPULATION REGARDING BRIEFING SCHEDULE <br> (FILED 3/27/1996) | 208-209 |
|  | 4 | STIPULATION TO CERTAIN FACTS <br> (FILED 10/10/1996) | 844-845 |
| $\begin{array}{lll} \text { 会 } & \text { 崮 } & 17 \\ & & 17 \end{array}$ | 2 | SUMMARY OF JUROR QUESTIONNAIRE DEVELOPMENTS (FILED 10/4/1996) | 342-353 |
| 19 20 | 20 | SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT'S WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS <br> (FILED 2/15/2012) | 4562-4643 |
| 21 | 9 | SUPPLEMENTAL INSTRUCTION <br> (FILED 10/24/1996) | 2165-2166 |
| 22 23 | 10 | SUPPLEMENTAL PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS <br> (FILED 4/30/2002) | 2417-2480 |
| 24 25 | 9 | VERDICT <br> (FILED 10/24/1996) | 2167-2167 |
| 26 | 15 | VERDICT <br> (FILED 3/21/2007) | 3741-3741 |
| 27 28 | 7 | VERDICT-COUNT I <br> (FILED 10/16/1996) | 1747-1747 |
|  | 7 | VERDICT- COUNT II <br> (FILED 10/16/1996) | 1748-1748 |
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